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

Greek Philosophical and Logical Terms in the 10th c. Preslav Translations[1]

Ivan CHRISTOV (Sofia)
https://doi.org/10.58377/byzslav.2024.7

The article examines the translation of Byzantine texts with logical content in the Preslav School in the 9th and 10th centuries. The way in which 90 Greek terms are rendered, referring to the ontological foundations of logic and above all those with a specific logical meaning, is studied. Slavonic equivalents related to terms in proposition and their hierarchy, propositions themselves as bearers of truth and falsity, logical operations, syllogism and definition are put to examination. There was no norm at that time and the Preslav translators put immense effort to render these most complex and unusual texts. Completely understandable under these circumstances they were not always consistent in word usage. That is why the Preslav translators used 204 Slavonic words and word combinations thus more than doubling (226%) the terminology of translation. A comparison is made of the practice of translation within the school and sceptical remarks are made about the existence of a unified, preconceived and agreed upon register of terms in it. The grounds for this are that out of 42 logical terms in John the Exarch, only 16 match those in the Miscellany of Tzar Simeon and out of 57 terms in the Constantine of Preslav's translation of the orations against the arians by Athanasius of Alexandria, also only 16 match those in the Miscellany of Tzar Simeon and in the translations by John the Exarch.

The article also studies the question of the persistence of the tradition and compares the first translations of the 9th and 10th centuries with those of the "Dialectic" by John Damascene and the "Areopagitics" in the 14th c. It is concluded that the Serbian translators of the 14th c. were quite independent from their Preslav predecessors using only 59 of their terms (29%) and have introduced 138 new ways of rendering the Greek originals. This testifies to the limited uniformity of Slavonic philosophical tradition through the centuries. Therefore, the applicability of Preslav translation forms today needs a conscious appreciation and balanced approach. In this way it can be recognized and properly appreciated.

The translators of Byzantine theology of the Preslav Literary School in the 9th and 10th century[2] faced challenges, the severity of which is difficult to imagine today. First of all, it is the underdevelopment of the Bulgarian and more

---

[1] This publication is related to the project 'Bogomilism in History and in the Present Day' sponsored by the National Science Fund of Bulgaria (КП-06-Н80/8 08.12.2023). The opinions expressed in it are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Fund.

[2] This is the second significant literary center in the Slavonic world. It was established after 893, around the time when the Bulgarian capital was moved from Pliska to Preslav, presu-

generally the Slavic languages of that time. While the language of the Greek originals has more than a thousand-year history in which terminological usages understandable to the reader have been established, the Slavic tradition is just beginning to build them. In this regard, the Preslav translations played a special role, which in part has not lost its importance today. Even if we leave aside the not indisputable versions[3] of the "Preslav redaction of the oldest translations", of the existence of "Preslav lexicon",[4] and of some particular "Preslav theological register",[5] the translators had to find the way among the diverse forms of lexical-morphological and semantic term formation and to convey the sophisticated meaning of the original. This has not always been successful. Some of the terms they used were forgotten in history. In other cases, they have imposed as conventional formulas not the most suitable modes of translation. Secondly and related to the above, the translators of that time were faced with texts of increased difficulty – those belonging to high Byzantine theology, rich in theological and philosophical terms. The use of philosophical language in a theological context is not unambiguous. It changes the terms meanings and sometimes even their semantic function, turning them into mental symbols. The translators' knowledge in the field of theology or still less in philosophy was hardly comparable to the authors they were translating. Accordingly, it was not at all easy for them to convey the transformations of philosophical language within theology – to that layer of it, which the tradition calls "Christian philosophy".

I will try in this paper to present some of the challenges the first translators had to face, which caused homonymy, variability and finally non-acceptance of the majority of their solutions by the later tradition. Being especially rich with philosophical and logical terms, the so called "Philosophical treatise" in Tzar Simeon's Miscellany (the earliest copy of which is dated 1073)[6] will be

---

mably in the "Saint Panteleimon" monastery, to continue the activity of the school in Pliska, which hosted the disciples of holy brothers Cyril and Methodius at the end of 885 (or the beginning of 886) after their expulsion from Great Moravia.

[3] Based on linguistic arguments, these versions did not receive general recognition and were doubted by other linguists denying the existence of both a "Preslav lexicon" and a "Preslav redaction:" R. Stankov, Eshhe raz k probleme tak nazyvaemoy „preslavskoy leksiki", *Palaeobulgarica* 45/2, 2021, 65–84, esp. 65–68.

[4] D. Ivanova Mircheva, Starobălgarskite knizhovni sredishha kato „ezikovi shkoli", *Văprosi na bălgarskiya knizhoven ezik do Văzrazhdaneto*, Sofia 1987, 177–187, esp. 185–186. See also Y. Miltenov, O treh lingvisticheskih kriteriyah lokalizatsii drevneyshih slavyanskih rukopisey: kriticheskiy obzor, *Trudy Instituta russkogo yazyka. Lingvisticheskoe istochnikovedenie* 1, 2021, 233–245. Y. Miltenov, Preslavskite leksikalni markeri. 1. Opit za văvedenie, *Palaeobulgarica* 44/2, 2020, 54–79.

[5] P. Penkova (ed.), *Sveti Atanasiy Aleksandriyski*, *Vtoro slovo protiv arianite (v starobălgarski prevod)*, Sofia 2015, 58–79.

[6] The Old Bulgarian translation of the so-called *Salvific Book* (a Byzantine anthology) made on demand of the Bulgarian king Symeon at the end of the 9th c. or the beginning of the 10th c. Along with other theological texts, it also includes more abstract "philosophical" content. Those are excerpts of the works of St. Maximus the Confessor (Qu. 29 [426],

used to provide the general context against which the “philosophical” usages in John Exarch works[7] and in the translation of the Orations Against the Arians[8] will be compared. To check to which extent they were adopted by the later tradition, they will be compared to the 14th c. translation of the “Philosophical chapters (the Dialectics)” – the first part of the “Fount of knowledge” by St John Damascene[9] and the Corpus Dionysiacum in the Slavonic translation by Starets Isaija.[10] All these treatises besides the general philosophical terms contain also such of logic, which are relatively rare in theological texts. Rendering them is even more difficult for a translator of spiritual literature. Nevertheless, the study of logic took an essencial part in the higher education of Byzantium. The *Vita Constantini* by St Clement of Ohrid testifies that the the great Apostle to the Slavs during his studies in Constantinople was a student of Leo the Philosopher

---

Qu. 30 [429–430]) and of Theodor of Raithu (Qu. 29 [428]). The translation of these high examples of Christian philosophy lays the bases for the philosophical language of the Orthodox Slavonic tradition. Quotations in the text below are to the edition *Simeonov sbornik (po Svetoslavoviya prepis ot 1073 g.). Tom 3: Grătski izvori,* P. Yaneva (ed.), Sofia 2015. The abbreviation I use in the paper is *SM.* For my more elaborate analysis of the texts see A. Christova – I. Christov, Ponyatiyna struktura i lingvistichna harakteristika na kategorialno-logicheskite termini văv Filosofskiya traktat na Simeonoviya sbornik, *Bălgarski filosofski pregled* 3*,* 2013, 15–61.

[7] The references to the *De fide orthodoxa* (JoE Th.) are to the edition *Des Hl. Johannes von Damaskus Ἔκθεσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως in der Übersetzung des Exarchen Johannes,* (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris, V.1–V.4), L. Sadnik – R. Aitzetmüller (ed.), Wiesbaden 1967–1983 and to the *Hexaemeron* (JoE Hex.) – *Das Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes*, (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris, I–VII), Graz 1958–1971. On terminology in John Exarch translations see T. Ilieva, *Terminologichnata leksika v Yoan-Ekzarhoviya prevod na „De fide orthodoxa“*, Sofia 2013. T. Ilieva, Nomina abstracta s terminologichna funktsia v Yoan Ekzarkhoviya prevod na De Fide Orthoxa, *Preslavska knizhovna shkola* 19, 2019, 50–74. T. Ilieva, Teologo-Filosofskata terminologichna leksika v starobălgarskata knizhnina i neinite kontinuanti v săvremenniia ezik, *Preslavska knizhovna shkola* 15, 2015, 119–139. A. M. Totomanova – I. Christov (red.), *Terminologichen rechnik na Yoan Ekzarh*, Sofia 2019.

[8] The references to the First oration against arians (Ath. *c. ar. 1*) are to the recent critical edition *Alexandrinus. Oratio I contra arianos.* T. I. Editio textus, A.-M. Totomanova – T. Slavova – I. Christov et al. (eds.), Sofia 2022; to the Second (Ath. *c. ar. 2*) – *Sveti Atanasiy Aleksandriyski*, *Vtoro slovo protiv arianite*, Penkova (ed.), op. cit. (cf. *Athanasius of Alexandria, Oratio II contra Arianos*. Old Slavonic Version and English Translation, V. V. Lytvynenko (ed.), Turnhout 2019), and to the Third (Ath. *c. ar. 3*) – *Sveti Atanasiy Aleksandriyski (Veliki). Treto slovo protiv arianite (izsledvane i izdanie na teksta)*, Sofia 2016 (cf. *Athanasius of Alexandria, Oratio III contra Arianos*. Old Slavonic Version and English Translation, V. V. Lytvynenko (ed.), Turnhout 2021).

[9] The references to the Philosophical chapters (*Dial.*) are to the edition: *Die Dialektik des Johannes von Damaskus in kirchenslavischer Übersetzung*, (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris, VIII), Wiesbaden 1969.

[10] *Das Corpus des Dionysios Areiopagites in der slavischen Übersetzung von Starec Isaija (14. Jahrhundert)*, (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris, LV–LVII, LIX (LV 1-3, 4.1-3, 5)), Freiburg i. Br. 2010–2014.

and Photius the Great "in dialectic and all philosophical knowledge".[11] Although we do not have more specific data about his training, there is no doubt that dialectics played an important role for his activity as a missionary – for his ability to build convincing arguments and to receive the recognition of the Gentiles. His students form the basis of the literary schools in Pliska and Preslav, and we can expect also some knowledge of logical terminology on their side, the more so that some of them have studies in the Magnaura school in Constantinople.

Much more specific is our knowledge of the teaching of logic in late Byzantium. According to the testimony in Vat. gr. 241 (13th c.),[12] besides the Aristotle's treatises 34 commentaries were recommended for reading, written by 15 commentators from the 1st to the late 13th c. In the most part they are dedicated to logic – 20 of them (59%), written by 10 authors.[13] The most popular commentators were Christians. They wrote 9 of the recommended texts: John Philoponus (490–570) – 5; Leo Magentenos Metropolitan of Mytilene (13th c.) – 4 commentaries. Although the Epitome logica by the monk Nicephorus Blemmydes (1197 – after 1269) is not on the list, it should also be mentioned among the influential texts of the time. Indicative of the teaching of logic in the following 14th century, when the Slavic translations of the Areopagitics and the Dialectic by John Damascene date, is a testimony of patr. Philotheos Kokkinos in his biography of St. Gregory Palamas. According to him, St. Gregory Palamas during the time of his studies in Constantinople showed exceptional abilities in the field of logic and was invited to deliver a speech before the imperial court on the Organon of Aristotle.[14]

Under such a rich cultural context, inherent in higher education in Byzantium and the interest of people with a spiritual calling in such secular knowledge like logic, we might expect some degree of familiarity of the Slavic translators with the logical terms. On the contrary, the shortcomings of their translations

---

[11] B. Angelov – Kh. Kodov (eds.), *Prostranno zhitie na Konstantin-Kiril filosof,* (Kliment Ohridski. Săbrani săchineniya, t. III), Sofia 1973, 91.

[12] https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.241, fol. 6r (accessed on 7. 1. 2023). Published by Michael Hayduck in his Introduction to *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, vol.* XVIII, pars 3, *Stephanus De interpretatione*, Berolini 1885, p. V.

[13] Alexander of Aphrodisias (2nd–beg. 3rd c.); Themistios, nicknamed Euphrades (317–c. 388); Ammonius Hermiae (ca. 435/445–517/526); Simplicius of Cilicia (ca. 480–560 CE); John Philoponus (490–570); David the Invincible (6th c.); Michael Psellos (1018–1081); Theodore Prodromos (1100–c. 1165/70); Michael of Ephesus (12th c.); Leo Magentenos, Metropolitan of Mytilene (13th c).

[14] D. G. Tsames (ed.), *Κοκκίνου, Εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ, κείμενον καὶ μετάφρασις,* Thessaloniki 1984, s. 52: "Gregory was considered to be so good in the physical, logical, and generally all the Aristotle's teachings, that he who was greatly admired in the manifold wisdom and sciences... I mean the Great Logothete [Theodore Metochites], organized a speech of Gregory before the king about Aristotle's logical treatise (τῆς λογικῆς Ἀριστοτέλους πραγματείας), and hearing what came from his tongue, he was so struck by the young man that he could not contain himself and could not conceal his astonishment, but struck immediately turned to the king with the words: 'if Aristotle himself had been present here, he would have listened and given him no small praise.'"

would mark the level of their education according to the standards of their time. In other publications of mine, I expressed some skepticism regarding the medieval Slavic translations of philosophical terms and about the applicability of their solutions today.[15] Let us now try to assess the medieval Slavic tradition of translation of logical terms.

It is common practice when analysing texts of logical content to begin with terms and their subordination in the hierarchy of genus and species. At the top of this hierarchy are the categories – the highest genera, which are at the same time forms of being, forms of thought and forms of language. I have written about the Slavic translation of texts where categories are considered forms of being and forms of language in other publications[16] and will now examine their logical function – as highest forms of thought.

Logical aspect of categories

The categories (κατηγορία/оглаголаньѥ) are the supreme genera to which *every utterance or name* (гласъ рекъше имѧ – φωνὴ ἤγουν προσηγορία),[17] is raised, i.e. any meaningful talk. For the speech to be meaningful, it should express the genus-species structure of the existing things. At the core of this genus-species structure are the categories. The first in the list of categories[18] is οὐσία (сѫштьѥ, ѥстьство) followed by other 9 categories д҃ оглаголании – θ´ κατηγορίαι: τὸ ποσόν / ἡ ποσότης (количьство), τὸ ποιόν / ἡ ποιότης (качьство), τὸ πρός τι (ѥже къ комоу), τὸ ποῦ (къде), τὸ πότε (къгда), τὸ ποιεῖν (творити), τὸ πάσχειν (страдати), τὸ κεῖσθαι (лежати), τὸ ἔχειν (имѣти).

Among the categories, the substance occupies the first place. In a certain sense, it is the highest genus (родъ паче родьнꙑи / прѣродьнꙑи родъ – τὸ γενικώτατον γένος).[19] According to the outers (i.e. the Hellenic philosophers), from it takes start the diaeresis (раꙁдѣлъ – διαίρεσις) of the lower genera and species.[20] This should not be taken literally, as if substance is a genus for the other categories. It heads the genus-species hierarchy in sense of analogy giving the model for other categories. Further, what falls under different categories is *heterogeneous* (инородьноѥ – ἑτερογενές),[21] and what falls under the same categories is *homogeneous* (єдинородьноѥ – ὁμογενές), and in the latter case it is explicitly said that this applies to substance, and by analogy to the other nine

---

[15] See I. Christov (ed.), *Greek-Church Slavonic Dictionary*, Foundation "Heritage of the Zograph Monastery", Sofia 2019, 6 and the bibliography in n. 1.

[16] See I. Christov, Theology of Greek Fathers in the 10th c. Preslav Literary School's Receptive Texts, *Patrologie und Ökumene. Theresia Hainthaler zum 75. Geburtstag*, Freiburg – Basel – Wien 2022, 152–163, esp. 155–159. Christova – Christov, Ponyatiyna struktura i lingvistichna harakteristika, op. cit., 19–23.

[17] *SM* 234d,10-17 (d,2-4).

[18] *SM* 234d,14f.

[19] *SM* 227b,26-c,2 (b,7-c,1); 227d,17-21 (d,4f); 227b,18-20 (b,5); 227b,29-c,2 (b,8-c,1).

[20] *SM* 227a,6-12 (a,2f).

[21] *SM* 235a,17-21 (a,4f).

categories (ѥликоже сѫть подъ сѫштиѥмь такожде же и҆ о҆ инѣхъ д҃ о҆глаголаниихъ – ὅσα ἐστὶν ὑπὸ τὴν οὐσίαν, ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων θʹ κατηγοριῶν).[22] If in some sense the substance as a genus has priority over all others, it is because the unity of being is embedded in it – the other categories express secondary aspects of being by analogy with substance. Now let's trace how the main elements of the genus-species hierarchy were transmitted to Old Bulgarian. In such a rich cultural context, inherent in higher education in Byzantium and the interest of people with a spiritual calling in knowledge, we might expect some degree of familiarity of the Slavic translators with its language. On the contrary, their insufficient knowledge is a marker of their education according to the standards of the time.

For comparison here, as after each section devoted to logical concepts, I will give a table of their similar translations from the 14th century[23]. The statistics will be presented at the end of the paper.

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. "philosophical" tradition**
γένος	*SM:* родъ JoE *Th.*: родъ	*Dial.*: родъ *CDS:* родь
γενικώτατος	*SM:* паче родьнꙑн, прѣродьнꙑн	*Dial.*: родьнѣиши *CDS:* –
διαίρεσις	*SM:* раздѣлъ, разлѫченьѥ JoE *Th.*: раздѣлъ, раздѣленьѥ	*Dial.*: раздѣлѥние *CDS:* раздѣлѥние, разлоученије
διαιρεῖν	*SM:* раздѣлꙗтн	*Dial.*: ѿдѣлꙗти, раздѣлити, раздѣлꙗти *CDS:* дѣлити, раздѣлити, раздѣлꙗти
ἑτερογενής	Ath. *c. ar.*: стоуждебꙑшьнъ, стоуждеродьнъ JoE *Th.*: ннородьнъ	*Dial.*: инородьнь *CDS:* –
ἔχειν	*SM:* нмѣтн	*Dial.*: имати, имѣти, приѥти
κατηγορία	*SM:* оглаголаньѥ	*Dial.*: наньглаголание, оглаголание, показание *CDS:* оглаголанне
κεῖσθαι	*SM:* лежатн	*Dial.*: лежати
ὁμογενής	Ath. *c. ar.*: тождеродьнъ; тъчьнъ *SM:* коупьнородьнъ, ѥднородьнъ	*Dial.*: вькоупородьнь *CDS:* вькоупобытьнь, ѥдинобытьнь
οὐσία	Ath. *c. ar.* ѥстьствьѥ, ѥстьство, сѫтьство *SM:* сѫштьѥ, ѥстьство JoE *Th.*: сѫщьство, сѫштьствьѥ, ѥстьство	*Dial.*: соущьство *CDS*: соущьствиѥ, соущьство
πάσχειν	*SM:* страдатн	*Dial.*: страдати
ποιεῖν	*SM:* творнтн	*Dial.*: качьствовати, творити

---

22 *SM* 234d,2-10 (d,1f).

23 See also I. Christov, Grătsko-slavyanski leksikalni paraleli kăm filosofskite glavi v Simeonoviya sbornik i Izvor na znanieto, in: *Sv. Yoan Damaskin, Izvor na znanieto,* t. 1, Sofia 2014, 335–380. V. Lytvynenko, Thematic Index of Selected Greek and Old Slavonic Ontological Terms: Orations Agains the Arians, Epistle to the Bishops of Egypt and Libya, and Didactic Gospel, (ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΑ. Yubileen sbornik v chest na 75-godishninata na prof. Pirinka Penkova Lyueyer), *Bălgaristika* 40, 2020, 111–140.

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. “philosophical” tradition**
τὸ ποιόν	*SM:* какоѥ, качьство	*Dial.*: какое
ποιότης	*SM:* качьство, како дроуго, творитвьною JoE *Th.*: творитво, претворъ, творитво качьство	*Dial.*: качьство *CDS*: качьствиѥ, качьство
τὸ ποσόν	*SM:* количьство, мѣра, число	*Dial.*: количьство
ποσότης	*SM:* количьство, мѣримоѥ, разноучьтомоѥ	*Dial.*: количьство
τὸ πότε	*SM:* къгда	*Dial.*: когда
τὸ ποῦ	*SM:* късде, мѣсто	*Dial.*: гдѣ
τὸ πρός τι	*SM:* ѥже къ комоу	*Dial.*: кь чесомоу
προσηγορία	*SM:* имѧ, нарокъ	*Dial.*: наречениѥ *CDS:* имѧ, именованиѥ, наречениѥ
φωνή	Ath. *c. ar.*: гласъ *SM:* гласъ JoE *Th.*: гласъ	*Dial.*: глась *CDS:* глась

1. Terms and their hierarchy

родъ (γένος)

The Old Bulgarian term for genus has remained unchanged in philosophical usage even today.[24] Following Porphyry,[25] the Greek original delineates the various meanings in which genus is spoken of,[26] in order to single out among them the logical one. *They call that which is divided into species, and when they define it, they say that genus is what is predicated* (оглаголаѥмоѥ – κατηγορούμενον) *of “what is”* (въ немьже чьто ѥсть – ἐν τῷ τί ἐστι) *of many different kinds of things*.[27] Its relationship with the species has the following characteristics. First, the genus is more general than the species (while they are more particular частьнѣйше сѫ родовъ – μερικώτερά εἰσιν) and are predicated of it (ȣ҆глаголаѭть сѧ – κατηγοροῦνται).[28] Second, the species is *subordinated* to it (подъчинıаѥмоѥ – ταττόμενον).[29] The division of the genus into species takes place through the differentia specifica.

различьѥ (διαφορά)

Presenting the *differentia*, the “Philosophical treatise” notes two points. The first makes it identical with the genus: it is *what is predicated* (оглаголаѥмо – κατηγορούμενον) *of “that what is”* (въ коѥмь что ѥсть – ἐν τῷ τί ἐστι) *in*

---

[24] **родъ:** род (Bg, Ru, RS).

[25] See Porph. *Isag*. 1,18-2,17: *Porphyrii isagoge et in Aristotelis categorias commentarium*, (Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, 4.1), Berlin 1887.

[26] See *SM* 227в2-20 (c,1-5).

[27] *SM* 227c,13-21 (c,4f).

[28] *SM* 233d,12-15 (d,3-5); 227b,20-24 (b,6f).

[29] *SM* 227b,24-26 (b,7); 227c,27-d,2 (c,7-d,1).

many different kinds of things.[30] The second point, however, separates it from genus: it is *that which distinguishes from one another the objects of which it is predicated* (ѥ҆сть вешть ѥ҆же прѣмѣнѧ́ѥть дроугъ ѻ҆тъ дроуга· ѻ҆ ни́хъже сама ѻ҆глаголаѥ́ма ѥ҆сть – ὃ διαλλάττει ἀλλήλων τὰ καθ΄ ὧν αὐτῇ κατηγορεῖται).[31] The *differentia* is spoken of in three ways, and accordingly it is of three types: *generally* (обьште – κοινῶς), *properly* (особь – ἰδίως) and *in the most proper sense* (свонтьнѣ – ἰδιαίτατα).[32] *General differentia* is a *separable concomitant* (разлѫченъіи сълоучаи – τὸ χωριστὸν συμβεβηκός).[33] By means of it the specification of one and the same separate existence (hypostasis) takes place. In turn, the *inseparable concomitant* (неотълѫчаѥмъіи сълоучаи – τὸ ἀχώριστον συμβεβηκός) is a *differentia specifica* in its own sense.[34] It distinguishes separate existences (hypostases) belonging to one species and substance,[35] and is called *ad-substantial* (осѫштьно различьѥ – ἐπουσιώδης διαφορά).[36] Finally, the *differentia specifica* in the most proper sense forms the individual species and is accordingly called *natural* (ѥстьствьноѥ различьѥ – φυσικὴ διαφορά)*, substantial* (сѫщьноѥ различьѥ – οὐσιώδης διαφορά)*, constitutive and species-forming* (видотвореноѥ различьѥ – συστατικὴ καὶ εἰδοποιὸς διαφορά).[37] On the one hand, the correspondence of the types of difference of the most general division of being into *substance* (сѫштьѥ – οὐσία) and *concomitant/accident* (сълоучаи – συμβεβηκός, τό) is clear. Its third type refers to the *substance*, while the first two – to the *concomitant230б*,19-в,27 (b,6-c,6). It is characteristic that the property distinguishing the concomitant from the substance is that it is not substantial (сѫщьноѥ – οὐσιῶδες).[38] On the other hand, however, this third type is also related to *quality* (качьство – ποιότης),[39] as an *ad-substantial differentia*.[40] The reason for this hesitancy in determining the ontological grounds of difference lies in the special status of quality, which we noted above.

видъ (εἶδος)

Like the rest of the terms for the logical hierarchy so far, the Old Bulgarian term for *species* has remained practically unchanged even today.[41] As to its content, Theodor of Raithu first separates its meaning in philosophy from its natural meaning in language. This is not the appearance – the outlines (очрьтеньѥ –

---

30 *SM* 229d,6-10 (d,3f).
31 *SM* 229d,10-15 (d,4f).
32 *SM* 229г15-17 (d,5).
33 *SM* 230b,22-25 (b,8).
34 *SM* 230c,14-17 (c,3f).
35 *SM* 230c,22-26 (c,6f). Срв. 229d,21-28 (d,6-8).
36 *SM* 230a,28 (a,6).
37 *SM* 230a,7-12 (a,1f).
38 *SM* 230b,19-c,27 (b,6-c,6).
39 The quotation above, listing the characteristics by which this kind of difference is named, concludes by saying that it is also a quality (καὶ ποιότης) *SM* 230a,7-12 (a,1f).
40 See 230a,27-b,2 (a,6f).
41 видъ: вид (Bg, Ru).

σχῆμα) and the object’s image (образъ – μορφή),[42] but the *subjected to the genus* (подъчинꙗѥмоѥ подъ родъ – τὸ τασσόμενον ὑπὸ τὸ γένος)*, i.e. that which is subdivided by it* (отъ рода роздѣлꙗѥмоѥ – τὸ ἐκ τοῦ γένους διαιρούμενον).[43] Species are more particular than genera (чѧстьнѣише – μερικώτερα), they are not predicated of them, but genera are predicated of species.[44] *Of one kind* коупьновидьно, ѥдиновидьно (ὁμοειδές) are the things that are arranged under one kind and have a common definition of the substance.[45]

свонтьно(ѥ), своє (τὸ ἴδιον)

Characteristic property is that which is present in a thing without constituting its substance or the definition of its nature (свои́тьно ѥ́сть въ не́мьже ѥ́сть несъврьшаꙗ̀ ѥ́моу сѫштиꙗ̀ и̏ли съпроста въ ѥ́стьствьнꙑи̏ ѥ́го разоумъ приѥ́мл҄емо – ἴδιόν ἐστιν, ᾧτινι μὲν ὑπάρχει, μὴ συμπληροῦν δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν οὐσίαν ἢ ὅλον τὸν τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ λόγον παραλαμβανόμενον).[46] In this sense, its addition does not come as a surplus (не ѥсть лихо – οὐ περιττεύει), and its non-joining – as a deficiency (нестатъка не творитъ – οὐκ ἐλλείπει).[47] Without affecting the substance of individual things, it is a criterion for their distinction. Thus, although we humans all live, move and be in the same way, each of us has some characteristic property that distinguish us from other people.[48] This property is a principle of individuality. That is why it conforms to one nature and is reversible with what it distinguishes (свои́тьно бо ѥ́сть ѥ́же ѥ́диномоу ѥ́стьствоу строить сѧ и̏ възвраштаѥ́ть сѧ на оу́ставьноѥ́ – ἴδιον γάρ ἐστι τὸ μιᾷ φύσει ἁρμόζον καὶ ἀντιστρέφον πρὸς τὸ ὁριστικόν).[49]

неотърѣзаѥмоѥ, непрѣрѣзаѥмоѥ, нераздраблꙗѥмоѥ, нерасѣкаѥмоѥ, нерасѣкомоѥ (τὸ ἄτομον)

Thus we have reached the limit of the logical division – the individual (the single). It is not predicated of the species, because it is more particular (чѧстьнѣѥ́ бо ѥ́сть вида – μερικωτέρα γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ εἴδους)[50] and being closed in itself, it is not predicated of anything else at all.[51] Its ontological characteristics are not of something *in-hypostasic*, but as of an independent hypostasis or person (не въсобл҄ено – οὐκ ἐνυπόστατον).[52] We will talk about this specifically below when we consider the concrete-existential aspect of ontological concepts.

---

[42] See 227c,24-27 (c,6f).
[43] *SM* 227c,27-d,2 (c,7-d,1).
[44] *SM* 233d,11-15 (d,3-5).
[45] *SM* 235b,1-6 (b,1).
[46] *SM* 230d,3-8 (d,1-3).
[47] *SM* 230d,25-231a,2 (d,7-231a,1).
[48] *SM* 226b,4-10 (b,1-3).
[49] *SM* 231b,8-12 (b,5f).
[50] *SM* 234a,5-14 (a,2-4).
[51] *SM* 227d,21-25 (d,5f).
[52] *SM* 235c,23-29 (c,8-10); 228a,23-25 (a,6f).

раздѣлъ, разлѫчєньѥ (διαίρεσις)

Diaeresis (division) is that logical operation that structures the hierarchy of genera and species. Thanks to it, the unity of the genus is divided into the plurality of species (на много раздѣлꙗти – εἰς πολλὰ διαιρεθῆναι).[53] That is why, the division enters into the definition of the species. The different degrees of generality are expressed by the concepts that follow.

обьштєѥ, обьштина (τὸ κοινόν)

As you can see, the translation of **κοινόν** as **обьштєѥ** is still in use today.[54] General is that which is said of many things (обьштє о многꙑихъ гл҃емоѥ – κοινῶς κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενον).[55]

вьсѣчьстѣише, всѣко (καθόλου)

This term is used in two senses. The first is synonymous with the above-presented term обьштєѥ, обьштина and, like it, expresses the community in the genus and species hierarchy.[56] In this case it is opposed to the *particular* – the more general is predicated with a wider scope (о больши – ἐπὶ πλέον) than the more particular, standing higher and the particular lower.[57] The second meaning is present in the attributive use of καθόλου – in this case it denotes the generic substance of the subject. This is how one speaks of a generic man (всѣкъ чл҃къ – ὁ καθόλου ἄνθρωπος[58]). In this sense of the general it is opposed to – онъсица (ὁ δεῖνα), e.g. *this here person* (ȯньсица чл҃къ – ὁ δεῖνα ἄνθρωπος).[59]

частьно(ѥ) (τὸ μερικόν)

As you can see, this old Bulgarian term is still in use today.[60] We have already mentioned the different degree of particularity in the genus and species hierarchy.[61] This term is opposed to обьштєѥ, обьштина (τὸ κοινόν) and to вьсѣчьстѣише, всѣко (καθόλου) in its first meaning.

оньсица (ὁ δεῖνα)

We have already noted that this term denotes the singular and is opposed to вьсѣчьстѣише, всѣко (καθόλου) in its second meaning. In the given examples it refers to the person.[62] I.e. it is related to the individual (отъдѣлꙗѥмꙑи – διοριζόμενος) man, and not of *man as such* (просто чловѣкъ – ἁπλῶς ἄνθρωπος).[63]

---

[53] See 227d,11f (d,3).
[54] обьштєѥ: общо (Bg), общее (Ru), опще (RS).
[55] *SM* 227d,19-21 (d,5).
[56] See 233d,11-234b,3 (233d,3-234b,1); 234a,21-27 (a,6-8); 233d,12-15 (d,3-5).
[57] *SM* 233c,23-29 (c,7f).
[58] E.g. 228c,1f (c,1); 228b,24f (b,7).
[59] E.g. 231c,16f (c,4). Срв. 227b,17f (b,4f); 236b,18 (b,5).
[60] частьно(є): частно (Bg), частное (Ru).
[61] See. 233d,11-234b,3 (233d,3-234b,1); 233d,12-15 (d,3-5).
[62] *SM* 231c,16-17 (c,4). Cf. 236b,18 (b,5); 227b,16-18 (b,4f).
[63] *SM* 228b,11-14 (b,3-4).

A table of the similar translations from the 14th century:

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. “philosophical” tradition**
ἀντιστρέφεσθαι	*SM:* възвраштати сѧ, обраштати сѧ, съвраштати сѧ	*Dial.*: противьобраштати се, сьпротивьобраштати се *CDS:* противьобраштати се, сьпротивьобраштати се
ἁπλῶς	Ath. *c. ar.*: просто *SM:* просто, съпроста	*Dial.*: просто *CDS:* –
ἁρμόζειν	*SM:* строити сѧ Ath. *c. ar.*: приставлꙗти сѧ, годити сѧ, съчетати сѧ, лѣпо быти, оуподоблꙗти сѧ, оугаждати	*Dial.*: прикладьно быти *CDS:* прикладовати, прикладьствовати, сьгаждати, сьстраꙗти, оуприкладити, оуприкладьствити
τὸ ἄτομον	*SM:* неотърѣꙁаѥмоѥ, непрѣрѣꙁаѥмоѥ, нераꙁдраблꙗѥмоѥ, нерасѣкаѥмоѥ, нерасѣкомоѥ	*Dial.*: несѣкомо *CDS:* –
ἀχώριστος	*SM:* нераꙁлѫчьнъ, неотълѫчаѥмъ JoE *Th.*: неотълѫчьнъ, нераꙁлѫчьнъ	*Dial.*: неразлоучьнь *CDS:* нераздѣльнь
γένος	*SM:* родъ JoE *Th.*: родъ	*Dial.*: родъ *CDS:* родь
ὁ δεῖνα	Ath. *c. ar.*: онъсь *SM:* оньсица	*Dial.*: оньсица *CDS:* –
διαίρεσις	*SM:* раꙁдѣлъ, раꙁлѫченьѥ JoE *Th.*: раꙁдѣлъ, раꙁдѣленьѥ	*Dial.*: раздѣлѥниѥ *CDS:* раздѣлѥниѥ, разлоучениѥ
διαφορά	*SM:* раꙁличьѥ Ath. *c. ar.*: раꙁньствьѥ, раꙁньство, раꙁдѣл҄еньѥ JoE *Th.*: раꙁличьство, раꙁличьѥ, раꙁличеньѥ	*Dial.*: различиѥ, разьньство *CDS*: различиѥ, разьньствиѥ, разьньство
διοριζόμενος (διορίζω)	*SM:* отъдѣлꙗѥмъıи	*Dial.*: – *CDS*: –
εἰδοποιός	*SM:* видотворенъıи	*Dial.*: видотворьнь *CDS:* видотворитeльнь, видотворьнь
εἶδος	*SM:* видъ	*Dial.*: видь, *CDS:* видь
ἐλλείπειν	*SM:* нестатъка не творити	*Dial.*: оскоудѣвати *CDS:* недостатьчьствовати, оскоудѣниѥ имѣти
ἐνυπόστατος	*SM:* иже въсобл҄енъ, въсобл҄ении, въсобьнии JoE *Th.*: оупостасьнъ	*Dial.*: сьставьнь *CDS:* сьставитeльнь, сьставьнь, вь сьставохь, сьставь
ἐπὶ πλέον	*SM:* о больши, о мноꙁѣ	*Dial.*: на множаишихь *CDS:* веще
ἐπουσιώδης	*SM:* осѫштьнъ, насѫштьнъ	*Dial.*: осоущьствьнь *CDS:* –
ἰδιαίτατα	*SM:* своитьнѣ	*Dial.*: особосвоиствьнѣ *CDS:* –
ἴδιος	*SM:* своитьнъ Ath. *c. ar.*: свои	*Dial.*: особьнь, особьствьнь, свои, своиствьнь *CDS:* особьнь, свои, своиствьнь
τὸ ἴδιον	*SM:* своитьно(ѥ), свое JoE *Th.*: особьѥ	*Dial.*: своиство, своиствьноѥ, особно *CDS:* –
ἰδίως	*SM:* особь	*Dial.*: своиствьнѣ *CDS:* –

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. “philosophical” tradition**
καθόλου	*SM:* всѧкъ, всѣко, съпроста, вьсѣчьстѣнше	*Dial.*: сьборьно, сьборьнѣ *CDS:* по вьсемь, от(ь)ноудь, сьборьнь, сьвьс(ь)ма
κατηγορεῖσθαι	*SM:* оглаголати сѧ	*Dial.*: наньглаголати, показати, показовати *CDS:* наньглаголати, нарицати, оглаголавати, оглаголовати
τὸ κατηγορούμενον	*SM:* оглаголаѥмое	*Dial.*: ѥже наньглаголѥмоѥ *CDS:* –
τὸ κοινόν	*SM:* обьштеѥ, обьштина JoE *Th.*: ѥже обьщѥ	*Dial.*: ѥже обьште *CDS:* обьщьство
κοινῶς	*SM:* обьште	*Dial.*: обьщьнѣи
λόγος	*SM:* слово, разоумъ JoE *Th.*: мысль, помыслъ, оученыѥ	*Dial.*: слово *CDS:* глаголь, слово
μερικός	*SM:* чѧстьнъ	*Dial.*: ѿ чести, честьнь *CDS:* от(ь)чести, честьнь
τὸ μερικόν	*SM:* чѧстьно(ѥ)	*Dial.*: честьное *CDS:* честьное
ὁμοειδής	*SM:* коупьновидьнъ, ѥдиновидьнъ	*Dial.*: вькоуповидьнь, вькоупьвидьнь, ѥдиновидьнь *CDS:* вькоуповидьнь, подобовидьнь, ѥдиновидьнь
τὸ ὁριστικόν	*SM:* оуставьноѥ	*Dial.*: – *CDS:* опрѣдѣлительное
οὐσία	Ath. *c. ar.* ѥстьствыѥ, ѥстьство, сѫтьство *SM:* сѫштыѥ, ѥстьство JoE *Th.*: сѫщьство, сѫштьствыѥ, ѥстьство	*Dial.*: соущьство *CDS:* соущьствиѥ, соущьство
οὐσιώδης	*SM:* сѫщьнъ	*Dial.*: соущьствьнь *CDS:* осоущьствьнь, соущьствьнь
περισσεύειν	*SM:* лихъ бꙑти	*Dial.*: изьобиловати *CDS:* –
τὸ συμβεβηκός	Ath. *c. ar.*: прилоучьноѥ *SM:* сълоучаи, сълоучаныѥ, лоучꙗѥмоѥ, сълоучаѭштеѥ сѧ, сълоучивъшеѥ сѧ JoE *Th.*: съшьствыѥ	*Dial.*: прилоучаи, слоучаи *CDS:* с(ь)лоучаи
συμπληροῦν	*SM:* съврьшати Ath. *c. ar.*: испльнꙗти	*Dial.*: сьнабрьшати *CDS*: сьврьшати, испльнꙗти, напльнити, сьиспльнꙗти, с(ь)коньчати
συστατικός	*SM:* съставьнъ	*Dial.*: сьстоꙗвательнь, сьстоꙗтельнь
σχῆμα	Ath. *c. ar.*: образъ *SM:* видъ, оучрьтеныѥ JoE *Th.*: одрьжимоѥ, образъ	*Dial.*: образь *CDS:* зракь, изьображениѥ, обличиѥ, образованиѥ, образь
τάσσειν	*SM:* въчинꙗти, подъчинꙗти	*Dial.*: вьчинити, вьчинꙗти *CDS:* вьрачоунити, вьчинити, вьчинꙗти, сьчинити, сьчинꙗти, оуставити, оуставлꙗти, оустроити
τὸ τί ἐστι	*SM:* коѥ чьто ѥсть, ѥже чьто ѥсть JoE *Th.*: чьто ѥсть	*Dial.*: ѥже каково чьто ѥсть *CDS:* чьто есть
φυσικός	*SM:* ѥстьствьнꙑи JoE *Th.*: ѥстьствьнъ, ѥстьстьства	*Dial.*: ѥстьствьнь *CDS:* ѥстьствьнь

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. “philosophical” tradition**
χωριστός	*SM:* разлѫчєнъ, разлнчьнъ	*Dial.:* разлоучьнь *CDS:* –

2. *The proposition*

Besides forms of being, categories are also forms of thought. This is rooted in the semantics of the word κατηγορία (**оглаголаньѥ**), which also means *predication*. The categories are the basis for connecting the subject and the predicate in the proposition. They set the modes of logic being manifested in the copula.

The terms in the sentence look like this. The subject is translated as **подълежаштєѥ, подълежаѥ** (ὑποκείμενον, τό), and the predicate as **оглаголаѥмоѥ** (κατηγορούμενον). As for the types of statement of the predicate for the subject, two classification schemes are presented in Simeon’s Miscellany:

First, according to its denotation, which depends on the denotation of the subject and the predicate, and could be two kinds – *more and equal*, but it can never be *ad less* (**о мьньши** – ἐπ΄ ἔλαττον),[64] because a term of a smaller scope cannot be predicated to one with a larger scope.

a. it is *ad more* (**о больши** – ἐπὶ πλέον**)**, when more general [terms] are predicated of more particular ones, because those standing above are more general, and those below are more particular.[65] In this case, they are not convertible.[66]
b. *ad equal* **(о равьнънхъ** – ἐπίσης**)** predication is when the terms are of equal volume. In this case they are convertible[67].

Second, predication can be positive or negative. This determines the quality of proposition.

a. When the predication is positive, there is a *positive statement* (**повѣштаньѥ, наповѣштаньѥ** – κατάφασις[68]).
b. When the predicate is negative, we have a *negation* (**отъвѣтъ, отъвѣштаньѥ** – ἀπόφασις[69]). Both in case of positive statement and negation the translator has coined morpheme-to-morpheme calques which are inapplicable in modern philosophical language.

---

[64] *SM* 233c,19-23 (c,6f).
[65] *SM* 233c,23-29 (c,7f).
[66] See 233d,11-234b,3 (233d,3-234b,1).
[67] See 234b,6-14 (b,2f).
[68] See 233b,19 (b,5); 233b,4f (b,1); 233b,6 (b,2).
[69] See 233b,11 (b,3); 233b,19 (b,4); 233b,16 (b,4).

The texts of Simeon's Miscellany do not discuss the question of the quantity of judgments. However, we have individual cases of the use of general judgments. For example: *every person is capable of laughing*. As a term for the subject's quantification **вьсѣкъ, вьсь** (πᾶς) is used.[70]

A table of the similar translations from the 14th century:

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. "philosophical" tradition**
ἀπόφασις	*SM:* отъвѣтъ, отъвѣштаньѥ JoE *Th.*: отъвѣтъ	*Dial.*: ѿречениѥ, ѿрѣчиѥ *CDS:* от(ь)речениѥ, от(ь)ѥтиѥ
ἐπὶ πλέον	*SM:* о больши, о мнозѣ	*Dial.*: на множаиших҄ь *CDS:* вещѥ
ἐπ᾽ ἔλαττον	*SM:* о мьньши	*Dial.*: на мьньшихь *CDS:* –
ἐπίσης	*SM:* о равьнъıихъ, о равьнѣѥмь, тъчьно	*Dial.*: равьно, равьнѣ, на равьнихь, о равьнихь *CDS:* –
κατάφασις	*SM:* наповѣштаньѥ, повѣштаньѥ,	*Dial.*: наньречениѥ, прирѣчиѥ *CDS:* наньречениѥ
κατηγορία	*SM:* оглаголаньѥ	*Dial.*: наньглаголаниѥ, оглаголаниѥ, показаниѥ *CDS:* оглаголание
τὸ κατηγορούμενον	*SM:* оглаголаѥмоѥ	*Dial.*: ѥже наньглаголѥмоѥ
πᾶς	*SM:* вьсѧкъ, вьсь	*Dial.*: вьсакь, вьсь *CDS:* вьсакь, вьсь, вьсачьскыи
ὑποκείμενον, τό	*SM:* подълежаштеѥ, подълежаѥ	*CDS:* подьлежещеѥ

3. *Verity in the relation of propositions*

The Old Bulgarian reader was able to obtain some, albeit far from exhaustive, information about the relationship between the propositions. In Simeon's Miscellany, one of the four possible relationships between them is presented – the contradiction. It is present when two judgments are opposed (**сѫпротивиꙗ** – ἀντικείμενα) in the form of a contradiction (**сѫпротиворѣчьѥ, обличеньѥ** – ἀντίφασις). The ontological basis for it are *hexis* and *privation* (**по нестатъкоу и҆ по и҆мѣниѭ҆ сѫпротивьнаꙗ҆** – τὰ καθ´ στέρησιν καὶ ἕξιν ἀντικείμενα).[71] For every statement there is a negation. In this sense, each of the two – the statement and the negation are negative to each other, and they both constitute a contradiction (**гл҃етъ же сѧ ѻ҆боѥ҆ ѻ҆тъвѣтъ и҆ ѻ҆бличениѥ҆· да ѥ҆льма оу҆бо вьсемоу наповѣштаниѭ҆ сѫпротивъ ѥ҆ ѻ҆тъвѣтъ** – λέγεται δὲ ἀμφότερα ἀπόφασις καὶ ἀντίφασις, ἐπεὶ οὖν πάσῃ καταφάσει ἀντίκειται ἀπόφασις).[72] Therefore [the set

---

[70] *SM* 234b,14f (b,4).

[71] *SM* 233a,25-28 (a,8).

[72] *SM* 233b,11-16 (b,3f).

of] negation (**отъвѣтъ** – ἀπόφασις), *opposed to the statement* ((**на)повѣштаньѥ** – κατάφασις), *and statement opposed to the negation* is called a *contradiction* (**сѫпротиворѣчьѥ** – ἀντίφασις).[73]

In the logical tradition starting with Aristotle, the problem of truth is posed at the level of proposition. It depends on whether our association of the subject with the predicate corresponds to reality. But if formal criteria for truth are absent in the proposition itself, such are present in the relation between the propositions. In the contradiction, one necessarily *deceives* (**лъгати** – ψεύδεσθαι), *and the other tells the truth* (**истиноу вѣштати** – ἀληθεύειν), *because by rejecting one, the other is confirmed; thus, in rejecting the statement, the negation is affirmed* (**да ноужда ѥ́ ѥ́диномоу лъгати· а҆ дроугомоу и҆стиноу вѣштати· да погоубениѥ́мь ѹ҆бо ѥ́диного дрѫга о҆ставлаѥ́ть сѧ· погоублаѥ́моу бо наповѣштаниѭ· о҆тъвѣштаниѥ́ съставлаѥ́ть сѧ** – καὶ ἀνάγκη τὴν μίαν ψεύδεσθαι καὶ τὴν μίαν ἀληθεύειν· τῇ οὖν ἀναιρέσει τῆς μιᾶς ἡ ἑτέρα συνίσταται. ἀναιρουμένης γὰρ τῆς καταφάσεως ἡ ἀπόφασις συνίσταται).[74] That is why the truth relation is included in the definition of this kind of logical opposition.[75]

A table of the similar translations from the 14th century:

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. "philosophical" tradition**
ἀληθεύειν	*SM:* истиноу вѣштати	*Dial.*: истиньствовати *CDS:* истиньствовати
ἀναιρεῖν	Ath. *c. ar.*: расъıпати *SM:* погоублıати	*Dial.*: ѿимати, ѿѥти *CDS:* от(ь)ѥти, от(ь)ражати, от(ь)разити, потрѣблıати, раздроушати, раздроушити, от(ь)ѥти
ἀναίρεσις	*SM:* погоубл҄ѥньѥ Ath. *c. ar.*: расъıпаньѥ JoE *Th.*: отърѣзаньѥ	*Dial.*: – *CDS:* от(ь)ѥтиѥ, от(ь)раженіѥ, раздроушениѥ
ἀντικεῖσθαι	*SM:* сѫпротивъ бъıти Ath. *c. ar.*: лежати сѫпротивоу	*Dial.*: соупротивити се, соупротивьлежати *CDS:* противьлежати, соупротивитисе, соупротивьнь быти
ἀντικείμενος	*SM:* сѫпротивьнъ Ath. *c. ar.*: сѫпротивь лежаштъ	*Dial.*: противьнь, соупротивьнь *CDS:* соупротивьнь
τὸ ἀντικείμενον	*SM:* сѫпротивьıе JoE *Th.*: сѫпротивьно(ѥ)	*Dial.*: соупротивьлежащеѥ *CDS:* соупротивьноѥ
ἀντίφασις	*SM:* сѫпротиворѣчьѥ, обличеньѥ	*Dial.*: соупротивьрѣчиѥ *CDS:* –
ἀπόφασις	*SM:* отъвѣтъ, отъвѣштаньѥ JoE *Th.*: отъвѣтъ	*Dial.*: ѿреченіѥ, ѿрѣчиѥ *CDS:* от(ь)реченіѥ, от(ь)ѥтиѥ
ἕξις	*SM:* имѣньѥ, нравъ Ath. *c. ar.*: объıчаи JoE *Th.*: нравъ	*Dial.*: имьство *CDS:* имьствиѥ, имьство

---

[73] *SM* 233b,19-25 (b,4f).

[74] *SM* 233b,25-c,6 (b,5-c,1).

[75] See 233c,11-17 (c,3f).

κατάφασις	*SM:* наповѣштаньѥ, повѣштаньѥ,	*Dial.*: наньречениѥ, прирѣчиѥ *CDS:* наньречениѥ
στέρησις	*SM:* лишеньѥ, нестатъкъ JoE *Th.*: лишеньѥ	*Dial.*: лишениѥ *CDS:* лишениѥ, оулишениѥ
συνίστασθαι	*SM:* оставлꙗти сѧ, съставлꙗти сѧ Ath. *c. ar.*: съставл̂ꙗти сѧ, съставити сѧ, състати сѧ, състоꙗти сѧ	*Dial.*: сьставлꙗти се, сьстоꙗти се, сьстоꙗтельно творити се *CDS:* сьставитисе, сьставлꙗтисе, сьнастатисе, сьстоꙗтисе, вькоупѣ стоꙗти, сьставлѥнь быти
ψεύδεσθαι	*SM:* лъгати Ath. *c. ar.*: лъгати JoE *Th.*: лъгати	*Dial.*: льгати, сьльгати *CDS:* льгати, сьльгати

4. *Logical operations*

In the texts from Tzar Simeon's Miscellany under consideration, two logical operations are presented – conversion and definition.

възвраштеньѥ (ἀντιστροφή)

In conversion, the subject and the predicate change their places and thus a new proposition is constructed. When the subject is a species and the predicate is something proper to that species, the newly obtained proposition is true. This is so, because the characteristic property by definition is that which is appropriate to one nature (ѥже ѥдиномоу ѥстьствоу строить сѧ – τὸ μιᾷ φύσει ἁρμόζον) and is convertible with the subject to be determined (на оуставьноѥ – πρὸς τὸ ὁριστικόν).[76] Therefore, the predication in this case is *ad equal* (о равьнѣихъ – ἐπίσης) and the conversion is undoubted. For example, it is correct to say that just as *man has the ability to laugh*, so *the one who has the ability to laugh is a man*.[77] This is also the case with relative propositions.[78] However, the conversion is not correct in case of a predication *ad more* (о больши – ἐπὶ πλέον), which occurs when terms in the judgment are substance and hypostasis (не възвраштаѥ́ть сѧ слово· не бо ѥ́льмаже собьство сѫштеѥ́· то да и҆ сѫштеѥ́ собьство боудеть – οὐκ ἀντιστρέφει ὁ λόγος· οὐ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ ἡ ὑπόστασις οὐσία, ἤδη καὶ ἡ οὐσία ὑπόστασίς),[79] or when the terms refer to different levels in the genus and species hierarchy.[80]

---

[76] *SM* 231b,8-12 (b,5f).

[77] See 231b,2-8 (b,3-5); 230d,10-17 (d,3-5).

[78] *SM* 232d,9-11 (d,3f).

[79] *SM* 228b,18-22 (b,5f).

[80] *SM* 233d,11-234b,3 (233d,3-234b,1); 234a,9-14 (a,3f).

A table of the similar translations from the 14th century:

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. “philosophical” tradition**
ἀντιστρέφεσθαι	*SM:* възвраштати сѧ, обраштати сѧ, съвраштати сѧ	*Dial.*: противьобращати се, сьпротивьобращати се *CDS:* противьобращати се, сьпротивьобращати се
ἀντιστροφή	*SM:* възвраштеньѥ	*Dial.*: – *CDS:* противьобращениѥ, соупротивьобращениѥ
ἁρμόζειν	*SM:* строити сѧ Ath. *c. ar.*: приставлꙗти сѧ, годити сѧ, съчетати сѧ, лѣпо быти, оуподоблꙗти сѧ, оугаждати	*Dial.*: прикладьно быти *CDS:* прикладовати, прикладьствовати, сьгаждати, сьстраꙗти, оуприкладити, оуприкладьствити
ἐπὶ πλέον	*SM:* о болши, о мнозѣ	*Dial.*: на множаишихь *CDS:* веще
ἐπ' ἔλαττον	*SM:* о мьнши	*Dial.*: на мьньшихь *CDS:* –
ἐπίσης	*SM:* о равьнꙑихъ, о равьнѣѥмь, тъчьно	*Dial.*: равьно, равьнѣ, на равьнихь, о равьнихь *CDS:* –
λόγος	*SM:* слово, разоумъ JoE *Th.*: мысль, помыслъ, оученьѥ	*Dial.*: слово *CDS:* глаголь, слово
τὸ ὁριστικόν	*SM:* оуставьноѥ	*Dial.*: – *CDS:* опрѣдѣлительное
οὐσία	Ath. *c. ar.* ѥстьствьѥ, ѥстьство, сѫтьство *SM:* сѫштьѥ, ѥстьство JoE *Th.*: сѫщьство, сѫштьствьѥ, ѥстьство	*Dial.*: соущьство *CDS:* соущьствиѥ, соущьство
ὑπόστασις	*SM:* собьство Ath. *c. ar.*: съставъ, ѵпостась JoE *Th.*: ѵпостась, съставъ	*Dial.*: сьставь *CDS:* сьставь, сьставьство

5. *Definition and verbal description*

оуставъ, отълѫченьѥ, разлѫченьѥ (ὁρισμός)
оуставъ (ὅρος)

The definition is a verbal formula that reveals “what is” a thing (чьто ѥсть – τὸ τί ἐστι).[81] Because of the relation of τὸ τί ἐστι and οὐσία, only the definition reveals the substance (cf. да сѫштиѥ̑ оу̑бо моштьно разлоучениѥ̑мь тъкмо оу̓казати – τὴν μὲν οὐσίαν δυνατὸν δι´ ὁρισμοῦ μόνον παραστῆσαι).[82] E.g. the definition of man, which fully reveals his “what is”.[83]

---

[81] See Arist. *APo*. A.22 83^{a}21, B.3 90^{b}16, B.6 92^{a}6, B.8 93^{a}5f: *Aristotelis analytica priora et posteriora*, Oxford 1968. Cf. Arist. *Top*. A.4 101^{b}21f, A.18 108^{a}38-^{b}1: *Aristotelis topica et sophistici elenchi*, Oxford 1991. *Met*. Z.4 1029^{b}21: *Aristoteles, Metaphysica.* Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Werner Jaeger. Oxonii 1978. Tὸ τί ἐστι, a term built by substantivation of the Socratic question “τί ἐστι;” (“what is?”) means “what we arrive to by answering this question”. Such an answer is expected to be a definition. Thus, the substance is denoted.

[82] *SM* 228d,27-229a,1 (d,8-229a,1).

[83] *SM* 230d,17-22 (d,5f). Срв. 229a,10-13 (a,3), 229a,1-10 (a,1-3).

The designation of substances by words (names) and their disclosure in the definition are relatively independent of each other. Along with the meaning we associate the definition with, names have meanings related to their everyday use. This is a source of wrong predication. This is why another classification is required for the ways in which the predicate is taken in the judgment.

a. we have *synonymous predication* (**сънмєньноє оглаголаныѥ** – συνώνυμος κατηγορία) when both the name and the definition of this name are involved (**и оуставъ самъ тъ имєньнꙑи** – τὸν ὅρον αὐτὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος).[84]
b. the predication is *homonymous* (ὁμώνυμος κατηγορία – **ѥдннонмєннто оглаголаныѥ**), when the name is taken, but by no means the definition.[85]

подъпнсаныѥ (ὑπογραφή)

In cases where a *definition* cannot be given, its replacement is the *verbal description*. For example, the single existence (the hypostasis) cannot be represented by a *definition* (**отълѫчєниѥмь** – δι΄ ὁρισμοῦ), *but only by a description* (**тъчьѭ подъписаниѥмь** – διὰ μόνης ὑπογραφῆς).[86] It does not have the logical structure of the definition and does not claim to reveal the subject's substance.

A table of the similar translations from the 14th century:

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. "philosophical" tradition**
κατηγορία	*SM:* оглаголаныѥ	*Dial.:* наньглаголаниѥ, оглаголаниѥ, показаниѥ *CDS:* оглаголанне
ὁμώνυμος	*SM:* ѥдннонмєннтъ, ѥдннонмєньнꙑн	*Dial.:* вькоупьимєньнь, ѥдиноимєньнь *CDS:* вькоупоимєньнь
ὄνομα	*SM:* нма Ath. *c. ar.*: нма JoE *Th.*: нма	*Dial.:* имє *CDS:* имє
ὁρισμός	*SM:* оуставъ, отълѫчєныѥ, раꙁлѫчєныѥ	*Dial.:* прѣдѣль, оуставь *CDS:* опрѣдѣлѥниѥ
ὅρος	*SM:* оуставъ	*Dial.:* прѣдѣль, оуставь *CDS:* прѣдѣль
οὐσία	Ath. *c. ar.* ѥстьствыѥ, ѥстьство, сѫтьство *SM:* сѫштыѥ, ѥстьство JoE *Th.*: сѫщьство, сѫштьствыѥ, ѥстьство	*Dial.:* соущьство *CDS:* соущьствиѥ, соущьство
παρίστασθαι	*SM:* оуказатн	*Dial.:* – *CDS:* –
συνώνυμος	*SM:* сънмєньнꙑн	*Dial.:* сьимєньнь *CDS:* сьимєньнь
τὸ τί ἔστι	*SM:* коѥ чьто ѥсть, ѥжє чьто ѥсть JoE *Th.*: чьто ѥсть	*Dial.:* ѥжє каково чьто ѥсть *CDS:* чьто есть
ὑπογραφή	*SM:* подъпнсаныѥ	*Dial.:* подьписаниѥ *CDS:* –

---

[84] *SM* 234b,22-26 (b,7f).

[85] *SM* 234c,9-13 (c,5).

[86] *SM* 229a,13-17 (a,4).

6. *Ontological basis of definition*

The most difficult challenge faced by the medieval Slavic translators were the passages dealing with the ontological foundations of logic. Such texts are extremely rare, as they almost never occcur in the translated patristic works. An exception is a passage from the Greek scholia to the work "On the Divine Names". It concerns the relationship of definition with substance, entity and essence:

> <I.e. the [verbal] formulas (λόγοι) are not independent from the natures>, because the definite term (τὸ ὡρισμένον) follows upon what the subject is by nature, being both definition and hermeneutic formula (ἑρμηνευτικὸς λόγος) of the subjects' substance (ὅρος τῆς οὐσίας τῶν πραγμάτων) and what reveals the entity (τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι), insofar as entity has the same meaning like essence (τὸ τί ἐστιν).[87]

At the heart of this passage is Aristotle's understanding of substance, entity and essence. The latter two concepts are substantivized variant of the question with which Socrates used to start his conversations and expected to receive a definition in response – *what is*? *(*τί ἐστιν, in Latin "quidditas"). The term τὸ τί ἐστιν (litterary *that what it is*) is a substantivized form of the Socratic question and means what we receive as a result of asking it – knowledge of the subject's essence, i.e. its definition. The other term (τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι) is Aristotle's answer to the question of being, i.e. according to his interpretation, to the substance.[88] It means literally "what it was to be" (in Latin "quod quid erat esse"). If the imperfect ἦν (was) is assumed to be in timeless usage, we get "what it has always been".[89] I.e. this formula fixes what the subject is in itself before and independent of our knowledge.[90] It means the object of knowledge – an entity, revealed by definition. This is what characterizes it first of all: τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι is that the speech for which is a definition. In turn, Aristotle defines the definition through the entity: we have a definition (ὅρος, ὁρισμός) when our verbal formula expresses the entity. But provided that Aristotle defines the entity and the definition through each other, does he not admit a tautology? Actually not, as between them lies the boundary between the objective and the subjective. The essence is objective (and therefore pre-reflexive and not articulated), the definition is subjective (i.e. articulated and presupposes reflection). In a classical way this is explained in the commentary of [pseudo]Alexander of Aphrodisias (Michael of Ephesus): "τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι is the object itself and its nature thought

---

[87] *Corpus Dionysiacum IV/1: Ioannis Scythopolitani Prologus et scholia in Dionysiui Areopagitae librum De Divinis Nominibus cum additamentis interpretum aliorum,* Berlin – New York 2011, 304,2-4 (PG 301 C,41-44). The English translation is mine.

[88] Met Z.4 1029^{b}1 f. See *Aristoteles, Metaphysica*, Jaeger (ed.), op. cit., 132.

[89] See Alex. in Top. 42,2-20: *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis topicorum libros octo commentaria*, (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 2.2), Berlin 1891.

[90] Ps. Alex. in Met. 467,14–15: *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria*, (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 1), Berlin 1891.

of in an interconnected, folded way, and as one”,[91] while “the definition <which gives us τὸ τί ἐστιν> is an understanding achieved by unfolding and counting over of the constitutive parts of it.”[92]

This makes clear the meaning of the Greek scholion to the “Divine names”: the verbal hermeneutic formula is definition of the subject’s substance (ὅρος τῆς οὐσίας),[93] because it explicates entity (τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι) which is identical with substance. The entity on its part has the same meaning like essence (τὸ τί ἐστιν), not being identical with it, because it is of the same content but in a subjective (i.e. in the articulated and reflexive) way, typical for human intellect.

Now let us turn to the Slavic translation of Starec Isaija. It is rather disappointing insofar as it misses key parts of the original text and simplifies its meaning. The omitted words are underlined.

> <Τουτέστιν οὐκ ἄτακτοι τῶν φύσεων οἱ λόγοι·> ἕπεται δὲ τῷ κατὰ φύσιν τὸ
> ὡρισμένον· ὅρος γάρ ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἑρμηνευτικὸς λόγος
> τῆς οὐσίας τῶν πραγμάτων, καὶ τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι δηλῶν,
> τοῦ τί ἦν εἶναι τῷ τί ἐστιν ἴσα δυναμένου.
>
> сиͬрѣчь не безьчиннаͯ ѥ҃ствьͯ словеса· послѣдоуѥтъ же по ѥ҃ствноͯмоу
> о́прѣ̑лѥнноѥ· прѣ̑ль бо ѥсть и҆ сказатеⷧноͯѥ слово
> соущ҆ства,
> чтоͯ ѥ҃·[94]
>
> I.e. the <verbal> formulas are not independent from the natures, because the term defined follows upon what the subject is by nature, being both definition and hermeneutic formula
> of substance,
> i.e. the essence.

There are no such omissions in the Greek manuscript tradition. Elder Isaija seems to have simplified the meaning of the text. This may be held out of concern for the Slavic reader, or it may be the result of his misunderstanding or just an error due to fatigue or distraction. In any case, his translation moves away from the Greek original and loses its depth and connection with Aristotle’s metaphysics.

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. “philosophical” tradition**
κατηγορία	*SM:* оглаголаныѥ	*Dial.:* наньглаголаниѥ, оглаголаниѥ, показаниѥ *CDS:* оглаголанне

---

[91] Ps. Alex. *in Met.* 467,9-11, Hayduck (ed.), op. cit.

[92] Ps. Alex. *in Met.* 467,11 f., Hayduck (ed.), op. cit.

[93] Cf. *SM* 228d,27-229a,1 (d,8-229a,1). Cf. *SM* 229a,10-13 (a,3).

[94] Schol. з҃, 148r,36-38: D. Fahl–S. Fahl (eds.), *Das Corpus des Dionysios Areiopagites in der slavischen Übersetzung von Starec Isaija*, op. cit.

7. *Syllogism*

A syllogism is a form of deductive argument where we justify our judgments by stating the reason for connecting the subject with the predicate by introducing a third (middle) term. Among the works of the Preslav School, we find the term syllogism only in the "Hexaemeron" by John the Exarch. In the "Oration of the Sixth Day" he incorporates a passage from the ninth homily on Hexaemeron by Basil of Caesarea where he asserts that the wisdom of the creator has endowed every creature with the ability to sustain its life, which is akin to the rationality of humans. This argument is also against the claims of the human intellect, insofar as the pursuit of syllogistic techniques is not superior to the natural instinct of the animal: "The dog is deprived of a share of reason, but is gifted with instinct with the same power like reason. What sages of the world have invented with great difficulty, sitting on it all their lives, I mean the constructures of syllogisms (τῶν συλλογισμῶν πλοκάς / оумъішлѣѥмъ плєтєниꙗ), the dog has learned by nature. When a dog follows the track of a hunted animal, if he finds it dividing in different directions, he examines these different paths, and what his actions lack is only a syllogistic utterance (τὴν συλλογιστικὴν φωνὴν / гласа съмъісльнааго). The animal, it <would> say, is gone here or there or in another direction; it is neither here nor there – it therefore has gone in the third direction. Thus, denying the false ones, he discovers the truth. What more do they, who are solemnly sitting over the diagrams (ἐπὶ τῶν διαγραμμάτων / кънигами), trace lines upon the dust and reject two of the three propositions (τριῶν προτάσεων / трии въпросъ) to find the truth in the third one?"[95]

There are five logical terms in this passage: συλλογισμός / оумъішлꙗи[96] (syllogism), πρότασις / въпросъ[97] (premiss); (συλλογιστικὴ φωνή[98] / гласъ съмъісльнъ[99]), πλοκή / плєтєньѥ[100] (constructure) и διάγραμμα / кънига[101] (diagram). The last three of these do not occur elsewhere in the translated texts considered here. As can be seen from the table below, none of the first two was adopted in the Slavic translations of the 14th century.

---

[95] S. Giet (ed., tr.), *Basile de Césarée. Homélies sur l'hexaéméron*, 2nd ed., (SC, 26 bis.), Paris 1968, Hom. 9 4,43-58. Cf. JoE *Hex*. 244b8-c23.

[96] JoE *Hex*. 244b19.

[97] JoE *Hex*. 244c19f.

[98] Bas. *Hom*. 9 4,50.

[99] JoE *Hex*. 244c3f.

[100] JoE *Hex*. 244b20.

[101] JoE *Hex*. 244c17.

	The Preslav translations	**The 14th c. translations**
διάγραμμα	JoE *Hex:* кънига	*Dial.*: – *CDS:* –
πλοκή	*SM:* – JoE *Hex:* плетеньѥ	*Dial.*: – *CDS:* –
πρότασις	*SM:* – JoE *Hex:* въпросъ	*Dial.*: прѣдьречениѥ, прѣдьоучиниѥ, прѣдьчиниѥ *CDS:* –
συλλογισμός	*SM:* – JoE *Hex:* оумышл҄ꙗн	*Dial.*: сьбраниѥ *CDS:* сьб(ь)раниѥ, сулогісмоі
συλλογιστικός	JoE *Hex:* съмъıсльныи	*Dial.*: – *CDS:* –
φωνή	Ath. *c. ar.*: гласъ *SM:* гласъ JoE *Th.*: гласъ	*Dial.*: глась *CDS:* глась

However, what is even more disturbing in John the Exarch's translation is the loss of logical context in the comparison of those dealing with logic diagrams to the actions of a dog. His successors in the 14th c. chose the way of using morphological calques, which makes the connection with the Greek original more recognizable and thereby makes the specific meaning of the text more understandable. Such Slavic words as оумышл҄ꙗн, съмъıсльнъ and въпросъ have meanings far removed from the logical context. This also applies to the translation of διάγραμμα as кънига. In such a case, in the comparison of the dog with the sages, the external, superficial aspect comes to the fore – in both cases, one looks at some branching lines and chooses the one that leads in the right direction. However, the analogy between the theoretical disjunctive syllogism, graphically presented by the sages, and the practical syllogism, which the dog realizes and only does not have the opportunity to express it in words[102] is no more evident. An indeed it is strange that the Slavonic equivalences for συλλογισμός and συλλογιστικός chosen by John the Exarch – оумышл҄ꙗн and съмъıсльнъ do not preserve the close ethymological connection like the Greek words. This engraviates doubts about his correct rendering the logical meaning of the text of St. Basil.

A syllogism is a form of deductive argument where the conclusion follows from two or more premises. It remains to consider the way in which medieval Slavic translations treat the term conclusion (συμπέρασμα). This term occurs only in the "Dialectic" by John Damascene. His translation with сьвькоуплѥниѥ has not only left no trace, but because of the subsequent development of the language it has acquired a meaning that makes it completely inapplicable in modern translations. As for its translation by сьбраниѥ, it is homonymous, because that is how the syllogism itself is rendered both in the Dialectic and in the Slavonic version of the "Areopagitics".

---

[102] "what his actions lack is only a syllogistic utterance" / "тъчиѭ акы гласа не испоущаѥтъ съмысльнааго" *Hom*. 9 4,43-58, JoE *Hex*. 244c3f.

The challenges the medieval Slavic translators had to face led them to intensive elaboration of the Old Slavonic language. That is why to render the 90 Greek terms listed above, the Preslav translators used 204 Slavonic words and word combinations thus more than doubling (226%) the terminology of translation. The translators of the 14th c. have slightly diminished the number of Slavic equivalents to 197. They have however inherited only 59 of them (29%) from their predecessors and introduced 138 new ways of rendering the Greek terms. This variety of translation was not so much due to their effort to differentiate the complex meanings of the Greek original as to some inconsistency caused by the undeveloped state of vocabulary of their native languages. There was no norm at that time and they put immence effort to render the most difficult texts of logical content. It was quite natural under these circumstances not to be always consistent in word usage. In the 14th c. translation of the "Dialectic" however there was some trend to reduce the variety of translation. Faced with the challenge of rendering 82 out of 90 Greek terms translated in Preslav, it reduced the Slavic equivalents from 204 to 118 (144% instead of 226%).

The question arises about the sustainability of the translation tradition and to what extent it has preserved the ways of translation of the Preslav school. Before that, however, we must ask ourselves the question of the unity of terminology in the Preslav school itself. Out of 42 logical terms that we observed in John the Exarch, only 16 (38%) match those in the Miscellany of Tzar Simeon (вндъ, гласъ, нмѧ, качьство, лншеньѥ, лъгатн, неразлѫчьнъ, нравъ, образъ, отъвѣтъ, раздѣлъ, разлнчьѥ, родъ, ѥже обьще, ѥстьство, ѥстьствьнъ). Out of 57 terms that we observed in the Constantine of Preslav's translation of the orations against the arians by Athanasius of Alexandria, only 16 (28%: вьсѧкъ, вьсь, гласъ, нмѣтн, нмѧ, къгда, къде, лъгатн, образъ, просто, раздѣлꙗтн, своє, съставлꙗ̂тн сѧ, съставъ, творнтн, ѥстьство) match those in the Miscellany of Tzar Simeon and in the translations by John the Exarch. This may raise doubts about the coordination of the translation activity in Preslav.[103] In any case, it is controversial to talk about a unified – preconceived and agreed upon register of terms in the school.

The Serbian translators of 14th c. proved to be quite independent from the Preslav tradition using only 59 of its terms (29%) and have introduced 138 new ways of rendering the Greek terms. About 30 of the inherited terms (15%) are stil in use even today in Bulgarian, Russian or Serbian: видъ, вьсь, всѧкъ, глась, нмѧ, инородьнь, качьство, къгда, количьство, лежати, лншеньѥ, мѣсто, образъ, обьштеѥ, подълежаштеѥ, просто, раздѣленьѥ, раздѣлꙗти, разлнчьѥ, родъ, слово, сънменьнꙑн, съставлꙗтн, състоꙗтн сѧ, сѫщьство, частьно(є), частьнъ,

---

[103] My sceptical notes about the unity of the Preslav translations of other specific terms – those of Divine being are set forth in another publication: I. Christov, Terminologiyata na Bozhieto bitie v starobălgarskiya prevod na Părvo slovo protiv arianite, *Atanasiy Aleksandriyski, Părvo slovo protiv arianite.* T. II. Izsledvaniya / *Athanasius Alexandrinus. Oratio I contra arianos.* T. II. Studia, Sofia 2022, 252–259, esp. 258–259.

ѥдиновидьнъ, ѥдиноименьнь, ѥстьствьнъ.[104] This testifies to the limited uniformity of Slavonic philosophical tradition through the centuries. Provided the long distance of time (more that a millenium) it may be regarded as a remarkable achievement but it should not be overestimated. The rest of 174 terms (85%) are either forgotten or replaced by other terms some of which came from the European tradition that influenced our national culture in Modern times,[105] or completely changed their meanings. Therefore, the applicability of Preslav translation forms today needs a conscious appreciation and balanced approach.[106] This is the correct way it to be recognized and properly appreciated.

Ivan Christov
Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"
Faculty of Theology
1000 Sofia, 19 Sveta Nedelya Sq.
Bulgaria
ivan.christov@gmail.com

---

[104] **видъ:** вид (Bg, Ru); **вьсь:** весь (Ru); **всѧкъ:** всеки (Bg), всякий (Ru); **глась:** глас (Bg), голос (Ru), глас (RS); **имѧ:** име (Bg), имя (Ru), име (RS); **инородьнъ:** инороден (Bg), инородный (Ru); **качьство:** качество (Bg, Ru); **къгда:** кога (Bg), когда (Ru); **количьство:** количество (Bg, Ru); **лежати:** лежа (Bg), лежать (Ru), лежати (RS); **лишеньѥ:** лишение, лишеност (Bg), лишенье (Ru); **мѣсто:** място (Bg), место (Ru, RS); **обраꙁъ:** образ (Bg, Ru); **обьштеѥ:** общо (Bg), общее (Ru), опще (RS); **подълежаштеѥ:** подлежащото (Bg), подлежащее (Ru); **просто:** просто (Bg, Ru, RS); **(раз)дѣлѥниѥ:** (раз)деление (Bg, Ru), дељење (RS); **раздѣлꙗти:** (разделям Bg), разделять Ru), раздељивати (RS); **раꙁличьѥ:** различие (Bg, Ru); **родъ:** род (Bg, Ru, RS); **слово:** слово (Bg, Ru, RS); **съименьнꙑи:** съименен (Bg), соимянный (Ru); **съставлꙗти:** съставям/съставлявам (Bg), составлять (Ru), состављати (RS); **състоꙗти сѧ:** състоя се (Bg), состояться (Ru), састојати се (RS); **сѫщьство:** същество (Bg), существо (Ru); **частьно(е):** частно (Bg), частное (Ru); **частьнъ:** частен (Bg), частный (Ru); **ѥдиновидьнъ:** единовиден (Bg), единовидный (Ru); **ѥдиноименьнь:** едноименен (Bg), одноимянный (Ru); **ѥстьствьнъ:** естествен (Bg), естественный (Ru).

[105] See I. Christov, Sravnitelno izsledvane na prevoda na Aristotelovite filosofski termini na latinski i v slavyanskata traditsiya, *ARKHIV za srednovekovna filosofiya i kultura* XIV, 2008, 335–376.

[106] Being the editor of the six-volume edition of Aristotle in Bulgarian (Aristotel, Săchineniya v 6 toma, Sofia, 2008–), I sometimes have to answer to criticism that we do not follow the "medieval Slavonic terminology". This is not possible for three reasons. First, as can be seen from the above, this "terminology" is not uniform and has been adopted to a minor extent by the modern languages influenced by medieval Slavic translations, such as Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian. Second, Aristotelian concepts undergo a semantic transformation in the writings of Church Fathers because of the spiritual context in which they are used. In the medieval tradition of Bulgaria, Serbia and Russia, the Aristotelian heritage is not known as such outside the writings of Christian authors. Today we have to distinguish the historical Aristotle's legacy from its Christianized versions. Third, the pursuit of the earliest possible state of the language is under the influence of 20th century European philosophy and has nothing to do with the Slavic tradition. Not to mention that in European philosophy itself this is not a dominant trend.