

Achtung!

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe (preprint) des Aufsatzes
„Georgian“

von Jost Gippert (2018).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe in
Alexander Kulik, Gabriele Boccaccini, Lorenzo DiTommaso, David Hamidović, Michael E. Stone
(Hrsg.),

A Guide to Early Jewish Texts and Traditions in Christian Transmission,
New York 2019, 165–194
zu entnehmen.

Attention!

This is a special internet edition (preprint) of the article
“Georgian”

by Jost Gippert (2018).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the original edition in
Alexander Kulik, Gabriele Boccaccini, Lorenzo DiTommaso, David Hamidović, Michael E. Stone
(eds.),

A Guide to Early Jewish Texts and Traditions in Christian Transmission,
New York 2019, 165–194.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:

Jost Gippert, Frankfurt 2019

Georgian

JOST GIPPERT

Works Discussed

Sapientia Salomonis

Sapientia Sirach

4 Ezra

Vita Adae

Caverna thesaurorum

Eiectio Adae et Euae e paradiso

Creatio caeli et terrae

Reuelationes de creatione

Historia creationis et transgressionis Adae

Historia explusionis Adae e paradiso

Historia Abel et Cain, filiorum Adae

De euangelio Seth

Historia Melchisedech

Liber de Melchisedech

Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*

Flavius Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*

Jewish culture played a significant role in the development of literacy among the Georgians. Curiously enough, this is even true for the Christianization of the country, which provided the background for the emergence of autochthonous literature in about the fourth century CE. The reason for this was that the alleged “apostle” of the Georgians, an Aramaic-speaking female captive from Cappadocia named Nino, sought support from the Jewish

community of Mtskheta, the first capital of Georgia, “because of the Hebrew language” she could communicate in there—as legend has it, the Jewish community had settled in Eastern Georgia some centuries before that, probably coming from Iran or Mesopotamia.¹

Nevertheless, there are no indications that Jewish literary products were taken over directly into Georgian in the early centuries, in direct translations from Hebrew sources. Instead, we may claim with certainty that in the first millennium of our era, Jewish text materials, biblical or others, all entered Georgia via Greek or other languages, especially Armenian and Syriac, as intermediaries, and over a long period of time. This is manifest, first of all, in the fact that for the bulk of Old Testament texts, the Old Georgian tradition possesses several redactions (up to four according to present-day knowledge) that can be shown to reflect different *Vorlagen*, different schools, different places (within and outside Georgia), and different times. As a matter of fact, it is at least as difficult to establish a critical text of “the” Old Testament in Georgian as it is to establish “the” Septuagint text.²

The same situation also exists for textual traditions from the Second Temple period that have been adopted by Georgians. Such sources are not numerous though. What we have, is some (but not all) of the apocryphal texts that found their way into the Greek Old Testament, a few other Biblical apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and a comparatively late version of Flavius Josephus’s *Jewish Antiquities*. The present chapter is meant to give a rough survey of these texts, focusing on some peculiarities in the Georgian tradition that deserve attention cross-linguistically.

1. Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in the Georgian Tradition

There are clear indications that the translation of Old Testament texts into Georgian began as early as the so-called Khanmet’i period, the first period of Georgian literacy extending roughly from the fifth to the seventh centuries, during which the Old Georgian language was characterized by certain prefixes that later disappeared. From this time, we possess a set of fragments from Old Testament books in Georgian that were discovered in the underwriting of palimpsests, either as parts of lectionaries or as parts of Bible manuscripts proper. What we have comprises—leaving aside Psalms—a few passages from Genesis,

1. Cf. K. Lerner, *Evrei Gruzii ot Ellenizma do pozdnego feodalizma / The Jews of Georgia since Hellenistic Times till the late feudal period* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2008) for a survey of facts and theories concerning the Jewish communities in Georgia and their relation with Nino (92–95); as to the saint and her provenance, cf. J. Gippert, “Marginalien zur Nino-Tradition,” *Stimme der Orthodoxie* 3 (1997): 126–30; and Gippert, “C’ m. Ninos legenda: Gansxvavebul c’q’arota k’vali,” *Enatmecnierebis sak’itxebi* 1–2 (2006): 104–22. English version: “St. Nino’s Legend: Vestiges of Its Various Sources,” <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/personal/jg/pdf/jg1997je.pdf>. As to the language spoken by the Georgian Jews, see R. Enoch, “Jewish Georgian,” in L. Kahn and A. D. Rubin, eds., *Handbook of Jewish Languages* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 178–93 at 179.

2. A comprehensive list of Georgian OT manuscripts and redactions is available online, see <http://ogb.tsu.ge/doc/GEO.pdf>.

Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, along with fragments from the book of “Esdras Zorobabel,” also known as the “Greek Ezra,”³ in a peculiar “Lucianic” text type.⁴

Palimpsest materials, mostly stemming from lectionaries, also continue into the following centuries, up to the year 978 CE, when the first codex containing a near-to complete Old Testament was created in the Georgian monastery of Oshk’i in the province of T’ao-K’larjeti in Eastern Anatolia. The so-called Oshk’i Bible, which has been preserved in the Iviron monastery on Mount Athos since its foundation by Georgian monks in the late tenth century,⁵ is a remarkable codex indeed. Except for some regrettable lacunae,⁶ its two large volumes comprise the complete Octateuch, Job, Kings, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, the Minor and Major Prophets, 1 Esdras (Zorobabel), 2 Esdras and Nehemia, 4 *Ezra*, Esther, and Judith, plus Tobit added from another manuscript written in a very different (later) hand. What is missing from a holistic perspective is the Psalter and the two books of Chronicles (the oldest fragments of which, written by a ninth- or tenth-century hand, have been detected in a palimpsest originating from Jerusalem, now Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, georg. 2)⁷ as well as Maccabees.⁸ After the Oshk’i Bible, seven hundred years would pass before a Bible codex of comparable extent was again created in Georgia, the so-called Mtskheta Bible compiled by the monk Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani;⁹ and yet another fifty years until the first printed Bible (the so-called Bakar Bible) appeared in Moscow, including several texts, among them three books of Maccabees, in a new translation based upon the Church Slavonic text of that time.

The Oshk’i Bible is indeed the best starting point for studying the divergent redactions of the Old Testament texts in Georgian. As a matter of fact, it is not only the oldest witness available for the bulk of the texts but also a very reliable one, owing to the skillful and diligent way it was written in by the three hands manifesting themselves in it. Remarkably enough, it has remained the only source available for an Old Georgian translation of some of the books, if we leave aside the “new” adaptation to—or translation of—Slavonic versions in the Bakar Bible (see preceding paragraph). This is especially true of the

3. Different from the Greek and Armenian traditions where “Esdras Zorobabel” appears as the first book of Esdras, it is the third book of Esdras in the Georgian tradition (matching the Latin Vulgate).

4. Cf. J. Gippert, ed., *The Old Georgian Palimpsest Codex Vindobonensis georgicus 2*, in cooperation with Z. Sarjeladze and L. Kajaia (Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi, Series Ibero-Caucasica, 1; Turnhout: Brepols, 2007) for an edition of ÖNB georg. 2 (see 4-1-18 on the Book of Esdras).

5. R. P. Blake, “The Athos Codex of the Georgian Old Testament,” *HTR* 22 (1929): 33-56 discusses the history of the codex.

6. *Ibid.*, 40-41, on the distribution of the lacunae.

7. Cf. Gippert, *Old Georgian Palimpsest Codex*, 8-1-42, for an edition of the fragments from 1 and 2 Chronicles.

8. Cf. Blake, “Athos Codex of the Georgian Old Testament,” 35, on the possible loss of an Old Georgian version of Maccabees.

9. There is no indication whatsoever that within this span of seven hundred years, another codex—now lost—comprising the complete Old Testament might have been compiled in Georgian. The so-called Gelati Bible of the twelfth century (Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-1108 and Q-1152) is incomplete and does not cover the texts dealt with below. Cf. section 2, on the so-called “Jerusalem Bible.”

two “apocryphal” books of the Wisdom of Solomon and Ben Sirach, which deserve more detailed discussion here.

1.1. *The “Wisdoms” of Solomon and Sirach in Georgian*

While the text of Sirach from the Oshk’i Bible has never been investigated in detail¹⁰, the text of the “Wisdom of Solomon” contained in it has been the object of a thorough study and edition by Ciala Kurcik’idze, who collated two other “recensions” of the same text—namely, the “Slavoid” text of the Bakar Bible and that of two eighteenth-century manuscripts whose wording differs considerably. The text of the Mtskheta Bible has been considered, too, but as a descendant of the redaction represented in the Oshk’i Bible. This is a bit misleading, given that Saba’s codex does not contain the complete text of the Wisdom of Solomon; what it contains is fragments from various chapters that match the Oshk’ian text conceivably enough to be subsumed under it. However, it is not by fragmentary transmission of the Oshk’ian text that this version has come about. It can easily be shown that when compiling the Mtskheta Bible, Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani had no access to the complete text of the Wisdom but only to lections from the book that are contained in ancient lectionaries.

As a matter of fact, the Georgian tradition has preserved a comprehensive testimony of the lections from both NT and OT books (including Psalms and antiphons) that were read in the Christian church of Jerusalem during the first millennium. Different from the Armenian tradition, which separated from the Greek rite of Jerusalem soon after the schism in the middle of the sixth century, leaving but very few witnesses of the ancient liturgical order behind,¹¹ the Jerusalem type of lectionaries continued to prevail among Georgians at least until the tenth century. A nearly complete picture of this is provided in the edition by M. Tarchnišvili, which is based upon the “Paris lectionary” (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, georg. 3 [x]), two codices from Svanetia (the K’ala and Lat’al lectionaries, Mestia, Svaneti Museum of History and Ethnography, 51/621[ix–x]), and one from Mt. Sinai (georg. 37 [982 CE]). Older witnesses do exist, among them the famous *Khanmet’i-Haemet’i* lectionary from Mount Sinai (now Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 2058–1),¹² as well as (*Khanmet’i* and post-*Khanmet’i*) fragments in the underwriting of palimpsests.¹³

10. The text has recently been published for the first time, in synopsis with other witnesses, in *Biblia. Dzveli agtkma* II, Tbilisi: National Centre of Manuscripts, 2017: 2299–373.

11. Cf. A. Renoux, ed., *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121* (2 vols.; Paris: Firmin Didot, 1969–1971). A new witness has been found in the undertext of the palimpsest of Athens, *Ἡ ἐθνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, 637, cf. J. Gippert, “An Early Witness of the Armenian Lectionary,” forthcoming in C. Horn et al., eds., *Armenia between Byzantium and the Orient: Celebrating the Memory of Karen Yuzbashyan (1927–2009)* (Leiden: Brill).

12. Cf. W. Imnaišvili, “Vom Sinai in die Steiermark: Zur Geschichte der altgeorgischen Handschriften der UB Graz,” *Codices Manuscripti* 64/65 (2008): 33–60, as to the provenance of the Graz lectionary, which covers only the Easter week; it contains no lections from the Old Testament.

13. *Khanmet’i* fragments of Genesis are contained in Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-999; cf. I. Džavaxišvili, “Axlad aḡmočenili udzvelesi kartuli xeltnac’erebi da mati mnišvneloba mecnierebisatvis” / “Anciens manuscrits géorgiens récemment découverts et leur importance pour la science,” *T’pilis universit’et’is moambe / Bulletin de l’Université de Tiflis* 2 (1922–23): 313–91 at 371–74, for a first edition of the fragments; and L. Kadzaia [Kajaia], *Sabac’miduri otxtavi. P’alimpsest’i / Gospels from Saint Saba’s Monastery. Palimpsest* (Tbilisi: National Centre of Manuscripts, 2014), 12–16, for a general account of the codex. A post-*Khanmet’i* fragment containing

Within the Georgian lectionaries of the Jerusalem type, both the Wisdom of Solomon (*Sapientia Salomonis*) and Sirach (the Wisdom of Ben Sirach) are well represented, although not in their entirety. With respect to the former, comparing the contents of the Paris lectionary and its “sister-witnesses”¹⁴ with the contents of the Mtskheta Bible, it becomes clear at once that Saba’s text is based upon the testimony of lectionaries,¹⁵ with but a few extensions in comparison to the Paris codex.¹⁶ For Sirach, the testimony of the Mtskheta Bible is much less comprehensive, only eleven verses from chapter 2 (2:1–11) and fourteen verses from chapter 24 (24:3–7a and 14–22) being contained in it.¹⁷ All these passages again match the lections of the Paris codex.¹⁸ A lection comprising Sir. 24:6–7 has also been detected in the lectionary undertext of the palimpsest Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, géorg. 5 (ix), fol. 292r.¹⁹

It is clear from this survey that the complete texts of the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach of the Oshk’i Bible were not used as such as the basis for later witnesses of the Old Testament in Georgian,²⁰ which may be due to the fact that the codex was not accessible outside of the Iviron monastery, at least until the nineteenth century.²¹ This, however, implies that the text represented in the Oshk’i Bible was, at least in parts, a *textus unicus*, compiled only for the completion of the codex itself. This leads to at least four additional

lections from Exodus and Isaiah is found in the Wien palimpsest; cf. Gippert, *Old Georgian Palimpsest Codex*, 7-1–14.

14. *Sap. Sal.* 1:1–2:4 (erroneously entitled *igavtay*, i.e., “Proverbs” in the lectionary): lection no. 338 (Tuesday of the first week of Lent); 380 (Wednesday of the second week of Lent); 2:10–25 (K’ala; Paris BnF géorg. 3 has only 2:12–25); 705 (Saturday after Easter) [the latter reading is not contained in the undertext of fol. 253r of the Paris palimpsest (BnF géorg. 5), which contains the other lections between nos. 701 and 706]; 3:1–8: 900 (Sunday of the sixth week after Pentecost); 1420 (12 December); 1456 (Commemoration of the Apostles); 4:8–12: 201 (2 February); 5:1–16: 901 (Sunday of the sixth week after Pentecost, second lection after 3:1–8); 5:1–17: 1425 (21 December); 7:15–29: 883 (Sunday of Pentecost); 8:2–4: 1222 (8 September); 9:1–19: 1237 (13 September); 1550 (Dedication of Churches); 14:1–7: 1242 (13 September, fourth lection after 9:1–19); 14:11–15:3: 425 (Friday of the third week of Lent). Lections are numbered according to the edition M. Tarnichsvili, *Le grand lectionnaire de l’Église de Jérusalem (V^e–VIII^e siècle)* (CSCO 188 and 204, Scriptores Iberici 9 and 13; Louvain: CSCO, 1959–1960).

15. The Mtskheta Bible contains Wis 1:1–2:4, 2:12–24, 3:1–9, 4:1, 7–10 and 12–15, 5:1–24, 6:2–4 and 12, 7:15–29, 9:1–18, and 14:1–7.

16. In addition, the edition of the Mtskheta Bible comprises a few stray verses that pertain to chapter 10 (9–13) and other chapters (6:13–16, 7:30, and 8:2–3 [8:2 is divided into two parts, with the second part coming first], 7–8, 17–18, and 21), including variants (3:18 and 9:1–5, 10–11, and 14) and a few unidentified passages. See E. Dočanašvili, *Mcxeturi xelnač’eri (Ek’lesiast’e, Sibrdzne Solomonisa, Keba Kebata Solomonisa . . .)* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1985), 50–59; the last four words of 7:29 are reckoned as the beginning of chapter 10 there.

17. Cf. *ibid.*, 59–60, which does not indicate the respective chapters; 24:3–7a is contained in an unidentified *additamentum* given under the title *igavi* (“proverb”) there. The online edition on <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/at/mcat/mcat.htm> provides the correct references.

18. Viz., nos. 147 (Sir 2:1–13, 17 January), 28 (Sir 24:2–12, again entitled “Proverbs,” 25 December), and 587 (Sir 24:13–23; Easter Sunday). Beyond that, the lectionary comprises one more lection, Sir 24:25–25:1 (read on 6 January).

19. The palimpsest was investigated with multispectral imaging by B. Outtier and the present author, with kind support by the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, in April 2013. The results of the work will be published.

20. Blake, “Athos Codex,” 56 n. 65 mentions the nineteenth-century codex S-409 as a further witness of the Wisdom of Solomon; according to the catalogue of the “S” collection of the National Centre of Manuscripts in Tbilisi, the manuscript also comprises Sirach. There is no indication of the redaction preserved in it.

21. Cf. Blake “Athos Codex,” 36–38, on the history of the “detection” of the manuscript by Georgians.

TABLE 8.1 John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, Sect. 90, Greek and Georgian

<p>Ἡ δὲ Πανάρητος, τουτέστιν ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Σολομώντος, καὶ ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ὁ πατὴρ μὲν τοῦ Σιράχ ἐξέθετο Ἑβραϊστὶ, Ἑλληνιστὶ δὲ ἡρμηνεύσεν ὁ τοῦτου μὲν ἕγγονος Ἰησοῦς, τοῦ δὲ Σιράχ υἱός, ἐνάρητοι μὲν καὶ καλοὶ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριθμοῦνται οὐδὲ ἐκείντο ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ.</p>	<p>The <i>panáretos</i>, i.e., the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, which the father of Sirach composed in Hebrew and which his own descendant Jesus, the son of Sirach, translated into Greek, are [both] virtuous and beautiful, but they are not counted and did not lie in the chest.</p>
<p>ხოლო პანარეტოსი, რომელ არს სიბრძნე სოლომონისი, და სიბრძნე ისუესი, რომელი-იგი ბირაქის მამამან ისუ აღწერა ებრაელთა ენითა, ხოლო ბერძულად თარგმნა ძის წულმან მისმან და ძემან ბირაქისმან ისუ—ორნივე ესე წიგნნი სათნო უკუც არიან და კეთილ, არამედ არავე აღირიცხუვიან ზემოთქმულთა მათ თანა, არცა მდებარე იყვნეს კიდობანსა მას შინა.</p>	<p>But the <i>p'anaret'osi</i>, which is the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus [Isu], which the father of Sirach [Zirak], Jesus [Isu], wrote in the Hebrew language, and which his grandson Jesus, the son of Sirach, translated into Greek—both these books are virtuous indeed and nice, but they are not counted together with the abovementioned ones and did not lie in the chest.</p>

questions: Where did the text of the Oshk'i Bible originate, when and by whom was it accomplished, and what was its *Vorlage*?²² A thorough analysis of the Book of Sirach as contained in the Oshk'i Bible is of fundamental importance to these issues.

1.2. The “All-Virtuous” Wisdom

The Oshk'i Bible is peculiar not only in providing complete texts of both the Wisdom of Solomon and Ben Sirach but also by the title it gives to the former. After the scribe's (*glaxak'i*, i.e., “poor”) Giorgi's colophon closing the Song of Songs (*keba kebatay*), the text of the Wisdom of Solomon begins at the bottom of vol. β, fol. 277vb, introduced by the words (in two lines in rubrics) *sibrzne solomonisi p'anaret'osi: k(rist')e š(ei)c'q'(a)le i(ovan)e t(o)rn(i)k'*. The second part of this formula obviously denotes the donor of the codex, a certain John Tornik' (“Christ, have mercy on Iovane Tornik'!”), who was an officer of the Byzantine army in the second half of the tenth century and probably a relative of the founder of the Ivron monastery, John the Athonite.²³ The first part of the rubric, however, names the text (*Sibrznē Solomonisi*, lit. “Wisdom of Solomon”), along with an epithet, *p'anaret'osi*, which does not occur elsewhere in the Georgian Bible. The editor of the Georgian text of the “Wisdom,” Ciala Kurcik'idze, rightly pointed out that this term must reflect Gk. *πανάρητος*, lit. “all-virtuous,” which is used as an epithet of the Wisdom of Solomon in the *Expositio fidei* by John of Damascus; accordingly, the term also occurs in the (hitherto unedited) Georgian version of the *Expositio* (styled *gardamocema* in Georgian, literally rendering Gk. *ἐκδοσις*), which is preserved in Tbilisi, K. Kekelidze

22. Cf. *ibid.*, 34, on the history of the codex itself, which is not necessarily relevant to the history of the text(s) contained in it.

23. Cf. *ibid.*, 33–34, on John Tornik' and his relation to John the Athonite.

TABLE 8.2 Epiphanius of Salamis, Measures and Weights, Sect. 4

<p>Αἱ γὰρ στιχῆρεις δύο βιβλίοι, ἡ τε τοῦ Σολομῶντος, ἡ Πανάρετος λεγομένη, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ, ἐκγόνου δὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, (ὁ γὰρ πάππος αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς ἐκαλεῖτο), τοῦ καὶ τὴν σοφίαν ἐβραϊστὶ γράψαντος, ἣν ὁ ἐκγονος αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς ἐρμηνεύσας ἐλληνιστὶ ἐγράψε. Καὶ αὗται χρήσιμοι μὲν εἰσι καὶ ὠφέλιμοι, ἀλλ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν τῶν ῥητῶν οὐκ ἀναφέρονται. Διὸ οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ ἀαρὼν ἐνετέθησαν, τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ τῆς διαθήκης κιβωτῷ.</p>	<p>“For the two books in verses, that by Solomon, which is called <i>panáretos</i>, and that by Jesus, the son of Sirach, descendant of Jesus (for his grandfather was [also] called Jesus), the one who also wrote [the book of] Wisdom in Hebrew, which his grandson Jesus, translating, wrote down in Greek—these [books] are also useful and effective, but they are not included in the number of the agreed [books of the Old Testament]. Therefore, they were not put in the ark, i.e., the chest of the covenant.”</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

National Centre of Manuscripts, A-24 (xi). Table 8.1 demonstrates that the Georgian text²⁴ follows the Greek²⁵ in most details.

John’s testimony yields the early eighth century as a *terminus a quo* for the usage of the Greek term. The text passage from the *Expositio*, however, is a quotation from older sources,²⁶ πανάρετος already occurring in the treatise on *Measures and Weights* by Epiphanius of Salamis (fourth century CE). The term πανάρετος relates only to the Wisdom of Solomon in this context, not to both “Wisdoms” together as speculated by C. Kurcik’idze with respect to the testimony of John of Damascus.²⁷ Note here Table 8.2 for the passage in question.²⁸

It is interesting, then, that the Georgian version of the latter treatise, which is preserved in the so-called Miscellany of Shat’berdi (Tbilisi, the K. Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts, S-1141), an invaluable manuscript of the late tenth century, and thus contemporary to the Oshk’i Bible, does not contain the epithet in the passage in question. As a matter of fact, the Georgian text is heavily abridged, thus differing from the Syriac text which translates πανάρετος by *mytrt bkl* (“most excellent”).²⁹ This is all the more remarkable given that the Georgian version does reflect another peculiar word in the given context, by using the otherwise unattested *aronaysa-* (lit. “of the *arona-*”) to render Gk. ἐν τῷ ἀαρὼν³⁰

24. Georgian text quoted after C. Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli aḡtkmis ap’ok’ripuli (arak’anonik’uri) c’ignebis kartuli versiebi*. II (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1973), 176–77.

25. Sect. 90, ll. 68–71 in the edition P. B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 2 (PTS 12; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1973).

26. This answers the question raised by Kurcik’idze in her account as to whether the term “belonged” to John of Damascus (*Dzveli aḡtkmis ap’ok’ripuli (arak’anonik’uri) c’ignebis kartuli versiebi*, 177 n. 1).

27. Question no. 3 in *ibid.*, 177 n. 1; in her transcript from A-24, the editor did not insert a comma between the two “Wisdoms,” thus suggesting the “joint” interpretation.

28. Sect. 4, ll. 118–124, in I. Moutsoulas, “To ‘peri metrōn kai stathmōn’ ergon Epiphaniou tou Salaminois,” *Theologia* 44 (1973): 157–98 at 162; cf. also P. de Lagarde, *Symmicta* II (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1880), 157.

29. Cf. J. E. Dean, *Epiphanius’ Treatise on Weights and Measures. The Syriac Version* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 11; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), 19 (col. 49c, l. 4 of London, British Library, Or. Add. 17148, as published in facsimile in Dean’s edition and transcribed in P. de Lagarde, *Veteris testamenti ab Origene recensiti fragmenta apud Syros servata quinque* [Göttingen: Dieterich, 1880], 12).

30. De Lagarde, *Symmicta*, 157, has the variant reading ἀρὼν. For the Greek term cf. G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 1.

TABLE 8.3 Epiphanius of Salamis, Measures and Weights, Sect. 4, Georgian Text

ხოლო სიბრძნე სოლომონისი და ზირაქი იგიცა სტიქერონვე არიან და სარგებელნი არონაჲსანი, რომელ არს კიდობნისანი, ხოლო ებრაელთა არა დადვეს ძუელისა შჯულისა [თანა]. ¹	But the Wisdom of Solomon and the Sirach ["Ziraki"], these are in verses, too, and useful for [lit. 'of'] the <i>arona</i> -, which is the chest, but the Hebrews did not deposit them [with] the Old Law.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

¹B. Giginešvili and E. Giunašvili, *Šat'berdis k'rebuli X sauk'unisa* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1979), 193, ll. 15–18 (the editors insert a semicolon after *sargebelni* "useful," which leaves the following genitives unmotivated). Van Esbroeck, *Les versions géorgiennes*, 40, ll. 14–17, omits the space between *da* "and" and *sargebelni* "useful," thus producing an otherwise unattested *dasargebelni*, and restores *zuelisa žžulisasa*, lit. "to that of the Old Law" at the end, which seems acceptable in the light of the variant reading *zuelisa žžulisata*, lit. "to those of the Old Law," adduced by van Esbroeck from the two Jerusalem manuscripts from the Georgian collection of the Greek Patriarchate, B (= Jer. 44) and J (= Jer. 74; *ibid.*, note 9).

or Syr. *b-ʿrun* "in the ark," both reflecting Hebr. *ʾārōn* ("ark"). The Georgian text passage is illustrated in Table 8.3.³¹

In the Greek tradition, the use of *πανάρετος* as an epithet of the Wisdom of Solomon is much more widespread in early patristic literature. Several authors quote from the Wisdom of Solomon simply by referring to "the *panáretos* Sophia of Solomon." This is true, for example, for Didymus the Blind (fourth century), who provides four such quotations in his Commentary on the Book of Zechariah,³² plus one more in his Commentary on *Ecclesiastes*, whose author is styled "the sage."³³ References to the *πανάρετος σοφία* Σολομώντος are also found in the *vitae* of St. Auxentius (fifth–sixth centuries)³⁴ and St. Symeon Stylites the Younger (sixth–seventh centuries);³⁵ in the latter text, the book is named, in a prominent position indeed, together with the Psalter, the Odes and the Gospels as part of the saint's daily service as shown in Table 8.4.

31. The translation by M.-J. van Esbroeck, ed., *Les versions géorgiennes d'Épiphanie de Chypre, traité des poids et des mesures* (CSCO 460–61, Scriptores Iberici, 19–20; Leuven: Peeters, 1984), 40, is misleading in that it mistakes the name of Aharon for the word denoting the ark ("des stichères utiles d'Aaron, qui sont de l'Arche"); as a matter of fact, the name of Aharon does appear in several spellings in Old Georgian sources (*aharon*-, *aaron*-, *aron*-), but nowhere as a stem in *-a* (*arona*-). The rendering of the word meaning the ark by a stem in *-a* (matching Syr. *ārōnā* rather than Gk. *ἀράων*) can be taken as an indication of a Syriac "intermediary" as suggested by Van Esbroeck, 7.

32. L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle sur Zacharie* (3 vols.; SC 83–85; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1962), 1.393, l. 7 and 2, 254, l. 2: ἐν τῇ παναρέτῳ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Σαλωμώνος (Wis 1:3 and 4:8); 2, 290, 4: ἐν παναρέτῳ Σαλωμώνος σοφίᾳ (Wis 1.4); 4, 63, 4: ἡ πανάρετος τοῦ Σαλωμώνος σοφία φησὶν (Wis 11:24–26 and 1:14).

33. M. Gronewald, *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes* (Tl. 5; Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 24; Bonn: Habelt, 1979), 64: 288, l. 6: ἐν τῇ παναρέτῳ σοφίᾳ ὁ σοφὸς εἰ[ρ]ηκεν οὗτος (Wis 17:1, ad Eccl. 9.13–15).

34. *Symeonis Logothetae, cognomento Metaphrastae, opera omnia* = PG 114, col. 1404, ll. 3–4 (sect. XXXIII; Wis 2:12).

35. P. van den Ven, *La vie ancienne de S. Syméon Stylite le jeune* (521–592). *Introduction et texte grec* (SubH 32; Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1962), ch. 37, l. 15–16.

TABLE 8.4 **Vita of St. Symeon Stylites the Younger, Ch. 37, Greek Text**

Καθ' ὅλης δὲ τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἔψαλλε τοὺς ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα ψαλμοὺς καὶ τὰς ὥδ' αὖ πάσας καὶ συνέτασσε τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν λέγων ὑπόψαλμα, καὶ συνυπηχῶν ἔλεγε καὶ τὴν πανάρετον σοφίαν Σολομώντος, ἐβδομὸν τε τὸ ἅγιον εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸ μᾶθημα τῶν πιστῶν, καὶ τὴν εὐχὴν τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ· “Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.”	During all night and day, he chanted the 150 Psalms and all the Odes, and he performed the reading by pronouncing the chanted responses, and by echoing, he re-told also the <i>panáretos</i> Wisdom of Solomon, and, as the seventh, also the holy Gospel and the creed of the believers, and the prayer of invocation: “Our Father in heaven . . .”
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

TABLE 8.5 **Vita of St. Symeon Stylites the Younger, Ch. 25, Georgian Text**

და დღე და ღამე ფსალმუნებნ და ადიდებნ ღმერთსა დაუცხრომელად: და წართქვს ას ორმეოც და ათი იგი ფსალმუნი დავითისი გალობითურთ და იკითხავნ წმიდასა სახარებასა და სიბრძნესა სოლომონისსა და წართქვს სარწმუნოებად იგი წმიდათა მამათად რომელი ითქუეს ნიკიას. და ლოცვაჲცა იგი რომელი ასწავა ქრისტემან მოწადეთა თვსთა . . .	And day and night, he intoned psalms and praised God restlessly, and he recited the 150 Psalms of David with the Odes, and he read the holy Gospel and the Wisdom of Solomon, and he recited the creed of the holy fathers which they pronounced in Nicaea. And the prayer which Christ taught his disciples . . .
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Of this legend, a Georgian version exists (in the so-called *Keimena* redaction), preserved, among others, in the tenth-century manuscript, Sinai georg. 46,³⁶ but this omits just the epithet again; cf. the excerpt in Table 8.5.³⁷

Another author of the fourth century, Gregory of Nyssa, twice quotes Wis 7:18 in his treatise *Contra Eunomium*, by referring to ἡ πανάρετος Σοφία,³⁸ while Eusebius (third and fourth centuries) in his *Praeparatio evangelica* introduces a similar quotation (7:17–18) by referring to both σοφία Σολομών (*sic!*) and the πανάρετον σοφίαν,³⁹ with the latter term designating the author himself (as the “personalized wisdom”) rather than the work. In a similar way, the spurious sermon “In illud: Memor fui dei” that is ascribed to John Chrysostom names the πανάρετος Σοφία as the author of the *Canticum* as shown in Table 8.6.⁴⁰

Likewise, the Pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis scripturae sacrae* speaks about the “power of the Wisdom of Solomon, which is called the *panáretos*” (δύναμις τῆς Σοφίας

36. Cf. G. Garitte, *Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens littéraires du Mont Sinai* (CSCO165, Subsidia 9; Louvain: Durbecq, 1956), 166, according to whom the manuscript is dated “avant 978”; this manuscript bears the number 73 in A. A. Cagareli, “Каталогъ грузинскихъ рукописей Синайского монастыря,” in *Памятники грузинской старины въ Святой Земль и на Синаѣ* (Православный Палестинский сборникъ 4.1; Sankt Petersburg: Akademija Nauk, 1888), 193–240 at 228; cf. also *Свѣдѣнія о памятникахъ грузинской письменности* (t. I, вып. 2; Sankt Petersburg: Akademija Nauk, 1889), 193–240 at 228.

37. K. Kekelidze [K'ek'elidze], *Keimena*. I. *Januarium, Februarium, Martium, Aprilem et Majum menses continens* (Tiflis: Rossica Academia Scientiarum, 1918), 235, l. 6 (ch. 25).

38. W. Jaeger, *Gregorii Nysseni opera. Contra Eunomium libri. Pars prior, liber I et II (vulgo I et XIIb); Pars altera, liber III (vulgo III–XII), refutatio confessionis Eunomii (vulgo lib. II)* (Leiden: Brill, 1960), Cap. 8.5.6 and 3.6.67.2.

39. K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke. Band 8: Die Praeparatio evangelica* (GCS 43.1–2; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954–1956), 11.7.5.2.

40. PG 61, col. 693, l. 25.

TABLE 8.6 **Ps.-John Chrysostom, *In illud: Memor fui dei*, Greek text**

Οὐ γὰρ ἀφίσταμαι τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Ἐμνήσθην τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἠύφρανθην· ὃν ἡ πανάρετος Σοφία ἐν τοῖς ᾄσμασιν ἀνακηρύττει· Ἐξεγείρου, βορῶν, καὶ ἔρχου, νότε, διάπνευσον κήπόν μου, καὶ βρυσάτωσαν ἀρώματα.	For I do not stand apart from the prophet [David], who says: "I remembered God, and I rejoiced" [Ps. 76.4 / 77.3], whom the <i>panáretos</i> Wisdom proclaims in the <i>Cantica</i> : "Awake, O north wind, and come, O south wind, blow upon my garden, and let (its) spices flow" [Cant. 4.16].
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

TABLE 8.7 **Ps.-John Chrysostom, *Synopsis scripturae sacrae*, Greek Text**

Συνέγραψε δὲ, ὡς μὲν τινὲς φασί, τρία μόνα βιβλία. Τοῦτό τε, καὶ τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστήν, καὶ τὸ Ἄισμα τῶν ᾠμάτων· ὡς δὲ τινες, καὶ τὴν Σοφίαν τὴν ἀπογεγραμμένην καὶ λεγομένην Πανάρετον· γνήσιαν γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ταύτην λέγουσιν εἶναι.	He wrote, as some people say, only three books: this one [i.e., Proverbs], the <i>Ecclesiastes</i> , and the Song of Songs; others, however, claim also the <i>Sapientia</i> registered [under his name] and called the <i>panáretos</i> to be a genuine [work] of his.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

TABLE 8.8 **Hippolytus, *In Canticum Canticorum* (Paraphrasis), 1.3–4, Greek Text**

Τρεῖς τοίνυν αὐτοῦ βιβλοὺς ἀνοθεύτους εὐρίσκομεν, τὴν τε παροιμίαν, τὸν ἐκκλησιαστήν καὶ τὸ ᾄσμα τῶν ᾠμάτων.	Three books of his [Solomon], then, we regard as genuine: the [book of] Proverbs, the <i>Ecclesiastes</i> and the Song of Songs.
Ὅπως δὲ τινες καὶ τὴν λεγομένην σοφίαν πανάρετον εἰς αὐτὸν περιπλέκωσιν, ἥντινα ξένην καὶ ἄλλοτριαν αὐτοῦ ἐπιστάμεθα, οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς βίβλου. Τὰ τε σκέμματα καὶ τοὺς τρόπους, τὰς παραβολὰς τε καὶ τὰ αἰνίγματα, τὰς τε ἐνεργείας καὶ τὰ μυστήρια, ὅσα ἐν τοῖς τρισὶ βίβλοις . . .	How, however, may some also associate the so-called <i>Sophia panáretos</i> with him, which we understand as strange and different, not only because of the old and blessed fathers, but also because of the book itself. The schemes and the tropes, the parables and the riddles, the actions and the mysteries, as many as there are in those three books . . .

Σολομώντος τῆς λεγομένης Παναρέτου).⁴¹ This formula reappears in the *Synopsis* of Pseudo-Chrysostom,⁴² which depends on Pseudo-Athanasius for the Wisdom of Solomon⁴³ but adds, in the subsequent treatise on Proverbs, an explicit discussion on Solomon's authorship of the Wisdom (Table 8.7).⁴⁴

The question of the authorship is already addressed in the *paraphrasis* (allegedly of the third century) of the treatise *In Canticum canticorum* by Hippolytus of Rome (c. 170–235; Table 8.8):⁴⁵

41. PG 28, col. 376, ll. 48–49.

42. PG 56, col. 370, ll. 14–15.

43. Cf. F. P. Barone, "Pour une édition critique de la Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae du Pseudo-Jean Chrysostome," *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 83 (2009): 7–19, on the dependency of pseudo-Chrysostomus on pseudo-Athanasius.

44. PG 61, col. 370, ll. 30–35.

45. M. Richard, "Une paraphrase grecque résumée du commentaire d'Hippolyte sur le cantique des cantiques," *Le Muséon* 77 (1964): 140–54 at 140–41: 1.3–4.

TABLE 8.9 Hippolytus, *In Canticum Canticorum* (fragment), Greek Text

Καὶ ποῦ πᾶσα ἡ πλοῦσία αὐτῇ γνώσις; ποῦ δὲ τὰ μυστήρια ταῦτα; καὶ ποῦ αἱ βίβλοι; ἀναφέρονται γὰρ μόναι αἱ παροιμίαι καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ὁ ἐκκλησιαστής καὶ τὸ ᾄσμα τῶν ᾄσμάτων. τί οὖν; ψεύδεται ἡ γραφή; μὴ γένοιτο!	“And where is all this rich cognition? Where are these mysteries? And where (are) the books? Because only the Proverbs and the Wisdom and the Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs are put forth. What now? Does the Scripture lie? Impossible!”
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

TABLE 8.10 Hippolytus, *In Canticum Canticorum*, Georgian Text

და სადა არს ესე ყოველი დიდ-დიდი მეც- ნიერებაჲ: ანუ სადა არს ზრახვაჲ მრავლით ჟამითგან თქუმული? დაეფარა ანუ ვინმე არს, რომელმან-მცა გამოთქუა ესე? სადა არიან წიგნნი იგი? რამეთუ არიან იგავნი ესე ხოლო მცირედ ოდენ, რომელ ითქუნეს სიბრძნით: არს სხუად-ცა წიგნი ეკლესიასტჱ, განწესებულ შუდას და რვა მუჯლ, და ქებაჲ ქებათაჲ, რომელ არა უმეტეს არს უფროჲს სამისა შესხმისა. აწ რეცა თუ ყოველნივე იგი წიგნნი წარწყმედულ. ხოლო თუ ვისმე ტყუვილ უჩნდეს წერილი იგი, ნუ იყოფინ!	“And where is all this rich cognition? Or, where is the thought that has been uttered for a long time? It has disappeared. Or is there somebody who might pronounce it? Where are those books? For there are only these Proverbs, few enough, which were pronounced with wisdom; there is also another book, the Ecclesiastes, arranged in 708 verses, and the Song of Songs, which is not more than three compositions. Now, all those books are virtually lost. But if the Scripture should seem a lie to somebody—impossible!”
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In contrast to this, the plain text of this treatise, which is only fragmentarily preserved in Greek,⁴⁶ seems to count the Wisdom of Solomon as a fourth book of Solomon, together with the other three (Table 8.9).⁴⁷

In the Georgian tradition, which provides the only full account of the treatise that has prevailed (in the Miscellany of Shat’berdi again), we see, however, that “wisdom” was not meant as the name of another book in this context. Instead, the instrumental case form *sibrznit* clearly indicates a means, an instrument associated with the emergence of Proverbs here, so that the interpretation of “Wisdom” being a separate book or even its author (this would have been indicated in the form *sibrznisagan* with the given passive verbal form) can be excluded (Table 8.10).⁴⁸

The association of “*panáretos* wisdom” with Proverbs is also met with in some other early patristic texts. This is true, for example, for Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–215 CE), who in his *Stromata* quotes Prov 1:33 by referring to ἡ πανάρετος σοφία.⁴⁹ In a similar manner, Clement of Rome (first century CE) introduces a citation of Prov 1:23 in his commentary on 1 Corinthians by Οὕτως γὰρ λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία.⁵⁰ And the fact that

46. Cf. G. N. Bonwetsch, *Hippolyts Kommentar zum Buche Daniel und die Fragmente des Kommentars zum Hohelied*, in H. Achelis and G.N. Bonwetsch, *Hippolytus Werke. I. Exegetische und homiletische Schriften. 1. Hälfte* (GCS 1.1; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897), xx–xxi.

47. Ibid., 343–74 at 343, ll. 11–12.

48. Giginešvili and Giunašvili, *Šat’berdis k’rebuli X sauk’unisa*, 250, l. 36–251, l. 1. None of the fragmentary versions in other languages (Syriac, Armenian) contains the passage in question.

49. O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus. 2. Bd. Stromata Buch I–VI* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 15; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906), 2.22.136.3.

50. A. Jaubert, *Clément de Rome. Épître aux Corinthiens* (SC 167; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971), 57.3.

Proverbs were named *πανάρετος σοφία* “by Irenaeus and all the choir of the older” is explicitly stated in a fragment by Hegesippus (second century) quoted in Eusebius’s *Historia ecclesiastica* (fourth century).⁵¹ In the Georgian tradition, this association seems not to have taken root; however, we might suspect on this basis that the “Wisdom of Solomon” mentioned in the vita of St. Symeon Stylites (see Table 8.4 above) rather means Proverbs, which was much more prominent in the Christian tradition than the Wisdom of Solomon.

The clear association of *πανάρετος σοφία* with Solomon and his works notwithstanding, there are still a few indications that the same term could also be used for the “Wisdom” of Sirach from early times on. While Methodius of Olympus (third century) in his *Symposium* still sharply distinguishes the quotation from Wis 4:1 from the preceding quotation from Sir 23:4–6 by referring only to the former as *τῇ παναρέτῳ δὲ Σοφίᾳ*,⁵² it is Eusebius again who, in his *Demonstratio evangelica*, states that Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ “composed the *πανάρετος σοφία*” under Simon, arch-priest of Jerusalem (Σίμων, καθ’ ὃν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ ἐγνωρίζετο, ὁ τὴν καλουμένην πανάρετον Σοφίαν συντάξας).⁵³ The same information is also found in later historiographical sources such as the *Chronicon paschale* (c. 630 CE)⁵⁴ or the *Ecloga chronographica* by Georgius Syncellus (end of the eighth century)⁵⁵. According to other historiographers, it was under Ptolemy V Epiphanes that Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ explained his “*panáretos* wisdom” to the Jews (Ἰουδαίοις τὴν πανάρετον σοφίαν ἐξέθετο); this information, first provided by John of Antioch (sixth to seventh centuries),⁵⁶ reappears, with but slight changes, in the *Compendium historiarum* by George Cedrenus (eleventh to twelfth centuries).⁵⁷ Yet another chronological information is found in the *Chronicon* by George Hamartolos (ninth century), where Sirach is related once to the reign of Antiochos (V) Eupator⁵⁸ and once, to Ptolemy (III) Euergetes.⁵⁹ This *Chronicon* is important again for our topic because we do possess a Georgian version of it, produced at the beginning of the twelfth century by Arseni Iq’altoeli, a member of the “Hellenizing” school of the monastery of Gelati near Kutaisi and later the founder of the academy of Iq’alto.⁶⁰ And indeed, the Georgian “kronograpi” adduces not only the epithet *panareṭosi*

51. M. J. Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1846), 218, 20; and G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1: *Livres I–IV* (SC 31; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952), 4.22.9. The information is also found in the *Historia ecclesiastica* by Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos (thirteenth century), 4.7. Cf. *PG* 145, col. 992, ll. 47–48.

52. V.-H. Debidour and H. Musurillo, *Méthode d’Olympe. Le banquet* (SC 95; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1963), 1.3 ll. 32–33; a second quotation from Wis 15:10 is likewise introduced by *ἐν τῇ παναρέτῳ Σοφίᾳ φησὶ* (2.7, ll. 12–13).

53. I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke. Bd. 6: Die Demonstratio evangelica* (GCS 23; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913), 8.2.71 ll. 1–2.

54. L. Dindorf, *Chronicon paschale*, vol. 1 (Bonn: Weber, 1832), 331, ll. 9–10.

55. A. A. Mooshammer, *Georgius Syncellus, Ecloga chronographica* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1984), 333, ll. 22–23.

56. U. Roberto, *Ioannis Antiocheni fragmenta ex historia chronica* (TUGAL 154; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2005), 6.125.

57. I. Bekker, *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope*, vol. 1 (Bonn: Weber, 1838), 340, ll. 3–5.

58. Book 7: C. de Boor, *Georgii monachi chronicon* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1904), 1.292, ll. 22–26; cf. *PG* 110, col. 348, ll. 5–9.

59. Book 8: de Boor, *Georgii monachi chronicon*, 2.435, ll. 12–14; cf. *PG* 110, col. 508, ll. 43–45.

60. Cf. K. Kekelidze, *Dzveli kartuli lit’eraturis istoria*, I (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1980 [reprint of the 4th ed., 1960]), 277; and M. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur* (Città del Vaticano, 1955), 204–5.

TABLE 8.11 George Hamartolos, *Chronicon*, Books 6 and 8, Greek and Georgian Texts

... Ἀντιόχου ... ἐφ' οὗ καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ ὁ σοφὸς καὶ πολυμαθὴς καὶ τὴν πανάρητον σοφίαν συντάξας Ἑβραίοις ἐγνωρίζετο.	... of Antiochos ... under whom also Jesus son of Sirach, the sage and multiply educated (and) who had composed the <i>πανάρητος σοφία</i> became known to the Hebrews.
... ანტიოხოზისა ... რომლისა-ზე იისუ ზირაქისი ვითარცა ბრძენი და მრავალწავლული და სიბრძნესა პანარეტოსისა აღმწერელი ებრაელთათ ვს იცნობებოდა.	... of Antiochos ... under whom also Iisu (son) of Zirak, the sage and multiply educated (and) who had composed the <i>πανάρητος σοφία</i> became known to the Hebrews.
Πτολέμαιος ὁ Εὐεργέτης, ἐφ' οὗ ὁ τὴν πανάρητον σοφίαν συντάξας Ἑβραίοις Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ ἐγνωρίζετο.	Ptolemy the Euergetes, under whom Jesus son of Sirach, who had composed the <i>πανάρητος σοφία</i> , became known to the Hebrews.
პტოლემეოს ქველის-მოქმედი, რომლისა-ზე სიბრძნესა პანარეტოსისა აღმწერელი ებრაელთათვს იისუ ზირაქისი იცნობებოდა.	Ptolemy the Benefactor, under whom Iisu (son) of Sirach, who composed the <i>πανάρητος σοφία</i> , became known to the Hebrews.

in both passages relating to the Wisdom but also the attributes *brzeni* “sage” — Gk. σοφός and *mravalscavluli* “multiply educated” — πολυμαθής referring to its author, Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ.⁶¹ See here the synoptic arrangement of the Greek and Georgian texts in Table 8.11.

A similar estimation of Sirach is already found, without a focus on chronology, several centuries before in the Epistles by Isidorus Pelusiota (360–431), for whom the sage author of the *πανάρητος σοφία* even “personalized wisdom” (Σοφὸς τις ἀνὴρ, ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ φημι, ὁ τὴν Πανάρητον Σοφίαν συγγράψας, προσωποποιήσας τὴν σοφίαν . . .),⁶² and the denomination of his “Wisdom” as being *panáretos* is even found in the title of the edition of the Latin text published by P. Dolscius in Leipzig, 1571.⁶³

In the Georgian tradition, however, the Greek epithet seems not to have been used further on to denote the Wisdom of Ben Sirach. This is also true of the Oshk’i Bible where different from the *titulus* introducing the Wisdom of Solomon, the title of Sirach does not contain *p’anaret’os-i*, appearing simply as *sibrznē isow zirakisi*—that is, “Wisdom of Jesus (son) of Sirach” (vol. β, fol. 402vb). It may be added at this point that in the fourth-century Greek Bible Codex Sinaiticus (portions of which are preserved among four institutions), the Wisdom of Solomon is entitled σοφία σαλομωντος (London, British Library, Add. 43725, fol. 151r / qu. 66, 8r), and Sirach, σοφία ιησου υἱου σειραχ (fol. 160v; qu. 68, 1v); σοφία σαλομωντος appears again at the end of the Wisdom of Solomon (fol. 160r / qu. 68, 1r),

61. S. Q’auxčičvili, *Xronograpi Giorgi Monazonisay / Georgii Monachi Chronicon* (T’pili: T’pilis Universit’et’is gamocema, 1920), 144, ll. 12–15 (Book 7) / 225, ll. 25–26 (Book 8).

62. P. Évieux, *Isidore de Péluse. 2. Lettres 1414–1700* (SC 454; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2000), Epistle 1550, ll. 5–6.

63. “Σοφία ἡ Παναρეტος Ἰησοῦ Του Σειραχ. Sapientia Iesv Siracidæ, Omnivm Virtvtvm Doctrinam Continens, Elegiaco Olim Carmine Reddita, & Nvnc Primvm Edita À Pavlo Dolscio Plavensi. Lipsiae.” Other early editions use the name “Ecclesiasticus,” which is also referred to by Luther in his first German translation (M. Luther, *Jesus Syrach zu Wittenberg verdeutscht* [Nürnberg: Peypus, 1533], 7). The Greek edition of the dictionary by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Λεξικόν της ελληνικής γλώσσης*, vol. 6 (Athens: Pelekanos, 2006), 52, refers under *πανάρητος* to Proverbs, the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach.

and σοφία ἡσου υἱου σειράχ, at the end of Sirach (fol. 185r; qu. 71, 2r). Similarly, the Codex Vaticanus (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1209) introduces the Wisdom of Solomon by σοφία σαλωμών (p. 809) and closes it by σοφία σαλωμώνος (p. 832); Sirach here bears the shorter title σοφία σειράχ (p. 833) after the πρόλογος (beginning on p. 832) and the longer one, σοφία ἡσοῦ υἱοῦ σειράχ, at the end (p. 893).

2. 4 Ezra

Different from the two “Wisdoms,” the Old Georgian text of 4 *Ezra* is not only preserved in the Oshk’i Bible but also in another important Old Testament manuscript. This is a mid-eleventh-century codex from the Monastery of the Cross in Jerusalem, now preserved in the library of the Greek Patriarchate, which is divided into two parts catalogued as nos. 7 and 11 of the Georgian collection.⁶⁴ The text of the apocalypse in fols. 194v–214v was edited in 1926 by R. P. Blake;⁶⁵ it is defective, ending within vision III⁶⁶ and missing about sixteen folia in comparison with the Latin text of the apocalypse.⁶⁷ In the Oshk’i Bible, which was collated by Blake a few years later, the text (on fols. 480v–496v) is even more defective; however, it goes beyond vision III, extending into vision VII.⁶⁸ Table 8.12 shows the distribution of the text passages that are represented in the two Georgian codices⁶⁹ in comparison with the Latin text of the apocalypse; for the sake of easy reference, the latter is represented according to the divergent numbering systems used in the editions by Bensly (1895) and Violet (1910).

It is clear from Table 8.12 that we have two types of lacunae (indicated by a grey background) in the two Old Georgian manuscripts, those that are common to both of them,

64. Cf. (R. P. Blake, “Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens de la Bibliothèque patriarcale grecque à Jérusalem [1],” *ROC* ser. 3/3 = 23 (1922–1923): 345–413 at 370–71 and 374–76. The codex was still coherent when it was inspected for the first time by A. A. Cagareli in 1886 (cf. “Каталогъ грузинскихъ рукописей монастыря св. Креста, близъ Иерусалима”; *prilozhenie* I in “Памятники грузинской старины в Св. Землѣ и на Синаѣ” [S.-Peterburg: Akademija Nauk, 1888 = *Православный Палестинский Сборник* 4.1], 143–92 at 152; also in *Сводънїя о памятникахъ грузинской письменности*, т. I, вып. 2 [Sankt Peterburg: Akademija Nauk, 1889], 143–92 at 152, where it is catalogued as no. 1 of the collection of the Monastery of the Holy Cross). Cagareli still lists 361 fols., while Blake’s nos. 7 and 11 comprise only (128 + 214 =) 342 fols., on a total of 44 quires (Blake, “Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens,” 370 and 375). N.J. Marr, who inspected the collection after its removal to the Greek Patriarchate in 1902, treats in his catalogue (published posthumously) under nos. 6 and 20 (N. Mari, *Ierusalimis berdznuли sap’at’riarko c’ignsacavis kartuli xelnač’erebis mok’le ač’c’eriloba* / *Kratkoe opisanie gruzinskix rukopisej biblioteki grečeskogo patriarxata v Ierusalime* [Tbilisi: Akademija Nauk GSSR, 1955], 12–14) only those parts (all from the Minor Prophets) that belong to the present no. 7 (Marr’s no. 20, 107 fols.) and those that were secondarily bound with no. 11, plus the end of Jeremy (Marr’s no. 6, no number of fols.), with no indication of the following texts; however, he indicates a total of 44 quires, thus matching Blake’s account.

65. R. P. Blake, “The Georgian Version of Fourth Esdras from the Jerusalem Manuscript,” *HTR* 19 (1926): 299–375 at 322–75 (with Latin translation).

66. Visions counted in accordance with the edition of the Latin text by B. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra). 1: Die Überlieferung* (GCS 18; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910).

67. Blake, “Georgian Version of Fourth Esdras from the Jerusalem Manuscript,” 301.

68. R. P. Blake, “The Georgian Text of Fourth Esdras from the Athos Manuscript,” *HTR* 22 (1929): 57–105 at 102.

69. The Georgian text passages are numbered in accordance with the edition in C. Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli ač’tkmis ap’ok’ripebis kartuli versiebi* (X–XVIII ss. *xelnač’erta mixedvit*). I (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1970), 326–405.

TABLE 8.12 *4 Ezra* in the Jerusalem (I) and Oshk'i (O) Manuscripts, Aligned with the Latin Text

Georgian I	Georgian O	Latin (Bensly)	Latin (Violet)
		I. 1–40	
		II. 1–48	
1.1–15		III. 1–15a	I. 1.1–3.5
		III. 15b–16	I. 3.6–7
1.17–36		III. 17–36	I. 4.1–6.9
2.1–26a		IV. 1–26a	I. 7.1–10.1
	2.26b–28a	IV. 26b–28a	I. 10.2–4a
2.28b–52		IV. 28b–52	I. 10.4b–13.2
3.1–6		V. 1–6a	I. 13.3–10
		V. 6b–7a	I. 13.11–12a
3.7–45a		V. 7b–45a	I. 13.12b–II. 5.5
3.45b–56a		V. 46b–56a	II. 5.6–II. 7.1a
3.56b		V. 56b	II. 7.1b
4.1–8		VI. 1–8a	II. 7.2–8.3a
		VI. 8b–9a	II. 8.3b–4a
4.9–59		VI. 9b–59	II. 8.4b–III. 2.23
5.1–3a		VII. 1–3a	III. 3.1–3
5.3b–35		VII. 3b–35	III. 3.4–5.10
5.35.1–35a ¹		VII. 36–60a	III. 5.11–7.12a
		VII. 60b–76a	III. 7.12b–10.4a ²
	5.35.50b–68a	VII. 76b–95a	III. 10.4b–12.7a
5.35.68b–82		VII. 95b–104	III. 12.7b–14.8
	5.35.83	VII. 105	III. 14.9
	5.36–44	VII. 106–114	III. 15.1–10
		VII. 115–124a	III. 15.11–16.10a
5.55b–70		VII. 124b–139	III. 16.10b–18.7
6.1–19		VIII. 1–19	III. 19.1–22.6
6.20–62		VIII. 20–62	III. 23.1–26.17
6.63		VIII. 63	III. 27.1
7.1–20		IX. 1–20	III. 27.2–28.7
		IX. 21–25	III. 28.8–29.4
		IX. 26–47	IV. 1.1–4.4
	
		XIV. 1–17	VII. 1.3–2.17
	12.18–24a	XIV. 18–24	VII. 3.1–4.2
		XIV. 25–26a	VII. 4.3–5a
	12.24b [26b]	XIV. 26b	VII. 4.5b
	12.27–48	XIV. 27–48	VII. 5.1–8.5
			VII. 9

¹The numbering of 83 subunits under 5.35 in Kurcik'idze's edition (*Dzveli aġtkmis ap'ok'ripebis kartuli versiebi*, 363–67) is based upon the Russian translation of the Ethiopian version of the apocalypse, cf. Kurcik'idze, *Dzveli aġtkmis ap'ok'ripuli*, 276 n. 1.

²Erroneously listed as “III. 10, 4–III. 12, 7” in Blake, “Georgian Text,” 58.

and those that are specific to one or the other. For the latter group, we may follow Ciala Kurcik'idze in assuming that some of the lacunae in the Oshk'i Bible are due to a mere *saut du même au même*;⁷⁰ this might even be true for the long lacuna between 6.62 and 12.18,

70. This is true, e.g., of the lacuna between 3.45a and 3.56b (Kurcik'idze, *Dzveli aġtkmis ap'ok'ripebis kartuli versiebi*, 348, n.*; and Kurcik'idze, *Dzveli aġtkmis ap'ok'ripuli*, 276). It is not probable, however, for the lacuna between 12.24 and 12.27 (Kurcik'idze, *Dzveli aġtkmis ap'ok'ripebis kartuli versiebi*, 402, n.*; and Kurcik'idze, *Dzveli aġtkmis ap'ok'ripuli*, 277), which must be accounted for differently.

TABLE 8.13 *4 Ezra 4.8–10 in Synopsis*

4.8–10 I	4.8–10 O	Latin (VI.8–10 / II. 8.2–5)
8. და მრქუა მე: ადამისით- გან ვიდრე აბრაჰამისამდე, რამეთუ მისგან იშვა იაკობი და ესაუ	8. და მრქუა მე: ადამისითგ ან ვიდრე აბრაჰამისამდე, რამეთუ მისგან იშვა	8. <i>Et dixit ad me: ab Abraham usque ad Abraham, quoniam ab eo natus est Iacob et Esau,</i> <i>manus enim Iacob tenebat ab initio calcaneum Esau.</i> 9. <i>Finis enim huius saeculi Esau, et principium sequentis Iacob</i>
9. დასაბამი მომავალისა სოფლისა – იაკობი	იაკობი	
10. რამეთუ დასასრული კაცისა ბრჭალი არს...	10. რამეთუ დასასრული კაცისა ბრჭალი არს...	10. <i>Hominis manus . . . inter calcaneum . . .</i>

both 6.63 and the latter verse beginning with *miuge da varku* “I replied and said,” if the text of the *Vorlage* was quite abridged between these two verses. Within the Jerusalem codex, there is but one lacuna that can be explained by assuming a *saut du même au même*—namely, in 4.8–9, where the text jumps from the first mention of Jacob to the third one. Curiously enough, the Oshk’i Bible offers another *Textsprung* at the same place—namely, from the first mention of Esau to the third one—thus proving that the two lacunae emerged independently. For the sake of illustration, the two passages are contrasted with the Latin text in Table 8.13.⁷¹

Except for the minor omission of one verse and two sentences in 2:26–28 (IV. 26b–28a in Bensly’s Latin text, I. 10.2–4a in Violet’s), which cannot be readily explained, the other specific lacunae of the Jerusalem codex are all likely to simply be due to the loss of entire folia as postulated, on a stichometrical basis, by Blake and Kurcik’idze.⁷² This can easily be demonstrated on fol. 208r, which begins with the three last letters of the word *saunžeta* “in the store-rooms” in 5.35.68 (~ *in promptuariis*, VII.95 / III. 12.7), there being no trace of the beginning of the word at the end of fol. 207v. The loss of folia may also be responsible for the text ending with 7:20 in the Jerusalem Bible, on the very last folium that has been preserved (214v); this, however, remains uncertain.⁷³

The question whether the text of the Jerusalem codex once extended beyond 7:20 is crucial indeed for the interrelationship of the two witnesses, especially for the assumption

71. Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli aḡtkmis ap’ok’ripuli*, 278, suggests that the jump from Esau to Esau is common; in Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli aḡtkmis ap’ok’ripebis kartuli versiebi*, 351 n. *, the state is analyzed correctly, however.

72. Blake, “Georgian Text,” 58; and Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli aḡtkmis ap’ok’ripuli*, 277.

73. The last folium indicated by Cagareli in his catalogue (“Каталогъ грузинскихъ рукописей монастыря св. Крестъ” 153) must be fols. 212v–213r in accordance with the text passage quoted, which pertains to 7:1. As the folium is stated to be “torn out,” we cannot tell whether any further folia were present beyond fol. 214 in his time. Marr states in his catalogue that “at the end, five folia have been preserved after the 44th quire” (“В конце сохранилось пять листов после 44-ой тетради”: Mari, *Ierusalimis berdznuli sap’a’riarko c’ignsacavis kartuli xelnač’erebis mok’le aḡč’eriloba*, 12); it remains unclear whether these were torn out or whether they pertained to an additional quire.

of a common archetype and, depending on this, the determination of its source. It was R. P. Blake who strongly argued in favor of both texts being “derived from the same ultimate original,”⁷⁴ in its turn based upon a “hypothetical Armenian version” that had the same Greek *Vorlage* as the Ethiopic version but was very different from the extant Armenian text.⁷⁵ The complex argumentation line need not be repeated here; it will be sufficient to focus on a few essentials.

2.1. *The Structure of the Two Old Georgian Versions*

It is clear, first of all, that the archetype of the two Georgian versions did not contain the two chapters styled “2 Esdras” in some Latin manuscripts, which precede the first Vision (chapters I and II in Bensly’s numbering), nor anything beyond the seventh Vision—that is, nothing of the part sometimes named “V” and “VI Esdras” (Bensly’s chapters XV and XVI).⁷⁶ In this way, it exactly matches the outline of the Ethiopic text of the apocalypse, which has the same limits, whereas it strongly differs from the “Slavonic” version as it appears in the Bakar Bible, which covers the total of the sixteen chapters of (Bensly’s) text of the Latin Vulgate. In this respect it is correct to refer to it as a “short redaction” as Kurcik’idze did in her edition.⁷⁷

The question remains whether the assumed archetype was complete in comparison with chapters III–XIV of the Latin text—which would imply that both witnesses exhibit a considerable loss of text—or whether it was abridged to a certain amount right from the beginning. Blake’s argumentation in this context seems a bit confusing. On the one hand, he argues that in “Codex O” (i.e., the Oshk’i Bible, which “contains only extracts from the text”) the “gaps do not correspond to anything in the other versions, nor do they follow any discernible ratio of size or any other character which would suggest that the archetype of O had been defective or mutilated. There are no breaks in the text of O to show that the excerpts were in any way marked as such in the archetype.” On the other hand, Blake admits that the “translation itself, while exhibiting many stylistic and other variants from I, is fundamentally the same version,” although “Codex I”—that is, the Jerusalem codex—differs from O by being “complete and continuous so far as it is preserved.”⁷⁸

The latter argument, however, is misleading. As we have seen, it is by no means clear that the Jerusalem text ever extended beyond 7:20, whereas the more “defective” Oshk’i text reaches the very end of the apocalypse (12:48), after the most considerable gap it is characterized by, covering more than five chapters (between 6:62 and 12:18). We have also seen that a *saut du même au même* can be assumed even for the latter gap, but this would be extremely hard to assume if it went across five chapters. What is more, the gap

74. Blake, “Georgian Version,” 304; and Blake, “Georgian Text,” 58.

75. Blake, “Georgian Version,” 307 and 317; and Blake, “Georgian Text,” 65.

76. R. L. Bensly, *The Fourth Book of Ezra. The Latin version* (Texts and Studies, III/2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895), xxvii; Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, XIII.

77. Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli agtkmis apok’ripuli*, 270 et pass.: “mok’le redakcia.”

78. Blake, “Georgian Text,” 57–58.

between 5:44 and 6:20 in the Oshk'i Bible might be intentional, given that the text of 5:44 ends with the last word of the verse and 6:20, the first verse of the so-called *Oratio Esrae*, begins immediately afterward with the title introducing it, which reads *dasabami sit'q'wsay ezraysi vidre aġmaġlebadmde misa kueq'anit*—that is, “Beginning of the speech of Ezra before his being exalted from (this) world” (with but slight differences, the Jerusalem codex has *dasabami locv[isay] ezraysi vidre aġmaġlebadmde*, with *locva-* “prayer” instead of *sit'q'ua-* “word, speech”). So what might the common “archetype” have had between chapters 5 and 12?

In this context, it is important to note that there is relevant evidence from a secondary source, namely, the Paris lectionary, which contains two lections from the apocalypse. The first one, read as the first lection on January 6 (no. 84), extends from 3:22–30 and thus matches a text passage that is present in both the Oshk'i and the Jerusalem Bibles. The second one, however, appearing as lection no. 1638 among the litanies concerning the Prophets, covers 6:6–36, thus including the *Oratio* (6:20–36),⁷⁹ which it leaves without a title, but also several verses before it. The possibility that the text of the Oshk'i Bible might have originated from a set of (uncontiguous) lections (as assumed above for the fragmentary texts of the Wisdom of Solomon and Ben Sirach in the Mtskheta Bible), one of them consisting of the *Oratio* alone, is therefore unlikely, and the problem of the emergence of the *lacunae* in the Oshk'i Bible must be left open.

2.2. *The Presumed Armenian Vorlage*

The assumption of a hypothetical Armenian *Vorlage* as put forth by Blake was mostly based upon some observations concerning individual words, and some of them are indeed worth being taken seriously. This is true, for example, of *dari* in III.5.21 (= 5:35.16, ~ VII.43) taken by Blake to represent Arm. *dar* “century.” The enigmatic text passage reads: *da ganigrzōs moslvay vidre šwdad c'lad oden, romel ars šwdi dari* (lit. “And the course will extend up to seven years, which is seven *daris*”). If *dari* really represents Arm. *dar* (“century”), the Georgian text virtually takes an intermediary position between the “seven years” of the Ethiopic version, the *ebdomados annorum* (“weeks of years”) of the Latin and, correspondingly, the Syriac and the first Arabic version, the “seventy years” of the second Arabic version, and the “700 years” of certain Ethiopic witnesses.⁸⁰ Another remarkable case is the use of *davardes* “cecidissent” in *da aravis auc'q'e raysatws davardes gzani igi matni* (“And you informed nobody why their ways should fall”) in I.6.3 (= 1:30, ~ III.31), which contrasts with Latin *quomodo debeat derelinqui via haec* (“how this way must be relinquished”),⁸¹ Ethiopic “how the end of this way would be,” and Syriac “how your way

79. Cf. B. Violet, *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt* (GCS 32; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924), 110 n. *, according to whom the *Oratio Esrae* (§23 of vision III in his edition) “ist der berühmteste und meist benutzte Teil der Esra-Apokalypse, wie die Fülle der liturgischen lateinischen Sonderhandschriften beweist.”

80. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 150–51, and A. F. J. Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra)* (GCS; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992), 10 and 47.

81. Similarly, in the first Arabic version: “dass du deinen Weg... verworfen hast” (Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 17).

should be understood.”⁸² Blake’s proposal to ascribe the curious wording of the Georgian text to a confusion of Armenian **ankal* (“fall”) with **ənkāl* “receive,” which would match the Syriac expression and reflect a presumed Greek **καταληφθῆ* (“begriffen werden soll”), in its turn confused with **καταλειφθῆ* (“verlassen werden soll”) in the Latin and Ethiopic wording, is ingenious indeed.⁸³

In other cases, however, Blake’s argumentation is misleading or even untenable. This is true, for example, of the use of “*mercede*” in I.13.3 (= 3:1, ~ V.1) as opposing itself to “Zeichen” (“sign”) of the other versions. It is true that the Jerusalem codex uses *sasq’idlisa mistws* (“on the payment”) in the title of Vision V, contrasting with Latin *de signis* as well as Syriac, Ethiopic, and Arabic “(On) the signs,”⁸⁴ which Blake explains by confusion of Arm. *šnorhac’* and *nšānac’*. This confusion may indeed be responsible for the erroneous rendering of Arm. *nšānac’n* (“of the signs”), which all Armenian witnesses show,⁸⁵ by “*de gratia*” in J. H. Petermann’s translation of the Armenian text;⁸⁶ however, if we consider that the Georgian text of the Oshk’i Bible has *sasc’aulisa mistws* (“on the miracle”) the assumption that the occurrence of *sasq’idlisa* is due to a mere inner-Georgian confusion of two very similar words (*sasc’aulisa* and *sasq’idlisa*) seems much more probable, all the more so if we assume the two Georgian codexes to depend on a common archetype. A similar case is II.10.5 (= 4:22, ~ VI.22), where according to Blake the Georgian text opposes “*infantes*” to the “*loca*” of the other versions,⁸⁷ by confusion of Arm. *telk’* (“places”) with *tlayk’* (“children”). This is again only true of the Jerusalem codex, which has *q’rmani* (“children”), while the Oshk’i Bible has *q’anani* (“fields”) as the perfect equivalent of the “(sowed) fields”⁸⁸ of the other versions, and again we may safely assume an inner-Georgian confusion of two very similar words (*q’anani* vs. *q’rmani*), here probably triggered by the double occurrence of *q’rmani* (“*infantes*”) in the verse before (4.21).⁸⁹

Blake’s argumentation is likewise weak⁹⁰ when he speaks of *iat’ak’i* (rather “floor, ground” than “bottom”) as an “Armenian word.”⁹¹ First, *iat’ak’i* is not at all “sparingly used in Georgian,” given that it occurs more than ninety times in Old Georgian texts published so far.⁹² Second, it is true that Arm. *yatak* is identical in both its formation

82. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 16–17 (“wie das Ende dieses Weges sei,” “wie dein Weg zu begreifen sei”), and Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 10. The second Arabic version and the Armenian text have no equivalent.

83. Cf. Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 10 n. 31, where the reference to Blake’s proposal is missing.

84. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 20–21, “(Über) die Zeichen”; and Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 20.

85. M. E. Stone, *The Armenian Version of IV Esra* (UPATS 1; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 62, notes no variant.

86. In A. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1869), 384, reprinted in Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 21, and indicated by “Arm^m” in Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 20 n.

87. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 104–5.

88. “(besäte) Felder”: Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 34.

89. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 102–3; and Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 34.

90. Blake’s plea for an Armenian *Vorlage* appeared in his article of 1926, which he authored before having access to the Oshk’i Bible. He did not withdraw his proposal afterward, however.

91. Blake, “Georgian Version,” 308.

92. The Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien (TITUS) database, which covers nearly all published Old Georgian text material, contains a total of ninety-eight occurrences; cf. http://titus.fkdg1.uni-frankfurt.de/database/titusinx/titusinx.asp?LXLANG=38405&LXWORD=iat2500ak2500*&LCPL=0&TCPL=1&C=H&T=0&LMT=100&K=0&MM=0&QF=1.

and its meaning, but the word is without doubt Middle Iranian (probably Parthian **yatak*, cf. Middle Persian *jadag*, “form, property”), belonging to the great bulk of shared Iranianisms in the two languages. Applying criteria that have been established recently,⁹³ there is no indication of this word having entered Georgian via Armenian, since it is not at all restricted to texts that are likely to have been translated from Armenian. An (immediate) Iranian basis may also be assumed for one of the words which according to Blake “are new to the lexica” and are still unattested elsewhere, namely, *iahravi* (“rare”), given the typical “Parthian” sequences of *ia-* (< **yā-*) and *-hr-* (< **-ṣr-*) it contains.⁹⁴ Different from this, *msxep’ri* (“violent, pelting [of rain]”) is clearly an inner-Georgian formation, even though its root remains as unclear as the actual source of *iahravi*.

2.3 The Title of the Apocalypse

Several authors noted the fact that the byname of the author of the apocalypse in Georgian comes closest to that of the Ethiopic text, appearing as *sutiel-i* in both Georgian codexes⁹⁵ and as *sutaēl* in the latter and thus establishing one more striking correspondence between these two versions.⁹⁶ The divergence in the second vowel notwithstanding, the name form clearly opposes itself to forms like Latin *salathiel*, *salathihel*, *salatiel*, or *sarathias*; Syriac *šalaṭiel*; Arabic *šalaṭiel*, *šalaṭal*, *salatiel*, or *salatan*; and Armenian *salat’iel*,⁹⁷ all of which are identical with, or come closer to, the “normal” form the name has in both OT and NT texts.⁹⁸ In this context it is important to note that in the Old Georgian version of those texts, we only find *salatiel*-, even in the Oshk’i and Jerusalem codexes;⁹⁹ and the same is true for biblical quotations and allusions, as in the chronicle and the commentary on the *Canticum* by Hippolytus of Rome in the Miscellany of Shat’berdi,¹⁰⁰ the treatise *De Gemmis* by Epiphanius of Cyprus in the same manuscript,¹⁰¹ or the commentary on the Gospel of Matthew by John Chrysostom translated by Euthymius the Athonite.¹⁰² All this renders the peculiar name form appearing in the apocalypse—and its correspondence with the Ethiopic version—even more remarkable, all the more so since the Georgian text exhibits

93. J. Gippert, *Iranica Armeno-Iberica: Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen I* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Iranistik 26; Sitzungsbericht der phil.-hist. Klasse 606; Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1993), 345–50.

94. Ibid., 56.

95. Cagareli, “Каталогъ грузинскихъ рукописей монастыря св. Креста,” 152, still notes *sulieli* for the Jerusalem Bible, which explains itself by confusion of the minuscule (*nuskhuri*) letters for *l* and *t* under the influence of Georg. *sulieli* (“insane”); cf. Blake, “Georgian Version,” 303n25. For the spelling of *w* instead of *u*, cf. Table 8.14 note 1 below.

96. Blake, “Georgian Version,” 303; and Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 4.

97. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 2–3; and Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 4.

98. I Esr. (LXX) 5.2 ff.; II Esr. 3.2 ff.; II Esr. 22.1 (Neh 12.1); I Chr 3.17 ff.; Agg. 1.1 ff.; Matt 1.12; Luke 3.27.

99. Agg. 1.1 ff.

100. Gignešvili and Giunašvili, *Šat’berdis k’rebuli X sauk’unisa*, 199 l. 8 and 268 l. 25.

101. Ibid., 172 l. 41.

102. V. Č’amalašvili and T. Dedabrišvili, eds., *C’m. Ioane Okrop’iri, Targmanebay Mates saxarebisay*. 1. (Tbilisi: Orioni, 1996), 59 l. 20; and M. Šanidze, ed., *C’m. Ioane Okrop’iri, Targmanebay Mates saxarebisay*. 1. (Tbilisi: Betania, 2014), 53 l. 31.

TABLE 8.14 *4 Ezra*, Title and First Verse

	O	I
Title	<i>c'igni ezra sutieli</i> Book Ezra Sutieli	<i>ezra swtieli¹ romeli iq'o babilovns</i> Ezra Sutieli who was in Babylon
1.1	<i>šemdgomad samisa c'lisa dacemitgan kalakisayt</i> <i>viq'av babilons me, sutieli, romel ars ezra.</i> Three years after the defeat of the city, I was in Babylon, me, Sutieli, which is Ezra.	<i>šemdgomad samisa c'lisa dacemitgan kalakisa viq'av</i> <i>babilons me, swtieli,¹¹⁰ romel ars ezra.</i>

¹The spelling of plain *w* instead of the digraph *ow* (i.e., *u*) is a typical phenomenon of certain Old Georgian manuscripts.

the name twice, once in the title of the apocalypse and once, in its first verse (in Table 8.14, the lines in question are displayed synoptically). Different from this, the Ethiopic title names only “Ezra the prophet,”¹⁰³ in a similar way to the Paris lectionary, where the two lections from the apocalypse are introduced by *sak'itxavi ezra c'inaysc'armet'q'uelisay*—that is, “Lection from Ezra the prophet.”

Be that as it may, the question remains how to account for the peculiar name form shared by the Georgian and Ethiopic versions. If these go back to a common branch of tradition, as proposed by Blake,¹⁰⁴ we are led to assume this to have been characterized by the corruption of an abbreviated Greek spelling ΣΛΘΗΛ by ΣΥΘΗΛ, or the like. Whether this common *Vorlage* originated in Egypt, as suggested by Blake on account of a Coptic ostrakon from the Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes exhibiting the title ΕΣΠΑ Ν ΣΟΥΘΙΗΛ,¹⁰⁵ must remain open; if it did, the case for a (lost) Armenian intermediary of the Georgian version becomes even weaker.¹⁰⁶

3. Apocryphal Writings Relating to Genesis

The Georgian tradition is comparatively rich in apocryphal texts that are related to the contents of the biblical book of Genesis. First of all, it possesses two different redactions of the *Vita Adae*, one represented by a set of five manuscripts (fifteenth to seventeenth centuries) and the second, by a *codex unicus* (seventeenth century). Both redactions were edited synoptically by C. Kurcik'idze, first in 1964 and a second time in 2003.¹⁰⁷ A French translation mostly based on the first redaction was provided by B. Outtier in 2012, in synopsis

103. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 3; and Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 4.

104. Styled “y” in Blake, “Georgian Version”, 308–11.

105. Ibid., 310–11, quoting W. E. Crum, “The Literary Material,” in H. E. Winlock and W. E. Crum, eds., *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes. Part I* (Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition 3.1; New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1926), 197. The ostrakon in question bears the signature BP. 1069.

106. Cf. Stone, *Armenian Version of IV Ezra*, 41, as to the aporia of Blake’s proposal.

107. The manuscripts in question are Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-153, H-433, H-881 (first redaction), and S-5175 (second redaction) (the information “Musée d’État de Géorgie” given in Haelewyck *CAVT*, 6 *et passim* is very misleading), plus Kutaisi, Historico-Ethnographical Museum, 128; and Tbilisi, (Giorgi Leonidze) State Museum of Literature, 3 [olim 128] (both first redaction); the latter manuscript was not included in C. Kurcik'idze’s edition because it is “recent and does not contribute anything interesting to the establishment of the text” (“გვიანდელია, ტექსტის გასამართავად საინტერესოსაც არაპერს იძლევა”: 1964, 97 n. 1). According to Haelewyck, *CAVT* 6, C. Kurcik'idze adduced another manuscript containing the first

with two Latin versions (V and P), the Greek text (with a French translation), and a French translation of the Armenian version.¹⁰⁸

The late date of the manuscripts notwithstanding, the first Georgian redaction is regarded as representing a comparatively early version, going back to the eleventh or twelfth centuries.¹⁰⁹ Whether it was translated directly from the Greek or via an Armenian intermediary¹¹⁰ is still a matter of debate;¹¹¹ it may be important in this context that the text best agrees with the Latin version in its chapters 1–44 (with chs. 25–29 missing),¹¹² while the rest is closer to the Greek text (with the exception of the passage on the death and entombment of Eve at the end of the text, which is abridged).¹¹³ The text is entitled “Lecture of the Walkout of Adam and Eve from the Paradise” (*Sak’itxavi Adam da Evaysi samotxit gamoslvisay*), which indicates that it must have been read during services.¹¹⁴

The manuscript of the (shorter) second redaction, which is defective at the beginning and thus provides no title for the apocryphon, has been attributed to the same writer as that of the so-called Queen Mariam manuscript of the Georgian Chronicle, *Kartlis cxovreba*, perhaps even as a former integral part of this codex (Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, S-30 [xvii^{2/4} (1633–46)]).¹¹⁵ The most important argument for this assumption is the fact that the latter manuscript begins with another apocryphal text relating to Adam, the “Commentary on the creation of heaven and earth and on Adam” (*Targmani dabadebisatws cisa da kueq’anisa da Adamistws*) styled a “Sermon of our holy father Ephrem” (*Tkumuli c’midisa mamisa čuenisa Epremisi*), which has been identified as the Georgian version of the *Caverna Thesaurorum*.¹¹⁶ As C. Kurcik’idze states, this apocryphon follows the *Vita Adae* in all other manuscripts containing it so that it is reasonable to assume that

redaction, viz. “Collection Hobi 6 an. 1831”; this information is misleading again, as Kurcik’idze does not mention this manuscript at all. Cf. § 3.1 as to the codex in question.

108. J.-P. Pettoirelli and J.-D. Kaestli, *Vita Latina Adae et Evae: Synopsis Vitae Adae et Evae latine, graece, armenice et iberice* (CCSA 19; Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 757–59 and 763–905.

109. C. Kurcik’idze, “Adamis ap’ok’ripuli cxovrebis kartuli versia,” *Pilologiuri dziebani / Filologičeskie razyskanija* 1 (1964): 97–136 at 97.

110. K’ek’elidze, *Dzveli kartuli literat’uris ist’oria*, 437; Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 336; Kurcik’idze, “Adamis ap’ok’ripuli cxovrebis kartuli versia,” 103; J.-P. Mahé, “Le livre d’Adam géorgien,” in R. van den Broek and M. J. Vermaseren, eds., *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions presented to G. Quispel* (ÉPRO 91; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 227–60 at 228–29; and Mahé, “Notes philologiques sur la version géorgienne de la Vita Adae,” *Bedi Kartlisa* 41 (198): 51–66 at 52–53.

111. Cf. M. E. Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 38.

112. Kurcik’idze’s edition does not contain chapter or paragraph numbers.

113. K’ek’elidze, *Dzveli kartuli literat’uris ist’oria*, 437; and Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 335. According to B. Outtier (pers. comm., November 30, 2015), the synopsis published in 2012 reveals clearly that the Georgian text, the Armenian text, and the Latin version P descend independently from a lost Greek model.

114. Cf. Mahé, “Le livre d’Adam géorgien,” 231 n. 21, as to the use of the apocryphon in the service of the Sunday τῆς τυροφάγου in the liturgy of Constantinople in the eleventh century. It must be noted that the Georgian lectionaries of the (older) Jerusalem rite do not contain the text.

115. Kurcik’idze, “Adamis ap’ok’ripuli cxovrebis kartuli versia,” 98–99, quoting D. K’arič’ašvili.

116. I. Džavaxov [Džavaxišvili], *Государственный строй древней Грузии и древней Армении*. I. (Тексты и разыскания по армяно-грузинской филологии 8; S.-Peterburg: Akademija Nauk, 1905), 26; and Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 335–36; cf. Haelewyck, *CAVT*, 18.

this was once also the case in Queen Mariam's manuscript.¹¹⁷ The Georgian *Caverna* was first edited on the basis of the *Kartlis cxovreba* codex by E. Taq'aišvili in 1906;¹¹⁸ a second edition, based upon nine manuscripts, was provided by C. Kurcik'idze in 1993.¹¹⁹ The text was sometimes identified in the Georgian tradition with a "Book of Nimrod" (*Nebrotis c'igni*) that is mentioned several times in the initial chapters of the Georgian Chronicle authored by Leont'i Mroveli;¹²⁰ however, as I. Džavaxišvili pointed out first, the book in question is referred to in the apocryphon itself so that the latter cannot have borne this title.¹²¹

3.1. *The Khobi Codex*

Beyond the two apocrypha treated above, a few other relevant texts have been mentioned in the literature. In his *Clavis apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti*, J.-C. Haelewyck notes three texts concerning Adam (and other topics from Genesis) that are restricted to Georgian, under the titles *Eiectio Adae et Euae e paradiso* (no. 39), *Creatio caeli et terrae* (no. 40), and *Reuelationes de creatione* (no. 41).¹²² Quoting M. Stone,¹²³ he states for the first two of them that "Interpretatio operis huius incerta est"; for the third one, he admits that "Opus hoc uersio georgica *Cavernae Thesaurorum* . . . fortasse est."¹²⁴ For all three texts, Haelewyck indicates a codex "coll. Hobi 6 an. 1813" as the primary source; for the first one, he adds Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-153,¹²⁵ and for the last one, H-1284 of the same institution.

Here Haelewyck relies on M. Tarchnišvili's *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, which lists the titles of a total of ten "alttestamentliche Apokryphen" from

117. Kurcik'idze, "Adamis ap'ok'ripuli cxovrebis kartuli versia," 99.

118. As "Appendix" (დამატება) I, 786–849; partial re-edition with French translation in Avalichvili, "Notice sur une version géorgienne de la Caverne des Trésors," *ROC* 26 (1927–1928): 381–405 at 396–405 (as "appendice").

119. C. Kourcikidzé [Kurcik'idze], ed., *La caverne des trésors: Version géorgienne* (CCSO 526; Scriptores Iberici 23; Louvain: Peeters, 1993), with French translation: J.-P. Mahé, trans., *La caverne des trésors: Version géorgienne* (CCSO 527; Scriptores Iberici 24; Louvain: Peeters, 1993); the codices used are Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-153 (=B), S-30 (=C), H-433 (=E), H-881 (=F), and H-1064 (=K); Kutaisi, Historico-Ethnographical Museum, 128 (=A); Saint Petersburg, Saltykov-Šchedrin Library, I. Bat'onišvili collection 10 (=D); Tbilisi, (Giorgi Leonidze) State Museum of Literature, 3 [olim 128] no. 3 (=G); and Tbilisi, National Archives of Georgia, 784 (=H). An edition of the oldest fragment available (a flyleaf of an Armenian manuscript of Nor-Julfa, Isfahan) was provided in B. Outtier, "Le plus ancien fragment géorgien de la *Caverne des trésors*," in A. Mardirossian et al., eds., *Mélanges Jean-Pierre Mahé* (Travaux et mémoires 18; Paris: Amis du Centre d'histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, 2014), 489–92.

120. M. Džanašvili, "Изгнание Адама изъ рая, Нимродъ и семь послѣпотопныхъ народовъ. Книга Нимрода," *Сборникъ материаловъ для описанія мѣстностей и племенъ Кавказа* 29/2 (1901): 19–44 at 19; and Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 336.

121. Džavaxov, *Государственный строй древней Грузии и древней Армении*, 26 n. 1; similarly W. Lüdtke, "Georgische Adam-Bücher," *ZAW* 38 (1919–1920): 155–168 at 164; and K'ek'elidze, *Dzveli kartuli lit'erat'uris istoria*, 439–40.

122. Haelewyck, *CAVT*, 27–28.

123. Stone, *History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, 111 n. 123, proposes that they might pertain to the *Cycle of Four Works* (cf. next note).

124. In agreement with Stone, *History*, 111.

125. Cf. note 107 above as to the denomination of the site.

the “Hobi-Handschrift Nr. 6 aus dem Jahre 1813,” some of which “converge with” the “Walkout of Adam and Eve from the Paradise” and the “Nebrot’buch.”¹²⁶ Tarchnišvili’s list stems from a short description of Mingrelia (West Georgia), Monastery of Khobi, 6, which was published by E. Taq’aišvili.¹²⁷ The problem is that (a) the present whereabouts of this manuscript are unknown,¹²⁸ so that the exact content of the texts in question cannot be ascertained, and (b) it can easily be shown that the list comprises nothing but the two apocrypha dealt with above, with the *Caverna thesaurorum* being represented by titles of nine of its chapters, given that other witnesses of this text contain similar subtitles. Table 8.15 illustrates this by contrasting Taq’aišvili’s (and Tarchnišvili’s) list with (explicit and implicit) subtitles from Queen Mariam’s *Kartlis Cxovreba* codex,¹²⁹ Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-153,¹³⁰ and the chapter division in C. Kurcik’idze’s edition of the *Caverna*.¹³¹

3.2. Other Georgian Apocrypha Relating to Genesis

Other Georgian apocrypha relating to Genesis that have been mentioned in the literature remain largely unstudied. This is true, first of all, of the “Book of Genesis” (*C’igni*

126. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 336: “von denen sich einige mit den oben angeführten berühren.”

127. E. Taq’aišvili, “Arxeologiuri mogzaurobidan Samegreloši,” *Dzveli Sakartvelo / Drevnjaja Gruzia / L’ancienne Géorgie* 3 (1913–1914): 1–241 at 160.

128. The codex in question must have been removed from the monastery of Khobi (Tarchnišvili’s “Hobi,” hence Haelewyck’s “Hobi”) together with other precious items in 1923, possibly to the Museum of the Dadiani Palace at Zugdidi (cf. <http://tinyurl.com/khobi1923>); however, the recent catalogue of Sh. Gloveli, ed., *Georgian Manuscripts in the Regions of Georgia. Catalogue* (Tbilisi: National Centre of Manuscripts, 2015) does not contain it (the catalogue mentions only two other codexes from Khobi—viz., the psalter of 1768 [as no. 9, p. 73] listed as no. 5 in Taq’aišvili, “Arxeologiuri mogzaurobidan Samegreloši,” 160, and a collective volume including homiletic, hagiographical, and biblical texts [as no. 21, p. 76] not listed in Taq’aišvili, “Arxeologiuri mogzaurobidan Samegreloši”). The Khobi codex no. 6 is by no means identical with Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-1284 or H-1378, both mentioned by Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 336, as containing related content (see below). The possibility cannot be ruled out that it was destroyed in a way similar to that of the manuscripts of the church of Sori (in Racha), as reported by G. Peradze, “Das geistige Leben im heutigen Sowjetgeorgien im Spiegel der schönen Literatur,” in B. von Richthofen, ed., *Bolschewistische Wissenschaft und “Kulturpolitik”* (2nd rev. ed.; Königsberg: Ost-Europa-Verlag, 1942), 287, quoting the “Yearbook for the Protection of Monuments of Arts and Nature” of the Commissariat of People’s Education, 1925. See also N. Papuashvili, *Aus der jüngeren Vergangenheit der georgischen orthodoxen Kirche—die Erneuerung der Autokephalie und die Reformen* (Tiflis: Universal, 2012), 79.

129. Taking manuscripts S-5175 and S-30 together as proposed above; for the subtitles from S-30, cf. E. Taq’aišvili, *Kartlis cxovreba, Mariam dedoplis variant’i* (T’pili: Dzmobisa, 1906), 786–849. The excerpt in “Notice sur une version géorgienne de la Caverne des Trésors,” 397–402, constitutes the “Testament d’Adam,” including the “Hours of the Day and Night”; this part is grouped by M. E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 167, together with the Arabic, Ethiopic, and Syriac versions of which the “latter seems to be the oldest.”

130. Subtitles according to T. Bregadze et al., *Kartul xelnačerta ačgeriloba: Qopili saeklesio muzeumis (A) kolekcia / Opisanie gruzinskix rukopisej. Kollekcija A, byvshego cerkovnogo muzeja I/2* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1976), 213. According to the authors, a chapter division (with subtitles) is not met with in manuscripts containing *Kartlis Cxovreba*; obviously, S-30 is an exception to this.

131. The chapter numbering was taken over from that of the French translation of the Syriac *Caverna*, cf. Mahé [*apud* Kourcikidzé], *La caverne des trésors. Version géorgienne*, XV.

TABLE 8.15 The List of Apocrypha in the Khobi MS 6

Khobi 6			S-5175 / S-30		A-153	Cav.
Taq'aišvili 1913–14	no.	Tarchnišvili 1955	no.	Kurcik'idze 1964 / Taq'aišvili 1906	page	ch.
<i>Sak'itxavi</i> <i>Adam da Evasi</i> <i>samotxisagan</i> <i>gamoslvisa</i> <i>Ca da kveq'nis</i> <i>gačena</i>	1)	“Vertreibung Adams und Evas aus dem Paradies”	a)	[<i>Sak'itxavi Adam</i> <i>da Evaysi samotxit</i> <i>gamoslvisay</i>]	[S-5157, 1–8]	<i>Sak'itxavi Adam</i> <i>da Evasi samotxit</i> <i>gamoslvisa</i>
	2)	“Erschaffung des Himmels und der Erde”	b)	<i>Tkmuli c'midisa</i> <i>mamisa čuenisa</i> <i>Epremi.</i> <i>Targmani</i> <i>dabadebisatws cisa</i> <i>da kveq'anisa da</i> <i>Adamistws . . .</i> (“Testament of Adam”) ¹	786 793,26	<i>Tkmuli c'midisa</i> <i>mamisa čuenisa</i> <i>Epremi.</i> <i>Targmani</i> <i>dabadebisatws cisa</i> <i>da Adamistws . . .</i> VI.14
<i>Atormet'i</i> <i>žamisatws dğisa</i>	3)	“Über die zwölf Stunden des Tages”	c)	(<i>Žamni dğisani</i> <i>i' b</i>)	794	VIA.2
<i>Atormet'ni žamni</i> <i>ğamisani</i>	4)	“Über die zwölf Stunden der Nacht”	d)	(<i>Žamni ġamisani</i> <i>i' b</i>)	795	VIA.16
<i>Targmaneba</i> <i>dabadebisa</i>	5)	“Offenbarung über die Schöpfung”	e)		814:39 ²	<i>Targmanebay</i> <i>dabadebisay</i> XXVIII.3
<i>Šeneba</i> <i>Ierusalimisa</i>	6)	“Der Wiederaufbau Jerusalems”	f)	<i>Šesuneba</i> <i>Ierusalems vitar</i> <i>agašenes</i>	816	XXX.2
<i>Štaslva israelta</i> <i>egvip't'ed</i>	7)	“Übersiedelung der Israeliten nach Ägypten”	g)	<i>Šesula israelta</i> <i>egvibi't'ed</i>	819	<i>Štaslva</i> <i>iērusalemelta</i> <i>egup't'ed</i> XXXII.18
<i>Gamoslva israelta</i> <i>egvip't'it</i>	8)	“Auszug der Israeliten aus Ägypten”	h)	<i>Gamoslva israelta</i> <i>egvibi't'ed</i>	821	XXXIV.1
<i>Mepe</i>	9)	“Vom König (?)”	i)	<i>Aka ic'q'ebis</i> <i>mepoba mepeta</i>	824	XXV.10
<i>Šoba mamat</i> <i>mtavarta</i>	10)	“Geburt der Patriarchen (?)”	j)	<i>Šoba mamat</i> <i>mtavarta</i> <i>Adamisitgan</i> <i>vidre Krist'ēs</i> <i>mosuladmde</i> (<i>Šoba Krist'ēst</i>)	832 835,71	<i>Šobay</i> <i>mamamtavarta</i> <i>Adamisitgan vidre</i> <i>Krist'emde</i> XLIV.21
<i>Krist'ēs šoba</i> ³	11)	[Birth of Christ]				

¹Beginning of the excerpt as noted in Avalichvili, “Notice sur une version géorgienne de la Caverne des Trésors,” 396.²The beginning of this chapter (XXVIII.3–6) is missing in A-153 because it falls into a lacuna of two folia; cf. Taq'aišvili, *Kartlis cxovreba*, *Mariam dedoplis variant'i*, 814.³This text is not contained in Tarchnišvili's list because it does not pertain to the Old Testament.

dabadebisa), which is contained in Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-1284 (fols. 4–212). In contrast to Tarchnišvili's suggestion,¹³² this text does not have very much in common with either the initial part of the sermon attributed to St. Ephrem or the “Offenbarung über die Schöpfung” contained in it, considering its incipit as quoted

132. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 336 n. 2, cf. note 127.

in the only description available of this nineteenth-century codex,¹³³ which reads like an awkward (and faulty) paraphrase of Gen 1:1 rather than an independent text: *p'irvelad ganačenia ġ(mer)ti* [!] *kveq'ana, da kveq'ana iq'o uxilavi da mounzadebeli* . . . —that is, “in the beginning God let appear the earth, and the earth was invisible and unprepared . . .”

The same is true of Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-1378 (1823), fols. 1–24, “welche Schöpfungsmythen enthält,”¹³⁴ according to the catalogue of the H collection.¹³⁵ This codex consists of three parts, beginning with a defective “Book of the Apparition of Heaven and Earth” (*C'igni gačenisa cisa da kveq'anisa*, fols. 1r–2r), continuing with a “Sermon, Explanation of Genesis, How Man Left Paradise” (*Kadagoba, targmani dabadebisa, tu rogor gardmovida k'aci samotxidgan*, fols. 2r–22r), and ending with an “Instruction and sermon on lodging travellers and compassion toward the poor” (*Sc'avla da kadagoba mest'umrobazeda mgzvarisa da glaxis šec'q'narebazed*, fols. 23r–24v). From the few lines of the quasi-incipit of the acephalous first text that is printed in the catalogue (*ikna sağ<a>mo, ikna dila, dġe me<e>kvse p'arask'evi, xolo šesrulda ca da q'vela mosak'mazi misi da šeasrula ġmertma dġe me<e>kvse da gaisvena dġesa mešvidesa, rom aris šapati* “it became evening, it became morning, the sixth day, Friday, and heaven and all its adornment was accomplished, and God accomplished the sixth day and rested on the seventh day, which is Sabbath”), it is clear that this represents another late adaptation of the history of creation, one that is not identical with the *Caverna*.

Likewise unexplored are the Georgian versions of the *Historia creationis et transgressionis Adae*, the *Historia expulsionis Adae e paradiso*, the *Historia Abel et Cain*, *filiorum Adae* and the text *De euangelio Seth*, which are subsumed under nos. 16, 17, 48, and 58 in Haelewyck's *CAVT* (as parallels of the respective Armenian texts).¹³⁶ To all of them, only vague references are made in a late-nineteenth-century article by A. Khakhanišvili (Khakhanov) and its German summary by W. Lüdtke,¹³⁷ without exact identification of their manuscript source.¹³⁸ Considering the sequence of topics appearing there, it is likely indeed that they pertain to a Georgian version of the *Cycle of Four Works* as known in the Armenian tradition.¹³⁹

133. K. Šarašidze, *Xelnač'erta aġc'eriloba: Sakartvelos saist'orio da saetnografi sazogadoebis q'opili muzeumis xelnač'erebi* (H *kolekcia*) / *Opisanie rukopisej: Rukopisi byvs'ego Muzeja Gruzinskogo Obščestva Istorii i Ėtnografii (kollekcija H)*. III. (Tbilisi: Mecnierebata Ak'ademia, 1948), 236–37; my thanks are due to B. Outtier, who made this description accessible to me.

134. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 336 n. 3, cf. note 128.

135. Šarašidze, *Xelnač'erta aġc'eriloba*, 339–40; my thanks are due to B. Outtier, who made this description accessible to me.

136. Haelewyck, *CAVT*, 22–23.

137. A. Chachanov [Xaxanašvili], “Памятники грузинской отреченной литературы,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 296 (1894): 35–49 at 36–40; and Lüdtke, “Georgische Adam-Bücher,” 155–56.

138. As a manuscript of the “Tiflis Society for the Spread of Literacy among the Georgians” (“Рукопись Тифлисского общества распространения грамотности среди грузинъ”), it should belong to the S collection of the National Centre of Manuscripts today.

139. Cf. Stone, *History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, 110, concerning this proposal, and 102–4; and W. L. Lipscomb, *The Armenian Apocryphal Adam Literature* (UPATS 8; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990), 1–34, regarding the Armenian witnesses.

Also unstudied are two apocrypha relating to Melchizedek that have been detected in Georgian. The first one of them is subsumed under the *Historia de Melchisedech* in Haelewyck's *CAVT* (no. 95), and represents a late translation from Russian that was undertaken by an archimandrite named Giorgi in 1782.¹⁴⁰ The second one, which Haelewyck *CAVT* (no. 97) takes to represent a *Liber Melchisedech*, is contained in Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-1375 (1827), fols. 49r–51v, and Mart'vili 64;¹⁴¹ in the former, the text in question (the only OT-related text among a series of NT-related apocrypha) exhibits no traits of representing an apocryphon of considerable age.¹⁴²

4. Nonbiblical Early Jewish Works in Georgian

All the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts discussed in sections 1 through 3 entered Georgian as integral parts of the (orthodox) Christian tradition. However, the Georgian adaptation of the *Antiquitates Iudaicae* of Flavius Josephus seems to have a different provenance. For a long time, the translation of this work was attributed to Ioane Petritsi (P'er'ric'i),¹⁴³ the founder of the Academy of Gelati in West Georgia, who also translated works by Proclus Diadochus, Ammonius Hermeiou, and other Neoplatonists. He was educated in Constantinople, and he exemplifies the turn toward a strongly Hellenizing attitude in Georgian thought in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. However, on the basis of a thorough linguistic analysis of the Georgian version of the *Antiquitates* and its Greek *Vorlage*, the editor of the Georgian version of the book, N. Melikišvili, raised serious doubts as to Petritsi's involvement, ending with the sarcastic conclusion that the translator "must have been a person of much less flair and knowledge than the famous philosopher."¹⁴⁴

The Georgian translation of Josephus's *Antiquitates* is attested in eight manuscripts, the oldest of which (Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-675) goes back to the thirteenth century. The text it contains is incomplete, comprising only chapters 1 through 15.

140. The text is contained in Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, S-1479, pp. 63–87; cf. K. K'ek'elidze, "Ucxo avt'orebi dzvel kartul mc'erlobaši / Auteurs étrangers dans l'ancienne littérature géorgienne," *T'pilis universit'et'is moambe / Bulletin de l'Université de Tiflis* 8 (1928): 99–202 at 102; K'ek'elidze, *Et'iudebi dzveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oriidan*, 5 (Tbilisi: Mecnierebata Ak'ademi, 1957), 3–114 at 9 (no. 16); G. Peradze, "Die alt-christliche Literatur in der georgischen Überlieferung," *Oriens Christianus* 25–26 (3. ser. 3–4) (1928–1929): 109–116 at 115 (no. 10); and C. Böttrich, *Melchisedek. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Weisheitliche, magische und legendarische Erzählungen*, I–II (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2010), 23.

141. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, 336n4.

142. Cf. the title and incipit quoted in Šarašidze, *Xelnač'erta aqč'eriloba*, 336–37 (text no. 10): *siť'q'va melkisedek'zeda, tu vin iq'o. erti xemc'ipe iq'o ieruselems, saxeli salim, da eq'ola imas erti švili, saxeli sağa*. "Sermon on Melchizedek, who he was. There was a king in Jerusalem, Salim (by) name, and he had one child, Sağa (by) name." An apocryphon referring to Noe may be contained on the first folio of the unedited Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, A-625 (according to the catalogue by T. D. Žordanija, *Описание рукописей Тифлисского Церковного Музея Карпалино-Кахетинского духовенства*. Кн. II (Издание Церковного Музея 9; Tiflis: Gutenberg, 1902), 116: "Отрывокъ изъ повѣствованія о патриархѣ Ноѣ"). Whether this is related to the Armenian *Historia Noe* (Haelewyck, *CAVT* 84) remains unclear.

143. The assumption is first attested in the work of the eighteenth-century lexicographer Davit Rek't'ori; cf. N. Melikišvili, *Ioseb Plaviosi, Motxrobani iudaebrivisa dzuelsit'q'uaobisani. I* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1987), 70, with reference to V. Beridze and Iv. Lolašvili.

144. Melikišvili, *Ioseb Plaviosi*, 70–84.

The same holds true of the sixteenth-century manuscript no. 10 of the Historico-Ethnographical Museum, Kutaisi. All the other manuscripts date from the nineteenth century. In two manuscripts (Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, S-315/321 and S-372/375) the text is complete, with chapters 16 to 20 added in a new translation accomplished by a priest named D. Inanišvili in 1835–1836 on the basis of a Russian *Vorlage*.¹⁴⁵ It is clear from this that only the text of the first fifteen chapters can be claimed to represent the medieval translation, and the date of the oldest manuscript available still admits of assigning this to the Hellenizing milieu of Petritsi's time.

In contrast to the *Antiquitates*, the other works by Flavius Josephus do not appear to have been translated into Georgian, at least not in a coherent form. However, we do find allusions to the *Jewish War* in a historiographical text pertaining to the *Georgian Chronicle*, which indicates that this work, too, was known to Georgian writers by about the twelfth century. The text in question is the (anonymous) *Vita* of the King David the Builder (1089–1125), which is assumed to have been written shortly after his death.¹⁴⁶ In this text, a writer named *Iosip'os ebraeli*—that is, Joseph the Hebrew—is mentioned, along with the Hellenes (*elinta*) Homer (*Umiros*), and Aristobulus of Cassandreia (*Arist'ovli*), the third in a triad of “great and famous narrators” (*didni igi da saxelovanni gamomet'q'uelni*) who wrote about the Trojans and Achaeans, Alexander, and Vespasian and Titus (*mesameman Vespasiane T'it'o[y]s-mierni met'ometa twsta zedani č'irni miscna ač'č'erasa* “the third one dedicated himself to describe the extreme hardships inflicted on his compatriots by Vespasian and Titus”).¹⁴⁷ Likewise, the anonymous, fifteenth-century chronicler of the Mongol invasions (*Žamtaagmč'ereli*, i.e., “Chronographer”) mentions a few centuries later the total destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian (*Ierusalimisa sruliadsa mosp'olvasa T'it'es da Uespasianes mier*) “as told by the chronographer and multi-narrator Joseph in the great distress of the Judaeans” (*vitarcā žamtaagmč'ereli da mravalmomtxrobeli Iosip'os č'armoit'q'ws esoden dzneldobasa iudeltasa*).¹⁴⁸

In both of these cases, the name form *Iosip'os* can be taken to indicate a Greek source for the information used. This assumption is clearly supported by the fact that the same name form occurs also in the Georgian version of the *Chronicle* by George Hamartolos, which is attributed to the Hellenizing school of Gelati. In this text, Josephus is mentioned many times, once along with *Pilon*—that is, Philo Judaeus—both being characterized as the “wise men of the Jews” (*huriataganni brdzenni*).¹⁴⁹ However, unlike Josephus, the latter author seems not to have gained much ground in the Georgian tradition, given that neither his works nor his name has yet been detected elsewhere.

145. K'ek'elidze, *Dzveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oria*, 287 n. 2; and Melikišvili, *Ioseb Plaviosi*, 13.

146. M. Šanidze, *Cxorebay mepet-mepisa davitisi* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1992).

147. S. Q'auxč'išvili, *Kartlis Cxovreba. (Istoriya Gruzii)* I (Tbilisi: Saxelgami, 1955), 342; and Šanidze, *Cxorebay mepet-mepisa davitisi*, 192–93.

148. S. Q'auxč'išvili, *Kartlis Cxovreba. (Istoriya Gruzii)*. II. (Tbilisi: Saxelgami, 1959), 176, l. 17; and R. K'ik'nadze, *Žamtaagmč'ereli, Asč'lovani mat'iane* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1987), 61. Cf. Melikišvili, *Ioseb Plaviosi*, 7 n. 7, on additional literature on these quotations.

149. Q'auxč'išvili, *Xronografi Giorgi Monazonisay*, 164.

TABLE 8.16 Collation of Kartlis Cxovreba and Mokcevey Kartlisay

K.Cx. (Leont'i Mroveli) sect. XIV ¹	M.K. (Shat'berdi version), ch. 1 ²
<i>meatertmet'e mepeni bart'am and kartam, dzeni aderk'i</i> <i>somexta mepisa, aršak'unianni</i> The eleventh kings, Bart'am and Kartam, sons of Aderk'i, the king of the Armenians, Arsacids <i>da mepobdes šemdgomad missa dzeni misni.</i> And after him his sons were kings.	<i>i 'b.</i> 19. <i>da mepobda kardzam armazs da mcxetas brat'man.</i> And in Armazi, Karzam was king, and in Mtskheta, Brat'man.
<i>xolo amatsa mepobasa uespašianos bromta k'eisarman</i> <i>c'armot'quena ierusalemi,</i> And during their reign, Vespasian, the Roman emperor, conquered Jerusalem, <i>da munit ot'ebulni uriani movides mcxetas da dasxdes</i> <i>dzuelrave uriata tana . . .</i> and Jews who had fled from there came to Mtskheta and settled together with the old Jews . . .	<i>da amatta šamta huriani movides mcxetas da dasxdes.</i> And in their times, Jews came to Mtskheta and settled there.

¹Q'auxčišvili, *Kartlis Cxovreba. (Istorija Gruzii)*, I.44, lines 1–4.²Gigineišvili and Giunašvili, *Šat'berdis k'rebuli X sauk'unisa*, 321, lines 12–13; Il. Abulaže, red., *Šveli kartuli agiografiuli lit'erat'uris zeglebi*, c. 1 (V–X ss.) (Tbilisi: Sak.SSR Mecnierebata Ak'ademiis Gamomcemloba, 1963), 82, lines 19–21. The so-called Č'eliši version of the “Conversion” does not contain the “Kings' List.”

No direct connection with the works by Josephus can be established for the *Georgian Chronicle's* claim that Jerusalem was conquered by Vespasian during the time of Kings Kartam and Bart'am, whereafter Jewish refugees arrived in Mtskheta to settle with the Jews already present. This information cannot have been invented by Leont'i Mroveli (the author of the *Chronicle*) by analogy to the first destruction of the Temple and the alleged arrival of the first Jews in Georgia in the course of the Babylonian exile,¹⁵⁰ but it is obviously derived from a shorter testimony we find in the “Conversion of Kartli” (*Mokcevey Kartlisay*), the compilation of texts pertaining to the legend of St. Nino (see introductory paragraph). The passage in question, which is contained only in the so-called “Kings' List” within the older (Shat'berdi) version of the legend, is much less verbose than its parallel in Leont'i Mroveli's text as the collation in Table 8.16 shows. The differences in the name forms remain unexplained.

5. Future Avenues of Exploration

It will be clear from the survey above that much research is still necessary with respect to the Georgian versions of Jewish texts. This is true, first of all, for a thorough investigation of the Wisdom of Sirach as contained in the Oshk'i and Jerusalem Bibles. In addition, it would be worthwhile indeed to treat the last pages from the apocalypse of Esdras in the latter codex with multispectral imaging to enhance their readability. In the case of

150. This was suggested by Lerner, *Evrei Gruzii ot Ellenizma do pozdnego feodalizma*, 10: “Леонти Мровели попросту увязывает приход евреев в Картли с хорошо известными ему судьбоносными событиями в истории еврейского народа – с падением Первого и Второго храмов.”

apocryphal texts relating to Genesis, a search for the Khobi manuscript would be of extreme importance in order to verify its contents. The Georgian tradition is too rich and, at least in parts, too important to leave the history of the texts concerned unexplored.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bensly, R. L. *The Fourth Book of Ezra: The Latin Version*. Texts and Studies 3.2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895.
- Blake, R. P. "Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens de la Bibliothèque patriarcale grecque à Jérusalem [1]." *ROC*, 3 ser. 3 = 23 (1922–1923): 345–413.
- . "The Georgian Version of Fourth Esdras from the Jerusalem Manuscript." *HTR* 19 (1926): 299–375.
- . "The Athos Codex of the Georgian Old Testament." *HTR* 22 (1929): 33–56.
- . "The Georgian Text of Fourth Esdras from the Athos Manuscript." *HTR* 22 (1929): 57–105.
- Cagareli, A. A. *Памятники грузинской старины в Святой Земле и на Синае: Православный Палестинский сборник 4.1*. Sankt Petersburg: Akademija Nauk, 1888, 143–92 and 193–240.
- . *Свидѣнія о памятникахъ грузинской письменности*. Т. I, вып. 2. Sankt Petersburg: Akademija Nauk, 1889, 143–92 and 193–240.
- Dočanašvili, E. *Mcxeturi xelnač'eri (Ek'lesiast'e, Sibrdzne Solomonisa, Keba Kebata Solomonisa . . .)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1985.
- Džavaḥov [Džavaḥišvili], I. *Государственный строй древней Грузии и древней Армении I*. Тексты и разыскания по армяно-грузинской филологии 8. Sankt Peterburg: Akademija Nauk, 1905.
- Garitte, G. *Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens littéraires du Mont Sinaï*. CSCO 165, Subsidia 9. Louvain: Durbecq, 1956.
- Giginešvili, B., and E. Giunašvili. *Šat'berdis k'rebuli X sauk'unisa*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1979.
- Gippert, J. *Iranica Armeno-Iberica. Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen [1]*. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Iranistik 26. Sitzungsbericht der phil.-hist. Klasse 606. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1993.
- . ed., *The Old Georgian Palimpsest Codex Vindobonensis georgicus 2*. In co-operation with Zurab Sarjveladze and Lamara Kajaia. Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi, Series Ibero-Caucasica 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- Gloveli, S., ed. *Georgian Manuscripts in the Regions of Georgia: Catalogue*. Materials for publication prepared by G. Gagnidze, Sh. Gloveli, D. Gogashvili, M. Karanadze, Th. Otkhmezuri, N. Chkhivadze. Tbilisi: National Centre of Manuscripts, 2015.
- Haelewyck, J.-C. *Clavis apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.
- Klijn, A. F. J. *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra)*. GCS. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992.
- Kourcikidzé [Kurcik'idze], C. *La caverne des trésors. Version géorgienne. Editée*. CSCO 526. Scriptores iberici, 23. Louvain: Peeters, 1993.
- . *Dzveli aḡtkmis ap'ok'ripebis kartuli versiebi (X–XVIII ss. xelnač'erta mixedvit)*. I. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1970.
- . *Dzveli aḡtkmis ap'ok'ripuli (arakanonik'uri) c'ignebis kartuli versiebi*. II. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1973.
- . *Adamis ap'ok'ripuli cxovrebis kartuli versia. (Dzveli kartuli ap'ok'ripuli lit'erat'uris dzegebi 1.)* Tbilisi: C'm. Irineos Lionelis sax. bibliur-teologiuri inst'it'ut'i, 2003.
- Mahé, J.-P., trans. *La caverne des trésors. Version géorgienne*. CSCO 527, Scriptores iberici 24. Louvain: Peeters, 1993.
- Melikišvili, N. *Ioseb Plaviosi, Motxrobani iudaebrivisa dzuelsit'q'uaobisani*. I. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1987.
- Stone, M. E. *The Armenian Version of IV Esra*. UPATS 1. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979.
- . *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*. SBLEJL 3. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve*. SVTP 14. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Tarchnišvili, M. *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, 1955.
- Violet, B. *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra)*. 1. Tl.: *Die Überlieferung*. GCS 18. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910.
- . *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt*. GCS 32. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924.