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Sonja Brentjes, Jens Høyrup, and Bruce O’Brien
The pseudo-epigraphic Corpus of Greek writings attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite (an Athenian judge converted by Paul during the latter’s visit to Athens, as narrated in Acts 17. 34), abruptly appeared in the third decade of the sixth century and immediately enjoyed a wide success among Christian theologians of all confessions. It consists of four treatises (On the Divine Names, On the Mystical Theology, On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and On the Heavenly Hierarchy) and of ten epistles addressed to known individuals of the apostolic age. The first half of the sixth century was an age of harsh Christological controversies concerning the way the human and divine components united in Christ. Since the first half of the fifth century, such controversies had been a matter of increasing political concern for the rulers of the eastern part of the empire, and by the first decades of the following century they had become a major reason for division among Christians, under both Roman and Sasanian rule. The writings of Pseudo-Dionysius, initially used by one of the Christological parties, the Miaphysites, as a source in their support, soon became a transversally appreciated theological authority. Their apostolic aura (they were allegedly written by a disciple of Saint Paul) also determined their apparent lack of interest in Christological controversy: Dionysius was instead interested in highly philosophical explanations of the divine names, in describing and interpreting the angelic and the Church orders, or in

* I am deeply indebted to Lucas Van Rompay for his valuable suggestions and for his careful revision of my translation of Phokas’ preface.
justifying and supporting the ineffability of God. These characteristics explain their peaceful and widespread reception; their apostolicity remained almost undisputed until the Italian Renaissance, when the style and content of the Corpus did not thwart the investigations of Lorenzo Valla. It became evident that Dionysius was a Christian disciple, or reader, of the last Neoplatonic philosopher Proclus, whose thought and language are pervasive and accurately reproduced (and, on crucial points, decisively modified to fit the Christian dogma) in the Dionysian oeuvre, especially in the treatise On the Divine Names. Dionysius’s language was difficult and oracular, bursting with neologisms and with elaborated syntactic castles, but this did not discourage translators from rendering his works into Latin and into many languages of the Christian East throughout the first millennium and beyond. The Syriac translation made by Sergius, the archiater (i.e. physician-in-chief, d. 536) of the North-Mesopotamian city of Reš‘ayna (today’s devastated town of Ra’s al-ʿAyin in northern Syria), presumably within the last four years of his life, is particularly important, insofar as it is the first translation of the Dionysian Corpus into any other language and as it was made only a few years after the first public appearance of the Corpus, and the only manuscript that preserves it in its entirety is the earliest witness to the text of the Corpus in any language. Because of its great relevance, this version has already enjoyed a partial critical edition and a certain number of studies.¹

The second Syriac translation of the pseudo-Dionysian writings, on the contrary, has not been the object of a deep-rooted scholarly attention, a fate it shares with the great majority of Syriac patristic translations of the period starting from the second half of the seventh century. Although a few of these translations enjoyed editions in the twentieth century (the seventh-century versions of Gregory Nazianzen’s Orations being a particularly remarkable case of a Syriac patristic translation in the good hands of a whole editorial team),² a more sustained philological engagement with them and a detailed investigation of their translation style is still lacking and represents a desideratum of Syriac studies. It is a commonly accepted truth,³ and is evident indeed from an even cursory reading of the published texts, that translations made by monks and clerics between the seventh and the ninth centuries, especially by those educated or active in the monastery of Qenneshre, on the eastern bank of the upper course of the Euphrates,⁴ were often highly literal. The particular

---

1 For the edition, see Dionigi Areopagita, ed. and trans. by Fiori.
4 For a first orientation on this monastery, founded around 530 and a most prominent centre
linguistic features of this literalism and the methodological principles inspiring it, however, have hardly ever been investigated in any detail.  

The second translation of the Dionysian Corpus dates indeed from this period. It was composed in the last quarter of the seventh century, and, what is more relevant, the second translator prefaced his work with an introduction in which he reflected on his choices, illustrating the methodological reasons that led him to produce a new version of the Dionysian writings. Of this translator we know little more than the name, Phokas bar Sargis of Edessa, the approximate dates (second half of the seventh century), and the fact that he translated Dionysius while being also distracted by ‘worldly affairs’.  

Unlike Sergius’s translation, which has come down to us in only one manuscript and in a bunch of anthologized fragments, Phokas’s version apparently enjoyed a wider circulation, which may prove that it actually succeeded in replacing the previous one.  

This case study intends to be a brief discussion of the translation principles of Phokas’s age on the basis of a comparison between the two versions of the Dionysian Corpus. In the following pages I shall take a first step towards the linguistic study of Phokas’s Dionysius, by 1) illustrating the conceptual foundations of his method as expounded in the preface, and 2) by comparing two representative samples of his translation with the corresponding passages in Sergius’s version.
Phokas of Edessa’s Methodological Preface

Phokas’s preface to his version of the Dionysian corpus is a document of the first rank for the history of Syriac translation techniques, but it has not received much critical attention. Phokas’s preface is particularly rich in indications, as it reveals much about the view West Syrians had of both what is required for a good translation from Greek into Syriac and of the historical development of translation techniques. In this respect, this short piece of writing (see the Appendix for the integral text) is one of the most important programmatic statements on translation in all of Syriac literature: the three prefaces of the sixth century that have reached us (to Severus’s anti-Julianist works by Paul of Callinicum, to Cyril’s Glaphyra by Moses of Inghilene, and to Gregory of Nyssa’s Commentary on the Song of Songs by an anonymous translator) actually give no indications of how their authors saw, and whether they were aware of, their historical position within the evolution of translation techniques. This must not surprise us: in the sixth century, many Greek texts were being translated for the very first time, whereas the seventh century saw a large movement of revisions, starting with the Bible (the Harklean and the Syro-Hexaplaric versions) up to philosophical and patristic texts. This means that at the end of the seventh century, after cultivated West Syrians had witnessed, and still were taking part in, a long and productive wave of revisions of earlier translations, they had also reached a theoretical elaboration of this process. The nature itself of a revision process obliges the reviser to interrogate the historical difference that separates his own approach to language from his predecessors. Phokas sees himself as a reviser, although his work, as we shall shortly see, can be better defined as a new translation. He ascribes the shortcomings in Sergius’s translation to what he deems to be the insufficient development of translation techniques in Sergius’s times:

perhaps, as I believe — he writes —, [...] not many at that time had yet been amply instructed in this art of translating from Greek. [Things went thus] until [...] time passed by and with its alternations brought other lovers of toil, like the saint | and renowned Athanasius, patriarch of Antioch, and Jacob, bishop of Edessa — they who with their skill paved the way as far as it was possible, in a certain sense married the two languages, and produced profitable fruits from their joining, together with yet other anonymous people who had come before them.10

---

9 It was translated into French by Michel van Esbroeck in 1997: van Esbroeck, ‘La triple préface syriaque’, pp. 167–86. Unfortunately, however, van Esbroeck’s translation misunderstands the meaning of the Syriac to such an extent that it is of no use for further research.

10 BL, MS Add. 12151, fols 2r–v.
The seventh-century translator Phokas, then, not only is aware of the progress made by the translation art in the previous 150 years, but he also underpins the expression of his awareness by explicitly mentioning the names of two representative figures of this progress, Athanasius of Balad (d. 687) and Jacob of Edessa (d. 708). In Phokas, however, this historical consciousness is filtered through the rhetoric of reverence, and does not feature as a dismissal of Sergius’s achievements as a translator, as is the case of Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq’s commentaries on most of Sergius’s Galenic version one and a half century after Phokas. Indeed, after a short introduction on the necessity of giving up the attachment to material things, Phokas sets out to discuss the translation of Dionysius made by the ‘pious and skilful Sergius, priest and archiater’. All the Syrians, Phokas goes on to say, read Sergius’s version of the Dionysian Corpus, so that they ‘highly admired and praised [it] on account of the highness of its thoughts, i.e., of its divinity’. We have also read above how he introduces his statement on the development of translation techniques with a nuancing ‘perhaps’ (ܟܒܪ). Phokas, however, immediately expounds the main problem with Sergius’s Dionysian version, though downplaying it through a declaration of humility:

[I] also [re-translated] those [words] that I found in the earlier translation of Sergius, which are not translated with precision […] And this [I did] not in order to take pride in things like these, or to blame the erudition of that [earlier translator], far be it; but in order to clearly show that […] by conforming to the Syriac language and taking pains to teach [the reader] by all means the things said [by Dionysius], [Sergius] simplified his wordings in various passages, lest the reader’s mind be dulled […] on account of the difficulty and the intricacy of the sentences, and their reading be found useless.

As can be seen, Phokas does not limit himself to the rhetoric of humility here, but he tells us something substantial and points to a historical truth. He admits

11 Of course, Phokas’s respect might also be due to the fact that he shared with Sergius the Miaphysite confession, whereas Ḥunayn belonged to the East Syriac Church. In Ḥunayn’s case, however, it is difficult to believe that his critical attitude may be attributed to a difference in ecclesiastical denomination. Moreover, Ḥunayn was not always critical toward Sergius: as he declares in the ‘auto-bibliographic’ letter on his Galenic translations (see Ḥunain ibn Ishāq über die syrischen und arabischen Galen-Übersetzungen, ed. by Bergsträßer, p. 30 text, 24 transl.; see also the most recent English translation in Lamoreaux, Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq on his Galen Translations), he did not re-translate Galen’s On Simple Drugs, which Sergius had (integrally?) already translated into Syriac, but simply revised it; and indeed, in his own compilation based on Galen’s On the Properties of Foodstuffs he integrated some passages from Sergius’s version of On Simple Drugs, often in the form of a simple copy-paste (see Bhayro and Hawley, ‘La littérature botanique et pharmaceutique en langue syriaque’, p. 301 n. 39).
12 BL, MS Add. 12151, fol. 1v.
13 BL, MS Add. 12151, fol. 2v.
that Sergius’s version, in his opinion, lacks precision (ではありません)，which is thus indicated as a major criterion for assessing a translation, and he explains why: because Sergius intended to adapt Dionysius’s difficult Greek to the Syriac language, although without sacrificing the content (‘to teach [the reader] by all means the things said [by Dionysius]’, امية إيلين دمامة دنسكليوس) and thus simplifies the wording ( المدني). The appropriateness of this analysis can be demonstrated through an accurate investigation of Sergius’s translation style: the archiater’s translation actually showcases a successful balance of care for the reader and attention to the content.14 Phokas does not blame Sergius’s choice, insofar as he understands that it aimed to the opheleia, the profit of the reader, as to its main goal; nevertheless, he now intends to abandon this orientation, and highlights precision as the major goal. Precision is also explicitly stressed as the synthesis of the ‘profitable fruits’ Jacob of Edessa, Athanasius of Balad, and many others have brought about (see the quotation above): thanks to their efforts ‘the art [of translation] is being refined and clarified, and thanks to their diligence [they, scil. the translators] are adopting from the precise rendering [لاشحة] of the Greek words that are unusual for the Syrians’.15 If precision was the main goal, we must assume that Phokas’s intended audience no longer was a generically broad cultivated clergy but rather a relatively small, highly learned circle of (monastic) scholars, who took the comprehension of the content of the translated texts for granted and concentrated on the correct application of an increasingly formalized set of translation rules.

Sketches for a Comparative Study, or,
Did Phokas Follow His Own Principles?

In the following I shall offer a comparative study of Sergius’s and Phokas’s translations of two selected passages from the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology, in order to understand 1) to what extent, and on what linguistic and stylistic levels, Phokas applied the criteria he sketched in his preface; 2) to what extent his Dionysian translation can actually be deemed a ‘revision’ of Sergius’s version.16 Let us delve into the first text, a particularly complicated eschatological passage from the Divine Names.


15 BL, MS Add. 12151, fol. 2v.

16 The foundations for this comparison were laid by Werner Strothmann in 1977, when he published a parallel edition and translation of Sergius’s and Phokas’s versions of Dionysius’s treatment of the consecration of the myron in his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy (Strothmann, Das Sakrament der Myron-Weihe). The Greek-Syriac index to this edition is an excellent starting point for any further comparative study of the two versions. A further, shorter comparative lexical sounding in Quaschning-Kirsch, ‘Die Frage der Benennbarkeit Gottes’, pp. 117–26.
Divine Names 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek* (Suchla 114.7–115.3)</th>
<th>Sergius* (Fiori 8)</th>
<th>Phokas (BL, MS Add. 12154, fol. 79r–80v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τότε δέ, ὅταν ἄφθαρτοι καὶ ἀθάνατοι</td>
<td>Τότε δέ, οὗτοι ἀφθάρτοι καὶ ἄθανατοι,</td>
<td>Τότε δέ, οὗτοι ἀφθάρτοι καὶ ἄθανατοι,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γενώμεθα καὶ τῆς χριστοειδοῦς</td>
<td>γενώμεθα καὶ τῆς χριστοειδοῦς</td>
<td>γενώμεθα καὶ τῆς χριστοειδοῦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μακαριωτάτης ἐφικώμεθα λήξεως</td>
<td>μακαριωτάτης ἐφικώμεθα λήξεως</td>
<td>μακαριωτάτης ἐφικώμεθα λήξεως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἑταίρου λήξεως, 'πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ</td>
<td>ἑταίρου λήξεως, 'πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ</td>
<td>ἑταίρου λήξεως, 'πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατὰ τὸ λόγιον 'ἐσόμεθα' τῆς μὲν</td>
<td>κατὰ τὸ λόγιον 'ἐσόμεθα' τῆς μὲν</td>
<td>κατὰ τὸ λόγιον 'ἐσόμεθα' τῆς μὲν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁρατῆς αὐτοῦ θεοφανείας ἐν πανάγνοις</td>
<td>ὁρατῆς αὐτοῦ θεοφανείας ἐν πανάγνοις</td>
<td>ὁρατῆς αὐτοῦ θεοφανείας ἐν πανάγνοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποπληρούμενοι φανοτάταις</td>
<td>ἀποπληρούμενοι φανοτάταις</td>
<td>ἀποπληρούμενοι φανοτάταις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαρμαρυγαῖς ἡμᾶς περιαυγαζούσης</td>
<td>μαρμαρυγαῖς ἡμᾶς περιαυγαζούσης</td>
<td>μαρμαρυγαῖς ἡμᾶς περιαυγαζούσης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὡς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ</td>
<td>ὡς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ</td>
<td>ὡς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θειοτάτῃ μεταμορφώσει, τῆς δὲ</td>
<td>θειοτάτῃ μεταμορφώσει, τῆς δὲ</td>
<td>θειοτάτῃ μεταμορφώσει, τῆς δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοητῆς αὐτοῦ φωτοδοσίας ἐν ἀπαθεῖ</td>
<td>νοητῆς αὐτοῦ φωτοδοσίας ἐν ἀπαθεῖ</td>
<td>νοητῆς αὐτοῦ φωτοδοσίας ἐν ἀπαθεῖ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀΰλῳ τῷ νῷ μετέχοντες καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ ἀΰλῳ τῷ νῷ μετέχοντες καὶ</td>
<td>καὶ ἀΰλῳ τῷ νῷ μετέχοντες καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῆς ὑπὲρ νοῦν ἑνώσεως ἐν ταῖς τῶν</td>
<td>τῆς ὑπὲρ νοῦν ἑνώσεως ἐν ταῖς τῶν</td>
<td>τῆς ὑπὲρ νοῦν ἑνώσεως ἐν ταῖς τῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερφανῶν ἀκτίνων ἀγνώστοις καὶ</td>
<td>ὑπερφανῶν ἀκτίνων ἀγνώστοις καὶ</td>
<td>ὑπερφανῶν ἀκτίνων ἀγνώστοις καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μακαρίαις ἐπιβολαῖς.</td>
<td>μακαρίαις ἐπιβολαῖς.</td>
<td>μακαρίαις ἐπιβολαῖς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But hereafter, when we are incorruptible and immortal and attain the blessed lot of being like unto Christ, then (as the Scripture saith), we shall be forever with the Lord, fulfilled with His visible Theophany in holy contemplations, which shall shine about us with radiant beams of glory (even as once of old it shone around the Disciples at the Divine Transfiguration); and so shall we, with our mind made passionless and spiritual, participate in a spiritual illumination from Him and in a union transcending our mental faculties, and there, amidst the blindling blissful impulsions of His dazzling rays, we shall, in a more divine manner than at present, be like unto the heavenly Intelligences.19

But when we become immortal and incorruptible, then we shall be raised to the blessed order that is assimilated to Christ, being forever with our Lord, according to the Scripture, and we shall be filled by the appearance of His divine revelation through completely pure contemplations, as the brightest glares will shine upon us, just as on the disciples, too, in that divine metamorphosis. In the gift of His intelligible light and in His union, which is above the intellect, we shall partake with an impassible and immaterial intellect, through the secret and blissful descents of His over-bright rays.

---

17 Corpus Dionysiacum I. De divinis nominibus, ed. by Suchla.
18 See no. 1.
19 Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology, trans. by Rolt, p. 58.
The following Greek sentence is a good starting point for the analysis:

Τότε δέ, ὅταν ἄφθαρτοι καὶ ἀθάνατοι γενώμεθα καὶ τῆς χριστοειδοῦς καὶ μακαριωτάτης ἐφικώμεθα λήξεως, 'πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ' κατὰ τὸ λόγιον 'ἐσόμεθα'

(But hereafter, when we are incorruptible and immortal and attain the blessed lot of being like unto Christ, then [as the Scripture saith], we shall be for ever with the Lord.)

Sergius renders it by:

But when we become immortal and incorruptible, then we shall enter the blessed order that is assimilated to Christ, being forever with our Lord, as the vivifying Word says.)

We can observe that τότε is translated but postponed, giving the Syriac sentence a more natural flow: हܝܕܝܢ [...] (then); in Phokas, on the contrary, the syntactical structure of the Greek is carefully mirrored:

(But then, when we become immortal and incorruptible, and we reach the perfection similar to Christ and blessed, we shall be forever with our Lord, according to the Scripture.)

ςωμα (then), translating τότε, is put forward as well as τότε is in Greek and, as in Greek, the subordinate clause precedes the main clause that τότε introduces. Thus, it is clear from the outset that for Phokas syntax is the first relevant level on which his literal orientation is applied. Phokas, however, does not push this as far as to radically mirroring the word order: if a structure is not reproducible in Syriac, he avoids it. This is evident from his translation of the phrase τῆς χριστοειδοῦς καὶ μακαριωτάτης ἐφικώμεθα λήξεως (we [...] attain the blessed lot of being like unto Christ), which cannot be mirrored in Syriac without distorting the language. Phokas renders it through the expression ܫܘܡܠܝܐ ܡܕܡܐ ܒܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܛܘܒܬܢܐ ܢܡܢܥ (we reach the perfection similar to Christ and blessed), which preserves the order of the adjectives and the position of the verb but does not postpone the translation of λήξεως, which would produce an unnatural effect in Syriac. Although his rendering cannot be defined a mirror translation, Phokas is, however, much stricter than Sergius in following the word order. If we turn to Sergius’s rendering (ܡܬܿܥܠܝܢܢ ܐܦ ܠܘܬ ܬܓܡܐ ܛܘܒܬܢܐ ܕܡܬܿܕܡܐ ܒܡܫܝܚܐ, we shall enter the blessed order that is assimilated to Christ), we see that he has been more flexible in transposing the order: the verb is in the first position and not at the end as in Phokas, who in this regard tries to keep closer to the original,
and the order of the adjectives is reversed. Moreover, Sergius adds the adverb ܐܦ, ‘also’, which does not find any parallel in Greek. On the lexical level, the most macroscopic difference consists in the different rendering of λήξεως, which Sergius apparently interprets as coming from λαγχάνω (ܬܓܡܐ, order/rank) whereas Phokas views it as linked to λήγω (ܝܗܘܒܘܬܐ, perfection). Besides these different interpretations, other significant shifts must be stressed: the use of the verb ܡܢܥ, ‘to come’ for ἐφικνέομαι in Phokas, which is semantically closer to the Greek, while Sergius prefers a much freer rendering through the verb ܥܠܝ, ‘to raise, elevate’, and the participle-adjective ܡܕܡܐ (similar) in Phokas, which mirrors the adjectival component -ειδοῦς more closely than Sergius’s typical periphrastic choice, ܕܡܬܕܡܐ (that is assimilated). Even more interesting is the difference between Phokas’s translation of the recurrent Dionysian expression κατὰ τὸ λόγιον by ܐܝܟ ܟܬܒܐ (according to the Scripture), which mirrors the Greek both semantically and syntactically, and Sergius’s preference for a paraphrase: on the one hand, he uses a Semitic idiom (ܐܠܗܡܐ ܒܪܬ ܩ, word) to render τὸ λόγιον, and on the other hand, he adds an adjective to it, ‘vivifying’, ܚܿܝܬܐ, and a verb: ‘as the vivifying Word says’(ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܿܪܐ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܚܿܝܬܐ). On all levels, then, we can observe that Phokas faithfully follows the method of ‘marrying the two languages’ as he brings them as close as possible to one another, whereas Sergius, though not sacrificing the contents of the original, tries to make one of Dionysius’s most characteristic phrases readable for an audience that did not know Greek. Both Phokas’s analysis of Sergius’s technique and his own translation principles, as stated in the preface, are confirmed by this first sample.

This is further confirmed by the evident effort made by Phokas to account for the radical signification of the Greek words. Indeed, he reformulates Sergius’s wording wherever the latter, though lato sensu correct, is not perfectly focused on the basic semantic level of the corresponding Greek word. An appropriate example is the shift observed above from Sergius’s ܥܠܝ (raise) to Phokas’s ܡܢܥ (arrive) for the verb ἐφικνέομαι. While the choice for ܥܠܝ does not compromise at all the comprehension of the text, yet Phokas is driven towards a more basic verb. An even more significant example of this tendency in Phokas is the very slight change from Sergius’s ܡܘܗܒܬܐ (gift) to ܝܗܘܒܘܬܐ (act of giving, gift) to render the component -δοσία in φωτοδοσία. From the noun formed on the af’el used by Sergius, Phokas switches to a plainer pattern and reflects -δοσία more immediately (more basically) than ܡܘܗܒܬܐ does. Indeed, the latter implies the idea of ‘gift, present’, whereas ܝܗܘܒܘܬܐ conveys no more than the simple concept of ‘giving’ and thereby the basic meaning of -δοσία. Despite all precision of the sixth-century translator, Sergius, allowing for a penetration

---

20 This expansion of Dionysius’s τὸ λόγιον is quite typical in Sergius; that it does not indicate Christ but the Scripture is unambiguous because of the use of ܠܐ ܒܪܬ ܩ, which, differently from the noun ܐܠܗܡܐ, does not usually indicate Christ as the Word of God.
of the second semantic level of ‘gift’, comes closer to the implied meaning of Dionysius’s term than Phokas does with his greater accuracy.

Phokas, however, proves flexible in cases of excessive complexity of the Greek syntax. The clause

τῆς δὲ νοητῆς αὐτοῦ φωτοδοσίας ἐν ἀπαθεῖ καὶ ἀυλῳ τῷ νῷ μετέχοντες καὶ τῆς ὑπὲρ νοὸν ἐνώσεως ἐν ταῖς τῶν ὑπερφανῶν ἀκτίων ἀγνώστης καὶ μακαρίας ἐπιβολαίς

(and so shall we, with our mind made passionless and spiritual, participate in a spiritual illumination from Him and in a union transcending our mental faculties, amidst the blinding blissful impulsions of His dazzling rays.)

cannot be rendered literally in Syriac as far as the word order is concerned. Phokas translates it as:

ܥܡ ܝܗܘܒܘܬ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܝܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ: ܘܚܕܝܘܬܗ ܕܠܥܠ ܡܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܙܬܐ ܢܘܬܐ ܓܢܝ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܝܢܢ: ܒܗܘܢܐ ܠܐ ܚܫܘܫܐ ܘܠܐ ܗܘܠܢܝܐ ܟܝ ܒܝܕ ܡܓܢ ܡܝ ܕܢܚܐ ܪܝ ܘܗܝ ܬܢܝܬܐ ܕܙܠܝܩ ܘܛܘܒ

(In the gift of His intelligible light and in His union, which is above the intellect, we shall partake with an impassible and immaterial intellect, through the secret and blissful descents of His over-bright rays.)

This sentence is particularly interesting insofar as its complexity probably derives from a textual corruption. Indeed, it would seem reasonable here to expect a second verb besides μετέχοντες, as a parallel structure seems to be needed. The whole sentence consists of two syntactically identical members, made up of a genitive (τῆς φωτοδοσίας – τῆς ἑνώσεως) and of a phrase introduced by ἐν (ἐν ἀπαθεῖ καὶ ἀυλῳ τῷ νῷ – ἐν ταῖς ἀγνώστης καὶ μακαρίας ἐπιβολαίς). The participle μετέχοντες of the first member, however, does not find any parallel in the second one. This may be due to an apo koinou structure, both genitives being related to μετέχοντες; alternatively, the second verb may have fallen in the course of the tradition. Sergius either read a different and more complete Greek original or added to it: not only does he have a second verb parallel to μετέχοντες, but as a matter of fact he also expands the whole sentence with contents that for various reasons may well be deemed to be Dionysian. One must also consider that Sergius pays much attention to the rhetorical level of Dionysius’s style, making an effort to render it. Be this as it may, Phokas also perceived that something was not in order in this sentence, to the point that he postponed the translation of μετέχοντες, putting it after the renderings of both genitives φωτοδοσίας and ἑνώσεως; as a result, he grouped both the phrases with ἐν at the bottom of the sentence, one after another.

21 I have illustrated them in Fiori, ‘Mélange eschatologique et “condition spirituelle” de l’intellect’.
22 See the analyses in Dionigi Areopagita, ed. by Fiori, translation volume, pp. xl–lvii.
Thus, while trying to make sense of the slightly awkward syntax, Phokas’s translation of this sentence does not reflect its rhetorical structure and is on the whole less faithful than Sergius’s, even if the latter showcases an elaboration that may be the result of an editing process. On the other hand, however, on the lexical level Phokas confirms his drive to precision. For example, he translates the Greek words ἀπαθεῖ καὶ ἀύλῳ with the perfect Syriac parallels ܠܐ ܚܫܘܫܐ ܘܠܐ ܗܘܠܢܝܐ (with an impassible and immaterial [intellect]), whereas Sergius renders them (with an inversion) as ܪܘܚܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܫܘܫܐ (spiritual and impassible), where the second adjective is translated according to similarity of meaning (not material = spiritual) and not through a semantically equivalent root. This cannot be considered as an occasional imprecision, as Sergius employs this rendering consistently throughout his translation.23 The phrase ἐν ταῖς τῶν ὑπερφανῶν ἀγνώστοις καὶ μακαρίαις ἐπιβολαῖς demonstrates, however, that Phokas allows for a certain degree of freedom and flexibility, even on the lexical level, on which he generally proves more coherent. His translation ܙܬܐ ܓܢܝ for ἀγνώστοις is something the reader would rather expect from Sergius, as it bears a similar meaning but is not formed on a semantically equivalent root; Sergius, on the contrary, gets closer (although he does not employ an exactly equivalent root either) to the original with ܠܐ ܟܢܐ (incomprehensible, lit. inaccessible). The latter example also proves that a clear-cut distinction free/literal does not account for all the possible situations with which Dionysius confronts our translators. Yet this is only an exception to the general rule that Phokas evidently imposed on himself. Indeed, whereas the pioneering translator Sergius is clearly at a loss to translate the Greek technical term ἐπιβολή (relatively common in Plotinus and Proclus) and renders it generically as ‘stirrings’ (ܥܐ ܙܘ), Phokas opts once more for a greater semantic precision, using the noun ܢܘܬܐ ܡܓܢ (lit. descents). As we have observed in the case of ܡܘܗܒܬܐ / ܝܗܘܒܘܬܐ (giving/gift) however, Phokas’s literalism impoverishes the Dionysian text as it does not display the philosophical connotations of the Greek word and lays it flat on the very basic sense of the root.24

Mystical Theology II

The previous example was useful to underline the methodological differences between Sergius and Phokas, as the divergence between their translation choices was quite remarkable. The following example, drawn from the second chapter of the Mystical Theology, is perhaps even more significant insofar as

---

23 See Dionigi Areopagita, ed. by Fiori, text volume, p. 138.
24 It must be recalled, however, that the root of ܢܘܬܐ ܡܓܢ is also rich in connotations throughout the history of Syriac literature: see Brock, ‘Passover, Annunciation and Epiclesis’, pp. 222–33.
the distance between the two translations is minimal. Phokas exhibits here a
greater closeness to his predecessor, whose renderings he mostly preserves;
but the changes he introduces, precisely because they are fairly slight, are all
the more significant to illustrate the methodological difference between the
two versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Sergius</th>
<th>Phokas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κατά τοῦτον ἡμεῖς γενέσθαι τὸν ὑπέρφωτον εὐχόμεθα γνόνον καὶ δι’ ἀβλεψίας καὶ ἀγνώσιας ἰδεῖν καὶ γνώναι τὸν ὑπὲρ θεαν καὶ γνώσιν αὐτῆς τῆς μὴ ἰδεῖν μὴ διὰ γνώναι — τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ὄντως ἰδεῖν καὶ γνῶναι — καὶ τὸν ὑπερούσον ὑπερουσίως ἐμνήσθαι διὰ τῆς πάντων τῶν ὄντων ἀφαιρέσεως, ᾧπερ οἱ αὐτοφύες ἄγαλμα ποιοῦντες ἐξαρούντες πάντα τὰ ἐπιπροσθοῦντα τῇ καθαρᾷ τοῦ κρυφίου θεία καλύμματα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I pray we could come to this darkness so far above light! If only we lacked sight and knowledge so as to see, so as to know, unseeing and unknowing, which lies beyond all vision and knowledge. For this would be really to see and to know: to praise the Transcendent One in a transcending way, namely through the denial of all beings. We would be like sculptors who set out to carve a statue. They remove every obstacle to the pure view of the hidden image, and simply by this act of clearing aside they show up the beauty which is hidden.26 |

Thus we pray to enter this mist, which is above all lights and, through non-sight and non-knowledge, to see and know Him who is above sight and knowledge: [by 'non-sight' and 'non-knowledge I mean] the fact of not seeing and not knowing — for this is actually seeing truly and knowing and celebrating Him who is essentially above all through separations from all natures, and doing this similarly to those who sculpt an image in stone or wood, who set apart and take [from] its whole thickness all the obstacles that, like a covering, obstructed the pure sight that was hidden inside. |

In this mist superior to light we pray to be and, through non-sight and non-knowledge, to see and to know Him who is above sight and knowledge. By not seeing and not knowing — for this is truly seeing and knowing — we shall celebrate above ousia Him who is above ousia, through separations from all that is: like those who sculpt an image in stones, who remove all the obstacles obstructing the pure sight of what is hidden.

If we observe the structure and the wording of the third clause, we realize that Sergius and Phokas overlap almost perfectly in every respect: syntax, word order, vocabulary.

---

25 Corpus Dionysiacum II, ed. by Heil and Ritter.
26 Dionysius, The Mystical Theology, trans. by Dysinger.
Phokas has clearly imported Sergius’s formulation into his version, but the small changes he introduces show the specific character of his methodology. Whereas Sergius expresses the verb ‘to be’ in ܗܿܘ ܡܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܥܠ ܡܢ ܚܙܬܐ ܘܝܕܥܬܐ (who is above sight and knowledge), Phokas corrects him by implying the verb ( ܠܗܿܘ ܕܠܥܠ ܡܢ ܚܙܬܐ ܘܝܕܥܬܐ, who [is] above sight and knowledge), as he wants to mirror the Greek wording τὸν ὑπὲρ θέαν καὶ γνώσιν more literally: indeed, the Greek does not include the verb. The same logic drives the correction of Sergius’s antecedent of the relative ܗܿܘ ܡܐ (him) into ܠܗܿܘ. Both the elimination of ܡܐ and the addition of the preposition -ܐ also obey to a principle of literalism: the first one as it is superfluous in order to render the original, the second one because it marks the direct object more precisely than the simple ܗܿܘ.

It is noteworthy that both Sergius and Phokas prefer to avoid translating the difficult adjective αὐτοφυές\(^27\) referred to the noun ἄγαλμα. As I have demonstrated elsewhere,\(^28\) the phrase ‘of stone and wood’ by which Sergius renders it is typically associated with sculpture (of idols) in the Bible\(^29\) and also used by Sergius in a similar philosophical context in his commentary on Aristotle’s Categories. Phokas omits ܒܩܝܼܣܐ, ‘in wood’, yet he maintains ‘in stone(s)’, which he can only have taken from Sergius.

The rest of Phokas’s wording in this sentence is also influenced by Sergius’s choices, but Phokas corrects Sergius in the usual way:

Sg: ܒܕܡܼܘܬܐ ܕܗܿܢܘܢ ܕܓܠܿܦܝܢ ܨܠܡܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܟܐܦܐ ܐܘ ܒܩܝܼܣܐ܇ ܕܦܪܫܝܢ ܟܐ܇ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܬܚܦܝܬܐ ܩܝܿܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ܇ (similarly to those who sculpt an image in stone or wood, who set apart and take [from] its whole thickness all the obstacles that, like a covering, obstructed the pure sight that was hidden inside.)

Ph: ܘܘܟܐ ܕܩܝܿܡܝܢ ܦܐ界限 ܕܡܪܝܡܝ܇ܢ ܠܟܠܗܿܘܢ ܥ ܐܟܙܢܐ ܕܗܿܢܘܢ ܕܓܠܿܦܝ܇ܢ ܨܠܡ܇ܐ ܒܟ܇ ܦܝ ܚܙܬܐ ܕܟܝܬܐ ܕܗܿܘ ܡܐ ܕܟܣܼܿ܇ܐ (similarly to those who sculpt an image in stone or wood, who set apart and take [from] its whole thickness all the obstacles that, like a covering, obstructed the pure sight that was hidden inside.)

---

\(^{27}\) Around Sergius’s times it mostly recurred in the Neoplatonists Proclus and Simplicius.


\(^{29}\) See e.g. Deuteronomy 4. 28; 2 Kings 19. 18; Isaiah 37. 19; Ezra 20. 32.
(like those who sculpt an image in stones, who remove all the obstacles obstructing the pure sight of what is hidden.)

In order to reflect the Greek ὥσπερ more faithfully, Phokas substitutes Sergius’s adverbial locution ἐξαιροῦντες (similarly to) with ἁκζν (like), which is closer to the original; he eliminates ἃὶ (something, ‘one’ as an indefinite pronoun) as it does not find any proper correspondence in Greek; and where Sergius used one of his typical translation devices, the doublet, to render a composite Greek verb, in this case ἐξαιροῦντες (in his version Ῥ🛁 filings, ‘set apart and take’, which translate ἐξ- and ἁρνοῦντες respectively), Phokas employed one single verb, restoring a 1:1 lexical correspondence and a more proper semantic proximity. Once again, he adds the preposition -ܠ to the direct object (ܕܡܘܬܐ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܐܟܙܢܐ) he cares for a more precise rendering of τοῦ κρυφίου, which in Sergius became an adjective of θέα whereas Phokas translates it as it is, namely as a substantivized adjective; Sergius’s explicative editing, i.e. his additions ܘܗܝܡܢ ܟܠ ܓܒ (from its whole thickness), ܐܝܟܬܚܦܝܬܐ (like a covering), and ܠܓܘ (inside), is abolished. Thus, the typical features of Phokas’s version, grammatical and lexical precision, are manifest here, but at the same time they are implanted in the body of Sergius’s version, which remains clearly recognizable under Phokas’s.

Provisional Conclusions

Much work remains to be done in order to generalize or inversely to limit the purport of the few notes offered above. From the samples I analysed, however, it seems evident that Phokas conceives of ‘precision’ as of the closest possible mirroring of the original on all levels, from syntax to vocabulary. Such closeness, however, on the one hand does not exclude flexibility and thus does not reach the excess of some extreme cases of mirror translations like those produced by the Armenian Hellenizing translators or, in some cases, in later Syriac versions (e.g. of Gregory Nazianzen’s Carmina). Phokas’s Dionysius can be read without a facing Greek text. On the other hand, I have observed that the constant search for linguistic precision can and does sometime impoverish the rich stratification of Dionysius’s style; whereas Sergius’s frequent periphrastic and paraphrastic twists, as they reflect the translator’s wandering through the labyrinth of the Dionysian discourse, do end up capturing and conveying its deepest implications.


Appendix: Text and Translation of Phokas’s Preface to his Syriac Version of the Dionysian Corpus (from BL, MS Add. 12151, fols 1v–2v)

First, the introduction that was composed by Phokas bar Sargis of Edessa on the translation and illustration of the scholia that he found to the writing of Dionysius, who is among the judges of the Areopagos.

All things material and that are received materially provide those who possess them with little satiety and with a burden of anxieties — whether concerning the material part in us or those things that grow outside, I mean abundance of foods and richness in belongings —, and the more they increase and the love of the one who cares about possessing them clings to them, the more they drag him down, so as to make the mistress in him a handmaiden. But of the things immaterial and that nourish in an intelligible way the intelligible [part in us], satiety can in no case be found, for the more [knowledge] rises and fixes its gaze, is lifted up from contemplation to contemplation, and senses the great beauty of Him who is truly covetable, the more it longs for that which it has not yet comprehended, acquiring, in the contact with this, a life that is higher. Of such an ascent it is made worthy by meditations of the sacred books, not only of each of them, but also of every chapter and verse: a new ray of light comes toward it, if it meditates on it with diligence and love for toil. These things I said briefly when considering this writing that came into my hands of Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, which was translated long time ago from the Greek language into the Syriac tongue by the pious and skilful priest and archiater Sergius, [a writing] that we all, Syrians, who read it highly admired and praised on account of the highness of its thoughts, i.e., of its divinity which is truly worthy of admiration. But as we found in it | hidden thoughts that are higher than most people [can conceive], we passed them over in uncertainty, except maybe for some (of us), who, because of the purity of their mind — while they receive a brighter splendour and investigate more deeply than the others — maybe also penetrate in the knowledge of those thoughts to a greater extent than the others like us. But now, since, as I said, a new light gushes forth every day from the investigation and the meditations of the sacred books for those who muse upon them, this holy book that I mentioned, written in Greek, came into the hands of my smallness from the divine providence and it included scholia, i.e., wondrous explanations of those words whose comprehension was difficult, as we sufficiently said, which were composed by an orthodox man, worthy of good memory, a scholastikos. A lawyer.
by [his] profession, John by name, from the city of Bishan. I took pains — as an incompetent of course, who nevertheless desires to take part in such a common profit within the limits of his ability — to translate those scholia from the Greek language into Syriac. Together with them, however, [I] also [re-translated] those [words] that I found in the earlier translation of Sergius, which are not translated with precision, having put my trust in God, who says: the one who seeks finds and the one who asks receives and to the one who knocks, the door will be opened (Matthew 7. 8). And this [I did] not in order to take pride in things like these, or to blame the erudition of that [earlier translator], far be it; but in order to clearly show that either by conforming to the Syriac language and taking pains to teach [the reader] by all means the things said [by Dionysius], [Sergius] simplified his wordings in various passages, lest the reader’s mind be dulled right from the beginning of hearing the writing and, so to speak, from the first encounter, on account of the difficulty and the intricacy of the sentences, their reading be found useless; or perhaps, as I believe, also because not many at that time had yet been amply instructed in this art of translating from Greek. [Things went thus] until, as time passed by and with its alternations brought other lovers of toil, like the saint and renowned Athanasius, patriarch of Antioch, and Jacob, bishop of Edessa — they who with their skill paved the way as far as it was possible, in a certain sense married the two languages, and produced profitable fruits from their joining, together with yet other anonymous people who had come before them — from that time, the art is being refined and clarified, and thanks to their diligence [they] are adopting from the precise rendering of the Greek words that are unusual for the Syrians. But you, too, o reader, lover of profit, come nigh with limpid mind as far as possible and, becoming examiner and corrector, if you are able, and abstaining from injurious blames without discernment, consider that, while we are copying the holy writing in the main body, we range the scholia, i.e., the shorter explanations, in the margin surrounding it, whereas we put the longer ones at the end of the book, marking with a certain sign every interpreted word that is within the [main] body [of the text], and [marking] it again at the head of its scholion, so that, if you want to read each of the scholia, of whatever word which is explained, you will be able to recognize its scholion without effort on the basis of the marking of the sign. But again, I put apart in the margin of the page, in small tables, also those words that I found in the scholia [and] that need to be explained further.

I also put, after this introduction and before the [already] mentioned holy writing, a useful discourse that was composed by the pious John the scholastikos, who was mentioned before, who also composed these scholia to the writing; and after it, again [another discourse] by another pious and orthodox man from the same Bishan, George the priest. But read and

---

33 The old Scythopolis, capital of Palaestina Secunda, and modern-day Beit Shean in northern Israel.
understand, and benefit and give benefit, and the Lord will give you wisdom, while you also pray for me, the sinner, that [His] grace may take pity on me on the day of the just judgement as on the prodigal son (cf. Luke 15. 11–32) and the robber on the right (cf. Luke 23. 40–43).

**Text**34 (A = London, British Library, MS Add. 12151; B = London, British Library, MS Add. 12152)

34 The present text is not a critical edition of Phokas' introduction, but only a collation of the text as found in two ancient MSS, BL Add. 12151 of 804 (the oldest one, which serves as the collation basis) and BL Add. 12152 of 837.
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