

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

The Centre For Kartvelian Studies

THE KARTVELOLOGIST
Journal of Georgian Studies

29

2021-2022

Tbilisi

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის
თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი
ქართველოლოგიური სკოლის ცენტრი

ქართველოლოგი

29



საგამომცემლო ინფორმაცია

ქართველოლოგია ფართო გაგებით ნიშნავს ქართული კულტურის, ისტორიისა და ქართულ სამყაროსთან დაკავშირებული ჰუმანიტარული სფეროს სხვა დარგის შესწავლას. ესენია: ენათმეცნიერება, ლიტერატურათმცოდნეობა, ხელოვნება, არქეოლოგია, ფოლკლორი, ეთნოგრაფია, წყაროთმცოდნეობა და სხვ.

ჟურნალი „ქართველოლოგი“ ორენოვანი (ქართული და ინგლისური), პროფესიული და აკადემიური ჟურნალია. ქართველოლოგიის დარგში მეცნიერული სიახლეების დანერგვასთან ერთად იგი მიზნად ისახავს ქართველ მკვლევართა ნარკვევების პოპულარიზაციას საერთაშორისო დონეზე და საზღვარგარეთული ქართველოლოგიური მეცნიერების გავრცელებას ქართულ სამეცნიერო წრეებში.

„ქართველოლოგი“ წელიწადში ერთხელ გამოდის როგორც ბეჭდური, ასევე ელექტრონული სახით. 1993-2009 წლებში იგი მხოლოდ ბეჭდურად გამოდიოდა (N1-15). გამომცემელია „ქართველოლოგიური სკოლის ცენტრი“ (თსუ), ფინანსური მხარდამჭერი – „ქართველოლოგიური სკოლის ფონდი“. ჟურნალის დამაარსებელია ელგუჯა ხინთიბიძე.

სარედაქციო კოლეგია:

ჟურნალის ირგვლივ შემოკრებილი უცხოელი ავტორები თავიანთ ქართველ კოლეგებთან ერთად არიან „ქართველოლოგის“ სარედაქციო კოლეგიის წევრები, აქტიური მონაწილენი ჟურნალის სამეცნიერო სტილისა და ფორმის ჩამოყალიბებაში, სამეცნიერო სტატიების ავტორები, ზოგიერთ შემთხვევაში გამოსაქვეყნებელი სტატიების რეცენზენტები და თავიანთ ქვეყნებსა და სამეცნიერო ცენტრებში ქართველოლოგიის პრობლემატიკის პოპულარიზატორები.

ბახტაძე მიხეილ (ისტორია) – საქართველო; ბეინენი ბერტ (რუსთველოლოგია) – აშშ; ბოედერი ვინფრიდ (ენათმეცნიერება) – გერმანია; დობორჯგინიძე ნინო (ენათმეცნიერება) – საქართველო; ენოხი რუვენ (ქართული ენა, ქართულ-ებრაული კულტურული ურთიერთობები) – ისრაელი; კოჭიმა იასუჰირო (ქართველური ენები) – იაპონია; კუდავა ბუბა (ხელნაწერთმცოდნეობა) – საქართველო; ლიჩელი ვახტანგ (არქეოლოგია) – საქართველო; მაგაროტო ლუიჯი (ქართული ლიტერატურა) – იტალია; მელიქიშვილი დამანა (ქართული ენა) – საქართველო; ნიკოლეიშვილი ავთანდილ (ქართული ლიტერატურა) – საქართველო; რატიანი ირმა (ლიტერატურათმცოდნეობა) – საქართველო; სიხარულიძე ქეთევან (ფოლკლორი) – საქართველო; ტიუიტი კევინ (ეთნოგრაფია და ფოლკლორი) – კანადა; უტიე ბერნარ (შუა საუკუნეების კვლევები) – საფრანგეთი; ფეინრიხი ჰაინც (ქართული ენათმეცნიერება) – გერმანია; შურაიაა გაგა (ქართული ლიტერატურა) – იტალია; ჩიხლაძე ნინო (ქართული ხელოვნების ისტორია) – საქართველო; ხოტივარი-იუნგერი შტეფი (ქართული ლიტერატურა) – გერმანია.

სამეცნიერო რედაქტორი: ელგუჯა ხინთიბიძე

ჟურნალის თითოეული ნომრის მომზადებას და გამოქვეყნებას ახორციელებს ახორციელებს ჟურნალის სარედაქციო ჯგუფი:

მანანა რუსიშვილი – ინგლისური ტექსტის რედ.
თამარ მელიქიძე – ტექსტის რედ.
სოფიო გულიაშვილი – ქართული ტექსტის რედ.

ცირა ვარდოსანიძე – კორექტორი
კონსტანტინე ლომიძე – კორექტორი
ირმა მაკარაძე – ქართული ტექსტის რედ.

ჟურნალის სარედაქციო საბჭო, საგამომცემლო ჯგუფი და რეცენზენტები ზოგიერთ შემთხვევაში არ იზიარებენ გამოქვეყნებული სტატიების სტილისტურ თავისებურებებს და მათში გამოთქმულ თვალსაზრისებს.

© ქართველოლოგი
ქართველოლოგიური სკოლის ფონდი
13, ჭავჭავაძის გამზირი, თსუ
0179, თბილისი, საქართველო
ელფოსტა: kartvcentre@hotmail.com;
kartvelologist@gmail.com
ვებგვერდი: kartvelologi.tsu.ge;
kartvelologi.openjournal.ge

© ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი, 2023
ISSN 1512-1186

The Kartvelologist is a bilingual (Georgian and English) peer-reviewed, academic journal, covering all spheres of Kartvelological (Georgian) scholarship. Along with introducing scholarly novelties in Georgian Studies, it aims at popularization of essays of Georgian researchers on the international level and diffusion of foreign Kartvelological scholarship in Georgian scholarly circles.

The Kartvelologist issues both in printed and electronic form. In 1993-2009 it came out only in printed form (#1-15). The publisher is the "Centre for Kartvelian Studies" of Tbilisi State University, financially supported by the "Fund of the Kartvelological School".

Editorial Board:

The foreign authors, together with their Georgian colleagues, are members of the Editorial Board of *The Kartvelologist*, taking an active part in shaping the scholarly style and form of the journal, authors of papers, occasionally reviewers of papers to be published, and popularizers in their home countries and scholarly centres of topics of Georgian Studies.

Bakhtadze, Michael (History) - Georgia; Beynen, Bert (Rustvelology) - Philadelphia, USA; Boeder, Winfried (Linguistics) - Germany; Chotiwary-Jünger, Steffi (Georgian literature) - Germany; Doborjginidze, Nino (Linguistics) - Georgia; Enoch, Reuven (The Georgian language, Georgian-Hebrew cultural contacts) - Israel; Fähnrich, Heinz (Georgian linguistics) - Germany; Kojima, Iasuhiro (Kartvelian languages) - Japan; Kudava, Buba (Study of Manuscripts) - Georgia; Licheli, Vakhtang (Archaeology) - Georgia; Magarotto, Luigi (Georgian literature) - Italy; Melikishvili, Damana (The Georgian language) - Georgia; Nikoleishvili, Avtandil (Georgian literature) - Georgia; Nocun, Przemyslaw (Archaeology) - Poland; Outtier, Bernard (Medieval Studies) - France; Ratiani, Irma (Literary criticism) - Georgia; Shurgaia, Gaga (Georgian literature) - Italy; Sikharulidze, Ketevan (Folklore) - Georgia; Tuite, Kevin (Ethnography and folklore) - Canada; Ketevan Khutsishvili (Ethnography) - Georgia; Manana Rusieshvili (English literature) - Georgia.

Each issue of the journal is prepared and published by the Editorial Staff:

Scientific Editor - Elguja Khintibidze

English text editor - Manana Rusieshvili
Text editor - Tamar Melikidze
Georgian text editor - Sophio Guliashvili

Proofreader - Tsira Vardosanidze
Georgian text editor: Irma Makaradze
Proofreader - Konstantine Lomidze

In some cases the Editorial Board, the staff and the reviewers do not share the stylistic peculiarities and the views expressed in the papers published.

© Kartvelologist
Fund for Kartvelian Studies,
0179, Tbilisi, Georgia
Email: kartvcentre@hotmail.com;
kartvelologist@gmail.com
Website: kartvelologi.tsu.ge; kartvelologi.openjournal.ge

© Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, 2023

სარჩევი

Contents

უცხოელ მეცნიერთა ქართველოლოგიური კვლევები

FOREIGN SCHOLARS ON GEORGIAN STUDIES

Christian Høgel

Euthymios the Athonite, Greek-Georgian

and Georgian-Greek Translator – and Metaphrast? 11

კრისტიან ჰეგელი

ეფთვიმე ათონელი, ბერძნულიდან ქართულად და

ქართულიდან ბერძნულად მთარგმნელი და მეტაფრასტი? 29

კვლევები: ქართულ-ევროპული ლიტერატურული ურთიერთობები

STUDIES: GEORGIAN-EUROPEAN LITERARY RELATIONS

ელგუჯა ხინტიბიძე

დიდი სიახლე ეფთვიმე ათონელის

მთარგმნელობითი მოღვაწეობის შესახებ 49

Elguja Khintibidze

Great News about the Translation Work of Euthymios the Athonite 75

ირმა მაკარაძე

„ვარლამ და იოასაფის ისტორიის“ წყაროთა საკითხისათვის 99

Irma Makaradze

For the Issue of the Sources of „ The Story of Barlaam and Ioasaph“ 109

ლუდმილა ჰრიციკი

*უკრაინულ-ქართული ლიტერატურული ურთიერთობების უცნობი მასალები:
ბორის ტენის გზა ჩახრუხადის „თამარიანამდე“* 119

Ludmila Grytsik

*Unknown Archival Materials on Ukrainian-Georgian Literary Contacts:
The Way of Borys Ten to Chakhrukhadze* 133

Людмила Грицик

*БОРИС ТЕН У КОНТЕКСТІ УКРАЇНСЬКО-ГРУЗИНСЬКИХ ЛІТЕРАТУРНИХ ВІДНОСИН XX СТОЛІТТЯ:
ДО ПИТАННЯ ПРО УКРАЇНСЬКОГО «ТАМАРІАНИ» ЧАХРУХАДЗЕ* 135

იზა ჩანტლაძე, მარიკა ოძელი

ევროპელ დიპლომატ-მკვლევართა (XVIII-XIX სს.) ღვაწლი კავკასიოლოგიაში ... 147

Iza Chantladze, Marika Odzeli

*European Diplomat-researchers’
(18th-19th cc.) Contribution to Caucasian Studies* 165

ნათია სიხარულიძე

ლიტერატურული პარალელები: გალაკტიონ ტაბიძე და ლუის დე კამოენსი ... 181

Natia Sikharulidze

Literary Parallels: Galaktion Tabidze and Luis de Camoens 195

კვლევები: ენათმეცნიერება

STUDIES: LINGUISTICS

კონსტანტინე ლერნერი

ქართული კერა - ივრითული kir // kira;

ქართული ქურა - ივრითული kur - აქადური quru 207

Constantine B. Lerner

Georgian კერა kera - Hebrew כִּיר kir "hearth"

Georgian ქურა kura - Hebrew כּוּר kur "furnace" 211

კვლევები: არქეოლოგია

STUDIES: ARCHAEOLOGY

ნინო ქობალია

კოლხეთის უძველესი ოქრო - კულტურული წინაპირობა და

საერთაშორისო კონტექსტი 215

Nino Kobalia

The Oldest Colchian Gold - Cultural Background and International Context 227

კვლევები: რუსთაველოლოგია
RUSTAVELI STUDIES

ინგა სანიკიძე

„ვეფხისტყაოსნის“ ერთი ტმესირებული სტრიქონის გააზრებისათვის..... 237

Inga Sanikidze

Towards Understanding Tmesis in the Line of

„The Knight in the Panther’s Skin“ 251

კოტე ლომიძე

„ვეფხისტყაოსნის“ სიმბოლისტური რეცეფციის ერთი შემთხვევა 265

Kote Lomidze

One Occurrence of the Symbolic Reception of

"The Man in the Panther’s Skin"273

Great News about the Translation Work of Euthymius the Athonite

Elguja Khintibidze

Professor

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

Abstract: This paper considers an article by the Danish Byzantinist Christian Høgel, “Euthymios the Athonite Greek-Georgian and Georgian-Greek translator and metaphrast?” The article reveals an essential novelty in Georgian studies: the discovery of the artistic style of Euthymius the Athonite as a Byzantine hagiographic writer; and an indication of his merits as an organizer of Byzantine church literature. The author of the paper Prof. Khintibidze puts forward new views on some problems of *Barlaam-romance: Colophon* of Iovanne the Athonite; the date and reason for the creation of *Barlaam-romance*; on the identity of John (Ioann) – a monk of the monastery of St. Saba.

Keywords: *Euthymios the Athonite; Colophon of Iovanne the Athonite; John (Ioann) of the lemma of Barlaam-romance; Christian Høgel.*

In the present issue of the Journal *The Kartvelologist*, we publish an article by Danish Byzantine studies scholar, Christian Høgel, “Euthymios the Athonite Greek-Georgian and Georgian-Greek translator and metaphrast?” [17]¹. C. Høgel is a well-known author of Byzantine studies. His monograph on Symeon

¹ Reprinting the paper and translating it into Georgian is kindly allowed by the author.

Metaphrastes – Symeon Metaphrastes: *Rewriting and Canonization* [16]², should be specially noted. The article published in this issue is based on the latest research concerning the study of *the History of Barlaam and Ioasaph (Barlaam-romance)*, an extremely popular work among the European peoples in the Middle Ages. Therefore, the article is significant for Georgian studies. The work by Euthymius the Athonite, a great Georgian translator, is evaluated from the standpoint of Byzantine studies and details/nuances unknown in the History of Georgian literature are revealed. The author relies on the highly productive works of the last decades of the German school of Byzantine studies in relation to *Barlaam-romance* sources, literary style, Greek manuscripts and the author's identity. From these works, the following should be noted: Robert Volk's fundamental two-volume – *The Edifying Story of Barlaam and Ioasaph*, published in two parts of volume VI of *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos* by the Byzantine Institute of Scheyern Abbey [28; 29]. Volk adds the Latin word *Spuria* (suspicious, falsehood) to the title of the volumes, indicating that it is false to attribute these writings to John of Damascus. The second work on which Høgel's article is based is Ioannis Grossmann's study of *Barlaam's* relation to Symeon Metaphrast's *Menologion* [14]. Grossman rejects Volk's view regarding the fact that the Symeon Metaphrast's Collection of Saints' Lives (*Menologion*) uses the *Balavari* translated by Euthymius, and believes that the relationship of the texts to each other suggests the opposite.

C. Høgel's article clearly indicates the achievements and contribution of the Georgian theological and literary school of Athos to Byzantine writing and the Greek Church. The contribution of the Athonite Georgians, first of all, of Euthymius, was revealed not only by the fact that, based on the Georgian material, he created an extremely popular work among the peoples of Europe of the period preceding the Renaissance³. It was revealed that the merit of Georgian Athonites was reproducing and saving *Barlaam-romance* and with it the most precious collection of the Greek Church, *Menologion* of Symeon Logothetes. In the 80s of the 10th century, during the reign of the Byzantine emperor Basil II,

² See the review of this monograph by Ingun Lunde [23]. Høgel is also the author of an article on the literary aspects of Symeon's metaphrastic work [15].

³ In his earlier works (including those of the first years of the 21st century), R. Volk consistently defended the point of view of the well-known researcher of *Barlaam-romance* F. Dolger, that the author of the work is St. John of Damascus.

Symeon was no longer favoured by the Royal court and his *Menologion* also shared the fate of its creator. Including the first quarter of the XI century, Iviron was the only church which kept and reproduced his manuscripts [17, p. 359]. The monastic corporation of Athos was the centre where the manuscripts of these two works (*Menologion* and *Barlaam*) were intensively reproduced. The spiritual leaders of this corporation, Epitroph, were Georgians: since 1001 Iovanne (John) the Athonite, for several years, and then Euthymius, until he died in 1028. According to Høgel, "Euthymius' literary importance comes with the influence of Georgians not only on the life of Mount Athos but on the intellectual life in Byzantium" [17, p. 364]. According to the observation of the Danish researcher, Euthymius' contribution to Byzantine literature is not only that the theological centre of Athos, under his leadership, saved and multiplied metaprasic writings, but also that he opened the way for these writings to the non Greek, in particular, Georgian Divine service. Euthymius translated several dozen works of Symeon's *Menologion* into Georgian. Moreover, his creative-artistic style as a writer is metaphrastic. At the same time, it is peculiarly metaphrastic, different from the style of Symeon Metaphrastes. Euthymius, bringing together fragments of metaphrastic and Christological writings of the holy fathers, creates a whole mosaic and lays the foundation for a peculiar literary style, which was also revealed in other hagiographic works written in the Greek language in the 12th century [17, p. 364].

An important innovation in Georgian studies is the discovery of the artistic style of Euthymius the Athonite as a Byzantine hagiographic writer and reference to his merits as an organizer in front of Byzantine church literature. This novelty is mainly based on the facts revealed in a comparison of Greek *Barlaam* with the *Menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes. R. Volk publishes an academic edition of the *Barlaam-romance* text in the two-volume set mentioned above, along with accurate electronic par between Euthymius *Barlaam* and the *Menologion* of Symeon Logothetes. Based on this, he formulates his point of view on the conceptual issue of the creation of *Barlaam*: the work was created by Euthymius the Athonite through the translation and reworking of the Georgian *Balavari* in the early 980s. The translation by Euthymius is used by Symeon Metaphrastes in his work on the *Menologion*. *Barlaam's* initial redaction was later revised by Euthymius himself.

As I mentioned above, I. Grossman comes to a different conclusion by examining some parallel passages from *Barlaam* and from the *Lives* of Saints from earlier and Symeon's metaphrastic redactions, published by Volk: Symeon's *Menologion* is the source of *Barlaam* of Euthymius the Athonite. Euthymius' translation was later reworked by another unknown author. Based on these works Høgel also explores the views spread in modern European literature regarding the creation of the *Barlaam*. Some of these points of view are discussed in this paper.

C. Høgel considers the activities of the Byzantine Institute of the Scheyern Abbey, specifically, Robert Volk, whose works and edition put an end to the centuries-old doubts of European Byzantine scholars regarding the authorship of Euthymius the Athos, to be a great contribution. Following the author of the article, Volk refuted the opposing opinions of the European Byzantinists "some of them cherished along with surprising reluctance to accept quite obviously reliable information coming especially from Georgian sources" [17, p. 354]. I would extend Høgel's interesting remark regarding the relation of the works of Byzantinists of the last period to the important essays of Georgian scholars on this issue. I mean that the innovative conclusions revealed in the significant studies of the latest period of Byzantinists on the problems of Barlaam and Ioasaph are, in many cases, both directly and by the method of processing a specific problem in coincidence with the investigation of Georgian studies. These studies have been published not only in Georgia but also in Europe and have been delivered at international Byzantine forums. Moreover, some dubious or controversial theses of the significant studies of Byzantinists are related to, or may even originate from, assumptions hypothetically expressed by Georgian scholars. I will stop at only one case.

The point of view of R. Volk that Simeon Metaphrast used Euthymius' Greek translation of Georgian *Balavari* was expressed in the form of an assumption as early as the 19th century. [25, pp. 253-293], although there existed an opposite viewpoint even then. I. Grossman's position regarding the assumption that Euthymius' *Balavari* might have been revised by someone else was already known as an assumption. However, I think that the main support for these points of view of the German Byzantineists should be the assumptions expressed by Georgian studies scholars.

Discussions of Georgian scientists on the issue of authorship of *Barlaam and Ioasaph* became more active after the publication of Dölger's famous monograph. In the studies of European Byzantinists, the distrust of Georgian primary sources was obvious (here I mean Giorgi the Athonite's reference to Euthymius' translation of *Balavari* from Georgian into Greek) and Euthymius' suitability as a non-Greek writer as the author of the Greek *Barlaam*. If we don't dwell on Zotenberg's ignorance of the history of Georgian literature and, in particular, Euthymius' work, it is enough to recall the words of Dölger: We dare say decisively that from 650 to 1085 (the time that is the extreme limits of the author of *Barlaam*) there could be no other Greek theologian than John of Damascus, whom we could consider the author of *Barlaam and Ioasaph* [13, p. 64]. This doubt is further specified later by the second great German Byzantine studies scholar H. Becky. In his opinion, based on the author's level of education, only John of Damascus can be considered the creator of *Barlaam and Ioasaph* [11, p. 37]. Naturally, the effort of Georgian scholars in this polemic would be to dispel distrust of Georgian sources (in particular, Giorgi the Athonite) and prove the truth of Euthymius' translation from Georgian to Greek. This was accompanied by the rather superficial ideas of the European and Russian Byzantine studies scholars of the time about the circulation of the narrative of this story in the East (assumptions about the old Syriac and Arabic Christian versions). That is why all opinions on the creation of the Greek *Barlaam* in Georgian studies of that period should not be accepted with the same confidence without critical discussion.

Korneli Kekelidze, a prominent researcher of Euthymius' translation work and in general, metaphrastic trend, was one of the first to respond to this actual problem of Byzantine studies in the 50s of the last century. His essay "*Balavarian's novel in Christian literature*" was published soon (1956), and later it was included in volume VI of his *Etudes* [4, pp. 41-71], and the main conclusions were moved in the first volume of "*History of Georgian Literature*" [5, pp. 189-190]. "It is an indisputable fact that Euthymius the Athonite translated *Balavari* from Georgian into Greek... He translated not Version A of the Georgian novel (*Wisdom of Balavari* - E. Kh.) but Version B (*The Life of St. Iodasaf* - E. Kh.). Version B derives from an Arabic-Christian version which seems to have been composed based on a non-Christian Arabic redaction, translated from Pahlavi". "The Greek version was not written by John of Damascus, nor

does it belong to Euthymius the Athonite". "The Greek version is the so-called metaphrastic redaction. It was compiled on the basis of the translation made by Euthymius, using other sources as well. The author of this metaphrastic redaction must be Symeon Metaphrastes himself, a contemporary of Euthymius the Athonite".

D. Lang, based on these conclusions assumed that the Greek translation of the Georgian *Balavari*, which may have been made for the needs of Symeon Metaphrastes, must have been later metaphrasted by one of Symeon Metaphrastes' disciples [22, p. XXXII].

Thus both controversial points of view expressed by the German Byzantinists (Symeon Metaphrastes used *Balavari* translated by Euthymius; Euthymius' translation was later metaphrasted by someone else) were expressed in different ways in the hypothetical assumptions of Georgian scholars. Such assumptions of Georgian scholars are rarely based on strict arguments but represent theoretical possibilities made up for a specific purpose. In the studies of Byzantinists, the authors seem to rely on them. This situation seems to be reflected in Høgel's article. I will try to comment on a couple of cases.

Colophon (Testament) of Iovanne the Athonite. *Colophon (Testament)* of Iovanne the Athonite. In connection with the problem of Barlaam, Byzantine studies scholars frequently mention Iovanne's (Euthymius Father's) Colophon about Euthymius translations. *Balavari* is not mentioned in the version of *Colophon* considered reliable in earlier studies of Georgian scholars. Because of this, some scholars thought that Euthymius did not translate *Balavari* until the 11th century. However, as this *Colophon* was published taking into account all of the manuscripts (9), from my point of view, the relationship between the redactions requires a special study. The Colophon is attached to the Euthymius translation of John Chrysostom's Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. The Colophon came down to us in 9 manuscripts, they show differences. In one passage of the Colophon Iovanne lists the books translated by his son. According to one manuscript (N20 of the Kutaisi Historical Museum), this list includes "თარგმანებაი ბალავარი" ("Translation//Commentary of *Balavari*"). In the rest of the manuscripts, this title does not appear. In this context, Iovanne speaks about Euthymius' achievements concerning translating theological books from Greek into Georgian: he writes that he was worried about the lack of sacred books in Georgi-

an and encourage his son to learn Greek, and instructed him to translate books from Greek into Georgian [12, p. 339] Based on this context, it is natural to assume that Iovanne lists the books translated from Greek into Georgian by Euthymius, which caused a difference of opinion regarding the version in which “Translation//Commentary of Balavari” is named (Kutaisi N20). Dölger relied on this version and referred to it to strengthen his assumption concerning Euthymius translating *Balavari* from Greek into Georgian [13, p. 37]. Other researchers of *Barlaam-romance* (K. Kekelidze [5, p. 188], P. Peeters [24, p. 286] and others) prefer and consider reliable the version of the *Colophon* that is read in the other manuscripts. Therefore, it was considered that the reference to Euthymius translation of *Balavari* from Georgian to Greek was not confirmed in Georgian sources until the 11th century. More modern explorers of European Byzantine studies who support the point of view that *Barlaam* was translated by Euthymius in the 10th century, explain that it was not mentioned in Iovanne's *Colophon* by the fact that Euthymius' works translated from Georgian into Greek could not be included in this list [17, p. 357]. I assumed that the list of Iovanne's *Colophon* should not be understood in such a way that it contains only the books translated from Greek into Georgian. This opinion is not categorically expressed in the *Colophon*. Thus, I would consider that the mention of *Balavari* in this list comes from Iovanne [20, p. 281]. Now I would like to present the argumentation of this assumption.

The version of the *Colophon* by Iovanne, which mentions *Balavari* in fifth place in the list of Euphemius' writings, as mentioned above, survives in only one manuscript (N20 of Kutaisi). The manuscript, which used to belong to Gelati Monastery, is dated and copied in 1048 in Manglisi. [7, p. 95]. Another edition of this *Colophon*, which does not mention *Balavari*, is preserved in 8 manuscripts some of which are from the 11th century. Two were copied on Athos during the lifetime of Euthymius; in particular, the dated one - Ath. 13 (1008), and Ath. 10 dated 1002 [8, p. 97]. The conclusion that was drawn from these facts seems natural: the version that does not mention *Balavari* is from Iovanne. It has reached us through many older manuscripts, and according to the context, the work translated from Georgian into Greek would not have been included in this list.

I base my opinion that Iovanne's original version is the one that mentions *Balavari*, on the following circumstances.

1. It is not categorically stated in the *Colophon* that Iovanne lists only the books translated from Greek into Georgian by Euthymius. As I have seen above, Iovanne writes that he was worried about the lack of books in Georgian, and tried to encourage his son to learn Greek and make him translate books from Greek into Georgian; he continues that they wrote books as much as they could write [12, p. 340]⁴. This notice is followed by the list in which *Balavari* is read in fifth place. Iovanne's words about "they wrote the books" rather indicate that the following books were written by them (Euthymius and Iovanne), and not that Euthymius translated these books from Greek to the Georgian language.

2. Iovanne wrote this *Colophon* when he was very old and weak, which he repeatedly points out. The text is not in order either, the theological and common life passages are interwoven in such an unorganized way that some researchers consider the text to be an incoherent combination of the *Colophon* of Euthymius and Iovanne. Nevertheless, the very section of the *Colophon*, which is the subject of our interest at this time, shows that Iovanne tells us about his own merits (his service to the country) and points to them himself. In the country of Kartli, there was a considerable lack of books and he made a big effort and listed his merits: he made his son learn Greek; forced him to translate books from Greek into Georgian. And they together wrote books as much as they could write. So, according to the *Colophon*, there are different facts: Iovanne's employment of his son to translate books from Greek into Georgian, and on the other hand, Euthymius and Iovanne's writing of books.

3. The widely-spread point of view which considers the version of the *Colophon* presented in the Kutaisi N20 manuscript to have been written later, is based on the assumption that some copyists of the *Colophon* knew that Euthymius translated *Balavari* and therefore added the work to the list. I think this assumption is highly questionable. First, it is hard to believe that a copyist would have been aware that *Barlaam* was written in Greek by Euthymius, did not pay attention to the fact that it was not expected to be mentioned among the

⁴ The text of the *Colophon* from MS. Ath. 10 we refer to is based on R. Blake's description. In the cited quotations, the text has been corrected with the latest description of the Athos manuscripts (J. Gippert, B. Outtier and others).

books listed by Iovanne, and added it to the list. This is when the books translated by Euthymius from Greek into Georgian, which appear in other versions, are not mentioned in this *Colophon*. If *Balavari*'s translation were an addition to this list, it would have been added at the bottom, and not in the fifth place. Attention should also be paid to the fact that *Balavari* named in this list does not refer to the translation of *Balavari*, but to the writing of "თარგმანებაჲ ბალავარიისი" ("*Translation/Commentaries of Balavari*"). It is the same type of title as the one mentioned beside it – "თარგმანებაჲ (*commentaries*) of John's Holy Gospel" by John Chrysostom. Iovanne says that the *Commentary of Balavari* was written by Euthymius and himself. We can also propose that Iovanne is vaguely hinting at a new literary style at that time, i.e. rewriting (metaphrasing) of *Balavari* [20, pp. 277-78]. Secondly, in another version of the *Colophon*, which is preserved in earlier Athonite manuscripts (namely, Ath. 10, Ath. 136), in addition to the first version, 6 other works translated by Euthymius are named. In these versions, the list of translated works of Euthymius is complete, and *Balavari* is removed because it was mistakenly considered among the works translated from Greek into Georgian. Based on the above, I think that the version preserved in the above-mentioned Athonite manuscripts of Iovanne's *Colophon* were later reworked while the version preserved in the Kutaisi manuscript must be the original.

This kind of revision of this *Colophon* could probably take place in the theological circle of the Georgians in Athos, and maybe under the supervision of Euthymius. Only there was it possible to understand that on Iovanne's list there was no place for the work created by Euthymius by reworking the Georgian *Balavari*, into Greek. That's why along with the removal of the *Balavari* from this list, other works were added to it, translated by Euthymius from Georgian, which Euthymius either translated after writing the *Colophon*, or Iovanne missed (he did not name) them. This *Colophon* appears in such, reworked version in the Athos N10 manuscript, which is dated 1002. At this time, Euthymius is already the main authority in the theological-literary circle of Iviron. It is clear that he was interested in the reworking of the *Colophon*. A manuscript of John Chrysostom's *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, copied in 1008 during the lifetime of Euthymius and ordered by him, has been preserved – Ath. 13. From the *Colophon* included in this manuscript, "Part II, the section where Iovanne speaks about the merits of Euthymius and names the books translated by

Euthymius is removed” [9, p. 97]. The version referred to *Balavari* is earlier than the other versions. This is indicated by the preserved date in this manuscript (Kutaisi N20) – 1002, which indicates either the completion of the translation *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* by Euthymius or the time of the writing of the manuscript from which the MS preserved in the Kutaisi originates. In Ath. 10, which is considered to be the earliest extant manuscript containing these works, this note is no longer being read.⁵ Therefore, we can conclude that at the beginning of the 11th century, it is indicated in the old Georgian sources that Euthymius the Athonite was already working on the creation of the *Barlaam-romance* [20, p. 221].

About the creation of *Barlaam-romance*. The findings from the discussion of this issue are not sufficient to date the creation of Greek *Barlaam* by Euthymius. Nor can we support the assumption that Euthymius’ *Balavari* had already been translated by the beginning of the 980s, and Symeon Logothetes used it in his *Menologion*, as R. Volk believed. We should not solve the issue so easily that Euthymius somehow came across metaphrastic texts and decided to translate *Balavari* with their help [17, p. 6]. My view regarding the creation of Greek *Barlaam* for European scientific circles was known at the end of the previous century. It was published as an abstract in the Materials of the XIX International Congress of Byzantine studies in Copenhagen in 1996 [19]; and as an article in Rome, in the magazine *Orientalia Cristiana Periodica*, in 1997 [18]. In 2000 it was delivered at the International Conference in St. Petersburg and published in its Materials [32]. This point of view was also presented in 2011 at the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine studies in Sofia [21].

The creation of the Greek *Story of the Barlaam and Ioasaph* cannot be considered a random circumstance, a creative act of the author's personal interest. It seems that the idea of popularizing the work has a lot of support from the very beginning. The work created approximately during the last decades of the 10th century have been preserved in dozens of manuscripts since the beginning of the 11th and later in the same century. In the same century, it was translated into Latin twice, probably into Russian and Arabic too. While

⁵ That is why, I think, it is not correct to transfer the date-referring part from the MS of Kutaisi 20 to Ath. 10. In the latter the date is deliberately omitted.

Barlaam and Ioasaph were not Saints of the Greek Church at this time. Their canonization appears in the Calendar of the Byzantine Church a whole century later. I think that there must have been a need and a reason for the emergence of such hagiographical works in the socio-political and religious life of Byzantium during the period of creation of the works. In my opinion, the thematic and ideological framework and outline of the *Barlaam* novel indicate this reason and need. This is not only a presentation of the merits and spiritual exaltation of two believers but also the conversion to Christianity of a pagan country that surpasses it, the condemnation of paganism, the apology of Christianity and the demonstration of the progress of a Christianized country. [18, p. 499].

Propagation of this ideology was on the agenda for the Byzantine state and church throughout the tenth century, and it became a vital interest in the last two decades of the same century. It was a matter of Christianization of the pagan Russ and all the northern Slavs – Bulgarians, Serbs. From the second half of the 9th century, one of the main directions of the foreign policy of the Byzantine Empire was the conversion of the pagan peoples living in the north to Christianity. Historical sources about Byzantine emperors clearly state this [18, pp. 500-501]: Nikephoros I (802-811), Basil I (867-886), Constantine Porphyrogenet (913-959), Romanos I (920-944), Nikephoros II (963-969), John I - Tzimiskes (969-976), Basil II (976-1025) [27, pp. 322-325]. The last wrathful emperor of these lists Basil II finished the conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity and unified the empire with fire and sword. Previously, the diplomacy of the Royal court and the Patriarchate made Russia a long-term friend of Byzantium, through the conversion of the Russian chief Vladimir. In 986, the great commander of the Empire rebelled against the Royal court, and a large army of the Southern provinces marched against the Capital. The Emperor asked Vladimir, the young chief of Kyiev Russ, for help. The diplomatic plan was such: Vladimir was to send an army of 6,000 to help Emperor Basil, and then, if Vladimir converted his people to Christianity and baptized them, He would be allowed to marry the emperor's young sister, Anna. The negotiations were performed after some contradictions and complications. Princess Anne was sent to Russia as a queen, with a large body of priests to baptize the Royal court and the people. It was in 988 or 989. This is the time when the Byzantine Royal court and the Patriarchate of Constantinople needed a condemnation of paganism, an apologue for the new religion, a simple and attractive interpretation of

the main postulates of the faith, and the narration of an attractive story of the young king's establishment of happiness through the Christianization of the country. This mission is served by the brilliant theological novel by Euthymius the Athonite in Greek – *Edifying History of Barlaam and Iosaph*.

The main ideological centre supporting the Royal court of Byzantium was the monastic corporation of Athos and its spiritual leader, Athanasius the Great. The main intellectual support of Athanasius was the educated group of Athonite Georgians (according to the will of Athanasius, after him the spiritual leader of the entire monastic corporation of Mount Athos was the head of the Georgian brotherhood Iovane, and after his death, his son Euthymius). The Georgians of Iviron were also directly connected with the interests of the Royal court (in order to defeat the rebelling Byzantine chieftain in 976, the Royal court sent Georgian monk Iovanne-Tornike from Athos to seek help from the Georgian Kingdom). Therefore, it is not surprising that the Georgian intellectuals of Iviron were interested in the problems that were very relevant for the Byzantine Royal court and the Church.

The material facts that have reached us seem to indicate that the chronology of the creation and distribution of the Greek *Barlaam* is related to the era of the Christianization of the Kyiev Russ. These are Greek manuscripts of that work, some of which date back to the end of the 10th century or the beginning of the 11th century. This probably indicates the creation of the work at the end of the last two decades of the 10th century. This period can also be assumed as the date of the writing of the “Translation of Balavari” by Euthymius, discussed above, in the *Colophon* of Iovanne of Athonite. In the Iovanne's *Colophon* a kind of chronological sequence can be seen in the list of Euthymius's translations. The first three works named here were already translated by Euthymius in the early 980s [5, pp. 198-204]. And the *Balavari* is named in the fifth place in this list. It is very important that the very old trace of the *Story of Barlaam and Ioasaph* appears in Russian literature. The old Russian translation of the excerpts and parables of this work is included in the ancient Russian Christological collection – *Prologue* [31, pp. 70-89]. It is believed that the Russian translation of *Barlaam* is made directly from the Greek language into Russian in Kyiv no later than the first half of the 12th century. The Serbian and Bulgarian translations of the work made in the XIII-XIV centuries comes from Athos [31, p. 107]. Russian manuscripts of *Barlaam and Ioasaph's*, in full or

fragmented, reach 1000 copies [30, p. 246]. An oldest Greek dated manuscript of *Barlaam*, written in 1021, during the life of Euthymius, is still kept in the Kiev Museum.

In conclusion, according to my point of view the creation of Greek *Barlaam-romance*, should be dated to about the last two decades of the X century and must be inspired by the idea of the Christianisation of the North Gentile neighbours, Russians and Slavs in general, by Byzantine Royal court and the Byzantine Church. This view is committed from the end of the first decade of the 21st century in European Byzantinist works. In 2013, a dissertation of A. Ribas about *Barlaam-romance* was published in Portugal. One of the main theses of this dissertation is that the creation of this work should be related to the Christianisation of North Gentile Slavs by the Byzantine Empire. In 2011, at the 22nd Congress of Byzantinists, after sending the thesis of my report, I received a letter from the well-known *Barlaam* researcher I. Grossmann, accompanied by his research published in 2009 (referred to above) on the interrelation of the texts of *Barlaam* and *Menologion*. I would like to bring this short letter to the full form:

Jannis Grossmann <jannis.grossmann@gmx.at>

To: khintibidze@yahoo.com Fri, May 13, 2011 at 1:16 PM

“Dear Prof. Khintibidze, I saw today that you will have a communication in Sofia on the story of Barlaam and Ioasaph. If you do not mind, I would like to send you my article on the Barlaam story published last year in Vienna. I hope this might be useful for you. Unfortunately, I came across your article published in OCP (Orientalia Cristiana Periodica – E.Kh.) after I finished my article for publication, so I could not cite it any more. However, I am glad that you agree with my dating at the end of the 10th c. for the creation of the Barlaam, though I have a different approach. In my article I try to show that the Barlaam is citing the Metaphrastes Menologion and not vice versa as Volk believed. What is not clear in my article and I plan to publish it in another, is that I believe that Euthymios the Athonite made the translation of the Balavariani, and that this translation was used by another writer who produced the Barlaam story. Since I do not know Georgian and I do not think that I will learn it once, I think a study of the Geor-

gian Balavariani and the parallel Greek passages of the *Barlaam* could reveal new aspects of the composition of the latter. Sincerely, Ioannis Grossmann”

I. Grossman's study convincingly proves that R. Volk's point of view on the relationship between *Barlaam* and *Menologion* is not credible. Grossman cites extracts from Volk's study, confirming the similarity of some passages from *Barlaam*, *Menologion* and the pre-metaphrastic Lives of some Saints. According to Grossmann's conclusion, contrary to Volk's view, *Barlaam* derives from *Menologion*. And the latter – from the previous metaphrastic Lives. Grossman's opinion that the Euthymius translation of *Balavari* was later reworked by an unknown author into *Barlaam* is a repetition of the previously expressed assumption, which is not based on any argument and is also probably incorrect at the level of facts known today. Neither the Georgian nor the Greek sources show any reference to the reworking of Euthymius's translated *Balavari* by someone. On the other hand, it is unlikely that Euthymius, who, during this period was the spiritual leader of the entire monastic corporation of Athos, and was mainly engaged in literary activities in the last decade of his life, would have commissioned his *Barlaam-romance* to be edited by someone else.

About Ioann (John) from the Lemma of *Barlaam*. The solution to the problematic issues of the Greek *Barlaam* with “light” assumptions was characteristic mainly of the research of the first half of the previous century. One of them was to clarify the question of the authorship of the *Story* by establishing the identity of the monk of the monastery of Saint Sabba Ioane (διὰ Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ), who brought this story to the Holy City, outlined in the so-called *Barlaam's Lemma*. As is known, the old Greek manuscripts of *Barlaam-romance* begin with a long title or the so-called *Lemma*. One of the versions of this Lemma, which, in my opinion, according to Zotenberg's and Dölger's point of view, must be the original one, reads as follows: “An edifying story from the inner land of the Ethiopians, called the land of the Indians, thence brought to the Holy City by John the monk (an honorable man and a virtuous, of the monastery of Saint Sabas)” (English Translation by G. R. Woodward and H. Mattingly). It is this Ioann (John) from the lavra of St. Sabba whose identity is specified in manuscripts as John of Sinai, John of Tabennisi, or mainly John of Damascus. Based on the same Ioann from Lemma, some research has suggested

the anonymous Ioann of the 6th century (H. Zotenberg), or Ioann the Ethiopian traveller of the 9th century (A. Kazdan), as the author of *Barlaam*. Such assumptions are certainly non-scientific, and the already passed stage of the issue of research. Subsequent studies were based on the discovery of facts hinting at *Barlaam* in Byzantine sources (P. Peeters); the search for sources of theological passages that take place in the Eastern narrative of *Balavari* (F. Dölger, R. Volk); connection of the plot of the Greek *Barlaam* with earlier oriental (Arabic and Georgian) works of the same plot (D. Gimaret, E. Khintibidze). By itself, the identity of Ioann, who brought the story (or book) to the Holy City, as mentioned in the Lemma, is certainly interesting (another thing is that it is unscientific to identify the author of the narrative by such assumptions). The reference to the narrator or the “bearer” of some books or stories is characteristic of medieval writing, which does not indicate real facts in any case. For example, the same kind of reference is the most popular version of the Georgian *Balavari* – *The Wisdom of Balavari* [1, p. 4]. This basis may be found in Peeters’ assumption that Ioann from Lemma is fictional, not a real person. This assumption is shared by R. Volk [28, p. 85]. Høgel considers the assumption to be a solution to the issue [17, p. 354]. For the last decades of the previous century, the view of considering Euthymius as the author of *Barlaam* became relevant. It is therefore natural that the search for the identity of the monk Ioann, who brought the Indian narrative to the Holy City, must have begun in the Iviron documents. That’s why I mentioned the three Iovanne, active figures in the cultural-literary centre of Iviron: Iovanne the Athonite, Iovane-Tornike, and Iovanne of Golgotha [10, p. 7]. I paid special attention to Iovanne-Tornike [20, pp. 219-220]. My assumption, as a specific view on this matter, is referred to in European Byzantine studies [28, p. 85]. I modestly referred to this assumption. I justified the authorship of Euthymius and thought that it would be unscientific to name an opinion based on assumptions as an argument. Today, when the fact that Euthymius translated *Balavari* into Greek is no longer in doubt, I will try to present my assumption in a clearer and more precise way.

Let's start by saying that when studying the problems of *Barlaam's* Lemma, in my opinion, we should pay special attention to the beginning of the *Story* (“Prologue” and “Introduction”), where the author talks about himself and also, about the details of the creation of the works too. These details lead us to the monastic corporation of Athos and specifically to the lavra of Iviron. The na-

me of the person who brought the Story is specified in the Lemma as Ioann. The author introduces to the Greek reader India of the narrative brought to him as Ethiopia. In my opinion, this confusion also leads to Euthymius. In the translations of the Eastern languages of the *Holy Scriptures* (Syrian, Armenian, Georgian), the "Ethiopian Queen" in the *Apostles* was transferred to the "Queen of India". Euthymius translated Greek proper names and terms into Georgian on the basis of Biblical texts. Euthymius is the translator of these texts [18, pp. 493-496]. The connection between *Barlaam's* lemma (title) and "Prologue" is evident in specific details: "an edifying story", "the inner country of Ethiopia, so-called Indians", and the reference to the bearer of the story (in one case to the Holy City, in the other – to the author). The title (lemma) says that this is an edifying story coming from India brought to the Holy City by the monk John (Ioane) of the monastery of Saint Saba. And in the "Prologue" the author mentions that he cannot ignore the story which was brought to him by devout men.

More importantly, according to the Lemma, the bearer of a *Story* in the Holy City seems to be decorated with the epithets of a secular man: "honourable and virtuous (valiant, famous) man" (ἀνδρὸς τιμίῳ καὶ ἐναρέτῳ)⁶. From the point of view of medieval monastic life, such a presentation of a monk is unexpected (let's remember medieval Georgian monks: Ephrem Mtsire, Iovanne Minchkhi, Mikael Modrekili, Tsodvili Iordane). On Mount Athos, the bearer of books, news, and other great wealth from the East is Iovanne-Tornike. He was decorated by his contemporaries with all such secular honours and he did not forget him as a monk for a long time. This is especially pointed out by the narrator of his life St. Giorgi the Athonite. He refers to Iovanne-Tornike with the same epithets: „განთქმულმან და საჩინოლმან კაცმან“ – "honorable and famous man" [2. p. 50]. In his *Colophon* attached to the book *Samotkhe* (Ivir. Geo. 9), Iovanne-Tornike, in his prayer to God honorable, mentions his secular titles given to him by the Kings [3, p. 47]. These are the words of the Athonite monk, the former famous Georgian general, who had the great title of *Patrick* from the Royal court of Byzantium, and after the defeat of the rebel Bardas Skleros, the Kings also gave him the honour of *Synkellos*. Iovanne-Tornike was always men-

⁶ I rely on the translation established in the scholarly literature [7, p. 224-6]. The mention of a monk of a monastery and the clarification that he is a man of particular virtues is a presentation of some special merits of this person.

tioned with secular honours not only on Mount Athos but also in Georgian monastic circles. He ordered and acquired the greatest treasure of Georgian monastic culture – the Athos Bible, copied under his leadership in Oshki. This huge book has several scribes who make notes at the end of each book of the Bible, blessing Iovanne-Tornike by noting his secular honorary titles (Ivir. Geo. 1, 117v, 148r, 220v, 271v, 397r).

Lemma's Ioann (John) – monk of St. Sabbas monastery. The Greek *Barlaam's* lemma hides another mysterious fact. Iovanne, the “honorable and virtuous” man who brought the “edifying story” to the Holy City, is presented as “the monk of the Saint Sabba Monastery”. There is no indication in Georgian sources whether Iovanne-Tornike ever visited Jerusalem and the famous Saint Sabba monastery.

Today, almost all Byzantine studies scholars consider that Euthymius translated the *Balavari* from Georgian into Greek. As I stated above, monk Ioann who brought this *Story* to the Holy City was Iovanne-Tornike. Based on these postulates, I would like to present one modest assumption. The Athos monk Iovanne, the former famous commander of the Georgian kingdom of Tao-Klarjeti, left the Holy Mount in 976 to help the young Greek kings and went to the East to battle against the rebellious Barda Skleros. He returned to Athos in 979, after Skleros’ defeat. Throughout this time, he remains a monk in the name of Iovane-Tornike and has close contact with the Tao-Klarjeti great Georgian monastery complex. During this period, Georgian sources show the connection of Iovane-Tornike mainly with the great Georgian monastic cultural centre of Oshki. The two-volume Georgian *Bible* transcribed in Oshki in 978 by order of Iovanne-Tornike is currently kept in the Georgian library of Iviron. This was the period when Iovanne-Tornike was in the East, from where he brought to Athos a large amount of wealth and also many monks [2, p. 299]. The *Samotkhe* mentioned above, in which the Iovanne-Tornike’s *Colophon* is included, was also ordered and copied in Oshki and purchased by him. In the *Colophon* he speaks about himself (Ivir. Geo. 9, 377v): “I, Iovanne former Tornike, and my brother, Iovanne Varazvache... purchased and wrote this Holy book...”. Thus ends the *Colophon* of Iovanne-Tornike: “This holy book was written in the Great Oshki, in the place of the Holy Baptist, when Saba was the Head (Abbot) of the monastery, Christ blessed him!” [3, p. 47]. The Athos *Bible* was also written in

the same Lavra, which is indicated by one of the scribes in exactly the same words: "This holy book was written in the Lavra Great Oshki, in the dwelling of the Holy Baptist" (Ivir. Geo 1, 213v). The *Bible* and *Samotkhe* were copied in 978 and 977 in the Oshki monastery during the leadership of Saba (Saba was the Abbot of the monastery). A year later (979-980), in the same place, on the orders of Ivane Tornike, another theological book was rewritten ("Sermon de Cosmas le Skeuophylax sur la translation des reliques de saint Jean Chrysostome..." - Ivir. Geo. 3). The scribe begins his *Colophon* by mentioning the names of the persons who ordered the copy of the book and ends by referring to the place where the book was copied (6, p. 29): "This holy book was written in the Great Lavra Oshki, in the place of the Holy and Great Baptist, when the Saint Father Saba was the Head (Abbot), may God be glorified..." (Ivir. Geo. 3, 141v). Apparently, in his native monastery, the Abbot of Oshki was called "Saint Father Saba". In 979, Iovanne-Tornike returns to Athos with books, including his own *Colophons*, and copied by his order in Oshki, when Saba was the Abbot. And it is natural that on Athos he was called "monk of the Saint Saba Monastery". It is expected that the book brought to the Georgian Lavra of Athos by Iovanne-Tornike, a monk from Oshki monastery during the time of the hierarchy of Saint Saba, would probably be named by the translator and the author (Euthymius) himself as the book brought by "the honorable and virtuous man, the monk of the Saint Sabba Monastery". This is how it is mentioned in the lemma (title) of almost all the old manuscripts of the Greek *Barlaam*: μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Σάββα (8, 33. 224-6). Later on, naturally, in the minds of Greek and Latin scribes, "the monk of St. Sabba Monastery" was perceived as a monk of the Great Laura of Saint Sabbas (*Mar Saba*) due to the great popularity of this famous monastery. The scribes and commentators of the Middle Ages also changed the Georgian monk of Iviron Iovanne to John (Ioann) of Damascus or John (Ioann) of Sinai, also because of the great popularity of the latter.

We also need to focus on one fact. As I mentioned above, according to *Barlaam-romance's* lemma, the bearer of the *Story* in the Holy City was "the monk of the Saint Sabba Monastery" (Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Σάββα). Are these words a typical reference to the famous monastery complex of St. Sabbas near Jerusalem? Of course, Greek and Latin scribes of the Middle Ages, as well as Byzantine studies scholars, could take these words as a reference to the famous monastery of St. Sabbas near Jerusalem. But it is

unlikely that the author of *Barlaam* if he considered the bearer of the *Story* a monk of the great and famous Sabba Lavra, would call him that. The fact is that the great Palestinian ascetic of the 5th-6th centuries, Sabba, inherited the name "Sanctified" (ἁγιασμένος) and was called that way both in the Middle Ages and later. "Blessed" (ὁσιος) is established as an epithet of his spiritual height in most cases, both in medieval sources and in later ones. This is how he is named in the Georgian translation of the 8th century of the version of his *Life* by Cyril of Scythopolis; and in the late metaphrastic Greek version of the same work: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα. Both in this ancient source of his *Life*, and in the established tradition, the ascetic abode of Sabba (like others under his care) is called a "laura" (Λαύρα), and not a monastery. While in the old Georgian translation of his *Life* other houses of ascetics are more often referred to as "monasteries". That is why the largest monastery complex of St. Sabba (*Mar Saba*) is mentioned in both old Greek and modern Greek sources as The Laura of Blessed Sabba the Sanctified – ἡ Λαύρα τοῦ ὁσίου Σάββα ἁγιασμένου (Ἱερὰ Λαύρα τοῦ Ὁσίου Σάββα τοῦ Ἁγιασμένου). So, the "honourable and famous man" of the lemma of the *Barlaam-romance*, monk Ioann (John), is not a monk of the Laura of the Blessed Sabba the Sanctified, but a monk of some monastery, the abbot of which is Saint Saba (Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Σάββα).

Let's return to the creative activity of Euthymius. A long process of research of Greek *Barlaam*, predominantly the relations revealed by Falk's editorship with the Symeon Logothets' *Menologion* and I. Grossman's clarification of this relationship (*Barlaam's* text is based on the *Menologion* and not the other way around) revealed Euthymius' creative style as a writer and translator and the importance of his work not only in the process of Georgian but also in Byzantine literature. According to Høgel, "Euthymius, by admitting that he metaphrasted countless Greek-Georgian translations and the great Georgian-Greek translation, *Barlaam*, can really be called a metaphrast" ... "Euthymius' literary importance comes with the influence of Georgians not only on the life of Mount Athos but on the intellectual life in Byzantium. Not only did the story of *Barlaam and Ioasaph* become a widely read text, but the Georgian influence on bringing the Metaphrastic text to success seems to have been extensive" [17, p. 364]. It is not new for the studies of Georgian scholars to reveal that the *Story of Barlaam and Ioasaph* is a metaphrastic work. This provision also originates from Kekelidze's research. As I mentioned above, he thought that Euthymius translated

Balavari from Georgian into Greek, and then this translation was probably metaphrased by Symeon Logothetes; according to European researchers – by one of Symeon's disciples. My study “The Greek romance of *Barlaam and Ioasaph*: a metaphrastic hagiographic work” was first published in the 70s of the last century and was subsequently included in my Georgian, Russian and English monographs under the same title [20, pp. 269-279]. It is an important innovation to discover that Euthymius in the Greek *Barlaam* makes very extensive use of individual phrases or passages from Symeon's Metaphrastic *Menologion* to supplement narrative or statements that came from *Balavari* and biblical or patristic literature. Høgel notes that this is similar to Symeon's metaphrastic style. In addition to the primary source (which he sometimes reworked), Symeon also used other secondary literature to fill the text with additional information. And Euthymius uses sections of metaphrastic texts not for the purpose of additional information, but directly, ready and useful phrases which serve to present the opinion or statement more clearly. Along with this, attention is also paid to the fact that Euthymius translates a number of metaphrastic-hagiographic texts from Symeon's *Menologion* into Georgian. Høgel concludes that Euthymius' literary style is metaphrastic, but different from the style of Symeon Metaphrastes. That's why he asks the question: can Euthymius be called a metaphrast, which was written like this by adding a question mark in the title of the essay: “Euthymios the Athonite Greek – Georgian and Georgian – Greek translator and metaphrast?” Yes! As it turns out, Euthymius' literary style emerged from the literary work of Symeon Metaphrastes. In my opinion, we can also assume that Euthymius is one of Symeon's disciples and not just a follower. It is also possible that he (as a good connoisseur of the Greek language and Royal etiquette) was in Constantinople not for a short time in the early 80s of the 10th century and had a relationship with the great official of the Royal court, Symeon Logothetes. At that time, it was necessary to have a close contact with the Royal court of the Georgian brotherhood of Athos in order to sign the proper deeds of the great Royal donation to Iovanne-Tornike and to agree on the permission for the construction of Iviron. This assumption can be confirmed by the research of the historical documents of the Byzantine Royal court at that time. This is indicated by the amazing loyalty and efforts to save the *Menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes, which the Athonite scribes showed during the epitrophate of Euthymius.

At the same time, I think it would not be correct to refer to Euthymius the Athonite, like Symeon Logothetes, by the name of Metaphrast. The fact is that the term *metaphrast* has been established in the scholarly literature as the name of one direction of the hagiographic genre (Cymenian, Metaphrastical, Svinaksar). With his style (omission-addition style) Euthymius translates not only hagiographic works from Greek, but also almost all other – dogmatic, canonical, exegetical... texts. He not only adds facts or passages from other works, but also shortens them and, moreover, often explains individual details for the Georgian readers. That's why we have to take into account Eprem Mtsire's assessment: our Holy Father Euthymius omits and adds while translated Greek texts.

The other thing is that Euthymius the Athonite was a continuator of the metaphrastic activity and, as it turned out, he was also a defender and survivor of the great literary heritage of Symeon Logothetes. Symeon Logothetes' metaphrastic activity probably ceased by 984, during the reign of Basil II, and he left the Royal court. His *Menologion* was not fully tolerated in the spiritual circles. A new study indicates that it was through the efforts of Mount Athos and, in particular, the monastic circle of Iviron that *Menologion* was rewritten in many ways in the first decades of the 11th century. And these are the years when the spiritual leader of the entire monastic corporation of Athos was Euthymius the Athonite. I think this circumstance also indicates Euthymius' personal loyalty and respect for the person of Symeon Logothet. "It seems that the Georgian influence on bringing the Metaphrastic text to success seems to have been extensive, even if it is difficult to assess the exact nature of the Iviron's dedication to the Metaphrastic enterprise through production of Greek manuscripts containing Metaphrastic texts, translations of these into Georgian, and recirculation of the same in the form of text bits in the *Barlaam*. But Euthymios and others at the Iviron certainly cherished these texts" [17, p. 364].

Bibliography

1. Balavariani. *The Georgian versions of the Story of Barlaam and Ioasaph*. (Ed. By I. Abuladze), Tbilisi 1957. [ბალავარიანის ქართული რედაქციები (ილ. აბულაძის გამოცემა). თბ. 1957].
2. Giorgi the Athonite, "The life of Iovane and Euthymius": *Monuments of old Georgian Hagiographic Literature*, Tbilisi 1967, pp.38-100 [გიორგი მთაწმიდელი, „ცხოვრება იოვანესი და ეფთჳმესი“: ძველი ქართული აგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები, II, თბ. 1967].
3. Iovane-Tornike, *Colophon on the book Samotkhe: Description of the Georgian manuscripts. Athonite collection*, I. "Metsniereba" Tb. 1986 [იოვანე-თორნიკეს ანდერძი წიგნზე „სამოთხე“: ქართულ ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა, ათონური კოლექცია I, „მეცნიერება“, თბ. 1986].
4. Kekelidze, K., The Romans of "Barlaam and Ioasaph" In *Cristian literature*. In: *Etudes in the History of old Georgian literature*, VI, pp. 41-71, Tb. 1960. [კეკელიძე კ., „ბალავარიანის“ რომანი ქრისტიანულ მწერლობაში: ეტიუდები ძველი ქართული ლიტერატურის ისტორიიდან, VI, თბ. 1960].
5. Kekelidze, K., *History of Georgian literature*, vol. I, Tb. 1960. [კეკელიძე კ., ქართული ლიტერატურის ისტორია, ტ. I, თბ. 1960].
6. *Description of Georgian manuscripts (Athonian collecti on, I)*. Edited by E. Metreveli. Tb., "Metsniereba" 1986. [ქართულ ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა (ათონური კოლექცია, I), ელ. მეტრეველის რედაქციით. თბ., „მეცნიერება“ 1986].
7. *Description of the manuscripts of the Kutaisi State Historical Museum*, (Ed. E. Nikoladze) Tb., 1953 [ქუთაისის სახელმწიფო ისტორიული მუზეუმის ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა, ტ. I, (შემდგენელი ე. ნიკოლაძე). თბ. 1953].
8. Qaukhchishvili, S., *History of Greek literature*, vol. III, Tb. 1973 [ყაუხჩიშვილი ს., ბერძნული ლიტერატურის ისტორია, ტ. III, თბ. 1973].
9. Tskitishvili T., Tvaltvdze D., "On the observation of the text attached to the *Commentares of John's Holy Gospel* by John Crysostom": *Studies of Tbilisi State University's chair of the old Georgian language*, vol. 30. Tb., 2001, pp. 95-114. [ცქიტიშვილი თ., თვალთვაძე დ., "იოანე ოქროპირის მათეს სახარების განმარტების ექვთიმე მთაწმიდლისეულ ქართულ თარგმანზე დართული ტექსტისთვის": თსუ ძველი ქართული ენის კათედრის შრომები, ტ. 30. თბ. 2001, გვ. 95-114].

10. Khintibidze E., "One more new assumption about the authorship of *Barlaam and Ioasaph*, mastership of medieval literature": *Matsne (language and Literature)*, Tb. 2003. [ხინთიბიძე ე., „კიდევ ერთი ახლებური თვალსაზრისი შუასაუკუნეების ევროპული ლიტერატურის შედევრის – ვარლაამ და იოასაფის ავტორობის საკითხზე": *მაცნე (ენისა და ლიტერატურის სერია)*, თბ. 2003].
11. Beck H. G., *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*, München 1971.
12. Blake R., Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens de la Bibliothèque de la Laure d'Iviron au Mont Athos. *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, XXVIII, 3-4, 1931-32, pp. 289-361.
13. Dölger F., *Der griechische Barlaam-Roman ein Werk des H. Johannes von Damaskos*, Ettal, 1953.
14. Grossmann J. K., "Die Abhängigkeit der Vita des Barlaam und Ioasaph von Menologion des Symeon Meraphrastes": *Jahrbuch Österreichischen Byzantinistik*. 59, 2009, pp.87-94.
15. Høgel C., "The Redaction of Symeon Metaphrastes: Literary aspects of the Metaphrastic martyria": C. Høgel (ed.) *Metaphrasis: Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*. Oslo: Research Council of Norway, 1996, pp.7-22.
16. Høgel C., *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002.
17. Høgel C., "Euthymios the Athonite, Greek-Georgian and Georgian-Greek Translator – and Metaphrast?": *Mélanges Bernard Flusin éd. par A. Binggeli & V. Déroche (travaux et mémoires 23/1)*, Paris 2019, 353-364.
18. Khintibidze E., "New Materials on the Origin of Barlaam and Ioasaph": *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, V, 63, II, Roma 1997, pp. 491-501.
19. Khintibidze E., "The Creation of the Byzantine Version of Barlaam and Ioasaph and Christianisation of the Rus": *XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies*. Copenhagen 1996. (Theses).
20. Khintibidze E., *Georgian-Byzantine Literary Contacts*, Amsterdam 1996.
21. Khintibidze E., Mount Athos: the origin of the Edifying Story of Barlaam and Ioasaph and its connection with the Slavonic World: 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, 2011 Sofia. (Theses).
22. Lang D. M., "Introduction", [*St. John Damascene*], *Barlaam and Ioasaph Romance* (with an English Translation by the Rev. G. R. Woodward and H.

- Mattingly. Introduction by D. M. Lang). London, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University Press, 1967.
23. Lunde, Ingunn, [Review of Høgel's monograph]: *Rhetorical Review* 1,2; October 2003 (<http://www.nnrh.dk/RR/index.html>).
24. Peeters P., "La première traduction latine de *Barlaam et Joasaph* et son original grec": *Analecta Bollandiana*, t. XLIX, Fasc. III et IV, Bruxelles, Paris 1931, pp.276-312.
25. Rabbow P., "Die Legende des Martinian", *WST*, 17, 1895.
26. Ribas A. A., *A construção da lenda de Barlaão e Josafá: Um estudo do processo de elaboração Hagiográfica em Bizâncio (séculos X-XI)*. Dissertation, Federal University of Paraná, 2013.
27. Vasilev A. A., *History of the Byzantine Empire*, v. I. Madison 1958.
28. Volk R., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*. 6/1, *Historia animae utilis de Barlaam et loasaph (Spuria)*. Berlin, New York, 2009.
29. Volk R., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*. 6/2, *Historia animae utilis de Barlaam et loasaph (Spuria). Text und zehn Appendices*. Berlin, New York, 2006.
30. Лебедева И. Н., «О древнерусском переводе Повести о Варлааме и Иоасафе»: *Древнерусские Литературные памятники*, Л. 1979.
31. Лебедева И. Н., «Предисловие»: *Повесть о Варлааме и Иоасафе* (Издание И. Н. Лебедевой). Л. 1985.
32. Хинтибидзе Э. Г., «Крещение Руси и шедевр Грузинско-Византийского Литературного Сотрудничества»: *Verbum*, выпуск 3, Санкт-Петербург 2000, стр. 142-147.