Byzantinoslavica, Revue internationale des études byzantines 82/1–2, 2024

Mind, Intellect, and Thought(s): Noetic Terms in the Greek Monastic Literature and Their Reception in the Medieval South Slavonic Translations*

Ivan P. PETROV (Vienna)
https://doi.org/10.58377/byzslav.2024.5

The aim of this paper is to investigate the Medieval (South) Slavonic reception of Greek vocabulary relating to certain noetic terms (i.e. 'mind', 'intellect', 'thought'). This lexical layer was particularly important for parts of the Patristic literature such as the monastic writings. Its diachronic semantic development is interesting not only because it relates to anthropological understandings of the human being, but also because of its relations to classical and post-classical Greek thought and its reception in the Christian milieu. The paper tries to outline the reception of these ideas through their translation in Old Church Slavonic from the 10th and 11th centuries, and then in the later period. As a beginning, a short diachronic overview of the semantics of each of the researched lexical units is provided. Then, the Slavonic equivalents are presented first in the most ancient Cyrillo-Methodian translations, then those accomplished in the First Bulgarian State, and finally the translation decisions attested in the texts of the later period, 13th–14th centuries.

Monastic language and vocabulary, whether as part of a study of a particular author or *per se,* succeeds in attracting scholarly attention every once in a while.[1]

* This paper has been written within the framework of the project *The Vocabulary of Constantine of Preslav's Uchitel'noe evangelie ('Didactic Gospel'): Old Bulgarian-Greek and Greek-Old Bulgarian Word Indices* which is financed by the Bulgarian National Science Fund (contract КП-06-Н50/2 of 30.11.2020). I am indebted to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and remarks, which I hope to have succesfully addressed. I am also thankful for the comments of E. Dikova and f. Athanasius Zographiensis, who read earlier versions of this text, and also to the participants in the discussion when the paper was first presented at the Workshop 'Neighbouring Ideas. The Byzantine-Slavonic Intellectual Contacts', organised at the Department for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, University of Vienna on the 9–11 November 2022. Needless to say, the standard disclaimers apply.

1 An exhaustive overview is neither possible in this article, nor necessary for its scope, but just to outline the research framework, some specific titles should be mentioned: P. Miquel, *Léxique du desert. Étude de quelques mots-clés du vocabulaire monastique grec ancien*, Abbaye de Bellefontaine 1986. L. Th. A. Lorié, *Spiritual terminology in the Latin translations of the Vita Antonii (with reference to fourth and fifth century monastic literature)*, (Spiritualité Orientale, 44), Utrecht – Nijmegen 1955. For Slavonic, see I. P. Petrov, L'horreur de la vie et l'exstase de la vie: първоначални бележки върху екстатичната терминология в Житието на св. Антоний Велики и славянските му преводи, in:

Starting from the 4th century with St Athanasius' *Life of St Anthony,* Christian ascetic literature was the main vehicle through which monastic spirituality, way of life, and the associated mentality were disseminated, and also developed – though this was only part of the story. Indeed, it should not be forgotten that the live transmission and spread of ideas were initially achieved mostly through *praxis,* spiritual discipleship and fatherhood, rather than education or institutional support. Nevertheless, with time, monasticism developed its own specific literature, which used a language on the one side very close to that of other Christian writings, and intermingled with this, on the other, a language also characterised by a specific vocabulary and phraseology. Based on the New Testament, this language was further developed and fostered by introducing a somewhat more Hellenised intellectual edge, influenced by, and rooted in, the Late Antique and Classical Greek heritage.

Thus, monastic language is an interesting offspring of both Christian and pre-Christian intellectual endeavours, combining terms connected with the ascetical life as well as a more philosophical layer connected to the specific spiritual anthropology which this movement develops. This may be explicitly observed in its lexical layer, where many terms share origins rooted in classical and post-classical Greek philosophy, such as *apatheia* ('passionlessness'), the Stoic *hegemonikon* ('the principal part [of the soul]), *athlesis,* and *agon.*

In the present paper, although monastic language remains the main focus of investigation, material from other sources is adduced, too. This has been necessary, on the one hand, on account of the inner coherence of the Christian literature and language: that is, works of different genres (biblical, theological-dogmatical, chronographic, homiletic, etc.) and which were composed for different audiences often employ similar linguistic expressions, terminology,

---

P. Petkov – I. Petrov – V. Savova – I. Trifonova (eds.), *Sapere aude. Сборник в чест на проф. дфн Искра Христова-Шомова*, Sofia 2019, 115–128. I. P. Petrov, Νοῦς и νοερός в Житието на св. Антоний Велики и в старобългарската книжнина, *Slavia* 4, 2020, 406–415. I. P. Petrov, Два термина за духовни видения в Житието на св. Антоний Велики и Старобългарските му преводи, *Palaeobulgarica* 45/1, 2021, 93–110. I. P. Petrov, Theoria et Optasia in the Old Church Slavonic Translations of the Life of St Anthony the Great, *Studia Ceranea* 11, 2021, 679–696. I. P. Petrov, Помислите (λογισμοί) в Житието на св. Антоний Велики и славянските му преводи, *Филологически форум* 13, 2021, 1, 19–36. I. P. Petrov, The Greek Term ΔΙΑΝΟΙΑ in *Učitel'noe Evangelie* and the Classical Old Church Slavonic Texts, *Linguistique Balkanique* 51, 2022, 1, 49–67. I. P. Petrov, Към преводаческите съответствия на гр. διάνοια в южнославянските преводи на Житието на св. Антоний Велики и старобългарската книжнина, *Кирило-Методиевски студии* 33, 2023, 247–270. I. P. Petrov, Еквивалентите на гр. ἀγών в Учителното Евангелие на Константин Преславски и в други средновековни южнославянски преводи, in: L. Taseva – A. Rabus – I. Petrov (eds.), *Учителното евангелие на Константин Преславски и южнославянските преводи на хомилетични текстове (IX–XIII в.)*. Доклади от Международната научна конференция в София, 25–27 април 2023 г., Sofia 2024, 251–280, DOI: 10.62761/491.SB37.10. I. P. Petrov, Die Terminologie der Askese in der altslawischen Übersetzung der Vita des heiligen Pachomius des Großen, in: *Festschrift for Petko Petkov*, Sofia 2024 (forthcoming).

and *topoi*. Yet on the other hand, enlarging the scope of comparison creates a larger context in which the researched lexis can be positioned and analysed. Additionally, the fact that since the beginning of Slavic literary culture the men of letters have mostly, or at least very often, been monks, justifies such an approach – namely, juxtaposing data from ascetic works with material from other genres and types of literary production. Last but not least, providing a larger scope of comparison might enable the elaboration of a broader view of how the research lexis was functioning on a larger contextual scale.

1. Preliminary remarks

It is usually accepted that monastic language was developed between the 4th and 7th centuries, and that later, with few exceptions, the authors repeated and glossed over the works of their predecessors.[2] Although ascetic topics or motives are to be found in the earliest writings of Christian authors, it was not until Athanasius of Alexandria's *Life of St Anthony the Great* that ascetical literature was truly 'born'.

Initially stories of great spiritual *athletes* in the Desert, those writings soon crystallised into a specific literary movement of its own. In this thematic circle, there were no longer only *Vitas* of illustrious spiritual *athletes,* but these were joined by more theoretical writings characterised by specific *topoi,* phraseology, vocabulary, and elaborate terminology. That said, it deserves restating that there was never an *intellectual school* of asceticism *stricto sensu*. The monastic literature always remained tightly bound up with the experience of the *ascetes*, which also provided the foundation of every literary work – the way of life (as understood in the Greek δίαιτα), the spiritual combats and experience, the wisdom shared in conversation, these formed the principal core of the ascetic literature. Later, if we now adopt the modern terminology – more theoretical works appeared, which elaborated ideas and teachings as *tractates*, i.e. more philosophically structured texts without narrative.

Additionally, although the vocabulary encountered in ascetic works may be gathered and separated into a distinct group, it needs to be taken into account that its usage by individual authors might differ in certain nuances. In this sense, speaking of a *monastic terminology* might not be the most accurate way of determining the semantic group of lexical units and phraseology employed for naming certain aspects or realities from the ascetic experience. Here I have in mind not physical items, such as parts of clothing etc., but rather that which is immaterial, which is often the topic of the monastic literature.

In this realm of the immaterial – that of the intellectual and spiritual – several thematic groups of lexemes that are encountered quite often in the texts are to be discerned. They are closely interconnected, and the list below is arbitrary:

2 Miquel, *Léxique du desert*, op. cit., 12.

- Ascesis and spiritual 'athleticism'
- Ecstatic experiences
- Contemplation and visions
- Noetic terms (intellect, mind, thoughts, reason, etc.)
- Passions
- Virtues (and practices)

As already stated, the way some of these terms were employed by individual authors can vary. Regardless of the similarities between different instances of ascetic literature, it should be kept in mind that each author (or work) employed the terms in a somewhat individual way, despite the similarity in context. As Pierre Miquel put it: "a common language with different accents".[3] It is noticeable, though, that the terms from these groups, and especially certain phrases which they constitute, become recognisable markers of monastic writing – thematic, as well as stylistic in tenor.

2. Monastic literature in the Early Medieval Slavonic realm[4]

In the Slavonic milieu, monastic writings tend to be considered as being among the earliest texts already translated at the very beginnings of Slavonic literacy – that is, in the 9th century with the translation of the lectionary Gospels and Apostolos, as well as other books needed for everyday liturgical usage. Some of these thus belong to the earliest and most archaic layer of intellectual transfer through translation, together with the Gospels and the *Praxapostolos*. Granted some differences of scholarly opinion, it is almost universally accepted that Methodius translated a number of monastic pieces, the so-called отьчьскъıа кънигъı or 'books of the fathers'[5] mentioned in the Life of Methodius. The precise coverage of these terms is still being discussed, though two works are usually considered possible reference: *the Scete Patericon* (Veder[6]) and the *Andron Agion Biblos* (van Wijk[7]).

A few decades later, after the Bulgarian knyaz Boris-Michael accepted Cyrill and Methodius' disciples in the newly baptised state after fleeing from Great Moravia and thus undertook to continue the Old Church Slavonic literary work, the translation of other key works proceeded in the capital Preslav (broadly

3 Miquel, *Léxique du desert*, op. cit., *ibid*.

4 Christian terminology has been a key focus of palaeoslavonic studies ever since its beginnings. An exhaustive listing is not possible here, but there is an attempt at an overview in I. P. Petrov, Два термина, op. cit.

5 For an overview of the scholarly literature and history of this matter, see the preface by Richard Pope in: N. van Wijk, *The Old Church Slavonic Translation of the Ανδρων Αγιων Βιβλος in the edition of Nikolaas van Wijk*, D. Armstrong – R. Pope – C. H. van Schooneveld (eds.), The Hague – Paris 1975, 1–24.

6 W. Veder, *The Scete Patericon. Introduction, Maps and Indices by W. Veder,* (Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies, 12)*,* Amsterdam 2012, 31–32.

7 Cf. van Wijk, *The Old Church Slavonic* Translation, op. cit., 29–32.

understood), among which was the *Life of St Anthony the Great,*[8] together with many other Church father writings, individually or as part of Miscellanies. And after the fall of the first Bulgarian Empire under Byzantine rule in the 12th century, literary activity among the Slavs was mostly preserved on Mount Athos, which later played a major role in, and exercised influence on, the literature of the 13th and 14th centuries after the restoration of the Bulgarian Kingdom. In this later period (also referred to as Middle Bulgarian) some works appeared in new translations (for example, *The Life of Anthony*,[9] and possibly also the *Ascetic Discourses* of Isaac of Nineveh[10]), while others were introduced for the first time, such as the writings of Dorotheus of Gaza, the Areopagite corpus, and writings by Symeon the New Theologian.

3. Some Methodological Remarks

In investigating the Slavonic reception of monastic terminology, several issues arise that need to be addressed at the outset. Firstly, not all important or useful texts yet have their own editions (or otherwise the edition of the Greek *Vorlage* does not correspond to the known Slavonic translation). Secondly, not all editions have indices nor do those supplied with such have a Greek-Slavonic index. Moreover, the provided indices also do not present the individual forms of words, thus preventing any attempt at quantitative lexical analysis. Next, texts were transmitted and translated not according to their importance or chronological primacy – *Apophthegmata* were seemingly translated earlier than the *Life of Anthony*, for example. This means that terms were not received or interpreted in a consistent or systematic manner, or through an established translation strategy. This has particular implications for the monastic terminology, which was not perceived as a separate or special layer of Christian literary language but rather as a consistent part of the whole of literary production and heritage. Furthermore, we do not know how the translators were prepared, or what was their theological or literary background (which might have influenced the way they understood and then rendered the Greek originals). Last but not least, all Old Church Slavonic translations and their manuscripts for the most part present the dialectal features of, first, the translator and/or, second, the scribe, which means that more often than not, one might expect dialect influences in

8 Cf. the overview in P. Petkov, Славянските преводи на Житие на св. Антоний Велики от св. Атанасий Александрийски – В: *Трети международен конгрес по българистика, 23–26 май 2013 г., София. Кръгла маса „Кирилометодиевистика“*, Sofia 2014, 126–140.

9 See Petkov, Славянските преводи, op. cit. A. Dimitrova, Третият превод на Житието на св. Антоний Велики. *Старобългарска литература* 47, (Светци и свети места на Балканите, 1), 2013, 92–107.

10 See A. Mincheva, Постническите слова на Исак Сирин между преводите от XIV век, in: *Преводите през XIV столетие на* балканите, L. Taseva – M. Yovcheva (eds.), Sofia 2004, 359–386.

the copy – always in the phonetics, and to a lesser but still significant extent in the morphology, and finally lexical individual changes in places where the text being copied was unintelligible to the scribe.

Another important aspect is how we handle the various readings – that is, the individual witnesses of a text – when we conduct a comparative analysis of lexical equivalents for a given Greek word or phrase. It is well-acknowledged that tradition of Old Slavonic studies aims at maximum fidelity to the textual witness, rather than trying to recreate an earlier source or hypothetical text (often considered a pure abstraction by scholars and thus not very readily accepted in the Palaeoslavonic research milieu). This attitude is also reflected in the general way that lexical investigations are conducted, or at least in the expectations that they are designed to meet. Where there is not an official edition of a text (often rather misleadingly termed *critical* when, in fact, the *apparatus* constitutes a diplomatic edition of a single witness supplemented with added material from other manuscripts), it is often assumed that each independent textual witness should be considered in order to trace the lexemes at a maximal scope. Although the technologies now permit a somewhat quicker digitalisation of huge textual masses, we are still a long way from creating bilingual Greek-Slavonic corpora automatically, where the lexical material is interconnected and searchable across the two languages. Thus, a certain restriction in terms of the research horizon as well as some reduction in textual quantity is needed for the material to be handled, systemised, and analysed.

That much said, the following text can only provide an *initial* step towards understanding the system of Slavic lexical renderings connected with the Greek noetic lexis. This approach cannot claim to be exhaustive, but rather aims at inductively clarifying the relations between the concepts expressed in the original texts, their cultural context, and the translated elements which, from their side, through the text in which they belong, help create a new cultural and intellectual environment.

Another aspect that needs to be addressed concerns part of the research material. Some of the core sources of the ascetic literature still lack (critical) editions of their Slavonic receptions. For the purposes of the present paper, though, it has been necessary to draw on at least some material from these key-sources – namely, the Life of St Anthony the Great (*VA* 1-3)[11] and that of St Pachomius the Great (*VPa*).[12] Even though the *VPa* was researched on the

11 For all abbreviations of the textual witnesses and editions used, see the list of sources at the end of this paper.

12 For the Life of Pachomius, I rely on the preliminary edition of the Slavonic text, prepared by P. Petkov, to whom I am indebted for providing me with the text of the Life together with the various readings found in the other available text witnesses.

basis of two of the available witnesses,[13] and VA3 has been preserved in only one codex,[14] the material taken from these sources should be considered as essentially preliminary.

4. Lexical Material – Textual witnesses and Editions

This paper tries to summarise and differentiate the attestations and contexts of Old Church Slavonic *lexis* from:

1. the earliest translated texts, i.e. the *Ev* and the *Ap* (its different redactions, viz. archaic, Athonite, etc.),[15] the *Scet*, *Rim* and *Euch*;
2. the literature of the so-called Preslav circle: *Supr*, the translations of John the Exarch (*JExFid*) and Constantine of Preslav (*UE, Ar1,* and *Ar3*), and other texts such as the *Zlat*, *Izb73*, *Izb76*, *Prol*, *GrN13*, *Am*, *Proph12*, *Ez*, and *VA1*.

In using the term 'the classical canon', I will refer to the texts that are attested in the oldest preserved written texts (10th –11th c.). The majority of texts, though, especially those considered to belong to the Preslav circle, have reached us in manuscripts from later centuries, inevitably affected by later language developments and/or the scribe's local (mostly phonetical, but also morphological) features.

Regarding the later period of the 13th–14th centuries, Athonite influence (often tending to archaise and follow the models[16] of the Preslav school) is strongly discernible in the literary production of Tărnovo, the new capital of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom and a major literary centre of the Middle Bulgarian period. In the current study, several translations from this time have been taken into consideration: *GNHO, Doroth*, *Dam.Drom1, Dorm3, Nat1, Nat2*, *SynTr*, *ALat*, *Job*, *DialXIV* and *DogmXIV, Areop*, *Phot*, *VA2*, *VA3* and *VPa.*

5. Greek noetic terms and their Slavonic equivalents. General overview

The terms connected with mental activity and cognitive process are important parts of the Greek lexical and intellectual heritage. Some of them became an object of interest and (meta)linguistic reflection early in the history of Greek thought. Their place retained its significance in Late Antiquity and continued henceforward in the works of the Church Fathers.

13 See more in I. P. Petrov, Die Terminologie der Askese, op. cit.

14 Cf. literature in note 9 above, as well as the literature in the list of sources.

15 Following Hristova-Shomova, *Служебният Апостол*, op. cit.

16 Cf. more in M. Yovcheva – L. Taseva, Езиковите образци на атонските редактори, in: *Българска филологическа медиевистика. Сборник научни изследвания в чест на проф. дфн. Иван Харалампиев по случай 60-годишния му юбилей*, Veliko Tarnovo 2006, 221–240.

What is special about this semantic group of lexemes is its twofold relation with both philosophy and anthropology. These words are rooted simultaneously in perceptions and ideas about the human soul, mind and thought, inherited from Antiquity and then further developed in the post-classical intellectual milieu, but later becoming interwoven with the views of Christianity and in particular with the development of intellectual life after the new faith achieved official status. Moreover, from a modern perspective, these terms bear reference simultaneously to the material side of the human being and its immaterial essence. Thus, they represent a (more or less holistic) understanding of the human being as a homogeneous entity and illuminate the intellectual perception of the individual person, especially regarding its *non-material, metaphysical* side. It was these understandings, the ideas of the human being's immateriality, that in time proved to be such a fertile source of exploration, being projected onto various theological discourses and creating in a way the linguistic (more precisely, lexical) core of what could be called a Christian anthropology.

The Greek terms used to refer to this part of the human being are *νοῦς (*together with *νόημα*, *νόησις*, *νοερός*, *νοητός*)*, διάνοια,* and *λογισμός,* but also *σύνεσις*, *συνείδησις*, *ἔννοια, φρήν/ φρένες*, *γνῶσις*, *γνώμη*, *σκοπός*. All of them began seemingly to have common or overlapping semantic nuances quite early on. These similarities in meaning were further elaborated by the *specific* idiom of individual authors, both classical and post-classical, where some notions were nurtured or sidelined, or simply the author's personal preference influenced the choice of one term over another.

In Old Church Slavonic, their translation equivalents tend to show similar tendencies of mutual exchangeability, semantic fusion, and ambiguity of scope. A short overview of the most frequent translation choices illustrates this.[17] Below, I will provide a closer look at the three, in my view, dominant terminological units – *νοῦς, διάνοια,* and *λογισμός,* and their Slavonic equivalents. I will try briefly to present the situation in the older period of the Old Church Slavonic literature (Old Bulgarian on grounds of provenance), and also the data from the Middle Bulgarian texts.[18]

Less attention is paid to the diachronic development of these terms in the Greek tradition itself – a task which, needless to say, still awaits completion and deserves careful attention in its own right, which would however exceed the limitations of our current endeavour. Analysing the Slavonic material from the earliest Cyrillo-Methodian translations, the Preslav texts and later Middle Bulgarian text witnesses, one can see a certain stratification of translation techniques and solutions. I will try to provide some possible explanations for these.

17 Meanings in English are given according to the Prague Lexicon Palaeoslovenicum SJS, via its online edition in: http://gorazd.org/gulliver/, (retrieved December 29, 2023).

18 See the full list of consulted texts above in note 4.

6. The noetic terms

6.1. *Νοῦς*[19]

The diachronic development of this Greek lexeme may be briefly sketched in the following way:[20] it was employed as *mind* (as in perceiving and thinking), sense, wit;[21] mind (more widely as employed in feeling, deciding, etc., heart);[22] mind, reason, purpose;[23] reason, intellect[24] and henceforward 'Mind as the active principle of the Universe';[25] act of mind, thought;[26] purpose, design;[27] sense, meaning of a word,[28] etc. Later in the Patristic literature,[29] νοῦς was used with reference to 'man's distinctive nature', the 'guiding principle of a man', and in relation to other mental faculties, but also to sense perception. From a more spiritual perspective, the lexeme was used to denote the 'mind's capacity for knowing God', the 'mind enslaved by senses', but also 'mind controlling senses', 'mind's responsibility for sin', 'mind between good and evil', 'mind's way of perfection', and 'mind in prayer and contemplation'. As a separate semantic field, Lampe distinguishes the 'sense, meaning of scripture, esp. of non-literal sense'.[30]

For the present, the most extensive study of the history of νοῦς in Greek and then Judeo-Hellenic literary culture is presented in the freshly published monograph of M. Nägele.[31] In this research, the author offers a wide-ranging analysis of the uses of the term in the LXX-translation, and in the works of illustrative helleno-judaic authors (the books of Judith, 2 and 3 Maccabees, Susanna and Solomon's *Sapientia*, Philo) and also of Helleno-Roman writers

19 Cf. also some preliminary notes in I. P. Petrov, Νοῦς и νοερός, op. cit.

20 The Greek material here and in what follows on the other terms is based on, G. Liddell – R. Scott – S. Jones, *Online Greek-English Lexicon*. https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/ (retrieved December 28, 2023).

21 νόῳ prudently, Od.6.320; παρὲκ νόον senselessly, Il.20.133; σὺν νόῳ wisely, Hdt.8.86, 138.

22 χαῖρε νόῳ Od.8.78; ἐκ παντὸς νόου with all his heart and soul, Hdt.8.97; κατὰ νόον according to one's mind, Hdt.1.117, 7.104.

23 ἀγαθῷ νόῳ, i.e. kindly, Hdt.1.60; ἐν ν. ἔχειν c. fut. inf., to intend... Id.1.1.

24 νόου φρενί Xenoph.25, cf. Parm.16.2, etc.; θεῖος ν. Democr.112.

25 Anaxag. 12, etc.; Θαλῆς νοῦν τοῦ κόσμου τὸν θεόν Placit.1.7.11; ἡ τοῦ κόσμου γένεσις ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ νοῦ συστάσεως Pl. Ti.48a.

26 ἡμῖν δ' οὔ τις τοῦδε νόος καὶ μῆτις ἀμείνων Il.15.509.

27 νόον τελεῖν τινι Il.23.

28 οὗτος ὁ νόος τοῦ ῥήματος Hdt.7.162.

29 G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Lexicon,* Oxford 1961, 923–927.

30 Ibid., 927.

31 M. Nägele, *Paulus und der Nous. Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischer Anthropologie vor dem Hintergrund hellenisch-jüdischer und griechisch-römischer Konzeption,* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe, 586), Tübingen 2023. DOI: 10.1628/978-3-16-161956-4. See also a separate study, focusing only on the earliest stages of the Greek language: F. Stella, *Nóος e voεῖν da Omero a Platone*, Franche-Comté 2021 (cf. the review in I. Petrov, Fabio Stella, *Noos e noein da Omero a Platone*. *Institut des sciences et techniques de l'Antiquité, 1518*, Besançon 2021, (Bryn Mawr Classical Reviews, 2022): https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2022/2022.10.25/ (retrieved June 30, 2024).

(Plutarch, Epictet). Nägele's analysis shows that in the original Greek texts in *Septuaginta*, νοῦς can appear as an equivalent for all the anthropological vocabulary connected with the mind and the cognitive processes (ψυχή, καρδία, διάνοια, λογιμσός, σύνεσις, ἐπίνοια, φρήν, βουλή, πρόθεσις).[32] In the Graeco-Roman literature, summarises Nägele,[33] in both the Platonic and the Stoic doctrines of the soul, νοῦς may be used to delineate any aspect of rationality in the human soul. In Platonic teaching, this is a more or less independent part of the two- or tri-partite human being, while for the Stoics it is the highest part that can be reached through the rational functioning of the soul. In both schools, this part is responsible for the various cognitive and psychological processes of the inner aspect. The term is used as a synonym for other cognitive terms such as ψυχή, διάνοια, λογισμός, λόγος, λογικόν, λογιστικόν, ἡγεμονικόν, etc., even though some specific aspects of the term's semantic field may be outlined. The most prominent feature of the term's (νοῦς) resonance, in comparison with the other terms that most often replace it (viz. διάνοια, ψυχή, λογισμός, λόγος, etc.), is summarised by Nägele as "the cognitive instance in the sense of a psychologically independent entity with rational ability".[34] Noῦς refers to the most central point of the self, the core of the personality, which is connected to the relationship between God and the human being, but also the prerequisite for relations with other humans. At the outermost layer in the semantic field can be observed usages denoting the products of inner processes and thinking – thoughts, decisions, views and attitudes.[35]

One of the many problematic aspects of investigating the noetic concepts of the early Church authors is the huge discrepancy between our contemporary understanding of these terms and the semantic coverage that was habitual for the era of the works in question. One such fundamental concerning what we call 'mind' and 'intellect', and the range of meaning encompassed in *νοῦς* is explained by Andrew Louth:

> Nous is usually translated as 'mind' or 'intellect'. Part of the problem is that neither of these words is as rich in derived forms as the Greek νοῦς (they have, most significantly, no verb). But beyond that, the words 'mind' and 'intellect' and their derivatives (intellection, intellectual, etc.) have quite different overtones from the Greek νοῦς. The most fundamental reason for this is a cultural one: the Greeks were pre-Cartesian; we are all post-Cartesian. We say, 'I think, therefore I am', that is, thinking is an activity I engage in and there must therefore be an 'I' to engage in it; the Greeks would say, 'I think, therefore there is that which I think – τὰ νοητά.' What I think is something going on in my head; what the Greek thinks, τὰ νοητά, are the objects of thought that (for example, for Plato) exist in a higher, more real world. This means that νοῦς and its derivatives have a quite different feel from our words,

32 Nägele, *Paulus und der Nous,* op. cit., 125.
33 Ibid., 367ff.
34 "[D]ie kognitive Instanz im Sinn einer psychisch eigenständigen Größe mit rationaler Fähigkeit.", Nägele, *Paulus und der Nous*, op. cit., 368.
35 Ibid, 377ff.

> mind, mental, intellect, intellection, etc. Our words suggest our reasoning, our thinking; νοῦς, νόησις, etc. suggest an almost intuitive grasp of reality. […] Nous, then, is more like an organ of mystical union than anything suggested by our words 'mind' or 'intellect'. And yet νοῦς does mean mind; νόησις is a deeper, simpler, more contemplative form of thought, not something quite other than thinking.[36]

This polysemy was partly reduced when *νοῦς* entered the Patristic literature, which has absorbed the intellectual achievements of the previous centuries.[37] Thus it was perceived to be in close connection with the idea of the divine *Intellect*. It is understood as the part of the human being that can be united with God and can contemplate Him and/or the intelligible realities (from the Platonic level of ideas). *Nous* is what perceives and understands *in toto*: it 'grasps' the significance or the meaning. In scholarly literature, it is often referred to as the *intuitive mind*. It enters more deeply into the anthropological views of Patristic literature and the Pauline trichotomy of 'spirit, soul, and body',[38] as J. Meyendorff summarises:

> Under Origenistic influence, the Fathers of the fourth century, followed by the later Byzantine authors, prefer to speak of mind (νοῦς), soul, and body. The desire to avoid ambiguity concerning the identity of the "spirit" and to affirm the created character of the human "spirit" may also have contributed to this evolution. […] The νοῦς, therefore, is not so much a "part" of man as (1) the ability which man possesses to transcend himself in order to participate in God; (2) the unity of man's composite nature when it faces his ultimate destiny in God and the world; (3) the freedom of man, which can either fully develop if it finds God or become defective if it submits itself to the body. "The spirit (νοῦς) in human nature corresponds most nearly to the person", writes Vladimir Losky (Myst. theol. p. 201).[39]

Later patristic authors, like Symeon the New Theologian, stay close to this perception of *νοῦς,* which is developed and clarified over time:

> With regard to the intellect (νοῦς), Symeon says that it is immaterial and bodiless (Eth. 15.98-9 cf. Maximos the Confessor, Quest. Thal. 65, sch. 1 [307]: 'the intellect is formless'), is always in motion (ἀεικίνητος) and cannot remain inactive (Cat. 10.94-5, cf. Nemesios of Emesa, Nat. Man. 2 [29]). The intellect is the highest part of the soul: it is the intellect that is capable of ascent to heaven and contemplation of the divine mysteries (Theol. 1.412-14, Eth. 6.252-5, cf. Dionysion, Div. Names 7.1

36 A. Louth, *The Origins of Christian Mystical Tradition. From Plato to Denys*, 2nd edition, Oxford 2007, xiv–xv.

37 Cf. also the entry in: Lampe, *A Patristic Lexicon*, op. cit.

38 A recent study has been published that deals with the use of *nous* in Pauline theology: M. Nägele, Paul's Usage of the Anthropological Term νοῦς. A New Approach to a Long-Standing Debate, *Novum Testamentum* 65, 2023, 330–349. DOI: 10.1163/15685365-bja10047. Cf. also the much more voluminous study of the concept of *nous* in Paul's writings regarding its Hellenistic, judaeic and Greco-roman cultural background, by the same author: idem, Nägele, *Paulus und der Nous*, op. cit.

39 J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology, historical trends and doctrinal themes*, New York 1976, 141–142.

[194]). Through the intellect (κατὰ νοῦν), man is able to know and see God (Hymn. 23.74-8). As a mystical capacity of the soul, the intellect is called by Symeon 'the eye of the heart' or 'the eye of the soul' (resp. Eth. 1.12.420, Cap.1.38, cf. Cat. 33.53-61; cf. Makarios of Egypt, Hom. 7.8.85-7 [76]).[40]

In the Slavonic milieu, the most often attested equivalent of νοῦς is оумъ. This solution was adopted with considerable confidence and only few exceptions in the early texts.[41] It is the the sole choice deployed in the Gospels (Lc 24.45 *Zogr*, *Ass*), in the Athonite redaction of the Apostolos (and the archaic version, though there are occasions where it is rendered as мъıсль*)*. It is the predominant solution in *Supr* (14 times vs 1 мъıсль, 1 разоумъ), *Euch*, *Scet,* the *Izb73, Men12, GrN13, JExFid,* and *Ar3*. It is also the only attested rendering in *Rim* (Gregorios Dialogos' dialogues), the *Izb76*, *IlKn* and Constantine of Preslav's *UE*.

Scet 11.36.2 διὰ τὸ ἀποσχοληθῆναι ἡμῶν τὸν νοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς Θεὸν θεωρίας αἰχμαλωτιζόμεθα ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν τῶν σαρκικῶν;
зане оупразни сѧ оумъ нашь отъ видѣниꙗ божиꙗ плѣнени бъıваемъ отъ похоти плътьскъıихъ
Because our mind [intellect] has voided itself of the contemplation [slav. vision, beholding?] of God we become captured by the carnal passions.[42]

The most frequent lexeme that оумъ 'intellect, mind' enters into synonymic relations with is разоумъ 'reason, mind', followed by мъıсль 'thought'.

Scet 3.5.2 καθεζόμενος ἐν τῷ κελλίῳ σου, συνάγαγέ σου τὸν νοῦν
сѣдѧ въ келии своеи съвери си мъıсль
sitting in your cell, gather your mind/intellect (Slav.: thought)

This situation of rare but still noticeable variability was significantly reduced in the following period. In the Middle Bulgarian translations, the equivalent of νοῦς seemingly became fossilized as оумъ – *passim* in *VA2* and *VA3,* in *GNHO, Doroth*, in four of John Damascenus' Marian homilies (*Dam.Drom1,3,* and *Nat1,2*), *SynTr*, *DialXIV, Areop* (all of the 358 attestations!), and predominantly in *ALat*. Occasionally, some texts present a few attestations with other solutions such as мъıсль in the 14th-century *DogmXIV* (but only 4 times), and разоумъ in *ALat*. This general tendency towards a reduction in the translation options could be regarded as a sign of growing terminological compactness in the language. On the other hand, the notions of νοῦς which extend beyond merely intellectual (sc. rational) connotations generally seem uncalled for.

The different ways of rendering *voῦς* also influenced the translation of adjectival derivatives and equally the rendering of the various concepts that they served. This may be seen, for example, in the adjective *νοερός,* especially

40 H. Alfeyev, *St. Symeon the New Theologian and Orthodox Tradition,* (Oxford Early Christian Studies), Oxford 2000, 181.

41 For exact and detailed data, see *Appendix* 1.

42 Veder, *Patericon*, op. cit., 371.

as used in *τὸ νοερόν* – the part of the human soul that Athanasius mentions so often in the *Life of Anthony.* Up to this point, there are three groups of texts in terms of how this adjective was translated.[43] The first of these renders it with разоумьноѥ 'the rational, reasonable one', featuring mostly texts considered to have originated in Preslav: *JExFid*, *VA1*, *Supr*, *Izb73*, and later the *Areop* (157 attestations vs 41 оумьнъ and 29 мъıсльнъ). In the second group (*Ez*, *VA2*, the Athonite redaction of the Apostolos books, and *GrN13*), νοερός is rendered оумьнъ or оумьнитъ (mindful, intelligent, intellectual). The third group of texts puts the semantic focus on 'thought' and translates the Greek adjective using мъıсльнъ and съмъıсльнъ – these are the *VA3*, *Euch*, and the archaic redaction of the Apostolos.

Cf. the following example from the *Life of Anthony* (ch.20)

> **[VA: 20]** Τῆς γὰρ ψυχῆς τὸ νοερὸν κατὰ φύσιν ἑκούσης, ἡ ἀρετὴ συνίσταται.
> For virtue exists when the soul maintains its intellectual part according to nature.[44]
>
> **VA1:** и҆ д҃ши бо разумное҄ по є҄стъству, и҆мѣ҄ꙗ҄щи доброволство. по є҄стьству съставлѣ҄єт сѧ,
> And when the soul has/keeps the reasonable [thing/part] according to nature/naturally, virtue is formed according to nature.
>
> **VA2:** д҃ши бѡ҆ по ѥ҃ствоу ѹ҆мное и҆моущи, добродѣ҆тѣль състои҆т се.
> When the soul has/keeps the intellectual [thing/part] according to nature, virtue is formed.
>
> **VA3:** д҃ши бѡ мъıслъное по сѫ҆щъствоу и҆маши, добрѡдѣтѣль съставлѣет сѧ.
> When the soul has/keeps the thoughtful [thing, part] according to nature, virtue is formed.

Another often used expression connected with *νοῦς* and *νοερός* in monastic writings is the 'the eye(s) of the mind/intellect' – *νοεροὶ ὀφθαλμοί*. This is an expression first encountered in the Pauline epistles (as 'the eyes of the heart'), then in Plotin and finally from Cyril of Alexandria onwards, although A. Louth (drawing on K. Rahner) finds this idea in Origen, who first develops the idea of the teaching of the spiritual sense of the inner man as opposed to that of the outer man.[45] This expression has a long tradition, as Daniélou summarises/captures succinctly:

> Ainsi Grégoire parle de '"l'œil de l'âme", ὁ οφθαλμός τῆς ψυχῆς (XLIV, 288 B; 465 D; 756 A; XLVI, 177 D, etc…) ou ὄψις τῆς ψυχῆς (XLIV, 332 C) […] Certaines de

43 I. P. Petrov, Νοῦς и νοερός, op. cit., 413.
44 R. Gregg, *The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus*, New York 1979, 45.
45 Louth, *The Origins*, op. cit., 67.

> ces expressions sont traditionnelles. Ainsi “l’œil de l’âme” ὁ ὀφθαλμός τῆς ψυχῆς, se trouve déjà chez Pilon (De Spec. leg., III, 6) et sous la forme plus sémitique, ὁ ὀφθαλμός τῆς καρδίας, on le rencontre chez saint Paul (Eph.I, 18).’[46]

This expression usually refers to the capacity of the human mind/spirit (later also soul) to contemplate the intelligible realities and experience God’s light (cf. ‘The divine light, Symeon [the New Theologian] says, is invisible to one’s bodily eyes (Hymn 38.83) but is seen with the intellect of?/or rather with what Symeon call’s ‘the eye of the intellect’ (ὀφθαλμὸς τοῦ νοός) (Hymn. 11.46), ‘the noetic eye of the intellect’ (νοερὸς ὁ τοῦ νοὸς ὀφθαλμός) (Hymn. 38.86), ‘the intelligible eyes of the heart’ (ὀφθαλμοί νοεροί τῆς καρδίας) (Hymn 32.82), ‘the eyes of the soul’ (ψυχῆς οἱ ὀφθαλμοί) (Hymn 22.108), ‘the intelligible eyes of the soul’ (νοεροὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοί) (Eth 10.673-4).’[47]

In the Greek texts that were translated into Old Church Slavonic, this expression appears in one of two guises: on the one hand, as νοερός ὀφθαλμός оумьноѥ око ‘intellect/intelligent eye’,[48] or ὀφθαλμός/-οί τοῦ νοός, and, on the other, as οἱ τῆς διανοίας ὀφθαλμοί.[49]

> Scet 18.4.27 ἠνοίχθησαν δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ νοεροί ὀφθαλμοί
> отъврьзосте же сѧ оумоу имъ оуи
> Their eyes of the mind/intellect were opened [up].

> Rim 93r4 Θῶμεν οὖν ἐνώπιον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τοῦ νοὸς οἰκοδομηθῆναι οἶκον
> положӥ оубо прѣ оуима оумнꙑима. съꙁати храмъ
> Let us set in front of our intellectual/spiritual eyes to build up the temple/house.

Here, on most occasions, the translations kept the etymological connection with *νοῦς (*as оумъ*)* and rendered the Greek adjective with оумьнъ – a solution that maintained some difference between the concept of intellect/mind and that of thought мꙑсль. However, it could be argued that such passages relate to the ‘spiritual eyes’, i.e. those that can distinguish or recognize (διακρίνειν) and envision the spiritual reality. There are other examples, though in later translations, where a similar expression is rendered мꙑсльньноѥ око ‘a thought eye/eye of the thought’, where the difference between mind and thought/thought process is blurred. This will be further discussed in the next section.

To sum up what has been considered so far, we may venture the following observations on translations of νοῦς. The Greek lexeme is predominantly rendered as оумъ ‘intellect, mind, sense’ in both the earliest translations of the Old Church Slavonic literature and the later (Middle Bulgarian) ones. The most frequent synonym that features as an alternative to the translation norm

---

46 J. Daniélou, *Platonisme & Théologie mystique. Doctrine spirituelle de saint Grégoire de Nysse*, Aubier 1944, 227.
47 Alfeyev, *St. Symeon the New Theologian,* op. cit., 236.
48 Rim 70v4, 92v19, 28r28, 50v11,18l 88v9; 93v16; 103r1, 110v30.
49 See below under *διάνοια*.

is разꙋмъ ‘reason, sense, mind’. In the later texts the degree of synonymity is significantly reduced. Noῦς is thus translated (almost) always as ꙋмъ, which in a way shifts the passages towards a more rationally (reason-) orientated perspective, where other inner processes, such as intuition or the emotions, are left outside of the lexical expression.

6.2. *Διάνοια*[50]

What is perceived or ‘grasped’ by the νοῦς is then ‘rationalised’, i.e. made transmittable and communicable with the surrounding reality and/or – through language – with fellow beings by means of the διάνοια. This term could be conceived of as designating the discursive mind which operates on the level of language and rational thinking – again through language). It is the part of the human being that can transmit perceptions, and which is capable of communicating and analysing – that is, of reducing what is perceived to their basic elements. In the Septuagint and then in the NT and the Church Fathers, διάνοια also corresponds to the decision-making centre of the human being – a place which could be affected and thus changed – that is, purified, or defiled. In the Septuagint text, in particular, διάνοια was one of the ways of rendering the Hebrew בֵּב/ בֵּל ‘heart’, together with καρδία and νοῦς.[51]

In Classical (and post-Classical) Greek, this term’s semantic field spans several main areas of cognitive meaning:[52] **1**. thought as intention, purpose;[53] **2.** thought as attitude of mind, way of thinking, mentality;[54] 2a. tard., plu. *sentimientos, apetencias*;[55] 2b. *mente*.[56] **3**. inner state (of soul and mind).[57] Equally, it can delineate intelligence, understanding (inteligencia, entendimiento), in opposition to αἴσθησις ‘conocimiento sensorial’.[58] Furthermore the term appears to lie in semantic opposition to *δόξα* and *φαντασία,*[59] *δόξα, ἐπιστήμη* and

50 This subchapter is based on the results published in I. P. Petrov, The Greek Term ΔΙΑΝΟΙΑ, op. cit. and I. P. Petrov, Към преводаческите съответствия на гр. Διάνοια, op. cit.

51 A. Weissenrieder – K. Dolle, Noῦς, διάνοια, φρόνησις, αἴσθησις, ἀνάμνησις, ἐπιστήμη. Denken, Verstand, (weisheitliche) Erkenntnis, Wahrnehmung, Wiedererinnerung, Wissen, in: A. Weissenrieder – K. Dolle (eds.), *Körper und Verkörperung. Biblische Anthropologie im Kontext antiker Medizin und Philosophie. Ein Quellenbuch für die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament*, Berlin – Boston 2019, 250–347.

52 Liddle – Scott – Jones, op. cit. and other dictionaries available (mostly, Diccionário Griego Español) in the online edition of the dictionary at https://lsj.gr/wiki/Main_Page.

53 μετὰ ὧν τὴν διάνοιαν ταύτην Hdt.1.46; Pl.Sph.265c, δ. θεοῦ designio divino.

54 ὥλοντ’ ἀσεβεῖ διανοίᾳ A.Th.83.

55 ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν realizando los deseos de la carne y los sentimientos, Ep.Eph.2.3.

56 παιδίου δ. *mente pueril* Arist.EN 1174a2, ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες *cuyas mentes están en la oscuridad,* Ep.Eph.4.13.

57 ὁ κατὰ διάνοιαν πόλεμος *guerra interio*r Evagr. Pont. Cap. Pract. 48.5.; κατὰ διάνοιαν interiormente Euagr. Pont. Cap. Pract.10.7.

58 δύο φησὶν εἶναι γνώσεις· τὴν μὲν διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων τὴν δὲ διὰ τῆς διανοίας Democr.B 11, cf. 125, 191, τῆς διανοίας ὄψις Pl.Smp.219a.

59 *Pl.Sph.263d.*

νόησις,[60] *νόησις, πίστις* and *εἰκασία.*[61] In certain cases it was also able to be identified with *λόγος.*[62] Thus, one of the core definitions of διάνοια, especially in the context that interests us, may be found in the *Diccionário Griego Español*:[63] *entendimiento discursivo (discursive understanding) op. νοῦς 'conocimiento intuitivo' (intuitive knowledge),*[64] of thinking, thought; esp. discursive thought (opp. to νόησις).[65] Hence: thinking faculty, intelligence, understanding;[66] thought expressed, meaning of a word or passage.[67]

This wide range of semantic nuance likely explains why this term never met such a degree of terminologisation as, for example, νοῦς, but rather held onto a degree of semantic fluctuation, allowing itself often to be replaced with other terms relating to cognitive activity as synonyms. Διάνοια operates with language (as λόγος*)* and thoughts (λογισμοί*)*. The latter is for the most part awarded a negative connotation – as something that could arise from one's passionate part (following the Evagrian terminology) or from being induced by enemy forces towards a decision in favour of an action which would cause a fall from the Divine plan/grace – that is, to the committing of a sin.

The position of διάνοια[68] and its semantic relations *vis-à-vis* other terms from the semantic circle of the *intellect, mind, processes of thinking*, and *soul* was further elaborated in the Hellenistic period. More precisely, its role in later Christian language seems to be influenced by its uses in the Septuagint and some Alexandrian authors (here, mainly Philo of Alexandria) which influenced later generations of Christian thinkers (starting with Clemens of Alexandria and Origenes, both who together laid down the foundations of a raft of systematically intellectualised concepts for Christianity which was developed further in the monastic literature).

In the Septuagint translation, the Greek διάνοια was used several times to render the Hebrew word for 'heart' (בל / בבל) – the basic concept of the core of the human personality, the 'organ' by which one takes decisions and changes opinions and views, and in general terms the very centre of the human being. In this respect, διάνοια retains a close relationship with another translation

60 καὶ ὅτι νόησις πρὸς δόξαν, ἐπιστήμην πρὸς πίστιν καὶ διάνοιαν πρὸς εἰκασίαν y que lo que es la inteligencia respecto a la opinión (hay que admitir que) es el conocimiento respecto a la creencia y el entendimiento a la imaginación Pl.R.534a.

61 Pl.R.511d.

62 οὐκοῦν δ. μὲν καὶ λόγος ταὐτόν ...; Pl.Sph.263e, ὁ τῆς διανοίας λογισμός Pl.Phd.79a.

63 http://dge.cchs.csic.es/xdge/ but also on the portla of LSJ see note 69.

64 Arist.APo.100b6, ἐπιτάττοντος τοῦ νοῦ καὶ λεγούσης τῆς διανοίας Arist.de An.433a2.

65 Procl.Inst.123.

66 agudeza mental, listeza, ingenio βασιλεὺς ... ἐθαύμασε ... αὐτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν Th.1.138.

67 ἐν δὲ διανοίᾳ ... λέξεως Gorg.B 5a, cf. Luc.Lex.24, Demetr.Eloc.2, 3, D.T.630.7, 9, 634.1, 642.21, A.D.Adu.119.6, 121.4, τὴν τούτου (τοῦ Ὁμήρου) διάνοιαν ἐκμανθάνειν, μὴ μόνον τὰ ἔπη Pl.Io 530b, πολλαὶ καὶ καλαὶ διάνοιαι περὶ Ὁμήρου Pl.Io 530d, αἱ τῶν ὀνομάτων διάνοιαι Pl.Cra.418a, διάνοιαν δὲ τοιαύτην εἶχε τὰ γεγραμμένα Plu.2.151b, δ. τοῦ νόμου el espíritu de la ley Aristeas 171, op. ῥητόν 'la letra escrita', Hermog.Stat.14.

68 I. P. Petrov, The Greek term ΔΙΑΝΟΙΑ, op. cit., 51.

solution in the Greek text, rendering the same Hebrew term – καρδία. Apart from these two, the Hebrew term is also translated by νοῦς, thus fusing the semantic borders even more.[69] This perception, relating to the mid-point of the human being, is found to some degree in later patristic authors such as Gregorius Nyssenus, who in search of a term to name this part of the human being uses the following: καρδία, ἡγεμονικόν (which is a Stoic term), συνείδησις, βαθεῖα διάνοιας[70] or Gregorius Nazianzus, who is somehow close to the classical notion of *νοῦς*: for him, this is the part of the human being created in God's image, the faculty that has the power of intelligence.[71] In later authors such as Symeon the New Theologian, it is often taken as a synonym for καρδία and νοῦς, especially, as H. Alfeyev puts it, "when speaking of the mystical vision of light. Both terms are of Biblical origin and occur in the Septuagint, being used widely in Christian ascetic literature. In particular, καρδία is one of the key anthropological terms in 'Makarian Homilies'."[72]

In the Old Church Slavonic environment διάνοια met with a variety of translation equivalents: мъıсль 'thought', помъıсль, помъıшлѣнїе 'intention, desire, wish' размъıшлѣнїе 'consideration', оумъ 'mind, intellect', разоумъ 'mind, reason', съвѣсть 'consciousness', съмъıслъ 'meaning, consciousness, thought', and срьдьце 'heart'. It is a prefixal derivative from оумъ and the morphological interrelations here correspond to the Greek νοῦς–διάνοια. This morphological parallelism points strongly to the conclusion that the Slavonic разоумъ may have been a calque[73] from Greek, though the data does not confirm a firm semantic equivalence.

This may be summarised, not without simplification of the attested data, as follows:[74]

1. The earliest texts, such as the *Gospels*, the *Apostolos* (in its most ancient redaction), and *Scet,* use the translation equivalent мъıсль and its derivatives (помъıсль, помъıшлѣнїе, съмъıслъ)[75] as renderings. Such decisions may have been made in conscious choice based on the understanding of the Greek terms as

69 Weissenrieder – Dolle, Noῦς, διάνοια, φρόνησις, op. cit., 263.

70 Daniélou, *Platonisme & Théologie mystique*, op. cit., 255. Louth, The origins, op. cit., 109.

71 A. N. Williams, *The Divine Sense. The Intellect in Patristic Theology*, Cambridge 2007, 91.

72 Alfeyev, *St Symeon the New Theologian*, op. cit., 235, n. 166.

73 The presence of the descendants of разоумъ and its derivatives (mainly the verb разоумѣти 'understand') in all contemporary Slavonic languages makes me believe that it could have been a calque implemented by spoken language contact, rather than a word constructed especially for the literary language.

74 See the data in Appendix 2.

75 For the exact attestations, see I. P. Petrov, *Към преводаческите съответствия*, op. cit., 251.

they primarily perceived in the earlier philosophical and theological literature, namely, as designating a discursive mind. The Slavonic translations suggest that διάνοια was comprehended as 'thoughts' or 'thought process'.

> Scet 2:27.3ff Δυνατόν γὰρ μετὰ πολλῶν ὄντα μονάζειν τῇ γνώμῃ, καὶ μόνον ὄντα μετὰ ὄχλων τῇ διανοίᾳ διάγειν.
> възможьно бо ѥстъ съ мъножьвми сѫщоу ѥдиноватн мъслиѭ нежели ѥдиномоу сѫщоу съ народомъ помъшлениѥмь бъıти
> Yet it is possible, while being with many, to be alone in thought, rather than, being alone, to be with the crowd in thinking.

Here it might be said that διάνοια resp. помъшлѣниѥ, express the whole aspect of the thinking process – that is, the inner life of thoughts in its totality, as opposed to the singular thoughts that appear as, or may lead to, specific intentions, a notion mostly expressed by λογισμός (see below).

> Scet G:2:7 (Ps 118:130) ἵνα σύ μοι φωτίζῃς τὴν διάνοιαν
> да тъı ми просвѣтиши оумъ и съмъıслъ [свѣтъмь разоума твоего]
> that you enlighten me [my] mind and reason [slav: +with the light of *Your* understanding]

This phrase – often met with as the Psalter quote, which is employed quite often – shows an interesting, likely double translation[76] of the Greek term, rendered as intellect (оумъ) and reason (съмъıслъ). As we will see below, *understanding* is also included in the semantic field of διάνοια (in this case mostly translated by разоумъ or even оумъ).

> Supr 76r.29-30 Οὐκ ἐξέστην τῶν φρενῶν οὐδὲ ὠλιγώρησα τῇ διανοίᾳ
> нѣсмъ оума ıзгоубилъ· ни ѡтънемогохъ съмъıсломъ·
> Neither have I gone out of my mind [slav. lost my mind], nor become weak in reasoning.

2. The occasional use of срьдьце 'heart' as an equivalent in some texts (once in: *Ap, Supr, Ez, Izb73*) may suggest a more *ad sensum* translation, possibly influenced by the spoken language where a clear distinction between 'heart' and 'mind' may not have existed. On the other hand, such an understanding is also encountered in the Greek tradition (even for νοῦς, see above). This would merely imply, therefore, the high versatility of the early Slavonic translators and their capacity to discern the slightest nuances in the original text.

> *Izb73* 93c4ff: ἀγαπᾶν τὸν θεὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας (=Mc 12:30.31; Deut 6:5)
> любити г҃а б҃а отъ всеѩ д҃ша и от всего с҃рца.

76 See more on double translations in A. Dimitrova, Double Translations as a Characteristic Feature of the Old Church Slavonic Translations of John Chrysostom's Commentaries on Acts, *Studia Ceranea* 9, 2019, 407–428.

In other text witnesses of the classical corpus, in a verse similar to this one, διάνοια is rendered with помꙑшлѥниѥ, cf. в҅сѣмь помꙑшлѣньемь твоимь ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου L10,27 Zogr Mar Sav Ostr. (example after SJS).

Ez 14:17 καὶ θῇ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοῦ
ти положить разоумꙑ своꙗ на срⷣци своемъ

In the example above, two things need to be commented on. First of all, the rendering of ἐνθύμημα as разоумъ. The Greek word is attested as помꙑшлѥниѥ in the Classical Corpus of Old Church Slavonic Translations.[77] As something that is (at least etymologically speaking) related to 'what is in the part of the soul connected with the affections', the translation choice разоумъ seems strange at a first sight. Such a solution might imply that the perception of разоумъ might be related to anything coming from the *inner* part of the human being. In this context, it might also relate to the idea of 'what has to be internalised' (laws, directions from God, wisdom, etc.) – that is, *understood,* and hence the translation with разоумъ. Rendering διάνοια as срьдьцє, then, seems to be a neat solution for expressing both the inner part of the human being *and* the somewhat emotional nuances of ἐνθύμημα, which are otherwise diminished by a translation with разоумъ.

3. The data from *Ar3* and *UE* suggest that оумъ was the equivalent preferred by Constantine of Preslav to translate διάνοια in its general sense of 'mind' or 'intellect'. This choice is mainly attested in *Supr* (22 times vs. мꙑсль 2, помꙑсль, разоумъ, and срьдьцє 1)*,* but also in *Izb73.* In John the Exarch's translations, it only appears in *Hex.* Broadly speaking, this lexical choice is likely specific to the Preslav circle. Rendering διάνοια as оумъ thus leads to a notable fusion with translations of νοῦς, which could later result in a complete blurring of understanding between those two terms. It has also been observed that in *Izb73,* the other lexical choices for διάνοια known from the earlier translations – съвѣсть and съмꙑслъ – were used only for rendering συνείδησις and σύνεσις.

In the Middle Bulgarian[78] corpus of texts looked at in this study, there is a clear tendency towards a reduction of translation equivalents. The most often encountered remain мꙑсль (passim in *Areop*, *GrigPal-BalCalabr*), помꙑслъ and помꙑшлѥниѥ, съмꙑслъ and оумъ. Among them, the circle of мꙑсль and its derivatives tends to present the strongest translation preference. Thus, διάνοια was given a narrower but still comprehensible scope of something connected to the thought process and its products – the concepts/intentions themselves.

There are some often-employed expressions featuring this Greek term that show interesting changes in their translations. As a specific collocation often appears throughout the texts, ὀρθὴ διάνοια should be granted particular atten-

77 Following the online version of SJS on the platform Gorazd.

78 A broader set of data is available in I. P. Petrov, *Към преводаческите съответствия*, op. cit., 255.

tion. There are some telling examples in Constantine of Preslav's translation of Athanasius Alexandrinus' *Contra Arianos III*:[79] ἀλλὰ καὶ ὀρθὴν εἶναι τὴν τοῦ ῥητοῦ διάνοιαν прѣмо сѫштѫ сего глагола ра҃зоумоу 130a14 [slav. according to] the same meaning of the word/what is said. The same collocation also appears in 134b12, 163b5 and it is translated consistently using ра҃зоумъ. As a variant, ἡ ὀρθόδοξος διάνοια can also be found, though there is only one instance: 181a13-14 νικώσης τῆς ὀρθοδόξου διανοίας прѣдѣлѣвшимѣ правовѣрнѣюмѣ оумѣ 'as the orthodox understanding overcame'. Another variant that might be considered is ἡ διάνοια τῆς ἀληθείας оу҆мъ же и҆сти́нꙑ (135a13-14 versus κακόνοιαν – зллоумѣние) – the understanding (slav. intellect) of the truth. The aforementioned ἡ διάνοια τοῦ ῥητοῦ /τῶν ῥητῶν, on the other hand, is attested as оу҆мъ глагóлъ (140a7-8), оумъ словесъ. (165a), ра҃зоумъ глагóлъ (Ταύτην ἔχοντος τοῦ ῥητοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν сь ра҃зоумъ глаголъ имѣвшимѣ 152б3), with seemingly no perceptible distinction offered between. Here we can discern that the fusion between 'mind'/'intellect' and 'understanding' was not only affecting the use of ра҃зоумъ, but also that of оумъ.

This expression regarding the eyes of the mind/soul could also appear with *διάνοια*, as in the Didactic Gospel: 8a1-b21 (hom. 1) εἰ δέ τινες ἥκοντες τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς διανοίας μύσαντες аще ли ѥтери оумима съвѣсти си волиѥю мьжаша 'if some willingly close the eyes of their consciousness.' As the same part of the human being where truth could also be discerned from lies and illusion, here we have οἱ τῆς διανοίας ὀφθαλμοί, the eyes of the soul/heart/conscious/mind, which are rendered as оуи съвѣсти (29c7) and оуи съвѣстьнꙑиа (50d15), showing a difference only in the manner in which the Greek genitive is dealt with, once with the Slavonic genitive and once with a possessive adjective – a typical solution, particularly for the early translations. In comparison, a similar expression – τῆς διανοίας ὄμμα – is rendered as мꙑсльнное око 'the eye of the thought/consciousness/mind' in *Izb73* 19d7-8, where the translation wanders more towards the figurative.[80]

Another collocation deserving attention is κατὰ διάνοιαν 'in the heart/consciousness/mind'. It is mainly attested in contexts where some activity was performed following some inner conviction or else performed especially in one's heart and/or mind. In *UE*, κατὰ διάνοιαν occurs in two places: κατὰ διάνοιαν ἤλγουν οἱ δέκα мꙑслы҃ѫ негодоваху҃ десать. 'the ten were discontented in their hearts/mind (slav: through their thought) 229b18ff; τῇ κατὰ διάνοιαν πίστει оумною вѣрою 'with the faith in mind/heart' (slav: with the intellectual /mental faith) 54a12. On both occasions, this expression conveys something experienced in a hidden manner. In the first passage, the ten disciples were grieving in their hearts after the dialogue between Jesus and the mother of the Zebedee brothers (Mt 20: 20–24). The other passage is part of an exegesis on Mt 10:32 about faith confessed with one's mouth (ἡ διὰ τοῦ στόματος ὁμολογία

79 *Supra,* following I. P. Petrov, *The Greek term ΔΙΑΝΟΙΑ*, op. cit., 57.
80 I. P. Petrov, *The Greek term ΔΙΑΝΟΙΑ*, op. cit., 58.

глаголѥма оустъı) as opposed to the hidden, inner conviction or belief. The same expression is attested in *Izb*73: 58a11 въ оумъ не прѣставаше съгрѣшаѧ κατὰ διάνοιαν οὐκ ἐπαύετο ἁμαρτάνων 'he did not stop committing sins in his mind [slav. intellect]'; 96a9 нача сѧ въ оумѣ къıчити и величати ἔρξατο κατὰ διάνοιαν φαντάζεσθαι καὶ μεγαλοφρονεῖν he started to boast and exalt himself in his mind/reason/heart [slav. intellect]. In *Scet,* the expression appears again at 5:2:3 as κατὰ διάνοιαν помъıшлѥниѥмь 'through intention/thought'; 5:5:3 κατὰ διάνοιαν мъıслиⷨ 'in his mind' (lit. 'through thought'); 18:26:38 στενάξας ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ въздъıхнⷭвъı помъıшлѥние 'having sighed in my thought'.[81]

These examples (and many others) would seem to suggest that the translation solutions often emphasized the thinking process and thoughts themselves that διάνοια was representing. Alongside the fact that the earliest text was to a considerable extent inclined to render the Greek term with equivalents from the derivational field of мъıсль 'thought', we might suppose that, for the early Old Church Slavonic translators, thought, thought process and the individual emerging thoughts occupied the inner centre of the human being. It might be concluded that one of the most frequently attested translations of διάνοια, разоумъ, was initially restricted to denoting the concept of 'understanding' (as a process and/or a result of an intellectual process, something coming from the reason, or out of a thought process). This could be referring to a word, a passage, or something said – that is, something verbally expressed and comprehensible. It is likely that the semantic development led to a merging with 'that by which this understanding was reached, that is, the 'mind', 'reason' and ultimately the 'intellect', thus inviting a merging with оумъ. This idea was later diversified and elaborated by introducing other Greek theological and philosophical concepts such as νοῦς. In a way, the Slavonic morpheme parallelism in оумъ – разоумъ corresponds tightly with the Greek νοῦς-διάνοια, which might suggest that the Slavic разоумъ was an early calque introduced henceforward into the intellectual, still developing, literary language.

6.3. Λογισμοί

In the Greek classical tradition,[82] this term was first used to denote arithmetical calculations[83] or the process of calculating, after which its meaning shifted to a more abstract and generalised idea of 'mental calculation, evaluation, assessment (of a situation)',[84] and from thence to 'rational thought, reasoning, reflection',[85] and finally to 'reasoning power, faculty of reason'.[86] In Patris-

81 I. P. Petrov, *ibid.,* 59.
82 Following the Cambridge Greek Lexicon, op. cit., 877.
83 E.g. τῶν ἡμερῶν Th.4.122. Examples are given according to Liddle – Scott – Jones, op. cit.
84 οὐ λογισμῷ δόντες τοὺς κινδύνους Lys.2.23.
85 οὗτος δὴ πᾶς ὅντος ἀεὶ λογισμὸς θεοῦ περὶ τὸν ποτὲ Pl. *Ti.* 34a.
86 τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος (ζῇ) καὶ τέχνῃ καὶ λογισμοῖς Arist. *Metaph.*980b28.

tic Greek[87] it evolved across a series of meanings as follows: 1. Argument, 2. Thought, imaging, 3. Notion, principle of interpretation, 4. Attitude, disposition, 5. Reason, mind.

In monastic writings, this term was one of the most frequently employed. Λογισμοί is usually used to denote the thoughts/intentions that come into the human mind and commonly lead to sin if an individual of their own free will decides to succumb to them. Especially in combination with ῥυπαρός, they very often carry a negative nuance.

> According to Evagrius [Ponticus], the true nature of the "mind" is to be fixed on God and anything which detaches it from God is evil. Thus, since the Fall, the human mind is captured with self-love, which generated "thoughts'; "thoughts", a definitely pejorative term in Evagrius, imply interest in sensible things and distraction from God. Acting upon the passible part of the soul, they can lead to *passions.* […] The first goal of the monastic "practice" is to subdue the passions and reach a state of "passionlessness" – a detachment from senses and "thoughts" – which makes a restoration of the true original relationship between the mind and God possible.[88]

The term can also be used to designate the whole thinking inner part of the human being, thus positioning it in close connection with διάνοια. This proximity is quite observable in the translation equivalents in Old Church Slavonic.[89] In the corpus of the oldest texts, λογισμός corresponds most often to помꙑслъ and/or the derivative помꙑшлѣниѥ (both terms frequently appear in the same text, with the exception of *Supr, Euch, Rom, AnSin, Izb73, Prol, Men12, Il, JEFid, Ar3,* and *VA1*, where the latter is either attested as a translation of λογισμός or not at all; and *Ap* and *UE* where the former does not feature as an equivalent to this Greek term).

> Scet 1.35.10 καὶ τότε εἰρηνεύσει σου ὁ λογισμός
> и тогда оумиритъ ти сѧ помꙑслъ
> And your thought will come to peace.

In examples like this, помꙑслъ especially in the singular, seems to convey the sense that it refers to the whole inner thinking part, the whole of the 'reason' or 'mind'. Interestingly, the derived term помꙑшлѣниѥ could also appear in such contexts as the example below:

> *Scet* 15.39.23 καὶ ἔλεγον τῷ λογισμῷ [μου]
> и глаголахъ помꙑшлѥнию моѥмоу
> And I said to my thought

87 Lampe, *A Patristic Lexicon*, op. cit., 806. Unfortunately, Lampe seems to have omitted *διάνοια* in his *Lexicon*.

88 Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, op. cit., 68.

89 See the data in Appendix 3.

More often, though, especially in the later periods, помъıшлѥниѥ together with помъıслъ were deployed especially when the Greek word was in the plural and refering to the thoughts as intentions, such as in the following:

> *Scet* 11.58.2 διακρίνων τοὺς λογισμούς
> разсѫждаѩ своꙗ помъıшлѥниꙗ
> Discerning his intentions [Veder: reflecting on his thoughts]

Other solutions were мъıсль (the derivational base for the previous two and very likely the generic term for thoughts and thought process/es) – it is the most frequently attested equivalent in *Scet* with more than 100 attestations; оумъ (based probably on contexts where the Greek term refers to the capacity for thinking, thus close to νοῦς and διάνοια); съмъıслъ (that is, consciousness, with a few attestations in *Supr, Rom, Izb76, Men12, GrN13, Am*); and sporadically as разоумъ (*Ez, Izb73, GrN13, Am*), and singularly as слово (i.e. λόγος in *Rom*) and доуша ('soul' in *Izb76*).

> Supr 211r21 Μηδεὶς τοίνυν ἐχέτω ἔνδον πονηροὺς λογισμούς
> не мози ѹбо никтоже ꙁъла ѹма ӥмѣти вь себѣ·
> Let no one have wicked thoughts [slav. intellect, mind]

Here the plural form in the Greek Vorlage (or at least the one available to us nowadays) probably understood in total and thus rendered in the Old Church Slavonic text with оумъ which appears to be the generic term used for the mind and intellect.

> Scet 3.4.4 ποίησον τὸν λογισμὸν σου
> иди сътвори мъıсль своѭ
> Go and make your thought [i.e. fulfil, act according to, I. P.]

As already mentioned, мъıсль is the most employed option for rendering λογισμός in *Scet*. Here, the context suggests that the notion of 'intention' was expressed by both the Vorlage and the Slavic translation.

> Scet 21.24.2 εἶπε γέρων ὅτι εἴκοσι ἔτη ἔμεινα πρὸς ἕνα λογισμὸν πολεμῶν ἵνα πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὡς ἕνα βλέπω
> рече старьць: к (дъвадесѧте) лѣть бѣхъ съ ѥдиноѭ мъıслиѭ борѧ сѧ да бимь вьсѣхъ чловѣкъ ꙗко ѥдиного зьрѣлъ
> An old man said: 20 years I was contending with one thought: that I would see all men as one[90]

In this last example, it might be suggested that λογισμός and its translation equivalent мъıсль express the idea of a thought as 'understanding', 'inner disposition'. This specific meaning brings both the original term and its rendering

90 Veder, *Patericon,* op. cit., 622.

towards other already commented on lexical units such as διάνοια and possibly ꙗꙁоумъ.[91]

In the Middle Bulgarian translations, this variability was significantly reduced, boiling down to three options: мъıсль or помъıслъ were deployed predominantly, followed by the derivative помъıшлѣнїе. Thus, помъıсль and помъıшлѣнїе have become *termini technici* used to denote the intentions and thoughts coming into the human mind. On other occasions, where λογισμός was used in its more generalised sense of 'thinking part/capability', the same solutions were employed. The Desert Fathers' teaching (then preserved and systemised mostly in Evagrius's works) about the eight principle λογισμοί also entered the Slavonic milieu, though under the name of Nylus of Ankyra, and there (according to the testimony of MS ÖNB Cod.Slav.28) they are referred to solely as помъıслъı. In later Church language, though, and even into the present, they are traditionally referred to as ⷭтрасти (lit. *passions*). The reception of this idea and its linguistic reflections in the Orthodox milieu, though, needs further study.

6. Concluding remarks

Nous, διάνοια and λογισμός, of course, are not the only three terms used to refer to the realm of the intellect, mind, thought and reason. They could lay a foundation, to which data and observations regarding other terms could be added, including ἔννοια, φρήν, γνῶσις, and so on. Their semantic field and subtle nuances constitute a complicated net of interchanges made possible by context variability, which led to similar confusion in their translation into Old Church Slavonic. This variability and contextual aptness, though, were reassessed and simplified in later centuries, mostly driven by the tendency to aspire to greater closeness to the Greek original, indeed as far as possible grammatically and quantitatively – a distinct characteristic, especially of 14th century South Slavonic translations.[92]

As already noted, the earliest texts mostly referred to terms like διάνοια and λογισμός with equivalents relating to thought and the thinking process. Νοῦς was most often translated by ꙋмъ which, although having the meaning of 'mind' and 'intellect', did not differ that much from διάνοια, or even sometimes λογισμός regarding the translation equivalents. One explanation for this fluctuation could be the fact that Greek texts from different stages of the development of the post-classical language were received and translated in a short period of time, without any diachronic order or a theoretical and systematic approach. From the observable fluctuation in the use of synonyms, it might also be concluded that the translators were not aiming at reproducing the inner terminological stability of the Greek originals. Different contextual

91 Which, as it has been demonstrated, was more preferred in the Preslavian texts.

92 See more in Yovcheva – Taseva, *Езиковите образци на атонските редактори*, op. cit.

meanings of the Greek terms could have entered as translation equivalents, which were henceforward used by Slavic writers in rendering the same word but in completely different contexts and thus with other meanings. In time, this led to a process of 'terminologisation' – that is to say, a reduction in possible synonymic relations and the expression of all the different contextual meanings through one lexical unit in the translation, regardless of the semantic specifics of this word in the target language. This process, though, never came to an end for words like διάνοια, where the variety of translation solutions remained high even in the Middle Bulgarian period when νοῦς, at the other extreme, almost always corresponded to оумъ. Similarly, λογισμός was reduced to помъıслъ and the derivative помъıшлѣниıе 'thought as intention, desire', though sometimes rendered also мъıсль 'thought (in general)'.

The finer notions of νοῦς as the higher part of the soul, capable of experiencing the Divine light or contemplating the Divine realities, remained somewhat ambiguous or was never fully expressed. In the later language, with оумъ brought towards a much narrower set of translation equivalents, we might speak of a more terminological understanding of the Greek term. The same applies to λογισμός conveyed by помъıслъ and помъıшлѣниıе in the sense of 'intention, wish, desire'. Διάνοια seems to have escaped this process, retaining its semantic multivalency in terms of contextual nuances and often operating synonymously with νοῦς and λογισμός (but also, for example, ἔννοια and σύνεσις), which resulted also in a wide array of translation equivalents. In contrast to the other two terms, διάνοια kept closest to the initial tendency of the earliest translators – to be faithful to the spirit of the written text, rather than obeying the letter.

Sources

Text Witnesses and Editions for the Early Period (10th–11th c.)

Am	George Hamartolos's Chronicle [93]
AnSin	The Erotoapokriseis of Abba Anastasius the Sinaite[94]
Ap	the translation(s) of the Apostolos[95]

93 V. Istrin, *Книги временныя и образныя Георгия Мниха. Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе. Т. 3. Греческо-славянский и славянско-греческий словари*, Leningrad 1930.

94 W. Veder, *Авва Анастасий Синайски. Въпроси и отговори. Том 1: Увод и показалци*, Veliko Tarnovo 2011.

95 I have used the *Řecko-Staroslověnský Index*. Index verborum Graeco-Palaeoslavonicus. Tomus I. fasc. 1, 2008, fasc.2, 2009, Prague, and also I. Hristova-Shomova, *Служебният Апостол в славянската ръкописна традиция. Том 1: Изследване на библейския текст*, Sofia 2004. I have also consulted the archive of the Greek-Old Church Slavonic index (ŘSI) of the Department for Slavonic Studies at the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, thanks to a research stay there sponsored by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in April 2022. I am indebted to V. Čermák and Š. Pilát for their valuable help and support before and during this stay.

Ar1	Constantine of Preslav's translation of Athanasius' *Contra Arianos I*[96]
Ar3	Constantine of Preslav's translation of Athanasius' *Contra Arianos III*[97]
ČudPs	Čudov's Psalter[98]
EphK	Ephrem's *Kormčaja*[99]
Euch	Euchologium Sinaiticum[100]
Ev	the Gospel translation(s)[101]
Ez	the book of Ezekiel[102]
GrN13	13 discourses of Gregory Nazianzus [103]
Il	*Ilina Kniga*[104]
Izb73	Symeon's Miscellany (*Izbornik of 1073)* [105]
Izb76	*Izbornik* of 1076[106]
JExFid	John the Exarch's translation of *De Fide Orthodoxa*[107]
Men12	Menaion for December[108]

96 Via the index in the edition of the First Speech against the Arians in A. Totomanova – I. Hristov – T. Slavova – G. Ganeva – M. Totomanova-Paneva – P. Penkova, *Атанасий Александрийски. Първо слово против Арианите. Том 1. Издание на текста. Том 2. Изследвания*, Sofia 2022.

97 P. Penkova, *Свети Атанасий Александрийски (Велики). Трето слово против арианите. Изследване и издание на текста*, Sofia 2016. The author made her work available online, which made it possible to search the Greek text digitally and then 'manually' trace the lexical equivalents in the Old Bulgarian translation.

98 V. Pogorelov, *Чудовская псалтырь XI века. Отрывок Толкования Феодорита Киррского на Псалтырь в древнеболгарском переводе*, Sankt-Peterburg 1910.

99 K. A. Maksimovich – L. Burgmann, *Византийская Синтагма 14 титулов без толкований в древнеболгарском переводе.* Славяно-греческий, греческо-славянский и обратный (славянский) словоуказатели, (= Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte, 27), Frankfurt am Main 2010.

100 P. Penkova, *Речник-индекс на Синайския евхологий*, Sofia 2016. Also SJS and the Archive of the ŘSI.

101 I have used the *Řecko-Staroslověnský Index* and its unpublished archive (v. supra) and Hristova-Shomova, *Служебният Апостол*, op. cit.

102 T. Ilieva, *Старобългарско-гръцки словоуказател към Книгата на пророк Иезекиил* (= Старобългарският превод на Стария Завет, 3), Sofia 2013.

103 A. Budilovich, *Исследование языка древнеславянского перевода XIII слов Григория Богослова. По рукописи Императорской публичной библиотеки XI века*, Sant-Peterburg 1871. I am indebted to L. Taseva for her help in preparing the excerpted material from this edition.

104 *Ильина книга (XIв.). Исследования. Указатели.* Подготовили V. B. Krys'ko – I. M. Ladyzhenskiy – T. I. Mezhikovskaya, Moscow 2015.

105 *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.). Т. 3. Гръцки извори.* Гръцки текст и изследване: P. Yaneva, Славянски текст, прегледан и сверен допълнително: A. Mincheva – T. Raleva – T. Doseva – P. Yaneva, Sofia 2015. The material was excerpted and systhematised partly using the Slavonic index in the vol.2., partly manually.

106 M. S. Mushinskaya – E. A. Mishina – V. S. Golyshenko, *Изборник 1076 года.* Второе издание, переработеное и дополненное, T. 2, Moscow 2009.

107 Via the Greek-Slavonic index in T. Ilieva, *Терминологичната лексика в Йоан-Екзарховия превод на "De Fide Orthodoxa"*, Sofia 2013.

108 D. Christians, *Wörterbuch zum Gottesdienstmenäum für den Monat Dezember. Slavisch-griechisch-deutsch nach ostslavischen Handschriften des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts mit*

Prol Simple Prolog[109]
Proph12 the book of the 12 Prophets[110]
Rim Roman Patericon (Gregorius Dialogos' *Dialogorum Libri IV)*[111]
Scet Scete Patericon [112]
Supr Codex Suprasliensis[113]
UE Constantine of Preslav's *Didactic Gospel* (*Učitel'noje Evangelije)*[114]
VA1 the first translation of the *Life of St Anthony the Great*[115]
Zlat *Zlarostruj*/Chrysorrhoas [116]

Text Witnesses and Editions from the Later (Middle Bulgarian) Period (12th–14th c.)

ALat the anti-Latin works of Gregorius Palamas and Barlaam of Calabria[117]
Areop the Areopagite corpus[118]
Dam.Dorm3 translation of John of Damascus' *Third homily on Theotokos's Dormition*[119]
Dam.Drom1 translation of John of Damascus' *First homily on Theotokos's Dormition*[120]
Dam.Nat1 translation of John of Damascus' *First homily on Theotokos's Nativity*[121]

---

einem Glossar griechisch-slavisch, Wiesbaden 2001.

109 *Славяно-русский Пролог по древнейшим спискам. Синаксарь (житийная часть Пролога краткой редакции) за сентябрь-февраль, Т. 2. Указатели. Исследования*, V. B. Krys'ko – L. V. Prokopenko – V. Zhelyazkova – I. M. Ladyzhenskiy – A. M. Pentkovskiy, Moscow 2011.

110 R. Zlatanova, *Книга на Дванадесетте пророци с тълкования* (=*Старобългарският превод на Стария Завет*, T. 1), Sofia 1998.

111 Ch. Diddi, *Патерик Римский. Диалоги Григория Великого в древнеславянском переводе*, Moscow 2001.

112 Veder, *Patericon,* op. cit.

113 Via SJA and the Archive of the ŘSI.

114 Via the working data-base of the project *The Vocabulary of Constantine of Preslav's Uchitel'noe evangelie ('Didactic Gospel'): Old Bulgarian-Greek and Greek-Old Bulgarian Word Indices* (sponsored by the National Scientific Fund Bulgaria, contract КП-06-H50/2).

115 Cf. Petkov, *Славянските преводи*, op. cit., and the edition of one of the copies in К. Костова, *Правопис и фонетика на преславските текстове*, Veliko Tarnovo – Sofia 2000. I have been able to consult the transcribed text of the witness Zogr. 19, 112r ff, dated to the late 14th century, thanks to P. Petkov.

116 This is the so-called *long edition* provided with a Greek-Slavonic index in A. Dimitrova's study of its language in А. Димитрова, *Златоструят в преводаческата традиция на старобългарските книжовници*, Sofia 2016.

117 Y. Kakridis – L. Taseva, *Gegen die Lateiner. Traktate von Gregorios Palamas und Barlaam von Kalabrien in kirchenslawischer Übersetzung*, (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris, fontes et dissertationes, LXI), Freiburg i. Br. 2014. I thank Professor L. Taseva for providing me with lexical data from her personal archive.

118 *Das Corpus des Dionysios Areopagites in der slavischen Übersetzung von Starec Isaija (14. Jahrhundert).* Band 4.1-3. Indices. Hrsg. S. Fahl – J. Harney – D. Fahl, Freiburg i. Br. 2012.

119 T. Danova, *John of Damascus's Marian Homilies in Mediaeval South Slavonic Literatures*, (Studies in Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe, 36), Berlin 2020.

120 Ibid.

121 Ibid.

Dam.Nat2	translation of John of Damascus' *Second homily on Theotokos's Nativity*[122]
DialXIV	the 14th c. Translations of John of Damascus' *Dialectica*[123]
DogmXIV	the 14th c. Translations of John of Damascus' *Dogmatica* [124]
Doroth	abba Dorotheus' works[125]
GNHO	Gregorius of Nyssa *De hominis opificio*[126]
Job	the translation of the book of Job[127]
Phot	Photius' letter to knyaz Boris[128]
SynTr	Triodion Synaxars[129]
VA2	the Second translation of the *Life of St Anthony the Great*[130]
VA3	the Third translation of the *Life of St Anthony the Great*[131]
VPa	the translation of the *Life of St Pachomius the Great*[132]

Appendix 1: Νοῦς

Featured in the tables below are only the texts where attestations have been found. The numbers indicate the number of lexical attestations wherever the index has mentioned them. The plus sign (+) indicates where a certain translation equivalent is attested, but due to the index structure, usage is impossible to quantify.

---

122 Ibid.

123 E. Weiher, *Die Dialektik des Johannes von Damaskus in der kirchenslavischen Übersetzung*, Wiesbaden 1969.

124 E. Weiher, *Die Dogmatik des Johannes von Damaskus in der kirchenslavischen Übersetzung des 14. Jahrhunderts*, E. Weiher – F. Keller – H. Miklas (eds.), Freiburg i. Br. 1987.

125 K. Dimitrov, *Авва Доротей. Слова. Среднобългарски превод. Гръцко-български словоуказател*, Veliko Tarnovo 2013.

126 *Gregory of Nyssa. De hominis opificio. О образѣ человѣка. The Fourteenth-Century Slavonic Translation. A Critical Edition with Greek Parallel and Commentary*, (= Bausteine zur slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte, Neue Folge, Reihe B: Editionen, Bd. 21), L. Sels (ed.), + Index. Slavonic-Greek and Greek-Slavonic. Version 1-09, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2009.

127 I. Hristova-Shomova, *Книга Йов с тълкувания в славянски превод* (по Владиславовия препис от 1456 г., ръкопис № 4/14 от сбирката на Рилския манастир), Sofia 2007.

128 T. Slavova, *Славянският превод на посланието на патриарх Фотий до княз Борис-Михаил*, Sofia 2013.

129 L. Taseva, *Триодните синаксари в средновековната славянска книжнина. Текстологично изследване. Издание на Закхеевия превод. Словоуказатели*, (= Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris, 54), Freiburg i. Br. 2010.

130 I have consulted the text in the copy at Rila Monastery, N 4/8, *Panegyricum Vladislavi* (1479). My thanks to P. Petkov, who provided me with the transcribed text, and to the project "Bulgarian Digital Book" at the Department of Slavonic Studies, University of Sofia "St Kliment Ohridksi", for the digital copy of the MS. Cf. in Petkov, *Славянските преводи*, op. cit.

131 I have consulted the text of the *codex unicus* in the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, N 43, ff., 1–47. The text of this witness has been published online (https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/textcorpus/show/doc_55) by A. Dimitrova, who also dedicated a special study to its language, cf. A. Dimitrova, Третият превод, op. cit.

132 I have consulted the text in the copy at Rila Monastery, N 4/8, thanks to P. Petkov. For more on this text, see I. P. Petrov, Die Terminologie der Askese, op. cit.

1. *Nous* and its corresponding terms in the Old Church Slavonic texts from the early period.

νοῦς	мъıсль	оумъ	разоумъ
Eu		Zogr Ass L24.45	
Ap	+ (archaic group: Ochr, Slepč,Chr) + 1, Supr	+ (Ath.) Tolst (Pres). Col 2:18 + Chr. Slepč, Mosk 18,	Tolst. (Pres.) 1Cor 1:10
Supr	1	13+1[133]	1
EuchSin	(N) 1 R12.2	(N) 2	
Scet	4	24	1
Rim		40	
Ez		2 (/18)	
Izb73[134]		32	3
Izb76		5	
Prol		1[135]	
Men12		50	5
Il		16	
EphK		23	
GrN13[136]		7	
ČudPs		1	1
JEFid		23	1
Ar1		+	+
Ar3		10	
UE		8	
GAM		1	1
VA1		+	+

2. *Nous* and its corresponding terms in some Middle Bulgarian texts.

νοῦς	мъıсль	оумъ	разоумъ	съвѣсть
GNHO		Passim		
Doroth		Passim		
Dam.Nativ2				Passim
Dam.Dorm3, Dorm1, Nativ1, Nativ2		Passim		

133 вєзоумиıє Supr 413.12 ἡ τύφλωσις τοῦ νοός.
134 +разоумѣниıє 1.
135 + εἰς νοῦν въ собє.
136 + νόημα разоумъ 3, размъıслъ 1, помъıслъ 1.

νοῦς	мъıсль	оумъ	разоумъ	съвѣсть
SynTr		Passim 4/4		
ALat +оумышление 1		17 (/20)	2 (/20)	
Job		+	+	
DialXIV		Passim		
DogmXIV	4	Passim		
Areop		passim (358)		
Phot		+		
VA2		Passim		
VA3		Passim		
VPa		Passim		

Appendix 2: Διάνοια[137]

1. *Dianoia* and its corresponding Old Church Slavonic terms in the texts from the early period.

διάνοια[138]	мъıсль	помъıслъ	помъıшленıе	размъıшленıе	оумъ	разоумъ	съвѣсть	съмъıслъ	ѹмъııлıе
Eu	2		2		2				
Ap	1		4			+ (Ath)		2	1
Supr	2	1			22	1			1
EuchSin	+		+		+				
Scet	1		3		2+1	1 (err)		1	
Rim	3	2+1[139]			3				
AnSin	2								
ChrhL					+		+	+	+
Proph12					1	1			
Ez					3/18	2/33			1/48
Izb73	1	3			7	1			1
Izb76	4				9	2			
Prol					2	1 (adj)			
Men12					8	15	3	1	
Il			1		5		2		
EphK			1		2	2		5	

137 Following I. P. Petrov, The Greek term ΔΙΑΝΟΙΑ, op. cit. and I. P. Petrov, Към преводаческите съответствия, op. cit.

138 +1 размъıслъ, +1 размъıшленıе, +1 съмъıшленıе; + гатаниѥ PsCaes (+ = νόημα ibid).

139 With a praes. act. part of помъıслити.

διάνοια[138]	мꙑсль	помꙑслъ	помꙑшлѣние	размꙑшлѣние	оумъ	разоумъ	съвѣсть	съмꙑслъ	срьдьце
GrN13[140]	4			1	5	4			
ČudPs	+				+	+			
JEFid	1	1				1			
JEHex	4	1			2	1			
Ar1	+				+	+			
Ar3					11	7	3	1	
UE	2		4		9		3		
GAM[141]			1	1		1	1		
VA1	5			3	4		1		

2. *Dianoia* and its corresponding terms in some Middle Bulgarian texts.

διάνοια	мꙑслъ	помꙑслъ	помꙑшлѣние	оумъ	разоумъ	съвѣсть	съмꙑслъ	срьдьце
GNHO	+			+			+	
Doroth	+	+		+				+
Dam.HMar1-2	+							
Dam.Nativ1						+		
SynTr	—	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALat[142]	16	1						
Job	+		+					
DialXIV[143]		+	+		+		+	
DogmXIV[144]	3	1	1					
Areop[145]	18+1			1			1	
Phot	+							
VA2	2	3	1	6				
VA3	2	1				2	6	
VPa	3		1	1+2			1	1

140 +размꙑслъ 2, размꙑшлѣние 1, освѣштение 1, просвѣштение 1.

141 +1 домꙑшлѣние, замꙑшлѣние, размꙑслъ, размꙑшлѣние, съвѣдание, съвѣдѣние, оувѣствие.

142 +мꙑшление, дѣание.

143 +размꙑслъ.

144 +размꙑслъ, размꙑшление.

145 +разоумѣние.

Appendix 3: Λογισμός

1. *Logismos* and its corresponding Old Church Slavonic terms in texts from the Early Period.

Λογισμός	мꙑсль	мꙑшл҄ениѥ	помꙑслъ	помꙑшл҄ениѥ	оумъ	разоумъ	разоумѣниѥ	съмꙑслъ	слово	доуша
Ap	+ R 2.15 (Christ Ochr Slepč Šiš Mak)			+ 2C10.4 Chr Slepč + Christ Philip2.14						
Supr	3		6		6			2		
EuchSin	+		+							
Scet	110+		5	60+	8					
Rim	3		37		12		1	2	1	
AnSin[146]	1		19							
Proph12				1[147]						
Ez[148]			4 (/22)	2 (/6)	3 (/ 18)	3 (/ 33)				
Izb73	15		39		2	1				
Izb76	3		6	1	3			2		1
Prol			4							
Men12			6					1		
Il		1								
EphK	1		18	4						
GrN13[149]	2		4	1	4	1		1		
ČudPs[150]	1			1					1	
JEFid	4		1							
Ar1	+			+						
Ar3	+									
UE				2						
GAM[151]	1		1	1		1		1		
VA1	+		+							

146 +глаголъ 3, искоусъ 7, льсть 1.
147 +1 помышлꙗти.
148 + глаголъ (1/7).
149 + нравъ, размꙑслъ, 1.
150 + дѣло.
151 +домꙑслъ, домꙑшление, замꙑслъ, замꙑшление, промꙑслъ, размꙑшление.

2. *Logismos* and its corresponding terms in some Middle Bulgarian texts

Λογισμός	мѣслѣ	помѣслъ	помѣшлѣение
GNHO		+	
Doroth		+	+
Dam.Dorm1		+	
Dam.Nativ1			+
SynTr	-	-	-
ALat	5/8	2/8	-
Job	-	-	-
DialXIV		+	+
DogmXIV	+	+	+
Areop		10/10	
Phot		+	
VA2	+	+	+
VA3	+	+	+
VPa	1	9	1

Ivan P. Petrov
Institut für Slawistik
Universität Wien
Spitalgasse 2-4, Hof 3
1090 Wien
ivan.petrov@univie.ac.at