HOMILIES OF APHRAHAT THE PERSIAN SAGE AND THEIR GEORGIAN TRANSLATIONS
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Abstract. During my research on the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus, I encountered the homilies of Aphrahat the Persian Sage, since their authorship in the Armenian translation was ascribed to the first Syrian ascetic, Jacob of Nisibis, hero of the first chapter of Theodoret’s Historia Philothea. It incited me to discover the Georgian translations of the Demonstrations and analyze their reliability. This article represents a preliminary study of both homilies of Aphrahat rendered into Georgian: the 10th century Georgian translation of Homily VI, rendered by an anonymous translator from an Armenian source, and the modern rendition of Homily VIII translated by Lasha Bezhanishvili from English.

Aphrahat the Persian Sage (c. 270-345), the Syriac theologian and writer, is one of the most eminent authors of the early centuries of Syriac literature. There is almost no record of his life. It was suggested, relying on his Demonstrations and the notices of later authors,¹ that his name was Jacob² and that he drew up a circular epistle for the bishops council to the Churches of Ctesiphon and Seleucia on Tigris.³  ”Demonstra-

¹ Aphrahat is mentioned by Abu l’Hassan bar Bahlul, Eliya bar Shinaya, Grigor bar Ebraya, Abd Isho bar Berika (AbouZayd 1993, 53-55).
² Some scholars believe, Aphrahat was a convert from Zoroastrianism and Jacob, consequently, his Christian name (AbouZayd 1993, 55).
³ Cf. Demonstration 14.1 in PS 1, 573-74.
tions”), the only known work from Aphrahat’s writings, represents one of the most ancient religious texts of the Syriac Christian Church and deals with the central topics of Christianity: faith, love, prayer, resurrection, ascetic vows, fasting, etc. The Demonstrations consists of 23 homilies composed in 336-337 (I-X hom.), 343-344 (XI-XXII hom.) and 345 (XXIII hom.), tied together by alphabetic acrostic. The Syriac text of the homilies was edited twice: by William Wright (1869, editio princeps, only Syriac text) and Joannes Parisot (1894 and 1907, Syriac text with the Latin translation) after three manuscripts: BL Add. 17182 (I-X hom. – 474; XIII-XXIII hom. – 512), BL Add. 14619 (6th century), and BL Or. 1017 (1364).

The Demonstrations was rendered already at an early stage, being ascribed to different authors in the translations. There are 19 homilies rendered from Syriac into Armenian (the translation is dated variously to c. 430, the first or the second half of the 5th century) and 3 homilies rendered into Ethiopic (Ge’ez), nos V, VIII and XVII; in both versions the work is ascribed to Jacob of Nisibis, who died in 337/338 prior to the composition of the second half of Aphrahat’s homilies (XI-XXIII). The five

---

4 The word has a meaning of “an example,” “sermon” and “exhortation” in the homilies (2.15,17,20; 20.6,7) and of “an appearance, showing forth, manifestation; a token, example, specimen; a demonstration, argument” in the Syriac Dictionary (Payne Smith 1976, 609).
6 The manuscript handwriting is Estrangela. It lacks folia from the I, V, VI, VII homilies and entire XI and XII homilies. The author is mentioned in the colophone on 99r, as (Wright 1871, 403-04).
7 The manuscript is written in Estrangela. It lacks few lines from the beginning of the I homily. The rest of the text is preserved in full. The author of the Demonstrations is indicated on 1v, between the columns, by a later hand, as (Wright 1871, 402, 401-403).
8 The manuscript handwriting is Jacobite script. The author of the Demonstrations is indicated as (Persian) Sage Aphrahat Jacob bishop of the convent of Mar Mattai,” 160r; Wright 1871, 401).
9 Antonellus 1756 (Armenian text with the Latin translation); Lafontaine 1977.
10 Sasse 1879.
11 Bonwetsch 1907, 4.
12 Lafontaine 1977, IX.
homilies (II, III, IV, VI, IX) of Aphrahat, translated into Arabic, are attributed to Ephrem the Syrian. There are only two homilies of the Demonstrations rendered into Georgian and one of them is ascribed to a different author:

1. The 10th century Georgian translation of Homily VI (“Demonstration on the Sons of the Covenant”), titled ჰოლინი ღონისძირი (‘Example of the Covenant,” or, after Gérard Garitte, “Forma Promissionis”), is ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome.

2. The second translation is the modern Georgian rendition of Homily VIII titled მკვდრთა ღარიგობა (‘On the Resurrection of the Dead’).

HOMILY VI. The first important notes on the old Georgian rendition of Aphrahat’s VI homily were provided by Gottlieb Bonwetsch. He deduced that the author of the Georgian translation was not Hippolytus of Rome, but Aphrahat the Persian Sage. Bonwetsch briefly compared the Georgian text to the German translation of Aphrahat’s Demonstrations, noted certain differences and indicated that the source of the Georgian text was an Armenian rendition. The translator of the Georgian version is unknown.

ied in 973-976 in the monastery of Shatberdi in Tao-Klarjeti, 203v-215r), Ath. 11 (10th century, 275v-288r) and Jer. 44 (12th-13th centuries, 235r-245v).21 The mss S 1141 and Jer. 44 lack folia,22 the Ath. 11 is the only manuscript that preserves the Demonstration in full and represents the text most faithful to the original. G. Garitte, describing the manuscripts, admitted that “les manuscrits J [= Jer. 44] et T [= S 1141] d’une part, et le manuscrit A [= Ath. 11] d’autre part représentent deux branches nettement différenciées de la tradition; des trois témoins, c’est A qui conserve le texte le meilleur et le plus fidèle à l’original; il est exempt de nombreuses omissions, modifications et corruptions qu’ont subies J et T; ces deux derniers manuscrits sont proches parents, mais n’ont pas entre eux de liens de dépendance directe; J est moins corrompu que T et a conserve maintes leçons attestées par A contre T.”23 G. Garitte applied to his edition the Latin translation, the most precise translation available. He briefly touched upon the relationship between the old Georgian and Armenian renditions, though he did not define the Armenian manuscripts’ recension that served as a source for the Georgian translation.

ARMENIAN TRANSLATION AS THE SOURCE OF THE GEORGIAN TEXT. The homilies of Aphrahat, according to G. Garitte, were translated from Syriac into Armenian after approximately the 5th century. The early version, preserved in a relatively large number of manuscripts, was published by Antonelli.24

There are two editions of the Armenian translation of the Demonstrations: 1. Antonellus, Nicolaus. Sancti Patris Nostri Jacobi Episcopi Nisibeni Sermones. Roma: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1756.25 The edition was made on the basis of a single manuscript, Vat. Borg. arm. 59 (18th century, c. 1740),26 where authorship is ascribed to Jacob of Nis-

---

21 The Georgian text is also preserved in the cod. A 165 (17th-18th centuries, 705-31), a copy of S 1141. It had not been considered in the editions.
22 S 1141 lacks folia between ff. 205/206 (1.18/3.1), Jer. 44 lacks the last part from 17.7 (Garitte 1964b, 302).
23 Garitte 1964b, 304-05.
24 Sasse 1879, 24-26; Garitte 1964b, 303.
25 The edition has been reprinted in 1769 (Gallandius 1769, vol. 5, iii-clii), in 1765 (Venice) and 1824 (Constantinople).
26 Lafontaine 1977, IX, XII. The cod. Vat. Borg. arm. 59 is copied from Venice, Meschitarists’ Library, cod. arm. 1551. There are two columns on each folia of the Vat. Borg. arm. 59, writ-
A few important lacunas, alterations, and orthographic mistakes were identified in this edition; 27) The most recent critical edition of the Armenian translation belongs to Guy Lafontaine. 28) The text was edited after the 12 most important manuscripts of the 13th-18th centuries, the earliest ones dating from the 13th-16th centuries (Venice, Mechitarists’ Library 254/526), 15th-16th (Venice, Mechitarists’ Library 194) and 1623 (Tubingue, Königsberg University Library, arm. Ma XIII 95). 29) This edition is applied with the Latin translation by Lafontaine. It represents an almost word-for-word rendition and is indeed precise and reliable. As for the Armenian translation, Lafontaine admits that, comparing it to the Syriac original, in the foreword Antonelli questions the authorship of Jacob of Nisibis, nevertheless, to affirm it, he indicates to Athanasius of Alexandria and to Gennadius (Lives of Illustrious Men, ch. 1), who ascribes the homilies to “Jacob, surnamed the Wise, bishop of Nisibis” (Antonellus 1756, I-X), and finds out arguments to support his thesis from the Demonstrations themselves (Antonellus 1756, X-XVI). The foreword includes the 1st chapter, “Vita Sancti Jacobi Episcopi Nisibeni”, from the Historia Philothea by Theodoret of Cyrus, and fragments from the writings of Armenian authors (Antonellus 1756, XIX).

27) Antonellus 1756, I-X, XXIII.
28) Lafontaine 1977, IX, XXIII.
30) The twelve manuscripts of Lafontaine’s edition are the following: E – Erevan, Matenadaran 496 (1669); F – Erevan, Matenadaran 497 (1671); N – New Julfa 387 (1797); R – Tubingue, Königsberg University Library, arm. Ma XIII 95 (1623); S – Rome, Vatican Library, arm. B 59 (1740); T – Rome, Vatican Library, arm. V 9 (1719); U – Venice, Mechitarists’ Library 98 (18th century); V – Venice, Mechitarists’ Library 194 (15th-16th centuries); W – Venice, Mechitarists’ Library 360 (18th century); X – Venice, Mechitarists’ Library 562 (18th century); Y – Venice, Mechitarists’ Library 1357 (18th century); Z – Venice, Mechitarists’ Library 254 (anc. 526) (13th-16th centuries) (Lafontaine 1977, VI, X-XVII). Lafontaine examines another 14 Armenian manuscripts in his “Post-scriptum” and admits that they do not adduce any new element to the edition (1977, XXV-XXVII).
some parts it is obscure and the translator didn’t properly understand the source.31

The old Georgian translation, with the exception of several notable differences, entirely follows its Armenian source, representing a near word-for-word translation and maintaining the lexical calques from the Armenian text in the corresponding sentences. These calques are:  „სპარეზი“ ( ”stadium,” 6.1),32 „ნახპეტი“ ( ”forefather,” 6.3),33 „ჭაშაკი“ ( ”bowl,” 6.11),34 „ბუნი“ ( ”beginning, nature,” 6.14),35 „ქეშმა-
The usage and meaning of these calques are the same in the

36 There are three examples of this calque in 6.1. The first one reads:

\(\text{et abit ad naturam suam, ad Chri stum, vadens}\), "երթայբ իբուն իւր առ Քրիստոս" ("et abit ad naturam suam ad Chri stum"); PS 1, 295/296 9-10; Lafontaine 1979, 254/156, cf. Antonellus 1756, 222; Gigineishvili and Gunashvili 1979, 31535; Garitte 1964b, 351, 6). It should be noted that "բուն" in the

Old Georgian Dictionary is interpreted as "նამდվილი" ("true, inhabitant," Abuladze 1973, 37).

37 The first example reads:

\(\text{Simus sal veritatis}\), "Եղիցուք աղ ճշմարթութեան" ("Simus sal veritatis"); PS 1, 2412/242; Lafontaine 1979, 116-17/116; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 30418-19; Garitte 1964b, 310, 3). The next one:

\(\text{quae est vinea vera}\), "զի նա ինքն է այգի ճշմարթութեան" ("quod ille ipse est vinea veritatis"); PS 1, 244 19/243; Lafontaine 1979, 312/217-18; Gi gi neishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 305 10; Garitte 1964b, 313, 9). The third passage says:

\(\text{Accingamus lumbis nostris veritatem}\) (Lumbos nostros aequitate et veritate A), "Պնդեսցուք զմէջս մեր ճշմարթութեամբ" ("Confirmemus lumbos nostros per-veritatem et iustitiam"); PS 1, 244-3/243; Lafontaine 1979, 221-3/25; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 30438-39; Garitte 1964b, 311, 7).

38 The Georgian text preserves few examples of the last two calques:

\(\text{Qui rura et mercatum amat}\), "Որ սիրէ զագարակս և զվաճառս" ("Qui amat agros et mercatum"); PS 1, 248/247; Lafontaine 1979, 43/36; Gigineishvili and Gunashvili 1979, 3056; Garitte 1964b, 315, 14). The next one reads:

\(\text{Qui cupit mercator fieri villam sibi cum thesauro qui in ea est emat}\), "Պիր կամի վաճառական լինել, գնեսցէ
Armenian and Georgian translations, indicating once again that the Armenian translation is the source for the Georgian text. The following sentence represents an additional proof: the Syriac ܡܫܬܐ ("maiestatis"), which means "greatness, grandeur, magnitude, importance, majesty," is rendered in the Armenian translation as մեծութեանցն "grandeur/majesty," "wealth." In the Georgian text the second meaning, "wealth," is translated (that is, "wealth of divinity," not "maiestate," as it is rendered by Garitte).

6.1. ܡܫܬܐ ܡ������ ܠ���� ("Ipsius orationem cum puritate proferamus, ut ea ad Dominum maiestatis accedat").

("Oremus ad eum cum-sanctitate, ut (preces) intrent coram magnitudine divinitatis").

("Oremus ad eum cum-sanctitate, ut intremus coram maiestate [lege: divitiae V. J.] divinitatis eius").

It is firmly established with other examples where the Georgian translation follows the Armenian source and not the Syriac that the Georgian text

ququaquuulh քալելձ նր հ լսու" ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակն և զգանձն որ ի նմա ("Qui vult mercator fieri, vendat agrum et thesaurum qui in eo (est)"); ,զագարակ

Payne Smith 1976, 526.

Khoudabashyan 1986, II, 141.

PS 1, 241-22/242; Lafontaine 1979, 23-14/1-2; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 3040-31; Garitte 1964b, 311, 6. Cf. “Oremus ad eum cum sanctitate, ut preces nostrae intrent ante Majestatem Divinitatis” (Antonellus 1756, 205).
was rendered from the Armenian. However, there is a long list of readings where the Georgian text does not reflect the Armenian source but matches the Syriac, where in the corresponding sentences the Armenian text lacks words, passages, and even sentences. The following two sentences have no correspondence in the Armenian translation but are represented in the Georgian:

6.1. **“Arma sumamus ad certamen, praeparationem Evangelii”**.

6.1. **“Suscipiamus nos arma proelii, praeparationem evangelii”**.42

The Georgian translation lacks certain phrases which are, however, preserved in the Armenian text.44 At the same time, there is a long additional

---

42 PS 1, 245-246; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 305-22; Garitte 1964b, 314, 11.

43 PS 1, 249-250; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 306-16; Garitte 1964b, 317, 17.

44 The lacking phrases of 6.1 are:

1. **“Qui centum denarios non exigit, ei myriadem talentorum Dominus eius dimittet”**, “Որ ոչ պահանջէ հարիւր դահեկան, բիւր քանքար թողցէ նմա տէր իւր” (“Qui non exigit centum denarios, myriadem talentorum dimittet ei Dominus eius”; PS 1, 251/249-252; Lafontaine 1979, 41/42-3); (2) **“Qui ponit argentum Domini sui super mensam [nummularii] collocavit, non vocabitur servus nequam”**, “Որ արկանէ զարծաթ տեառն իւրոյ ի սեղանաւորս, ոչ կոչեսցի նա ծառայ չար” (“Qui ponit argentum Domini sui ad nummularium, non vocabitur ille servus malus”; PS 1, 252-1/251; Lafontaine 1979, 51-2/42-3); (3) **“Qui pecuniam Domini sui super mensam [nummularii] collocavit, non vocabitur servus nequam”**, “Որ արկանէ զարծաթ տեառն իւրոյ ի սեղանաւորս, ոչ կոչեսցի նա ծառայ չար” (“Qui ponit argentum Domini sui ad nummularium, non vocabitur ille servus malus”); PS 1, 252-1/251; Lafontaine 1979, 51-2/42-3);
sentence in the Georgian version that does not correspond to either the Syriac original or the Armenian rendition, and since the Georgian text, in general, represents the literal translation, this sentence must not have been augmented but rendered from the Armenian source:

6.1. “...and we may help him, so that he may receive help, and he will acknowledge us. If we do not believe, let us burn, and let us extinguish the fire that consumes him.”

(“et afferamus ei adiutoriam promissionem, iustitiam, et fideles-simus promissioni et effugiamus ignem inextrin-quivilem”).

THE RECESSION. The aforementioned differences draw our attention to the recensions of the source of the Georgian rendition – the Armenian translation. The editor of the Armenian text, Lafontaine, specifies five recensions: the UV (both include 1-9 hom.), EF (19-19 hom.), WY (18-18 hom.), NSTX (NST – 19, X – 17 hom.), and RZ (R - 19; Z – 8.8, 10.5) recensions. From these recensions the lacking parts of the 1st and 2nd chapters of the Armenian version are preserved only by the UV recension. The rendition of the aforementioned part of the Armenian text is represented in the Georgian translation; nevertheless, the Georgian text shows a number of differences from the source. Thus, in the following sentence, the Syriac ḫeḇeṯ (“qui apparebit”) is translated into the Armenian as արևելյան նորա (“apparitionis eius”), the reading of the V ms being: երկրի նորա և արևելյան (“virtutis eius et apparitionis”). The Georgian գանձաբուծության դերով (“apparitionis eius”) follows the main text of the translation and not the reading of the V ms:

(“Qui confidentiam in Dominum suum reposuit, arbori iterum similis erit super flumen consti-
tuta”), “Որ եթ իր է, դարձեալ նման է ծառոյ որ հաստատեալ է ի վերայ սիզոյ (“cuius spes in Domino est, rursus similis est arbori quae fermata est super gramine”); PS 1, 253/254:2; Lafontaine 1979, 417-18/419-20); (4) Ṭελ." stabentur (b) (“Quem Sponsus invitavit, praeparet animam suam”), “Որ իրարեցաւ առ փեսայն, հանդերձ զանձն իւր (“Qui invitatus est apud Sponsum, paret se ipsum”; PS 1, 253-4/254; Lafontaine 1979, 519-20/421-22).

46 Laffontaine 1977, XIX-XXI.
47 More than half of the first 2 chapters, from almost the beginning of the first chapter till the middle of the second, is missing in most of the Armenian manuscripts (cf. Antonellus 1756, 205; Lafontaine 1979, 2:1061/2:43).
6.1. “Oculos nostros ad superna [ad excelsa caelorum A] extollamus, ut splendorem qui apparebit contemplamus”.

(“Extollamus oculos nostros ad excelsa ut videamus splendorem apparitionis eius” [virtutis eius et apparitionis]).

“In another sentence, the Georgian “ღმერთმა” (“God”), Կորսա (“God”) of the Syriac original, corresponds to “Աստուած” (“God”) in the Armenian main text, while the readings of the UV recension are “քրիստոս” (“Christ” V) and “քրիստոս և” (“Christ and” U):

6.1. Կորսա անհավասար, ինչպես և գրեալ է, զի ողորմեսցի մեզ Աստուած [քրիստոս V, քրիստոս և U].”

(“Simus misericordes sicut et scriptum est, ut misereatur nostri Deus” [“Christ” V, “Christ and” U]).

“The Georgian translation in the next example follows the UV recension while also demonstrating notable differences from it. The Syriac Նախար (“honor”) has no correspondence in the Armenian translation apart from the mss U and V, where it is rendered as պատուի (“honor”) with the corresponding ուրախ “(“pretiosus”) in the Georgian text. Along with it,


the Georgian version differs from the Syriac 

(“our Lord”), as well as from the Armenian “տեառն մերում” (“Domini nostri”) of the main text and the readings of the U and V mss in the same sentence, and says „ուֆլիսա թჳսիսա” (“Domino suo”).

6.1. 

(The Georgian translation frequently shows itself to be closer to the Syriac A manuscript version (BL Add. 14619, 6th century). Thus, for example, in the next sentence, the Georgian “սիմարթլի” (“iustitiam”) has no correspondence in the Armenian text and reflects the reading of the Syriac A ms: })

6.1. 

(“Simus vasa honoris, ut nos Dominus ad utilitatem suam requirat”).

(“Simus vasa utilia Domino Nostro; quaestum faciamus in omnibus, quae nobis data sunt” [“honoris utilia ad necessitate Domini nostri UVS]).

(“Simus vasa utilia Domino Nostro; quaestum faciamus in omnibus, quae nobis data sunt” [“honoris utilia ad necessitate Domini nostri UVS]).

6.1. 

(“Fiamus vas pretiosum, utile Domino suo”).}

The Georgian translation frequently shows itself to be closer to the Syriac A manuscript version (BL Add. 14619, 6th century). Thus, for example, in the next sentence, the Georgian “սուխարության” (“iustitiam”) has no correspondence in the Armenian text and reflects the reading of the Syriac A ms: )

6.1. 

(“Accingamus lumbis nostris veritatem, ne debilis in agone inveniamur” [lumbos nostros aequitate et veritate ne forte inveniamur A]).

(“Comprimamus lumbos nostros veritate ne relixi inveniamur in praelio belli”)

50 PS 1, 241a-s/242; Lafontaine 1979, 234/119; Antonellus 1756, 204; Gigineishvili and Giunashvili 1979, 30421-22; Garitte 1964b, 310, 4.
In the next example, the Georgian "ვისუათ" ("aequiremus") also corresponds to the reading of the Syriac A ms, ḳʙn ("habeamus"), contrary to the main Syriac text (nantsa "vocemus") and to the Armenian version (կոչեցուք "vocemus").

6.1. "Patrem neminem vocemus (habeamus A) nobis super terram, ut simus filii Patris qui in caelis est").

"HAy maq սութիւի ընթացքում, պահեք տանքից երկրի զիցլոց որդիք հաւրը երկնավորի.

("Patrem ne vocemus in terra, ut simus filii Patris caelestis").

"Մեր մի կոչեցակալ տաճար Աստուծոյ սրբեսցէ զմարմին իւր յամենայն պղծութենէ.

("Patrem non aequiremus super terram, ut fiamus filii Patris caelorum").

However, not all the readings of the Syriac A ms have correspondences in the Georgian text. The next sentence serves as an example:

6.1. կոչեցուք տաճար Աստուծոյ սրբեսցէ զմարմին իւր յամենայն պղծութենէ.

("Qui vocatus est templum Dei, purificet corpus suum ab omni foeditate").

Thus, the 10th century Georgian translation of the VI homily, rendered by an anonymous translator from the Armenian source, mostly represents its faithful rendition, though it also reveals a number of significant differ-
ences from the Armenian text edited by Lafontaine, as well as from his UV recension that stands closer to the Georgian translation. Along with that, contrary to all Armenian recensions, the Georgian version maintains some correspondence to the Syriac Arm ms recension (BL Add. 14619, 6th century) reflected in the Georgian text, presumably through the unknown Armenian source – the recension, not considered in Lafontaine’s edition.

THE VIII HOMILY of Aphrahat’s Demonstrations is rendered from English into modern Georgian by the young historian and researcher of the Bible and Church history, Lasha Bezhanishvili. The translation is titled წმინდა აფრაატი, სპარსი ბრძენი მკვდართა აღდგომაზე (“Saint Aphrahat, Persian Sage. On the Resurrection of the Dead”). The text is published in 2011, on the website of wordpress.com. The source of the translation is the English precise and word-for-word rendition of the work, titled “Of the Resurrection of the Dead,” published by J. Gwynn in the Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (= NPNF), 2nd series, vol. 13 (1898). The English rendition of the text is more precise in comparison with the Latin translation of Parisot, with its additions, omissions, and minor alterations. The Georgian translation, as the translator notes, is not intended for schol-
arly use, and though the meaning of the text is well rendered, there are additions, omissions, and alterations, of which the most significant are the following:

1. Additions:
The Georgian translation in the following sentence for the passage “of whom, after a long time elapses, there remains nothing at all there” says:

“მათი ფიზიკური სხეულიდან არაფერი რჩება” (“of whose physical body nothing remains”), includes an addition to clarify the meaning of the text.

2. Omissions:
The important term “spiritual” is omitted in the passage:

“მაგრამ შეიმოსებიან ციური სხეულებით და ფორმებით.”

(“But [they] will be clothed with heavenly bodies and forms”).

3. Alterations:
In the next example, the second part of the passage “and that which thou sowest is not like that which grows up into blade” is altered as „და როცა თესავ, მომავალ სხეულს კი არ თესავ” (“and when thou sowest, [you] don’t sowest the future body”).

58 PS 1, 36113-14/362; NPNF, 375; The English translation of the VIII homily’s Georgian text, here and below, belongs to the author of this article.
59 PS 1, 36110-11/362; NPNF, 375.
8.2. Two phrases of similar meaning are rendered as one:

“et quod seminas non speciem habet huius quod in herbam crescit, sed nudum granum est tritici, aut hordei, aut alcuieis ceterorum seminum”.

“and that which thou sowest is not like that which grows up into blade, but one bare grain of wheat or barley or some other seedling.”

(And when thou sowest, you do not sowest the future body, but bare grain, it does not matter, whether it will be a seedling of wheat or of other cereals).60

4. There are additions, omissions, and alterations throughout the entire text. In total, the translation of the VIII chapter of the Demonstrations is significant since it represents the only rendition of this homily in Georgian and since it is the only modern translation of Aphrahat’s Demonstrations in Georgian. The rendition is good enough to read and understand the content of the text, though for a scholarly use it must be treated with caution.

---

60 PS 1, 364:11-14/363; NPNF, 375.
61 PS 1, 364:14-17/363; NPNF, 375.
CONCLUSION. At this stage of our preliminary study, it can be stated that from two Georgian translations of the homilies (VI and VIII) by Aphrahat the Persian Sage, the translation of the VI homily rendered by an anonymous translator in the 10th century, essentially represents a faithful and word-for-word rendition of the Armenian source. Nevertheless, the Georgian text reveals significant differences from the recensions edited by Lafontaine, even from the UV recension that stands closer to it, and maintains correspondences to the Syriac A ms recension (BL Add. 14619, 6th century) reflected in the Georgian, presumably through the unknown Armenian source, – the recension, not considered in the edition of Lafontaine. The second, modern translation of the VIII homily, On the Resurrection of the Dead, rendered by Lasha Bezhanishvili from the English source, is good enough to understand the content of the text, though for scholarly purposes it must be referred to with caution, since, having the English translation as the direct source, it is not always sufficiently precise.
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