

Thamar Otkhmezuri (Tbilisi)

EUTHYMIUS THE ATHONITE AND COMMENTARIES ON GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS' WRITINGS

The writings of Cappadocian father Gregory of Nazianzus, one of the most significant representatives of early Byzantine ecclesiastic literature, have always attracted particular interest of Byzantine scholars and have been discussed by them. During the Middle Ages no other Byzantine author's writings were commented on as frequently as Gregory of Nazianzus' homilies, poetry and letters. The commentaries on his writings were composed by well-known scholars of Byzantium: Dorotheus of Gaza, Maximus the Confessor, Michael Psellos, Nicetas Heracliensis, etc. The commentaries on Gregory of Nazianzus' writings were popular not only in Byzantium, but in the Christian East as well. Over the period of several centuries these works were translated into different languages of the Christian East including Georgian.

In Georgian literary tradition the translation of commentaries on Gregory of Nazianzus' writings is closely connected with the translation of these writings themselves. Almost every translator who worked on the writings by the Cappadocian father, rendered into Georgian the commentaries on his writings as well. These translators are: Grigol Oshkeli, David Tbeli, Euthymius the Athonite, Ephrem Mtsire and the anonymous representative of Gelati translation school. Among the Georgian translations of the commentaries on the works by Gregory of Nazianzus, the translations of the tenth-eleventh century scholar Euthymius the Athonite deserve special interest.

The period of transition between the tenth and the eleventh centuries is supposed to be the beginning of the so-called Golden Age – a new era in old

Georgian literature.¹ This was the starting point of a determined orientation of Georgian intellectuals towards Byzantine culture. The process of the growth of Byzantine influence on Georgian literature began in the monastic centre of Mt. Athos and the initiator of this cultural process was Euthymius the Athonite. The aim of Euthymius' literary activity was to bring Georgian literature into line with the Byzantine norm. As is well known, earlier Georgian translated literature, being under the influence of Jerusalem liturgical practice in the fifth-tenth centuries, was quite diverse, but in a certain sense limited.² The main task of Euthymius was to enrich Georgian literature with Byzantine writings of a different character. There hardly exists a single genre of ecclesiastical literature which has not benefited from the translations of Euthymius: he translated the works of well-known Byzantine authors like Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Maximus the Confessor and others; he rendered into Georgian more than one of the patristic commentaries on Biblical books, etc.

The commentaries on the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus translated by Euthymius the Athonite are: *Pseudo-Nonnos Mythological Commentary on Oratio 39 (In sancta Lumina)*, which survived as a fragment, compiled theological-philosophical *Commentary on Oratio 38* and *Commentary on Oratio 44*.³

Commentary on Oratio 38 (In Nativitatem)

The *Commentary on Oratio 38* by Gregory of Nazianzus – "თარგმანებად ძნელ გულისკმისსაკოფელთა სიტყუათა ჭრისტეს შობის საკითხავისათა. თქმული წმიდისა მამისა ჩუენისა მაქსიმეს აღმსარებლისა" (*The Explanation of Difficult Passages from Oratio in Nativitatem by our Father St. Maximus the Confessor*) is attested in the most

¹ Kekelidze K., *History of Old Georgian Literature*, I, 5th ed., Tbilisi 1980, 60 (in Georgian); Tarkhnishvili M., *Geschichte der Kirchlichen Georgischen Literatur (Studi e testi, 185)*, Citta del Vaticano, 1955, 35.

² Metreveli H., *Le rôle de l'Athos dans l'histoire de la culture géorgienne*, dans *Bedi Kartlisa, Revue de Kartvélogie*, XLI, 1983, 19.

³ The texts of the commentaries are published, see *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera, Versio iberica I, Orationes I, XLV, XLIV, XLI*, ed. a H. Metreveli et K. Bezarachvili, Ts. Kourtsikidze, N. Melikichvili, Th. Otkhmezouri, M. Raphava, M. Chanidze (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca*, 36. *Corpus Nazianzenum*, 5), Turnhout-Leuven 1998; *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera, Versio iberica III, Oratio XXXVIII*, ed. a H. Metreveli et K. Bezarachvili, Ts. Kourtsikidze, N. Melikichvili, Th. Otkhmezouri, M. Raphava (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca*, 45. *Corpus Nazianzenum*, 12), Turnhout-Leuven 2001; Th. Otkhmezuri, *Pseudo-Nonniani in IV orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni commentarii* (*Corpus Christianorum. Seires Graeca*, 50. *Corpus Nazianzenum*, 16), Turnhout-Leuven 2002. The introductory part of this work deals with Euthymius the Athonite's translation of *Pseudo-Nonnos Mythological Commentary*. Therefore this issue is not discussed here.

important collections of Gregory of Nazianzus' homilies translated by Euthymius the Athonite. The manuscripts are: *Ath.* 68 (a. 1002-1005), *Tbilisi A-1* (a. 1030), *P-3* (a. 1040), *Tbilisi S-383* (s. XI), *Tbilisi S-413* (s. XI), *Tbilisi A-87* (s. XI), *Tbilisi A-80* (s. XIII), *Tbilisi A-518* (a.1708).⁴

The Structure and Nature of the *Commentary*. The *Commentary* has the following structure: before the passages taken from Gregory's *Oratio* 38 for explanation there is a note ღმრთისმეტყველისა (*From the Theologian*), referring them in this way to Gregory of Nazianzus. The passages are followed by explanations with the note თარგმანი (*Explanation*). In total, 101 *explanations* are attested in *Commentary* on *Oratio* 38.

The title of the *Commentary* ascribes the writing to the famous Byzantine scholar of the seventh century, Maximus the Confessor. In the history of Byzantine literature the name of Maximus is closely connected with the thoughts of Cappadocian fathers, especially Gregory of Nazianzus.⁵ One of his most famous writings *Ambiguorum Liber* consists of commentaries on the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus and Dionysius Areopagita.⁶ The *Commentary* on *Oratio* 38 translated by Euthymius is connected with the above-mentioned work of Maximus the Confessor, namely, with one of the parts of this writing – *Ambigua ad Iohannem*. The writing consists of commentaries on seventeen homilies, one epistle and one poem by Gregory: *Orationes* – 7, 14, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45; *Epist.* 101; *Carm.* II, 2. In *Ambigua ad Iohannem* Maximus the Confessor comments on eight passages from *Oratio* 38 by Gregory of Nazianzus. These eight *explanations* by Maximus have equivalents among 101 *explanations* in Euthymius' translation. So *Ambigua ad Iohannem* serves as one of the sources for the Georgian translation of *Oratio* 38. These *explanations* are: *expl.* 20 – PG 91, col. 1273 D 5; *expl.* 21 – PG 91, col. 1281 B 7; *expl.* 23 – PG 91, col. 1285 B 14; *expl.* 43 – PG 91, col. 1288 A 10; *expl.* 52 – PG 91, col. 1288 D 1; *expl.* 91 – PG 91, col. 1289 B 5; *expl.* 95 – PG 91, col. 1289 D 6; *expl.* 101 – PG 91, col. 1297 C 1.

The *explanations* make up the most important part of the writing according to their volume (Maximus' eight *explanations* constitute half of the whole text of the *Commentary*) as well as their content (with their

⁴ Bregvadze T., Répertoire des manuscrits de la version géorgienne, dans *Versions orientales, repertorium ibericum et studia ad editiones curandas*, ed. B. Coulie (Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca, 20. Corpus Nazianzenum, I, Brepols-Turnhout 1988, 67-74.

⁵ Berthold G. C., The Cappadocian Roots of Maximus the Confessor, in *Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur*, ed. E. Heinzer et Ch. Schonborn, Fribourg 1982, 51-59.

⁶ Jeuneau E., *Maximi Confessoris Ambigua ad Iohannem* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca, 18), 1988, IX.

philosophical depth and meaning). This probably explains why Maximus the Confessor is named as the author of the *Commentary* in its title.

The remaining *explanations* included in the translation of the *Commentary on Oratio 38* are connected with the *Commentary on Oratio 38* composed by the tenth-century Byzantine scholar Basilus Minimus,⁷ namely, a particular version of the *Commentary* attested in *Sylloge* (a collection of the second half of the tenth century consisting of commentaries by Basilus Minimus and George Mokenos). Phraseological coincidences are revealed in Basilus' commentaries and in several *explanations of the Commentary: expl. 1, l. 3 = Bas. Minim. 1a, l. 1; expl. 19, l. 2-6 = Bas. Minim. 12, l. 6-11; expl. 2, l. 5-6 = Bas. Minim. 2, l. 3-4; expl. 36, l. 3-5 = Bas. Minim. 36, l. 1-3*. This clearly demonstrates the influence of Basilus Minimus' writing on the *Commentary*.

Two *explanations* in Euthymius' translation are identical with the text of Basilus Minimus:

რამეთუ ვითარცა ხატი გამოაჩინებს პირმშოსა მას სახესა, ეგრეთვე საზღვარი და სიტყუაჲ გამოაჩინებს მას, რომლისა იყოს საზღვარ და სიტყუა. ხოლო საზღვარი მამისა არს ძმ, ვითარცა სიტყუაჲ, რომლისა მიერ გამოჩნდების მამაჲ. რამეთუ იტყვს, ვითარმედ "რომელმან მიხილა მე, იხილა მამაჲ ჩემი და მე და მამაჲ ერთ ვართ." (Ioh. 12, 45). რამეთუ ვითარცა თვნიერ მამისა არა ითქუმის ძმ, ეგრეთვე არცა თვნიერ ძისა იცნობების მამაჲ. და სამართლად საზღვარად და სიტყუად მამისად უწოლა ძესა, ვითარცა აღმასრულებელსა არსებისა მისისა და მომასწავებელსა, თუ რაჲ არს იგი. რამეთუ არა ითქუმის, არცა გულისკმა-იყოფების თვნიერ

Ὡσπερ ἡ εἰκὼν τὸ πρωτότυπον οὕτως μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πλέον ὁ λόγον καὶ ὄρος εἶτ' οὖν ὁ ὀρισμός, δηλοῖ τὸ οὐ ἔστι λόγος καὶ ὀρισμός. Ὅρος δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς ὡς Λόγος δι' οὐ δεικνύται ὁ Πατήρ· ὁ ἑωρακῶς, φησι ἐμὲ, ἑώρακε τὸν Πατέρα. Σὺν ἀλλήλοις γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα νοεῖται. Ὡς γὰρ ἄτερ Υἱοῦ ὀρισμός δι' οὐ γινώσκεται τὰ πράγματα οὐκ ἂν ἀποδοθεῖ Πατρὸς, οὕτως οὐδὲ γνωσθεῖ δηλαδὴ Πατήρ ἂνευ Υἱοῦ. Εἰκότως οὖν ὄρον Πατρὸς καὶ λόγον τὸν Υἱὸν εἶπεν οὐ μόνον ὡς ἀπαθῶς ὡς Λόγον ἐκ Νοῦ προελθόντα τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς συμπληρωτικὸν οὐσίας καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ τί ἐστι δηλοῦντα τοῦ Πατρὸς. Οὐ δὲ γὰρ ἂν νοηθεῖ ἢ λεχθεῖ Υἱοῦ ἂνευ Πατὴρ ἢ ὄρου καὶ λόγου χωρὶς δι' οὐ καὶ πᾶν ὄλως ὠρίσθη καὶ γέγονε γενητὸν καὶ τάξει καὶ λόγῳ τετήρηται (Bas. Minim. 128).

⁷ Basilii Minimi in Gregorii Nazianzeni orationem XXXVIII commentarii, editi a Th. S. Schmidt (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca, 46, Corpus Nazianzenum 13), Turnhout-Leuven 2001.

ძისა მამა, ვინა თუ
საზღვარი არს და სიტყუად,
რომლისა მიერ დაისაზღვრა
და იქმნა ყოველივე (*expl.* 85).

რამეთუ უჟამოდ და არა
ჟამიერად იშვა მამისაგან ძმ
და ამისთვის დასაბამი არს
მამად, ვითარცა მიზეზი.
არამედ უჟამოდ დასაბამი,
რამეთუ არცა ერთი ჟამი
შემოსრულ არს შორის მამისა
და ძისა, არამედ ოდესცა იყო
მამად, იყო ძეცა (*expl.* 93).

ἀχρόως γὰρ ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν χρόνῳ ἐκ τοῦ
Πατρὸς τοῦ Υἱοῦ γεννηθέντος· ἀρχὴ μὲν
ἐστὶν ὁ Πατήρ, ὡς αἴτιος ἀλλ' ἄχρονος
μηδενὸς μεσιτεύσαντος χρόνου· ἅμα γὰρ
Πατήρ ἅμα Υἱός (Bas. Minim. 145 b).

The traces of Basilios' work found in the *Commentary on Oratio* 38 enables to determine the date of its origin. As far as one of the sources (the *Sylloge* version) of the compiled theological-philosophical *Commentary* on *Oratio* 38 had already been composed by the second half of the tenth century, the *Commentary* must have been created no later than the end of the tenth century.

In general, the compilation style is a distinctive feature of Byzantine commentarial genre. The tradition of using earlier commentaries to compose new writings has been present throughout the whole history of exegetical and commentarial genre in Byzantium. This process is evident in the studies of commentaries on Gregory's writings.⁸

It should be noted that Georgian scholars were well familiar with this characteristic feature of commentarial genre. The epistles of Byzantine scholars Basilios Minimus and Cyril of Alexandria with description of this method were translated into Georgian by Georgian scholars.⁹ It can be said that Georgian scholars creatively applied the compilation method. They often made efforts to introduce Byzantine techniques into Georgian translation practice. This is particularly relevant in relation to the tenth-eleventh century Georgian translators, who introduced into Georgian scholarly tradition not only new genres and conceptions, but Byzantine scholarly techniques as well: e.g. complementing the writings of one author with excerpts from the writings of another author on the same topic, the method of compositional

⁸ Fromont M., Lequeux X., Mossay J., Gregorius Florellius, commentateur de Gregoire de Naziance au XVIe siecle, dans *Versiones orientales, repertorium ibericum et studia ad editiones curandas*, ed. B. Coulie, (Corpus Christianorum, Serie Graeca, 20. Corpus Nazianzenum, 1, Brepols-Turnhout 1988.

⁹ The texts of these epistles are published, see Otkhmezuri Th., *Towards the History of Commentaries on Gregory of Nazianzus' Writings*, in Mravaltavi, *Philological and Historical Researches*, 15, 1989, 18-31; Tvaltvaдзе D., *The Georgian Translations of the Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul*, in *Philological Researches II*, Tbilisi 1995, 345-362.

restructuring and rearrangement of texts, copying the expression techniques from Greek editors and scribes, etc. The compilation method belongs to the same category. It is noteworthy that this method was often used by Euthymius the Athonite: e. g. he used it in his translation of Maximus the Confessor's writing *Ad Thalassium* as well as the *Nomocanon* and the *Guide*.¹⁰

Today it is very difficult to say who compiled the *Commentary* on *Or.* 38 – an anonymous Greek scholar or Euthymius the Athonite. Even Ephrem Mtsire was unable to provide exact answers to the like questions. Regarding the Georgian version of *De Fide Orthodoxa* by John of Damascus rendered into Georgian by Euthymius the Athonite, Ephrem admits: *I do not know whether it was compiled by Father Euthymius himself, or he used the already compiled Greek source* (ხოლო ესე არა უწყვი, თუ თვთ მამასა ევთუმის გამოუკრებია, ანუ ბერძულად ესრეთ უპოვია¹¹). Ephrem is also very careful in his remarks regarding Euthymius' translation of *Oratio* 2 and *Oratio* 3 by Gregory of Nazianzus: *We do not know whether our Father St. Euthymius had a Greek original of this kind, or whether he did it by himself* (არა ვიცით ანუ თვთ წმიდასა მამასა ჩუენსა ევთიმის დედად ესეგუარი მიჰხუდა, ანუ თვთ რამე განგებულეობით ჰყო¹²). Therefore, it is very difficult to say whether Euthymius himself compiled *Commentary on Oratio* 38, or whether he simply chose a compiled text for translation.

Character of Translation. Those parts of the *Commentary on Oratio* 38 which have Greek equivalents in Maximus' and Basiliius Minimus' commentaries are translated through the *reduction / expansion* method. This method used by Euthymius the Athonite in translating Greek texts was described as early as in the eleventh century by Ephrem Mtsire: *By the grace of the Holy Spirit Euthymius could both, expand and reduce*.¹³ The results of scientific study of Euthymius' works fully support the observation of the Middle-Age scholar.

Scholars have noticed two types of the *reduction / expansion* method in Euthymius' translations. One is introducing minor changes into the text without altering the meaning of the Greek original. The aim of this method is to convey the idea of the original text more clearly, to facilitate its comprehension for Georgian readers and in some cases to refine the text

¹⁰ Van Esbroek M., Euthyme l'Hagiorite: le traducteur et ses traductions, dans *Revue des études géorgiennes et caucasiennes*, IV, 1988, 97; Euthymius the Athonite, *Nomocanon*, E. Giunashvili ed., Tbilisi 1972; N. Chikvatia, Euthymius of the Holy Mountain, the *Guide*, Diss., 1997.

¹¹ John of Damascus, *Dialectica*, ed. by M. Raphava, Tbilisi 1976, 69.

¹² See the colophon by Ephrem Mtsire in cod. A-292. Bregvadze Th., *The Description of the Georgian Manuscripts of the Works by Gregory of Nazianzus*, Tbilisi 1988, 174.

¹³ John of Damascus, *Dialectica*, 67.

stylistically. Euthymius also used another kind of *reduction / expansion* method, which allowed making major changes to the text, i. e. dropping rather long extracts from the original and inserting vast interpolations into it. Besides, he also used other techniques such as compiling, excerpting, combining texts and paraphrasing. In the translation of the *Commentary on Oratio 38* both kinds of the *reduction / expansion* method are used. In general, due to their nature and function, the texts of commentarial genre are open to such kind of changes – additions or alterations by translators, scribes or scholars who work on the commentaries.¹⁴

Maximus the Confessor, the author of the main part of *Commentary on Or. 38*, is considered to be one of the writers with the most difficult and complicated language and style in the history of Byzantine literature.¹⁵ This, of course, encourages a translator to make some changes while translating Maximus' text, for stylistic refinement and clarity.

The *Commentary on Oratio 38* is translated by Euthymius mainly in natural, plain Georgian. The translation follows the principle of dynamic equivalence. A sentence is taken as a unit of translation, as it is usual for the translations of this type. Euthymius reorders the structure of the sentences of the original text placing the constituent parts of the sentence according to the norms of the Georgian language. Euthymius also simplifies Maximus' long and complicated sentences through omitting those words that are not essential for understanding the meaning of the sentence. In some cases he renders Greek words with alternative meaning and inserts verbs into nominal sentences, which are rather characteristic of Greek language. In the translation, several examples of inserting Biblical quotations and references are also observed.

In the translation of Maximus' *Commentary* Euthymius has also omitted and inserted large passages, e.g. in Euthymius' translation of *explanations 91 and 95* large parts of Maximus' text are omitted, while at the beginning of *explanation 21* a long interpolation is inserted. The comparison of this interpolation with Greek texts of *Commentary on Oratio 38* has revealed that one passage of Basiliius Minimus' *Commentary on Oratio 38* is used as a source for the interpolation:

¹⁴ West M. L., *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart 1973, 16.

¹⁵ Аверинцев С., *Философия VIII-XII вв.*, Культура Византии, вторая половина VIII-XII вв., М., 1989, 38ж Флоровский Г., *Византийские Отцы V-VIII вв.*, Париж 1933, 197; Laga С., *Maximus as a Stylist in Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, in *Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur*, ed. Heinzer E. et Schonborn C., Fribourg 1982, 145.

და კეთილად თითოეული თითოეულსა შვერთვის – შობაა ყრმასა თანა ჩუენთვის ქუეყანად მოსრულსა, ხოლო მოცემა ძესა თანა და დაუსაბამოსა მას მამისაგან შობასა, რამეთუ იშვა ჩუენდა ყრმა ჩხელი და სრული კაცი. ხოლო არს იგი ძე დაუსაბამოდ მამისაგან შობილი, რომელი-იგი ჩუენ, ვითარცა ყრმა, მოგუეცა მკსნელად წარწემედელთა ამათ. ხოლო თუ იშვა ჩუენდა და მოგუეცა ჩუენ, ესე ამისთვის, რამეთუ ყოველი კაცი თავისა თვისსათვის იშვების, რაითა მიიღოს ნათელი და გულისკმისყოფაა ღმრთისაა სარგებელად თვსა. ხოლო ქრისტე ძე იყო თანამოსაყდრე მამისა და არა ეკმარებოდა შობა ქუეყანასა ზედა, არცა თავისა თვისსა იშვა, არამედ ჩუენდა იშვა და ჩუენ მოგუეცა მაცხოვრად, რამეთუ ყოველთა კაცთა შობანი თავთა თვსათვის არიან, არა სხუათათვის. ხოლო ქრისტე ჩუენთვის და ჩუენისა ცხორებისათვის იშვა (*Expl.* 21).

προσφῶς καὶ πάνυ προσηκόντως ἑκάτερον ἑκατέρῳ συήπται. Τὸ μὲν ἐγενήθη, πρὸς τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν κάτῳ γενήσιν, τὸ δὲ ἐδόθη πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον καὶ τὴν ἄνω προαιώνιον ἐκ Πατρὸς ἔκλαψιν. Τὸ δὲ ἡμῖν πρόσκειται ἐπειδὴ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτῷ γενᾶται πρὸς τὸφωτὸς καὶ γνώσεως Θεοῦ μετασχεῖν εἰς ὠφέλειαν ἑαυτοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ μηδεὶς τούτων ὑπάρχων ἐπιδειχθεὶς ἡμῶν ὄφελος γεννηθεὶς ἡμῖν ἐδόθη Σωτήρ (*Bas. Minim.* 16, l. 1-8).

There are two possibilities: the Greek compiler of the *Commentary*, while combining the *Commentaries* of Maximus the Confessor and Basilus Minimus, inserted a fragment from Basilus' commentaries into the *explanation of Commentary on Oratio* 38 by Maximus. The second possibility is that while translating the *Commentary*, Euthymius the Athonite inserted into Maximus' text part of Basilus' commentaries in which Basilus explains a phrase from *Oratio* 38, not commented on in Maximus' text. In general, the practice of inserting an excerpt from one author's work into another author's writing is very characteristic of Euthymius.¹⁶ The study of commentaries on the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus has also revealed the practice of inserting previous commentaries into new editions. This specific feature of

¹⁶ Vast interpolations have been attested in Euthymius' translation of Basil the Great's Teachings – the excerpts from Gregory of Nazianzus' sermons are interpolated into his writings, see Euthymius the Athonite's Translation of Basil of Caesarea's Teachings, Ts. Kurttsikidze ed., Tbilisi 1983, 70; Interpolations are found in Gregory of Nazianzus' Or. 43, into which the description of the miracles ascribed to Basil the Great are added, see Kurttsikidze Ts., The Peculiarities of Euthymius the Athonite's Translation of Gregory the Theologian's Or. 43, in *Philological Researches*, II, 43; Extracts from the epistles of Gregory of Nazianzus are attested in Euthymius' translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' Or. 42, see Bezarashvili K., *Interpretation of One Peculiarity of Euthymius the Athonite's Translation Method: Interpolations of Oratio* 42, in *Matsne, Proceedings in Language and Literature*, 1-4, 1999, 133-148.

commentaries on Gregory's writings was apparently well familiar to Georgian translators and they often creatively applied this method themselves.

It is noteworthy, that together with the above-observed practice, Euthymius also used literal translation method in rendering the *Commentary on Oratio* 38 into Georgian. This is particularly obvious in the translation of certain Greek terms. While translating the adjectives and abstract nouns with common stem Euthymius carefully follows word-for-word translation method, e.g. the Greek text contains substantivised adjectives denoting abstract notion. Euthymius renders them into Georgian as abstract nouns with suffixes -ება/-ობა, while the adjectives with the same stem are rendered without changing their part of speech affiliation: τὸ ἀγαθόν – სახიერება / ἀγαθός – სახიერი; τὸ ἄναρχον – დაუსაბამობა / ἄναρχος – დაუსაბამო; τὸ ἄπειρον – მიუწოთმელობა / ἄπειρος – უზომო; τὸ ἀσώματον – უჭორცობა / ἀσώματος – უჭორცო. The so-called qualitative nouns (*nomine qualitatis*) with suffix -της (-της) are often used by Maximus. These nouns are formed from adjective stems and denote abstract notions. In the translation Euthymius substituted these Greek nouns with Georgian abstract nouns; while rendering Greek adjectives with the same stem he used Georgian adjectives: τελεότης – სრულება / τελείος – სრული; ἀγαθότης – სახიერება / ἀγαθός – სახიერი. An interesting example of word-for-word translation is presented in the *explanation* 20, which contains about ten different lexical units formed from the verb πλερώω. In most cases Euthymius tries to render the lexical units without changing their part of speech affiliation: πληρώθεις (*Aor. pass. particip.*) – აღვსებულ [არს]; πληρωθισόμενος (*Fut. pass. particip.*) – აღვსებად [არს]; πληρωθήναι (*Aor. Pass. Inf.*) – აღვსება; πληρούμενος (*Pr. med.-pass. particip.*) – აღვსებულო; τὸ πλήρουν (*Pr. Act. particip.*) – აღმაავსებლო; πλήρωσις (*nomina actionis*) – აღვსება.

Therefore, Euthymius' translation of the *Commentary* is a free translation with some passages and terms rendered into Georgian with literal translation method. The word-for-word translation of certain passages and some terms in particular must have been conditioned by the specific nature of term-formation by Maximus.

The Place and Function of the *Commentary on Oratio* 38 in Georgian Manuscripts.

Gregory of Nazianzus appends the *Commentary on Oratio* 38 to *Oratio* 38 in Georgian manuscripts. It is inserted into the collection of Gregory's liturgical sermons. It is noteworthy that the Greek collections of Gregory's sermons do not include the *Commentary*. Neither Maximus the Confessor's

Commentary on Or. 38 is attested in any Greek manuscript of Gregory's writings. The *Commentary* by Maximus is usually presented in a separate manuscript together with other writings by Maximus.¹⁷ This makes us believe that Euthymius the Athonite himself inserted the *Commentary* into the collection of Gregory of Nazianzus' liturgical sermons. Euthymius must have translated the *Commentary* at the beginning of his work on the collection of Gregory's sermons. This suggestion is supported by the fact that the above mentioned *Commentary* is attested in the manuscript *Ath.* 68 (a. 1002-1005), which was created at the initial stage of Euthymius' work on the translation of Gregory's collection.¹⁸ It is obvious that from the very beginning Euthymius intended to append commentaries to Gregory's work in order to make them clearer and easier for Georgian readers. Euthymius' intention is well illustrated by a colophon attached to *the Commentary*: "ლოცვა-ეკავთ მამისა ეფთუმიისთვის, წმიდანო ღმრთისანო, რომელმან ესე საკითხავი შეუნიერი ქრისტეს შობისად თარგმანითურთ თარგმნა, განმანათლებელი სულისად და ჳორცთად, დღესასწაულობად ერისა მორწმუნისა და სამოდურებელად და სადიდებელად მამისა და ძისა და წმიდისა სულისა"¹⁹ (*Saints of God, pray for Father Euthymius, as he has translated Oratio In Nativitatem and the Commentary to enlighten soul and body, to be celebrated by parish and to teach them and to glorify the Holy Trinity*). The reason for translating *Commentary* on Gregory's work (*to teach believers*) is perfectly in line with the major direction of Euthymius the Athonite's activities, namely, his educational and enlightenment intentions.

Commentary on Oratio 44 (In novam Dominicam).

In the collections of Euthymius' translations of Gregory of Nazianzus' homilies (*Tbilisi A-1* (a.1030-1031), *P-3* (a. 1040), *Tbilisi S-383* (s. XI), *Tbilisi S-413* (s. XI), *Tbilisi A-87* (s. XI), *Tbilisi A-87* (s. X-XI) the sermon *ახალკვირთაისათვის და სატფურებისათვის ეკლესიისა (In Novam Dominicam)* is followed by a short text – *ძნელთა სიტყუათა განმარტება (Explanations of Difficult Passages)*. The text consists of explanations of five passages of *Oratio 44* (*PG 36, col. 613 D 5-6; col. 617 A 7-8; col. 617 A 8-9; col. 617 A 9-10; col. 617 A 10-11*). The *Commentary* is translated in plain Georgian language. It provides explanations to those passages of *Oratio 44*, in which the author talks about human envy, the necessity to overcome it and the vanity of luxury.

¹⁷ Bracke R., Some Aspects of the Manuscript Tradition of the Ambigua of Maximus the Confessor, Acts du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur, 100-101.

¹⁸ Metreveli H., Introduction, I. presentation generale, dans Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni opera. Versio Iberica I, 9.

¹⁹ Cods. *Tbilisi A-80*, 56v; *Tbilisi A-518*, 52v; *Tbilisi A-87*, 40r.

The *Commentary on Oratio 44* containing five *explanations* is not attested in Greek manuscripts of Gregory of Nazianzus' works. Therefore, it can be suggested that this text could be a fragment from unknown *Commentary on Or. 44* inserted into Georgian collection of Gregory's sermons by Euthymius the Athonite. The distinct didactic character of the explanations probably makes clear Euthymius' motivation for inserting this text, rather than another, into the collection. For him, a discourse on moral issues supported with examples and quotations from the Bible would be the best way to establish strong moral principles among his parish.

The fact of translating the commentaries on the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus illustrates one more aspect of Euthymius the Athonite's dedication as a translator: he was determined to acquaint Georgian reader with the latest developments of Byzantine culture and literature as quickly, consistently and accurately as possible. Basilios Minimus' commentaries on Gregory of Nazianzus' homilies written in the middle of the tenth century as well as the collection *Sylloge* dating back to the end of the tenth century were very popular in Byzantium. The fact that Euthymius translated the *Commentary on Or. 38* created on the basis of the above-mentioned works attests Euthymius' profound interest in the latest developments in Byzantine literature and his commitment to introducing these processes to Georgian readers. This also proves that the Georgian monastic center on Mt. Athos was actively involved in the contemporary cultural-literary life of Byzantium.