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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
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. 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.

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,

---


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 Oshki in the province of T’ao-K’larjeti in Eastern Anatolia. The so-called Oshki 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 Oshki Bible, seven hundred years would pass before a Bible codex of comparable extent was again created in Georgia, the so-called Mtshketa Bible compiled by the monk Sul’khan-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 Oshki 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).


\(^{6}\) 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.


\(^{9}\) 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 detail\(^\text{10}\), 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, Sul’khan-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,\(^\text{11}\) 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, géorg. 3 [x]), two codices from Svaneti ([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),\(^\text{12}\) as well as (Khanmet’i and post-Khanmet’i) fragments in the underwriting of palimpsests.\(^\text{13}\)

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


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*, 7–14.

14. *Sap. Sal.* 1:1–2:4 (erroneously entitled Ḣaqetwy, 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. Tarchnischvili, *Le grand lectionnaire de l’Église de Jérusalem (IVe–VIIIe siècles)* (CSCO 188 and 204, Scriptores Iberici 9 and 13; Louvain: CSCO, 1959–1960).


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. Dočana, *Mecniereba, 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/etcx/cauc/ageo/at/mcat/mcat.htm provides the correct references.


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 3–409 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.

questions: Where did the text of the Oshk’i Bible originate, when and by whom was it accomplished, and what was its Vorlage? 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) sibrne solomonisi p’anaret’osi: k.(rist’)e ṣ(ei)č’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 Iviron monastery, John the Athonite. The first part of the rubric, however, names the text (Sibrne 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. πανάρετος, lit. “all-virtuous,” which is used as an epithet of the Wisdom of Solomon in the Expositio fidei by John of Damascus; accordingly, the text also occurs in the (hitherto unedited) Georgian version of the Expositio (styled gardamocema in Georgian, literally rendering Gk. ἔκθεσις), which is preserved in Tbilisi, K. Kekelidze.
National Centre of Manuscripts, A-24 (xi). Table 8.1 demonstrates that the Georgian text follows the Greek 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, 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. Kurci’idze with respect to the testimony of John of Damascus. Note here Table 8.2 for the passage in question.

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”). 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 ἀαρ

26. This answers the question raised by Kurci’idze in her account as to whether the term “belonged” to John of Damascus (Dzveli a’gtkmis ap’ok’ripuli (arakanonik’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.
or Syr. b-ᵣᵣₒ “in the ark,” both reflecting Hebr. ˒ārôn (“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 πανάρετος 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 Sophia Ἱερομύντος 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’Épiphane 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’Aharon, 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 (aron-). The rendering of the word meaning the ark by a stem in -a (matching Syr. ˒ārōnā rather than Gk. ἀαρών) 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, 139, l. 7 and 2, 254, l. 2: ˒ ārōnă (matching Syr. ˒ārōnā) can be taken as an indication of a Syriac “intermediary” as suggested by Van Esbroeck, 7.
33. M. Gronewald, Didynos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes (TL 5; Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 24; Bonn: Habelt, 1979), 64: 288, l. 6: ˒ ārōn (matching Syr. ˒ārōnā) can be taken as an indication of a Syriac “intermediary” as suggested by Van Esbroeck, 7.
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 Stylete le jeune (521–592), Introduction et texte grec (SubH 32; Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1962), ch. 37, l. 15–16.
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 panarétes 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 ..."

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 Σολομῶν (sic!) and the panárëtovn sofìán,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 panárëtovn Σοφία as the author of the Canticum as shown in Table 8.6.40

Likewise, the Pseudo-Athanasián 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, "Katalogh gruzinskih' rukopisi tsvetnoj Siniagskogo monastyrya," in Памятники грузинской письменности (t. I, vyp. 2; Sankt Petersburg: Akademija Nauk, 1888), 193–240 at 228; cf. also Сводные о памятниках грузинской письменности (ч. I, vyp. 2; Sankt Petersburg: Akademija Nauk, 1889), 193–240 at 228.
40. PG 61, col. 693, l. 25.
This formula reappears in the Synopsis of Pseudo-Chrysostom, which depends on Pseudo-Athanasius for the Wisdom of Solomon but adds, in the subsequent treatise on Proverbs, an explicit discussion on Solomon's authorship (Table 8.7).

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).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Οὐ γὰρ ἄφησεν τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος Ἠρωύδην τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γράφατον· ἧν ἡ πανάρετος Σοφία ἐν τοῖς ἰσόμοιον ἀνακηρύττει. Εξεγέρω, βοήθσαι, καὶ ἤρρων, νότη, διάπνευσον κῆπόν μου, καὶ Ῥεψάτωσαν ἀρώματα.</td>
<td>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 Panarétes Wisdom proclaims in the Cantic: “Awake, O north wind, and come, O south wind, blow upon my garden, and let (its) spices flow” [Cant. 4.16].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Συνέγραψε δὲ, ὡς μὲν τινὲς φασί, τρία μόνα βιβλία. Τοῦτο τε, καὶ τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστήν, καὶ τὸ Λυσμα τῶν ἰσόμοιον ἀνακηρύττει. ὡς δὲ τινες, καὶ τὴν Σοφίαν τὴν ἀπογεγραμμένην καὶ λεγομένην Πανάρετον· γνησία γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ταύτην λέγουσι εἶναι.</td>
<td>He wrote, as some people say, only three books: this one [i.e., Proverbs], the Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs; others, however, claim also the Sapientia registered [under his name] and called the Panarétes to be a genuine [work] of his.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τρεῖς τοίνυν αὐτοῦ βιβλίου ἀνοθεύτους εὑρίσκομεν, τὴν τε παροιμίαν, τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστήν καὶ τὸ Ἰσόμοιον τῶν ἰσόμοιον.</td>
<td>Three books of his [Solomon], then, we regard as genuine: the [book of] Proverbs, the Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὡς δὲ τινες καὶ τὴν λεγομένην σοφίαν πανάρετον εἰς αὐτὸν περιπλέκωσιν, ἤντιν ξένην καὶ ἀλλοτρίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπιστάμεθα, ὡς πάντως οὐκ ἄρχον ἔπεισαν αὐτού ἐπιστάμεθα, ἢ μόνον ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων, ἢ πάντως εὐσάτωσαν ἁρώματα.</td>
<td>How, however, may some also associate the so-called Sophia panarétes 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 . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Σολομόντος τῆς λεγομένης Παναρέτου). 41 This formula reappears in the Synopsis of Pseudo-Chrysostom, 42 which depends on Pseudo-Athanasius for the Wisdom of Solomon 43 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

---

44. *PG* 61, col. 370, ll. 30–35.
TABLE 8.9 Hippolytus, In Canticum Canticorum (fragment), Greek Text

"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

"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, seems to count the Wisdom of Solomon as a fourth book of Solomon, together with the other three (Table 8.9).

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 sibrznaít 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 sibrznaísagan with the given passive verbal form) can be excluded (Table 8.10).

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. In a similar manner, Clement of Rome (first century CE) introduces a citation of Prov 1:23 in his commentary on 1 Corinthians by ὁ ὅπως ἢπράξει ἢ πανάρετος σοφία. And the fact that

47. Ibid., 343–74 at 343, ll. 11–12.
48. Gigineišvili and Giunašvili, Šat’berdi k’rebuli X saukunisa, 250, l. 36–251, l. 1. None of the fragmentary versions in other languages (Syriac, Armenian) contains the passage in question.
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). 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 Olympos (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, 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’ ἐν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ ἐγνωρίζετο, ὅ τιν παναρέτος Σοφίαν συντάξας). The same information is also found in later historiographical sources such as the *Chronicon paschale* (c. 630 CE) or the *Eclologia chronographica* by Georgius Synkellos (end of the eighth century). According to other historiographers, it was under Ptolemy V Epiphanes that Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ explained his “πανάρετος wisdom” to the Jews (Ἰουδαίοις τὴν παναρέτον σοφίαν ἐξέθετο); this information, first provided by John of Antioch (sixth to seventh centuries), reappears, with but slight changes, in the *Compendium historiarum* by George Cedrenus (eleventh to twelfth centuries). 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) Eupator and once, to Ptolemy (III) Euergetes. 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. And indeed, the Georgian “kronographe” adduces not only the epithet παναρέτος σοφία, but also the term πανάρετος σοφία under Solomon and his works. But further indications that the same term could also be used for the “Wisdom” of Sirach from early times on...
in both passages relating to the Wisdom but also the attributes brženi “sage”—Gk. σοφός and mnawalscauli “multiply educated”—πολυμαθής referring to its author, Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ. 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 πανάρετος σοφία even “personalized wisdom” (Σοφός τις ἄνηρ, ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ φίλος, ὁ τῆς Παναρετος Σοφίαν ὑπηρέτας, προσωποποιήσας τὴν σοφίαν . . .), and the denomination of his “Wisdom” as being panaretos is even found in the title of the edition of the Latin text published by P. Dolsius in Leipzig, 1571.

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 panaretos-i, appearing simply as sibrynë isow zirakisi—that is, “Wisdom of Jesus (son) of Sirach” (vol. 8, 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 σαλομώντος (London, British Library, Add. 43725, fol. 151r / qu. 66, 8r), and Sirach, σοφία Ἰησοῦ ζίραχ (fol. 160v; qu. 68, 1v); σοφία σαλομώντος appears again at the end of the Wisdom of Solomon (fol. 160r / qu. 68, 1r).

61. S. Q’auxčivili, Xronograp Giorgi Monachos Morokias / Georgii Monachi Chronicon (T’pilisi: T’pilisis Universit’et’is gamocema, 1920), 144, ll. 12–15 (Book 7) / 225, ll. 25–26 (Book 8).
63. “Σοφία ὁ Παναρέτος Ἰησοῦ Τοῦ Σιράχ. Sapientia Iesv Siracidæ, Omnivm Virtvm Doctrinam Continens, Elegiaco Olim Carmine Redita, & Nunc Primvm Edita A Pavlo Dolscio Plavensi. Lipsiae.” Other early editions use the name “Eclesiasticius,” which is also referred to by Luther in his first German translation (M. Luther, Jesus Synach zu Wittensberg verdachts [Nürnberg: Peypus, 1533], 7). The Greek edition of the dictionary by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, Aξίων της ἐλεγιακῆς γλάσσης, vol. 6 (Athens: Pelekanos, 2006), 52, refers under πανάρετος to Proverbs, the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach.
and σοφία ιησοῦ υἱοῦ σειράχ, at the end of Sirach (fol. 185r; qu. 71, 2r). Similarly, the Codex Vaticanus (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Var. gr. 1209) introduces the Wisdom of Solomon by σοφία σαλωμῶν (p. 809) and closes it by σοφία σαλωμῆς (p. 832); Sirach here bears the shorter title σοφία σειράχ (p. 833) after the πρόλογος (beginning on p. 832) and the longer one, σοφία ιησοῦ 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 patriarchale 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. “Каталог грузинских рукописей монастыря св. Креста, близ Йерусалима”; прелюдии I in “Памятники грузинской старин в Св. Земля и на Синае” [S.-Peterburg: Akademïia Nauk, 1888 = Православный Палестинский Сборник 4.1], 143–92 at 152; also in Сводных о памятниках грузинской письменности, т. I, vyp. 2 [Sankt Peterburg: Akademïia 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, Иерусалимский библиотечный список древних рукописей грузинского письма / Краткое описание грузинских рукописей библиотек грузинского патриархата в Иерусалиме [Tbilisi: Akademïia 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.


69. The Georgian text passages are numbered in accordance with the edition in C. Kuric’idze, Dzveli aġtkmis ap’ok’ripebis kartuli versiebi (X–XVIII ss. xelnac’erta mixedvebi), I (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1970), 326–405.
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, Dveli aģtkmis apıkrip’ipebis kartuli versiebi, 348, n.\(^\ast\); and Kurcik’idze, Dveli aģtkmis apıkrip’ipuli, 276). It is not probable, however, for the lacuna between 12.24 and 12.27 (Kurcik’idze, Dveli aģtkmis apıkrip’ipebis kartuli versiebi, 402, n.\(^\ast\); and Kurcik’idze, Dveli aģtkmis apıkrip’ipuli, 277), which must be accounted for differently.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgian I</th>
<th>Georgian O</th>
<th>Latin (Bensly)</th>
<th>Latin (Violet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 1–15</td>
<td>III. 1–15a</td>
<td>I. 1.1–3.5</td>
<td>I. 1.1–3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 17–36</td>
<td>III. 17–36</td>
<td>I. 3.6–7</td>
<td>I. 3.6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1–26a</td>
<td>IV. 1–26a</td>
<td>I. 4.1–6.9</td>
<td>I. 4.1–6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28b–52</td>
<td>IV. 28b–52</td>
<td>I. 7.1–10.1</td>
<td>I. 7.1–10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1–6</td>
<td>V. 1–6a</td>
<td>I. 10.2–4a</td>
<td>I. 10.2–4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7–45a</td>
<td>V. 6b–7a</td>
<td>I. 13.3–10</td>
<td>I. 13.3–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45b–56a</td>
<td>V. 46b–56a</td>
<td>II. 5.6–7.1a</td>
<td>II. 5.6–7.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.56b</td>
<td>V. 56b</td>
<td>II. 7.1b</td>
<td>II. 7.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1–8</td>
<td>VI. 1–8a</td>
<td>II. 7.2–8.3a</td>
<td>II. 7.2–8.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9–59</td>
<td>VI. 9b–59</td>
<td>II. 8.3b–4a</td>
<td>II. 8.3b–4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1–3a</td>
<td>VII. 1–3a</td>
<td>III. 3.1–3</td>
<td>III. 3.1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3b–35</td>
<td>VII. 3b–35</td>
<td>III. 3.4–5.10</td>
<td>III. 3.4–5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.35.1–35a</td>
<td>VII. 36–60a</td>
<td>III. 5.11–7.1a</td>
<td>III. 5.11–7.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.35.50b–68a</td>
<td>VII. 60b–76a</td>
<td>III. 7.12b–10.4a</td>
<td>III. 7.12b–10.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.35.68b–82</td>
<td>VII. 76b–95a</td>
<td>III. 10.4b–12.7a</td>
<td>III. 10.4b–12.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.35.83</td>
<td>VII. 95b–104</td>
<td>III. 12.7b–14.8</td>
<td>III. 12.7b–14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.56–44</td>
<td>VII. 105</td>
<td>III. 14.9</td>
<td>III. 14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.55b–70</td>
<td>VII. 115–124a</td>
<td>III. 15.1–10</td>
<td>III. 15.1–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1–19</td>
<td>VII. 12b–139</td>
<td>III. 16.10b–18.7</td>
<td>III. 16.10b–18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.20–62</td>
<td>VIII. 1–19</td>
<td>III. 19.1–22.6</td>
<td>III. 19.1–22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1–20</td>
<td>IX. 1–20</td>
<td>III. 27.1</td>
<td>III. 27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.18–24a</td>
<td>XIV. 1–17</td>
<td>VII. 1.3–2.17</td>
<td>VII. 1.3–2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.24b [26b]</td>
<td>XIV. 18–24</td>
<td>VII. 3.1–4.2</td>
<td>VII. 3.1–4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.27–48</td>
<td>XIV. 25–26a</td>
<td>VII. 4.3–5a</td>
<td>VII. 4.3–5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{70}\) The numbering of 83 subunits under 5.35 in Kurcik’idze’s edition (Dveli aģtkmis apıkrip’ipebis kartuli versiebi, 363–67) is based upon the Russian translation of the Ethiopian version of the apocalypse, cf. Kurcik’idze, Dveli aģtkmis apıkrip’ipuli, 276 n. 1.

\(^{2}\) Erroneously listed as “III. 10, 4–III. 12, 7” in Blake, “Georgian Text,” 58.
both 6.63 and the latter verse beginning with miuge da yapku “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.\(^\text{71}\)

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.\(^\text{72}\) This can easily be demonstrated on fol. 208r, which begins with the three last letters of the word satnżeta “in the storerooms” 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.\(^\text{73}\)

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

---

**Table 8.13 4 Ezra 4.8–10 in Synopsis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Latin (VI.8–10 / II.8.2–5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8. דא מריישת ש: אֲבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָאָבָа

---

\(^\text{71}\) Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli aģkimis apokriptuli*, 278, suggests that the jump from Esau to Esau is common; in Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli aģkimis apokriptebis kartuli versiebi*, 351 n. *,* the state is analyzed correctly, however.

\(^\text{72}\) Blake, *Georgian Text*, 58; and Kurcik’idze, *Dzveli aģkimis apokriptuli*, 277.

\(^\text{73}\) The last folium indicated by Cagareli in his catalogue (“Ката́лог грузинских рукописей монастыря св. Кре́ста” 153) must be folks. 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 its time. Mari states in his catalogue that “at the end, five folia have been preserved after the 44th quire” (“В конце сохранились пять листов после 44-й гетрады”: Mari, *Ierusalimis berdznuli sap’at’riarko c’ignsacavis kartuli xelnac’erebis mok’le aģc’erloba*, 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,” 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. 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). 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.

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.”

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

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 aġtkmis ap’ok’ripuli, 270 et pass.; “mok’le redakcia.”
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’usay ezraysi vidre a’gmaglebadmde 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 a’gmaglebadmde, with locva- “prayer” instead of sit’qua- “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), 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 ganigrʒos moslvay vidre šwdad c’lad oden, romel ars šwdi dari (lit. “And the course will extend up to seven years, which is seven dari”). 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 Ethiopian witnesses.80 Another remarkable case is the use of davardes “cecidissent” in da aravis auc’q’e raysatus 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 Ethiopian “how the end of this way would be,” and Syriac “how your way

---

79. Cf. B. Violet, Die Apokalypsen des Ezra 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 Ezra-Apokalypse, wie die Fülle der liturgischen lateinischen Sonderhandschriften beweist.”
81. Similarly, in the first Arabic version: “dass du deinen Weg…verworfen hast” (Violet, Die Ezra-Apokalypse, 17).
Blake's proposal to ascribe the curious wording of the Georgian text to a confusion of Armenian "ankal ("fall") with "ǝnkal "receive," which would match the Syriac expression and reflect a presumed Greek καταλαβθῆ ("begriffen werden soll"), in its turn confused with καταλειφθῇ ("verlassen werden soll") in the Latin and Ethiopic wording, is ingenious indeed. 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," which Blake explains by confusion of Arm. šnorhac and nšanac'. This confusion may indeed be responsible for the erroneous rendering of Arm. nšanac' ("of the signs"), which all Armenian witnesses show, by "de gratia" in J. H. Petermann's translation of the Armenian text; however, if we consider that the Georgian text of the Oshk'i Bible has sasç'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 (sasç'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, by confusion of Arm. telk' ("places") with thayk' ("children"). This is again only true of the Jerusalem codex, which has q'rmani ("children"), while the Oshk'i Bible has q'nanis ("fields") as the perfect equivalent of the (sowed) fields of the other versions, and again we may safely assume an inner-Georgian confusion of two very similar words (q'nanis vs. q'rmani), here probably triggered by the double occurrence of q'rmani ("infantes") in the verse before (4.21).

Blake's argumentation is likewise weak when he speaks of iat'ak'i (rather "floor, ground" than "bottom") as an "Armenian word." 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. Second, it is true that Arm. yatak is identical in both its formation

82. Violet, Die Essa-Apokalypse, 16–17 ("wie das Ende dieses Weges sei," "wie dein Weg zu begreifen sei"), and Klijn, Die Essa-Apokalypse, 10. The second Arabic version and the Armenian text have no equivalent.
83. Cf. Klijn, Die Essa-Apokalypse, 10 n. 31, where the reference to Blake's proposal is missing.
88. "(besate) Felder": Klijn, Die Essa-Apokalypse, 34.
89. Violet, Die Essa-Apokalypse, 102–3; and Klijn, Die Essa-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.
92. The Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien (TTITUS) database, which covers nearly all published Old Georgian text material, contains a total of ninety-eight occurrences; cf. http://titus.ikid.gu-frankfurt.de/database/titusinx/titusinx.asp?LXLANG=38405&LXWORD=iat2500ak2500*&LCPL=0&TCPL=1&C=H&T=0&LMT=100&K=0&MN=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, iabravi (“rare”), given the typical “Parthian” sequences of ia- (< *yā-) and -br- (< *-br-) 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 iabravi.

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 codices95 and as sutaël 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, salathibel, salattiel, or sarathias; Syriac šalṭiel; Arabic šalṭiel, šalaṭiel, šalṭiel, 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 codices;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

94. Ibid., 56.
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. Gignei švili and Giuna švili, Šat’berdis k’rebdi X sauk’unisa, 199 l. 8 and 268 l. 25.
101. Ibid., 172 l. 41.
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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," in a similar way to the Paris lectionary, where the two lections from the apocalypse are introduced by sak’itxavi ezra c’imays’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, 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 ostracon from the Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes exhibiting the title ΕΣΡΑ ΝΣΟΥΘΙΗΛ, must remain open; if it did, the case for a (lost) Armenian intermediary of the Georgian version becomes even weaker.

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. A French translation mostly based on the first redaction was provided by B. Outtier in 2012, in synopsis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c’igni ezra sutielı</td>
<td>ezra sutielı</td>
<td>romeli info babilovns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Ezra Sutielı</td>
<td>Ezra Sutielı who was in Babylon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temdgomad samisa c’lisa dacemtigan kalakisayt</td>
<td>temdgomad samisa c’lisa dacemtigan kalakisiga viq’av</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viq’av babilons me, sutiel, romel ars ezra.</td>
<td>babilons me, sutiel, romel ars ezra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years after the defeat of the city, I was in Babylon, me, Sutiel, which is Ezra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

103. Violet, Die Ezra-Apokalypse, 3; and Klijn, Die Ezra-Apokalypse, 4.
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” (“ღვთისმშობლი, ჩვენის გადამხარებამდე პარალელურებზე არომებელი ფოთისა” 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 intermediary\(^{110}\) 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 “Lection of the Walkout of Adam and Eve from the Paradise” (\emph{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, \emph{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” (\emph{Targmani dabadebisatws cisa da kueq’anisa da Adamistws}) styled a “Sermon of our holy father Ephrem” (\emph{Tkumuli c’midisa mamisa čuenisa Epremisi}), which has been identified as the Georgian version of the \emph{Caverna Thesaurorum}.\(^{116}\) As C. Kurcik’idze states, this apocryphon follows the \emph{Vita Adae} in all other manuscripts containing it so that it is reasonable to assume that


\(^{111}\) Cf. M. E. Stone, \emph{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, \emph{Dzveli kartuli li’erat’uris ist’oria}, 437; and Tarchnišvili, \emph{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 τυροφείνος 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.


\(^{116}\) I. Džavašvili [Džavašvili], \emph{Gosudarstvennyj sovremennyj Gruzii i drevnej Gruzii. I. (Tekсты и разыскания по армяно-грузинской филологии} 8; S.-Peterburg: Akademija Nauk, 1905), 26; and Tarchnišvili, \emph{Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur}, 335–36; cf. Haelewyck, \emph{CAVT}, 18.
this was once also the case in Queen Mariam’s manuscript. The Georgian Caverna was first edited on the basis of the Kartlis cxovreba codex by E. Taq’aisvili in 1906; a second edition, based upon nine manuscripts, was provided by C. Kucik’idze in 1993. 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; however, as I. Dzavaxisvili pointed out first, the book in question is referred to in the apocryphon itself so that the latter cannot have borne this title.

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). Quoting M. Stone, 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.” 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, 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

119. C. Kourckidzé [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 (E), and H-1064 (K); Kutaisi, Historico-Ethnographical Museum, 128 (A); Saint Petersburg, Saltykov-Šchedrin Library, I. Baronišvili collection 10 (D); Tbilisi, (Giorgi Leonidze) State Museum of Literature, 128 (=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. Dzavašvili, ”Изгнание Адама из рая, Нимрод и семь послепотопных народов. Книга Нимрода,” Сборник материалов для описания местностей и племен Кавказа 29/2 (1901): 19–44 at 19; and Tarchnišvili, Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur, 336.
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’aisvili.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’aisvili’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


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 codices from Khobi—viz., the psalter of 1768 [as no. 9, p. 73] listed as no. 5 in Taq’aisvili, “Arxeologiuri mogzaurobidan Samegreloši,” 160, and a collective volume including homiletic, hagiographical, and biblical texts [as no. 21, p. 76] not listed in Taq’aisvili, “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. Papashvili, Aus der jüngeren Vergangenheit der georgischen orthodoxen Kirche—die Erneuerung der Autokatholie 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’aisvili, Kartlis cxovreba, Mariam dedoplis variant’i (T’biliis: 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 xelnac aģercioba: Qopili saaklesi waszmoum (A) kolekcia / Opisanie gruzinskix rukopisj. Kollekcija A, bylyego cerkvenogo museja 1/2 (Tbilisi: Mencierba, 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 Kurcik’idze], La caverne des trésors. Version géorgienne, XV.
TABLE 8.15  The List of Apocrypha in the Khobi MS 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khobi MS 6</th>
<th>S-5175 / S-30</th>
<th>A-153</th>
<th>Cef.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tāqāši’vili 1913–14</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sak’its’avi Adam da Evasi samotsi’ara ganmolisa Ca da kve’šgin ga’lena</td>
<td>1) “Vertreibung Adams und Evas aus dem Paradies”</td>
<td>Kurci’k’ide 1964</td>
<td>Taqāši’vili 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) “Erschaffung des Himmels und der Erde”</td>
<td>[S-5157, 1–8]</td>
<td>Sak’its’avi Adam da Evasi samotsi’ara ganmolisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) “Über die zwölf Stunden des Tages”</td>
<td>793,26</td>
<td>VI.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) “Über die zwölf Stunden der Nacht”</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>VIA.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) “Offenbarung über die Schöpfung”</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>VIA.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) “Des Wiederaufbaus Jerusalems”</td>
<td>814,39</td>
<td>Targmanebay dabadebisay XXVIII.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) “Übersiedelung der Israeliten nach Ägypten”</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>XXX.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8) “Auszug der Israeliten aus Ägypten”</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>Stauša ierusalmeta egvi’p’ed XXXII.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) “Vom König (?)”</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>Gamolusa israela egvi’p’ed XXXIV.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10) “Geburt der Patriarchen (?)”</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>Mepe XXV.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11) [Birth of Christ]</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Šoba mamat mtavarta XLI.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12) [Birth of Christ]</td>
<td>835,71</td>
<td>Šobay mamatavarta Adamisitgan vidre Krist’esi mosuladme (Šoba Krist’esi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Taqāši’vili, 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.

_dabadebisia_), which is contained in Tbilisi, National Centre of Manuscripts, H-1284 (fols. 4–212). In contrast to Tarchnišvili’s suggestion, 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

in the only description available of this nineteenth-century codex,\(^{133}\) which reads like an awkward (and faulty) paraphrasis of Gen 1:1 rather than an independent text: p‘irvelad ganaćenia ġ(mer)ti ([!] kveq’ana, da kveq’ana i‘g’o uxivla ri moumzadebeli . . . — 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 Schöpfungsmysnhen 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, targ–manı 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” (Sa‘vla 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 saġ<a>mo, ikna dila, dġe me<kve> parask‘evi, xolo šesrulda ca da q’vela mosak’mazi misi da šeasrulda gnertma dġe me<kve> da gaisvena dgesa mèsvidea, 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 evangelio Seth, which are subsumed under nos. 16, 17, 48, and 58 in Haelewyck’s CAVT\(^ {136}\) (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. Khakhani\(^ {137}\) (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.\(^ {139}\)
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. 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; 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.

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’et’ric’i), 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.”

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.


142. Cf. the title and incipit quoted in Šaradžide, *Xelna’erba ać’eriloha*, 336–37 (text no. 10): *sit’q’va melkisedek’zedu, tu vin i’qo. erti xemc’ipe i’qo iersulems, saxel salim, da q’ol’ma imas erti isili, saxeli saga.* “Sermon on Melchizedek, who he was. There was a king in Jerusalem, Salim (by) name, and he had one child, Sägle (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, *Описаніе рукописей Тифлисскаго Церковнаго Музея Карталинско-Кахетинскаго духовенства*. Кн. II (Издании Церковнаго Музея 9; Tiflis: Gutenberg, 1902), 116: “Отрывок из повествования о патриарх Ноб”). Whether this is related to the Armenian *Historia Noe* (Haelewyck, *CAVT* 84) remains unclear.


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. Inanisvili 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 *Iosp'os ebraeli*—that is, Joseph the Hebrew—is mentioned, along with the Hellenes (*elinta*) Homer (*Umrios*), and Aristobulus of Cassandrea (*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 Achaians, Alexander, and Vespasian and Titus (*mesameman Vesp'asiane T'it'o[y]s-mierni met'ometa twsta zedani č'irni misca aġc'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 (*Žamtaaġmc'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 Uesp'asianes mier*) “as told by the chronographer and multi-narrator Joseph in the great distress of the Judeans” (*vitarca žamtaaġmc'ereli da mravalmomtxrobeli Iosip'os c'armoit'q'ws esoden dzenelbedobasa iudeltasa*).\(^{148}\)

In both of these cases, the name form *Iosp'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.

---

149. Q'auxčišvili, *Xronografi Giorgi Monazonisay*, 164.
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, but it is obviously derived from a shorter testimony we find in the “Conversion of Kartli” (Mokcevay 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

1Q’auxiši, Kartlis Cxovreba, (Istorija Gruzii), I.44, lines 1–4.
2Gigineišvili and Giunashvili, Sat’berdis k’rebuli X sauk’unisa, 321, lines 12–13; Il. Abulage, red., ’evli kartuli agiograpiuli literat’uris ègebi, c. I (V–X ss.) (Tbilisi: Sak.SSR Mecnierebata Ak’ademiis Gamomcemloba, 1963), 82, lines 19–21. The so-called ’eliši version of the “Conversion” does not contain the “Kings’ List.”
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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.