

The Biblical Quotations in the Old Georgian Translations of the *Hexaemeron* of Basil of Caesarea

Author(s): Magda Mtchedlidze

Source: *Phasis. Greek and Roman Studies* 23 (2020): 54-73

ISSN: 1512-1046

E-ISSN: 2346-8459

Published by: The Institute of Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies of the Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48614/phasis.23.2020.54-73>

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

THE BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS IN THE OLD GEORGIAN TRANSLATIONS OF THE *HEXAEMERON* OF BASIL OF CAESAREA*

MAGDA MTCHEDLIDZE

Abstract. This article addresses the issue of the provenance of the Biblical passages cited in two Georgian translations of the *Hexaemeron* of St. Basil the Great. Specifically, it focuses on procedures adopted by the translators of Basil's work, namely whether they used any of the surviving Georgian versions of the Holy Scriptures, provided their own rendering, or if the quotations of their translations were taken from a hitherto unknown Georgian recension of the Bible. Finally, this article emphasizes the importance of studying the Biblical passages cited in the Old Georgian translations of the *Hexaemeron* for a better understanding of the history of the Georgian translation of the Holy Scriptures.

Identifying the provenance of the Biblical quotations in the translations of patristic writings into Georgian (as well as in other languages) reveals a number of possible procedures: the translator may quote Biblical passages from several different Georgian versions, or from

* I am grateful to Prof. Ana Kharanauli for her consultations, as well as to her MA student, Tamar Magrakvelidze, during discussions with whom in my class the idea of this paper was born. I am also thankful to the anonymous reviewers of this article for their useful comments and corrections.

memory, or may offer his own rendering; or he may accurately follow the quotations in his source text, which, in turn, may open up other possibilities: the author of the source text may cite a recension of the Biblical text that is different from all the surviving recensions, or may quote the Biblical passage from memory or may offer an abridged or paraphrased version, etc. However, as concerns the subject of the exegesis, i.e. the text that was to be explained systemically, verse-by-verse (such as *Homilies on the Song of Songs* by Gregory of Nyssa, or *Commentaries on the Gospels* by Theophylact of Bulgaria, etc.), it is logical to suppose that the exegete would have this text in front of him² (while other Biblical quotations, both from the Old and the New Testaments, may have been cited from memory). Therefore, the author of a systemic Hexaemeron work, would very probably have in front of him the text of Genesis 1, which he aimed to explicate verse-by-verse. Basil of Caesarea, when working on the *Hexaemeron*, not only had in front of him the Septuagint, but other Greek translations as well (probably, Hexaplaric texts), which he sometimes cites in parallel with the text of the Septuagint.³ Other church fathers also used to cite and analyze the interpretations of the recensions of Biblical texts. In his exegetical works, including *An Apology for the Hexaemeron*, Gregory of Nyssa, the brother of Basil, directly refers to the translators – Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotus.⁴

The same can be said about the translators of the *Hexaemeron*, who must have considered the already existing version (or versions) of the Bible when quoting the initial verses of Genesis. Thus, the texts that are different from the widely known recensions of the Georgian Bible in the Georgian versions of the *Hexaemeron* are less likely to be related to citing from memory: the translator either follows a recension lost to us or intentionally revises the existing version (probably, according to the recension cited by the exegete or considering his commentaries).

² This explains why various readings quoted in such exegeses have been included in the apparatus of the critical editions of the Bible.

³ E.g., see Bas. Caes. *Hex.* 1.6, p. 12, 2-4 (De Mendieta and Rudberg 1997).

⁴ Cf. Gr. Nyssa. *Apol.*, PG 44, col. 69 D3ff; 80 A16-B1ff.

There are two surviving Old Georgian translations of Basil's *Hexaemeron*: one was rendered from Greek by Giorgi the Hagiorite in the 11th century,⁵ while the other was rendered by a translator not yet identified and dated to an earlier period⁶ (as Giorgi the Hagiorite notes, he was familiar with and used this translation)⁷. Ilia Abuladze dated this earlier translation to the 8th-10th century (because of the archaic language of the text, the scholar is more inclined to date the translation to the 8th or 9th century) and due to the presence of Arabic and Persian borrowings found in it, identified it as a rendering from Arabic.⁸ According to recent studies, the source text of the translation is believed to be Greek, while lexical Arabisms are explained by the Arabic environment in which the translation was done.⁹ I share this opinion but will not dwell on the question any further, as the source language of the Biblical passages included in the anonymous translation of Basil's work and discussed in this paper is definitely Greek and these passages closely resemble the Biblical text cited in Giorgi the Hagiorite's translation.

As far as the Georgian recensions of the Bible¹⁰ and, specifically, the Pentateuch are concerned, the surviving Georgian manuscripts have been grouped into two principal text types: that of Oshki and Gelati. The scholars speak of a third text type as well, which basically is the combination of the two main types.¹¹ The recension of the Biblical verses cited in Giorgi the Hagiorite's and the earlier anonymous

⁵ The text was edited by Mikheil Kakhadze based on the Shatberdi manuscript A 73 (11th century), which is one of the six surviving copies of Giorgi the Hagiorite's translation of Basil's *Hexaemeron*. The gaps were filled up and misreadings found in it were corrected according to A 55 (12th century manuscript). See Kakhadze 1947, ix.

⁶ The text was edited by Ilia Abuladze on the ground of two manuscripts from the Jerusalemite collection: nos. 44 and 4 (Abuladze 1964, 11), dating from the 11th-12th and 12th-13th centuries respectively (Noble 2019, 32).

⁷ Abuladze 1964, 9-10.

⁸ Abuladze 1964, 17.

⁹ Noble 2019.

¹⁰ Issues related to the Georgian Biblical texts and to their editing are discussed in detail by Gigineishvili (1989, 5-60), as well as by Melikishvili (2012, 35-156).

¹¹ Gigineishvili 1989, 9, 40.

translator's renderings of Basil's *Hexaemeron* differs from the texts of all surviving Georgian manuscripts of the Bible, while their comparison with the Oshki Bible (978) is impossible as the latter lacks the first twelve chapters of Genesis.

I compared the Biblical quotations in Georgian translations of the *Hexaemeron* with the text of Genesis 1 included in 10th century Georgian lectionaries¹² (the texts of the Pentateuch included in these lectionaries, closely resemble in general the Oshki Bible text).¹³ The comparison revealed that in both Georgian translations, out of the eighteen verses of Genesis 1 cited in Basil's *Hexaemeron*, eleven verses (fully or partially) coincide with the text included in the lectionaries or they are closely parallel. The few differences shown in the table below are either due to the use of the absolute case, or to the orthography of ჳ (confusions in the use of both of these elements are frequent in works dating from the mentioned period, including the lectionaries);¹⁴ there are two more cases where the texts show minor differences: one is the use of the conjunction „ოჲ“ (“and”) and the other is the use of the article.

Let us see the passages from Genesis 1, that are almost identical in the Georgian translations of Basil's *Hexaemeron* and the lectionaries. For comparison, the table also shows the same passages from the Gelati text type.¹⁵

¹² Although the four surviving copies of the lectionaries date from the 10th century, their original redaction is believed to be formed in the 5th-8th centuries. See Melikishvili 1974, 34.

¹³ One of the four lectionaries (the Parisian Lectionary), which, according to Melikishvili (1974, 36), is different from the Oshki Bible, does not include the first three chapters of Genesis at all (Melikishvili 1974, 9).

¹⁴ Melikishvili 1974, 90-95, 134-137.

¹⁵ Genesis 1 as cited in Giorgi the Hagiorite's translation of Basil's work is largely identical with Biblical quotations included in his translation of Gregory of Nyssa's *Apology*. It would be likewise interesting to study Biblical quotations in other Hexaemeronic works that are not currently available to me: the earliest Georgian translation of the *Hexaemeron* by Severian of Gabala (4th-5th century), prepared for publication by Tornike Chkonia (Chelidze 1997, 5) and Theophilus' translation of John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* (the manuscript that contains this work is preserved in the monastery of Iviron on Athos)

Gen.	Bas. Caes. <i>Hex.</i> (De Mendieta and Rudberg 1997) = Septuagint	Earlier Georgian Ver- sion of the <i>Hexaemeron</i> , 8 th -10 th centuries (Abuladze 1964)	Giorgi the Hagiorite's Translation of the <i>Hexa- emeron</i> , 11 th Century (Kakhadze 1947)	Lectionaries, 10 th Century (Melikishvili 1974) ¹⁶	Gelati Text Type, Bible ms A -179 (1669) (Giginei- shvili and Kikvidze 1989) ¹⁷
1.1	ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν (p. 3, 14)	დასაბამად ქმნა ღმერთმან ცამ და ქუეყანად (p. 40, 24)	დასაბამად ქმნა ღმერთმან ცამ და ქუეყანად (p. 2, 25)	დასაბამად ქმნა ღმერთმან ცამ და ქუეყანად (p. 1)	დასაბამად ქმნა ღმერთმან ცამ და ქუეყანად (p. 62)
1.2	καὶ σκοτός ¹⁸ ἐπᾶνω τῆς ἀβύσσου	– ბნელ იყო ზედა უფსკრულთა	– ბნელი იყო ზედა უფსკრუ-	და ბნელი ¹⁹ იყო ზედა უფსკრუ-	და ბნელი იყო ზედა უფსკრუ-

(Gigineishvili 1989, 35). Some information on texts quoted in Theophilus' translation is provided in Gigineishvili 1989.

¹⁶ The text of the lectionaries in the table is basically cited from the Sinai Lectionary (S). The variant readings from other lectionaries (namely, from Latali (L) and Kala (K) lectionaries) are also cited from Melikishvili 1974. The text under consideration is also included in the edition of Parisian Lectionary (Danelia, Chkhenkeli and Shavishvili 1987).

¹⁷ In Gigineishvili and Kikvidze's edition of the Pentateuch (1989), the text of Genesis of ms. A-179 (C), assigned to the Gelati text type, is presented together with the text of the Bible of Bakar (1743) (B) and is considered as being of the same type. It should be noted that the variant readings of B, in some cases, are different from C and identical with the lectionaries.

¹⁸ Cf. v. 1. σκοτός ἦν (Giet 1949, 152).

¹⁹ და ბნელი SK] ბნელ L.

		ლოთა	ლოთა	ლოთა
	(p. 26, 20)	(p. 32, 20)	(p. 18, 28)	(p. 1)
	καὶ	და	და	და
	πνεῦμα	სული	სული	სული
	θεοῦ	ღმრთისად	ღმრთისად	ღმრთისად
	ἐπεφῆρετο	იქცეოდა	იქცეოდა	იქცეოდა
	ἐπάνω	ზედა	ზედა	ზედა
	τοῦ ὕδατος	წყალთა	წყალთა	წყალთა
	(p. 31, 1)	(p. 36, 8)	(p. 22, 15)	(p. 1)
1.3	καὶ	და	და	და
	εἶπεν	თქუა	თქუა	თქუა
	ὁ θεός	ღმერთმან:	ღმერთმან:	ღმერთმან:
	γενηθήτω	იყავნ	იყავნ	იქმენინ
	φῶς	ნათელი	ნათელი	ნათელი
	(p. 32, 1)	(p. 36, 34)	(p. 23, 5, 112, 26-27)	(p. 1)
	καὶ	და	და	და
	ἐγένετο	იყო	იყო	იქმნა
	φῶς	ნათელი	ნათელი	ნათელი
	(p. 158, 16)	(p. 134, 12-13)	(p. 112, 26-27)	(p. 1)
1.4	καὶ	და	და	და
	εἶδεν	იხილა	იხილა	იხილა
	ὁ θεός	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან
	τὸ φῶς	ნათელი	ნათელი	ნათელი
		იგი	იგი	–
	ὅτι	რამეთუ	რამეთუ	რამეთუ
	καλόν	კეთილ	კეთილ	კეთილ
	–	არს	არს ²²	–
	(p. 33, 6)	(p. 37, 30)	(p. 23, 35-36)	(p. 1)

²⁰ წყალსა| წყალთა B.

²¹ კეთილ| კეთილა K. As we see, the trace (s) of the verb „არს“ (“is”) is evident in the Kala lectionary.

²² Cf. the quotation used by Giorgi the Hagiorite in Gr. Nyss. *Apol.* 3.2: „რამეთუ კეთილ“ (Chelidze 1989, 209).

Cf. Gen. 1.10

(K), 1.25 (K):

„კეთილ
არს“

	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	διεχώρισεν	განაშორა	განაშორა ²³	განაშორა	განწვალა
	ὁ θεὸς	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან
	ἀνὰ μέσον	შორის	შორის	შორის	შორის
	τοῦ φωτός	[ნათლისა	ნათლისა	ნათლისა	ნათლისა
		მის	მის	მის	–
	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	ἀνὰ μέσον	შორის	შორის	შორის	შორის
	τοῦ σκοτούς	ბნელისა]	ბნელისა	ბნელისა	ბნელისა
		–	–	მის	–
1.5	(p. 34, 1-2)	(p. 38, 14-15)	(p. 24, 19)	(p. 1)	(p. 62)
	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	ἐκάλεσεν	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა
	ὁ θεὸς	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან
	τὸ φῶς	ნათელსა	ნათელსა	ნათელსა	ნათელსა
		მას	მას	მას	–
	ἡμέραν	დღე	დღე	დღე	დღე
	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	τὸ σκότος	ბნელსა	ბნელსა	ბნელსა	ბნელსა
		მას	მას	მას	–
	ἐκάλεσεν	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა
	νύκτα	ღამე	ღამე	ღამე	ღამე
1.6	(p. 34, 5)	(p. 38, 18-19)	(p. 24, 22-23)	(p. 1)	(p. 62)
	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	εἶπεν	თქუა	თქუა	თქუა	თქუა
	ὁ θεὸς	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან
	γενηθήτω	იყავნ	იყავნ	იყავნ	იქნენინ
	στερέωμα	სამყაროდ	სამყაროდ	სამყაროდ	სამყაროდ
	ἐν μέσῳ	შორის	შორის	შორის	შორის
	τοῦ ὑδάτος	წყალთა	წყალთა	წყალთა,	წყლისა
	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	ἔστω	იყავნ	იყავნ	იყავნ	იყავნ

²³ Cf. the quotation used by Giorgi the Hagiorite in Gr. Nyss. *Apol.* 3.2: „განწვალა“ (Chelidze 1989, 209).

	διαχρῖζον	განმაშორებელ	განმაშორებელ	განმაშორებელ	განწყველ
	ἀνὰ μέσον	შორის	შორის	შორის	შორის
	ἕδατος	წყალთა	წყალთა	წყალთა	წყლისა ²⁴
	καὶ	და	და	და	–
	ἕδατος	წყალთა	წყალთა	წყალთა	–
1.8	(p. 39, 15-16, 43, 7-8)	(p. 42, 29-31)	(p. 28, 7)	(p. 1)	(p. 62)
	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	ἐκάλεσεν	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა
	ὁ θεὸς	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან
	τὸ στερέωμα	სამყაროსა	სამყაროსა	სამყაროსა	სამყაროსა
		მას	მას	მას	–
	οὐρανόν	ცაჲ	ცაჲ	ცაჲ	ცაჲ
	(p. 51, 18)	(p. 49, 10)	(p. 37, 8)	(p. 2)	(p. 62)
	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	εἶδεν	იხილა	იხილა	იხილა	იხილნა
	ὁ θεὸς	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან
	ὅτι	რამეთუ	რამეთუ	რამეთუ	რამეთუ
	καλόν	კეთილ	კეთილ	კეთილ	კეთილ
	–	არს	არს	–	–
	(p. 55, 7)	(p. 52, 1-2)	(p. 39, 18)	(p. 2)	(p. 62)
1.10	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	ἐκάλεσεν	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა
	ὁ θεὸς	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან
	τὴν ξηρὰν	ჭმელსა	ჭმელსა	ჭმელსა	ჭმელსა
		მას	მას	მას	–
	γῆν	ქუეყანაჲ	ქუეყანაჲ	ქუეყანაჲ	ქუეყანა
	καὶ	და	და	და	და
	τὰ συστῆματα	შესაკრებელსა	შესაკრებელსა	შესაკრებელსა	შესაკრებელსა
		მას	მას	მას	–
	τῶν ὑδάτων	წყალთასა	წყალთასა	წყალთასა	წყალთასა
	ἐκάλεσεν	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა	უწოდა
	θαλάσσης	ზღუეზ	ზღუეზ	ზღუეზ	ზღუეზ
	(p. 58, 19-20)	(p. 54, 11-13)	(p. 41, 29-30)	(p. 2)	(p. 62)

²⁴ წყლისა] + და წყლისა B.

1.14	καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός γενηθήτωσαν φαστήρες ἐν τῷ στερέωματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς φάσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς – τοῦ διαχρᾶζειν ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς νυκτὸς (p. 89, 17-19)	და თქუა ღმერთმან იყვნედ მნათობნი სამყაროსა – ცისასა განმან- თლებელად – ქუეყანისა და განმწვა- ლებელად შორის დღისა და შორის ღამისა (p. 78, 25-27)	და თქუა ღმერთმან იყვნედ მნათობნი სამყაროსა – ცისასა განმან- თლებელად – ქუეყანისა და განმწვა- ლებელად შორის დღისა და შორის ღამისა (p. 64, 33-34)	და თქუა ღმერთმან იყვნედ მნათობნი ²⁵ სამყაროსა – ცისასა განმან- თლებელად – ქუეყანისა ²⁶ და განმწვა- ლებელად შორის დღისა და შორის ღამისა (p. 3)	და თქუა ღმერთმან იყვნენ მნათობნი სამყაროსა შინა ცისასა მნათობად – ქუეყანისა – განსაყოფელად შორის დღისა და შორის ღამისა (p. 63)
1.26	καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον (p. 158, 11) ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν (p. 160, 6; cf. p. 159, 23)	და თქუა ღმერთმან ვეძნეთ კაცი (p. 134, 7) ვეძნეთ კაცი ხატად ჩუენდა (p. 135, 25-26; cf. p. 135, 15-16)	და თქუა ღმერთმან ვეძნეთ კაცი (p. 112, 21) ვეძნეთ კაცი ხატად ჩუენდა (p. 113, 35; cf. p. 113, 24)	და თქუა ღმერთმან ვეძნეთ კაცი (p. 5) ვეძნეთ კაცი ხატად ჩუენდა (p. 5)	და თქუა ღმერთმან ვეძნეთ კაცი (p. 65) ვეძნეთ კაცი ხატები- საებრ ჩუენისა (p. 65)
1.27	Ἐν εἰκόνι	ხატად	ხატად	ხატად	ხატებად

²⁵ მნათობნი] + ქუეყანასა ზედა S.

²⁶ ქუეყანისა ... წელიწადებად K] –S.

θεοῦ	ღმრთისა	ღმრთისა	ღმრთისა ²⁷	ღმრთისა
ἐποίησεν	შექმნა	შექმნა	შექმნა	შექმნა
αὐτόν	ოგი	ოგი	ოგი	ოგი
(p. 160, 12)	(p. 136, 4)	(p. 114, 3)	(p. 6)	(p. 65)

Various combinations can be found in other verses: a. quotations included either in Giorgi’s rendering or in the anonymous translation fully coincide with the text of the lectionaries; b. quotations included in Giorgi’s rendering and in the anonymous translation are identical but different from the text of the lectionaries; c. the texts of the anonymous translation, Giorgi’s rendering and the lectionaries are different in some respects. However, despite the differences, the texts of the lectionaries and the Hexaemeron quotations exhibit close redactional similarities, as shown in the example below:

Gen.	Bas. Caes. <i>Hex.</i> = Septua- gint	Earlier Georgian Version of the <i>Hexa-</i> <i>emeron</i>	Giorgi the Hagiorite’s Translation of the <i>He-</i> <i>xaemeron</i>	Lectionaries	Gelati Text Type
1.7	καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στερεώ- σασθαι	და ქმნა ღმერთმან სამყარო.	და შექმნა ღმერთმან სამყარო.	და ²⁸ შექმნა ღმერთმან სამყარო	– – – –
	καὶ διέχρω- σεν ὁ θεὸς	– განაშოვრა	ოგი და განაშორა	ოგი და განაშოვრა	– და ²⁹ განყო
		–	ღმერთმან	ღმერთმან ³⁰	ღმერთმან

²⁷ ღმრთისა KL] ღმრთეებისა S.

²⁸ და შექმნა ღმერთმან სამყარო ოგი და განაშოვრა ღმერთმან შორის წყალთა მათ] –S.

²⁹ და] pr. და შექმნა ღმერთმან სამყარო B.

³⁰ და შექმნა ღმერთმან სამყარო ოგი და განაშოვრა KL] + ღმერთმან L. The word “God” is omitted in some Greek Biblical manuscripts as well. See Wevers 1974, 76.

ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ὕδα- τος	შორის წყალთა	შორის წყალთა	შორის წყალთა,	შორის წყლისა
ὁ	–	მათ	მათ ³¹	–
ἦν	რომელნი	რომელნი (+ იგი v.l.)	რომელი- იგი	რომელი
ὑπο	იყვნეს	იყვნეს	იყო	იყო
κάτω	ქუეშე	ქუეშე	ქუეშე	ქუეშე
τοῦ στε- ρεώματος	–	–	–	კერძო
	სამყაროსა	სამყარო- მსა	სამყაროსა	სამყაროსა
	–	მის	მას	–
καί	და	და	და	და
ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ὕδα- τος	შორის წყალთა	შორის წყალთა	შორის წყალთა	შორის წყლისა
	–	მათ	მათ	–
τοῦ	რომელნი	რომელნი	რომელი ³²	–
	არიან	იყვნეს	იყო	–
ἐπάνω	ზედა	ზედა	ზედა	ზედა
	–	–	–	კერძო
τοῦ στε- ρεώματος	სამყაროსა	სამყარო- მსა	სამყაროსა	სამყაროსა
	–	მის	მას	–
(p. 43, 9-11)	(p. 42, 31-34)	(p. 30, 33-31, 1)	(p. 1)	(p. 62)

In some cases, the differences between the Georgian translations of the *Hexaemeron* and the lectionaries is to be explained by the fact that the translators follow Basil's paraphrased or abridged quotations of the Biblical text. In one case, the Georgian renderings offer an unexpected change in Biblical quotation: specifically, both Georgian

³¹ მათ K]– L.

³² რომელი] რომელი-იგი L.

translations add „ჰოსორცა სხბეო“ (“as species”)³³ in Genesis 1.21 (καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ κήτη τὰ μέγالا³⁴).

Textual similarities with the lectionaries were found in Biblical quotations used in another exegetical work as well. Bakar Gigineishvili compared the passages from the first eleven chapters of Genesis quoted in Theophilus’ translation of John Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Genesis* (ms. Ath. 29) with the texts of the Georgian lectionaries and concluded that they mostly differ from each other.³⁵ However, the scholar cites the cases when the text of the Biblical verses quoted in Theophilus’ translation and the texts of the lectionaries are fully identical and differ from those found in the Biblical copies pertaining to the Gelati text type.³⁶ We can say that the differences Gigineishvili revealed between these texts and the Gelati Bible are the same as the differences I point out in the table between the Biblical passages quoted in Georgian translation of the *Hexaemeron* and the Gelati recension. I mean the identity of the variant readings of Genesis 1.16 cited by the scholar as an illustrative example, as well as redactional parallels in the renderings of Genesis 1.9 and 1.11. Also of note is that in the quotations found in the Georgian translations of Basil’s *Hexamaeron*, the verb „ჰბნა“ (“come into being”) is regularly replaced by „ყოფა“ (“be”) (Gen. 1.3; 1.5-6 and elsewhere), as in the translation of John Chrysostom’s homilies (ms. Ath. 29).

Furthemore, one can add to this that the lectionaries and the Georgian translations of the *Hexaemeron* are characterized by a more frequent insertion of the verb „ყოფნა“ to render Greek verbless sentences than the Gelati type redaction (the frequency of such insertion is also typical of the Oshki Bible); likewise, the lectionaries and the Georgian translations of Basil’s work, as well as the Oshki Bible, use articles more often than the Gelati Bible, and so on.

³³ Abuladze 1964, p. 105, 18-19; Kakhadze 1947, 88, 30-31.

³⁴ De Mendieta and Rudberg 1997, p. 123, 17.

³⁵ Giginesihvili 1989, 36.

³⁶ Giginesihvili 1989, 36.

Nino Melikishvili, whose research focuses on Georgian lectionaries and namely the texts of the Pentateuch included in them, finds it possible to suppose that the Biblical texts contained in the lectionaries were excerpted from the source that was very close to the Oshki text type (so-called proto-Oshki).³⁷ Anyway, the lectionaries show, in general, textual parallels with the Oshki Bible, and the Biblical quotations included in the Georgian translations of Basil's *Hexaameron*, despite their similarity with the texts of the lectionaries have some peculiarities as well. Hence, may we assume that these peculiarities reflect the readings of the Oshki Bible? In other words, may we hypothesize that the Oshki Bible could have been the immediate source for the Biblical quotations of the *Hexaameron*?³⁸ If we agree with Ilia Abuladze's dating of the anonymous translation, the above-mentioned hypothesis can only be applied to Giorgi the Hagiorite's translation of the *Hexaameron* (especially so that the Oshki Bible is preserved on Athos),³⁹ while the source for the anonymous translator could have been the archetype of the Oshki Bible.

However, such hypotheses can be relevant only if we are certain that the translators of the *Hexaameron* cites Biblical passages from sources available to them exactly, without applying any changes. I believe, the following passage from the anonymous translation of the *Hexaameron* is especially important in this regard.

³⁷ Melikishvili 1974, 35.

³⁸ The same hypothesis regarding Theophilus' translation of John Chrysostom's exegetical homilies on Genesis has been proposed by Gigineishvili (1989, 39).

³⁹ I should add that the hypothesis regarding Giorgi the Hagiorite's use of the Oshki Bible was not confirmed for Biblical quotations included in his translation of Gregory of Nyssa's exegetical homilies on the Song of Songs. See Kiknadze 2013, 9.

Gen.	Bas. Caes. <i>Hex.</i> = Septua- gint	Earlier Georgian Version of the <i>He- xaameron</i>	Giorgi the Hagiorite's Translation of the <i>He- xaameron</i>	Lectionaries	Gelati Text Type
1.5	καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρῶτῃ ἡμέρᾳ μία (p. 34, 11)	და იყო მწუხრი და იყო განთიადი დღე იგი პირველი (p. 38, 24-25) Cf. „დღე იგი ერთი“ (p. 39, 6-7)	და იყო მწუხრი და იყო განთიად დღე იგი ერთი (p. 24, 28-29)	და იყო მწუხრი და იყო განთიად ⁴⁰ დღე იგი პირველი (p. 1)	და იქმნა მწუხრი და იქმნა განთიად დღე – ერთი (p. 62)

As we see, in this verse, ἡμέρα μία of the Septuagint is rendered as „დღე იგი პირველი“ (“the first day”) in the lectionaries and in the earlier anonymous translation of the *Hexaameron*, and as „დღე იგი ერთი“ (“day one” or “one day”) by Giorgi the Hagiorite and in the Biblical texts assigned to the Gelati type. It should be noted that ἡμέρα πρῶτῃ (“the first day”) is a variant reading attested in the apparatus of the critical edition of the Greek version of Genesis – however, not among the variants of the Septuagint,⁴¹ but in Aquila’s version.⁴² We should also add that variant

⁴⁰ განთიად] განთიადი K.

⁴¹ There are other differences as well between the texts of the lectionaries and the Septuagint (Melikishvili 1974, 40). Differences against the Septuagint are also noted by Gigineishvili as regards Biblical passages included in Theophilus’ translation of John Chrysostom’s commentaries on Genesis (Gigineishvili 1989, 39).

⁴² Wevers 1974, 76. A similar reading can be found in a number of Bible translations into other languages (e.g., in the King James Bible, the Louis Second Bible, etc.). “Day one” or “one day” is believed to be a Hebrew calque (Harl 1986,

readings of the versions of Aquila and Symmachus have been revealed in the books of the Oshki Bible as well.⁴³

The importance of the reading of Genesis 1.5 in the earlier Georgian version of the *Hexaemeron* is even more evident when analyzing the context of Genesis 1.5 in Basil's *Hexaemeron*. The exegete here makes a special emphasis on why the first day and night of Genesis is simply referred to as "day" („დღე“), and also, why "one" („ერთი“) is used instead of "the first" („პირველი“).⁴⁴ Specifically, according to Basil, "one" refers to a circadian period (which is constant) and at the same time, reflects the eternity, as one day returns to itself after a seven-day period is fulfilled, thus accounting for the everlasting circulation of time (the eighth day is the symbol of eternity).⁴⁵ Below is the passage in question from the earlier Georgian translation of Basil's *Hexaemeron*:

Bas. Caes. *Hex.* 2; 8
(De Mendieta and Rud-
berg 1997, p. 34, 11-35, 6)

Earlier Georgian
Version of the *Hexae-*
meron, 8th-10th Centuries
(Abuladze 1964, 38,
24-39, 8)

English Translation of
the Georgian Version⁴⁶

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα, καὶ
ἐγένετο πρωΐ, ἡμέρα μία.
Ἑσπέρα μὲν οὖν ἔστι
κοινὸς ὄρος ἡμέρας καὶ
νυκτός· καὶ πρωΐα
ὁμοίως ἢ γειτονία
νυκτός πρὸς ἡμέραν.
Ἴνα τοίνυν τὰ πρῶσιβια
τῆς γενέσεως ἀποδῶ τῇ
ἡμέρᾳ, πρότερον εἶπε τὸ

და იყო მწუხრი და იყო
განთიადი, დღე იგი პი-
რველი (დაბ. 1.5).
მწუხრი იგი საზღვარი
არს ზიარი დღისა და
ღამისა, და განთიადი
კულად მოძმეობა არს
ღამისა დღესა თანა. და
რამთა მისცეს დღესა
პირველი არსებამ,
მოქსენა დასასრუ-

And it was the evening and
it was the morning: the first
day. Evening is then the
boundary common to day
and night; and in the
same way morning con-
stitutes the fraternity of
night and day. It was to
give day the priority of
being that [the Scripture]

88), but my immediate goal is not to study the source of this reading or of other variants in the earliest surviving Georgian translations of the Bible.

⁴³ Melikishvili 2012, 81.

⁴⁴ Philo of Alexandria too gives special attention to this issue (see Philo, *De opif. mund.* 3.15.4; 9.35.11 Cohn 1896).

⁴⁵ Bas. Caes. *Hex.* 1.8, 177-182 Giet 1949.

⁴⁶ I use the text of English translation of *Hexaemeron* by Jackson 1895.

πέρας τῆς ἡμέρας...

Ἐγένετο οὖν ἑσπέρα, καὶ ἐγένετο πρωΐ. Τὸ ἡμεροσύκιον λέγει. Καὶ οὐκέτι προσηγόρευσεν, ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐπικρατοῦντι τὴν πᾶσαν προσηγορίαν ἀπένευμε. Ταύτην ἂν καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Γραφῇ τὴν συνήθειαν εὖροις, ἐν τῇ τοῦ χρόνου μετρῆσει ἡμέρας ἀριθμουμένας, οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ νύκτας μετὰ τῶν ἡμερῶν...

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα, καὶ ἐγένετο πρωΐ, ἡμέρα μία. Τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐκ εἶπε **πρώτην**, ἀλλὰ **μίαν**; καίτοιγε ἀκολουθότερον ἦν τὸν μέλλοντα ἐπάγειν δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην καὶ τετάρτην ἡμέραν, τὴν κατὰρχουσαν τῶν ἐφεξῆς πρώτην προσαγορεύσαι.

ლი დღისად...

და იყო მწუხრი და იყო განთიად. დღესა მას ერთსა ღამითურთ მისით უწოდა დღე, და არა უწოდა დღე და ღამე, არამედ მისცა სახელის-დებად მძლესა მას. და ესე ჩუელეზად იპოვების ყოველთა შინა წიგნთა რაცხვასა შინა ჟამთასა, რამეთუ აღირაცხვიან დღენი და არა თუ ღამენი დღეთა თანა...

და იყო მწუხრი და იყო განთიადი **დღე იგი ერთი**. რაღსათჳს არა თქუა. „იყო **დღე იგი პირველი**“, არამედ თქუა: „იყო **დღე იგი ერთი**?“ და შეჰკავს მისა, რომელი-იგი იტყოდის...⁴⁷

mentioned the end of the day...

And it was the evening and it was the morning. [The Scripture] called the day that day with the night, and did not call day and night, but gave a designation to the superior: a custom which you will find throughout the Scripture when measuring the time, because the measure of time is counted by days, and not by nights with days...

And it was the evening and it was the morning: day one. Why does [the Scripture] not say “it was the first day”? but said “it was day one” Before speaking to us of...

As we can see, at first the translator cites Genesis 1.5 from one Georgian version of the Bible – *და იყო მწუხრი და იყო განთიადი, დღე იგი პირველი* (*And it was the evening and it was the morning: the first day*), while later, when rendering the passage in which Basil explains why the first day is referred to as “one,” he offers a different translation of the same Biblical passage – *და იყო მწუხრი და იყო განთიადი, დღე იგი ერთი* (*And it was the evening and it was the morning: one day*).

⁴⁷ Here the manuscript discontinues, the end of Chapter 2 and the beginning of Chapter 3 are lost.

What conclusions can we draw? I think this can be interpreted as a case where the translator creates a new version of Genesis 1.5 by considering a very important exegetical work.⁴⁸ If so, it can be argued that the anonymous translator of Basil the Great's *Hexaemeron* remains extremely faithful to the Georgian version of the Bible available to him and makes revisions only out of sheer necessity.⁴⁹ This loyalty allows us to assume that elsewhere he cites the existing Georgian version of the Holy Scriptures without any changes, which in turn suggests that the Biblical verses quoted in the earlier Georgian translation of the *Hexaemeron*, should have been taken from one of the earliest Georgian recensions of the Bible (naturally, excluding the cases when the translator follows Basil the Great's paraphrases or abridgements of Biblical quotations, applied by the exegete for highlighting a particular word or idea). This is especially important if we bear in mind that the Biblical passages cited in the Georgian versions of the *Hexaemeron* are not fully identical with the text of any hitherto known Georgian recension. As concerns Giorgi the Hagiorite's translation of the *Hexaemeron*, Genesis 1.5 as he cited, follows the recension to which all the surviving Georgian Biblical manuscripts have been assigned.⁵⁰

Thus, the preliminary research findings suggest that the two Old Georgian translations of Basil the Great's *Hexaemeron* quote passages from the Georgian version of the Bible that is very close to the text included in the lectionaries and can be assigned to the Oshki text type. Thus, if we take into consideration that the anonymous translator of Basil's *Hexaemeron* demonstrates extreme fidelity to the Old Georgian version of

⁴⁸ The method of revising the existing version of a Biblical text by considering exegetical literature is discussed in my article in which, along with other examples, I also analyze Genesis 1.5. See Mchedlidze 2019, 8-9.

⁴⁹ A similar approach in quoting Genesis 1.5 can be observed in some translations of Basil's *Hexaemeron* into European languages. For an example of faithfulness to an authoritative version of the Bible, see an English translation of Basil's work by B. Jackson (1895).

⁵⁰ Giorgi uses the same recension of Genesis 1.5 in his translation of Gregory of Nyssa's *Apology*, where the use of "day one" („ἡμέρα") instead of "the first day" is likewise highlighted (Chelidze 1989, 209-210, 217).

the Bible available to him, I believe there is a sufficient ground to assume that Biblical passages that are not identical with the texts of the lectionaries may be taken from the archetype of the Oshki Bible (which would enable us to reconstruct its lost part). This assumption is prompted by a number of lexical, grammatical and stylistic parallels found in the texts under consideration. However, final conclusions can be drawn only after a comprehensive study of the texts, which will also enable us to establish if the Biblical passages present in the Georgian translations of Hexaemeron works are relevant for the critical edition of the Georgian version of the Bible.

Tbilisi State University, Georgia
magda.mtchedlidze@tsu.ge

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abuladze, Iliia, ed. 1964. *Udzvelesi redak' c'iebi Basili Kesarielis 'Ek'ust'a Dget' aysa' da Grigol Noselis t'argmanebisa 'Kac'isa Agebulebisat'vis'. X-XIII saukuneebis xelnacert'a mixedoit'* [The Earliest Versions of the Translations of Basil of Caesarea's *Hexaemeron* and Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis officio*, according to the 10th-13th Century Manuscripts]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Chelidze, Edisher, ed. 1989. *Cminda Grigol Noseli. Pasuxi 'Ek'ust'a Mat' Dgethaj. Giorgi Mt'acmindelis udzvelesi k'art'uli t'argmani* [Gregorius Nyssenus, In *Hexaemeron explicatio apologetica*, translated by Giorgi the Hagiorite]. *The Calendar of the Georgian Church*: 194-413.

— 1997. “Dzveli k'art'uli sagvt'ismetqvelo terminologia 'Ekhustha Dgethas' udzvelesi k'art'uli t'argmanis sap'udzvelze” [Old Georgian Theological Terminology according to the Earliest Georgian Translation of Severianus of Gabala's *Hexaemeron*]. Ph.D diss., Georgian Academy of Sciences; Korneli Kekelidze Manuscript Institute.

Cohn, Leopoldus, ed. 1896. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Vol. I. Berlin: G. Reimer.

Giet, Stanislas, ed. 1949. *Basil de Césarée, Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron*. Sources chrétiennes 26. Paris: Cerf.

Gigineishvili, Bakar. 1989. "Introduction." In *Cigni Zuelisa Agt'k'umisani. I: Sesak'misai. Gamosolat'ai* [The Books of the Old Testament. I: Genesis. Exodus], ed. Bakar Gigineishvili and Tsotne Kikvidze, 5-60. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Gigineishvili, Bakar, and Tsotne Kikvidze, eds. 1989. *Cigni Zuelisa Agt'k'umisani. I: Sesak'misai. Gamosolat'ai* [The Books of the Old Testament. I: Genesis. Exodus]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Danelia, Korneli, Stephane Chkhenkeli, and Bedisa Shavishvili, eds. 1987. *K'art'uli lek'c'ionaris parizuli xelnaceri. I.1: Dzoeli da Axali Agt'k'mis sakit'xavebi*. [Parisian Manuscript of Georgian Lectionary. I.1: Texts of the Old and New Testaments.]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press.

Dochanashvili, Elene, ed. 1981. *Mc'xet'uri xelnaceri (Moses xut'cigneuli, Iso Nave, msajult'a, Rut'i)* [Mtskheta Manuscript (the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth)]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Harl, Marguerite, ed. 1986. *La Bible d'Alexandrie. LXX.1: La Genèse*. Paris: Cerf.

Jackson, Blomfield, trans. 1895. *The Treatise de Spiritu Sancto. The Nine Homilies of the Hexaemeron and the Letters of Saint Basil the Great, Archbishop of Caesarea*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series, vol. VIII. NY: The Christian Literature Co.

Kakhadze, Mikheil, ed. 1947. *Basili Didi. 'Ekhushta Dgëthaj'. Giorgi Athoneliseuli thargmani* [Basil the Great. The Hexaemeron. Giorgi the Hagiorite's Translation]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Kiknadze, Gulnaz, ed. 2013. *Cmindai Grigol Noseli. T'argmanebat'ai Qebat'aisa* [Saint Gregory of Nyssa, On the Song of Songs]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi Theological Academy and Seminary Publishing House.

Melikishvili, Nino. 1974. "Xut'cigneuli dzveli k'art'uli lek'c'ionarebis mixedvit'" [The Pentateuch according to Old Georgian Lectionaries]. Ph.D diss., Academy of Sciences of the Georgian Soviet Republic; The Institute of Manuscripts.

— 2012. *Bibliologia. Bibliur cignt'a zveli k'art'uli t'argmanebi* [Bibliology. Old Georgian Translations of the Books of the Bible]. Tbilisi: Agmsarebeli.

De Mendieta, Emmanuel Amand, and Stig Y. Rudberg, eds. 1997. *Basiliius von Caesarea. Homilien zum Hexaemeron*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Mtchedlidze, Magda. 2019. "Patristikuli egzegetika rogorc k'aro tsminda cerilis k'art'uli t'argmanebistvis" [Patristic Exegetics as a Source for Georgian Translations of the Holy Scripture]. In *Proceeding of the International Conference: Archival and Source Studies — Trends and Challenges, Tbilisi 25-27 October, 2018*, ed. Teona Iashvili et al., 3-11. Tbilisi.

<https://archive.gov.ge/ge/sametsniro-publikatsiebi/erovnuli-arkivis-saertashoriso-konferentsiis-krebuli-2018-1>

Noble, Samuel. 2019. "Was the Earliest Georgian Version of Basil's *Hexaemeron* Based on an Arabic Vorlage?" In *Georgian Manuscript. Proceedings of the International Summer School and Conference*, 32-37. Tbilisi: Georgian National Center of Manuscripts.

Wevers, John William, ed. 1974. *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. I: Genesis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.