

**The Blessed Theodoret of Cyrus:
The Life, Activities, Creed, Writings and
Their Georgian Translations**
(Summary)

Victoria Jugeli

**Section I
The Life, Activities and Creed of Theodoret**

The preface deals with the significance of the figure of Theodoret in the context of Antiochian theological school and Christian Byzantine world. It highlights the novelty of the work as the research is the first monograph written in Georgian about Theodoret of Cyrus.

The Introduction offers an overview of christological thoughts of the Alexandrian and Antiochian schools, analyzing theological thoughts of Theodoret.

Five chapters present the biography of Theodoret relating about his birth, activities, his significance in the dramatic events of two extremely different heresies that arose during his lifetime, Nestorianism and Monophysitism. It also reveals the important role of Theodoret and Antiochian Theological school in defense of the human nature of Christ. The fact that Theodoret, together with the Antiochian School, which he represented, sided with Nestorius, was turned against him and at the 5th ecumenical council, by the instigations of Monophysites, Theodoret's few anti-Cyrian writings were anathematized. This fact causes disagreement among scholars towards his creed – some consider Theodoret to be Nestorian, some believe that he was a pure Orthodox, while others are of the opinion that he held Orthodox views. The monograph attempts to answer the questions that arose on account of Theodoret's creed. The main line is that Theodoret always held Orthodox views.

**Section II
The Writings of Theodoret and their Georgian Translations,
Ancient Georgian Literature on Theodoret of Cyrus**

**Part I
The Writings of Theodoret of Cyrus**

The first part discusses Theodoret's exegetical (ch.1), dogmatic and controversial (ch.2), apologetic (ch.3), historical (ch.4), oratorical (ch.5) writings, his epistles (ch.6) and works falsely attributed to Theodoret (ch.7).

In the 3rd chapter, the research concerns a lost apologetic work, *Ad Quaesita Magorum Persarum*. Theodoret mentions the work in his epistles (ep. 82, 113), as written before the Ephesus Council (431), and refers to it also in the *Church History*: “Magi is the name given by the Persians to the worshippers of the sun and moon, but I have exposed their fabulous system in another treatise and have adduced solutions of their difficulties” (5.39).¹ There are only three extant fragments of the work.

¹ μάγους δὲ καλοῦσιν οἱ Πέρσαι τοὺς τὰ στοιχεῖα θεοποιούντας· τὴν δὲ τούτων μυθολογίαν ἐν ἑτέρῳ συγγράμματι δεδηλώκαμεν, ἐν ᾧ τὴν λύσιν ταῖς τούτων πεύσεσι προσημέγαμεν (PG 82, col. 1272C).

The first one appears among Greek catenae of the Kings, under the title: θεοδω(ρήτου) ἐκ τοῦ γ' λόγου τοῦ κατὰ Μαιμαχάων.² Karo and Lietzmann, Opitz and Bardy indicated the fragment in the *Coislin.gr.* 8 (115v). The fragment in the manuscript is anonymous. It was published under the name of Procopius of Gaza in the Catena Collection of Nicephoros (the author's name, Procopius, to the fragment had been added by Nicephoros) and in the PG 80, col. 741-2, n. 71. Brok indicated also 6 manuscripts that preserve the same fragment, and PG edition (PG 87/1, col. 1086), that relies on one of them (Monacensis 358). Brok doubted its authenticity and stated that the fragment does not represent the work of Theodoret, but the work of anonymous writer, written against Manicheans.³

The fragment begins with the refutation of the 3King. 22.20: “*And the Lord said: Who shall persuade Ahab?*”, and it has not a polemical, but exegetical maintenance. The fragment concerns with Lord's revelations, his invisible nature, and with the devil, the God's creature being under God's πρόθεσις and disobedient to the Lord. The magi in the fragment are not mentioned and, according to its maintenance, to connect it with the magi and their “mythology” is absolutely groundless. Scholars doubt its authenticity and admit that it is uncertain, the excerpt of which book it is.⁴

Theodoret's any work against Manicheans or any indication concerning them are unknown. In the *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium* (453) he researches in detail this heresy and names the Church fathers who composed the writings against Manicheans and does not mention his own.⁵ Consequently, Brok's statement that fragment does not belong to Theodoret seems to be veritable and, since it has no concern with any question related to magi, it can not represent the excerpt of Theodoret's work against them.

Photius lists Theodoret's few works and does not mention Theodoret's *Ad Quaesita Magorum Persarum*. However, he summarizes the work *On Persian Magic and wherein it differs from Christianity*, the author of which “is believed to be Theodore of Mopsuestia, since he mentions with approval the heresy of Nestorius... He also foolishly talks about the restoration of sinners to their former condition (ἀποκατάστασις)” (*Biblioth.* 81, PG 103, col. 281AB). It is well-known that similarity of Theodore's and Theodoret's names (cf. Θεοδ) frequently caused the confusion of their catenae. Besides, the mentioning of Nestorius' heresy with approval, while Theodore died before Nestorius was ordained as a patriarch of Constantinople (cf. Theodoret's *Church History*, 5.40: “When the divine Theodorus was the ruler of the church of Antioch, Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia... ended this life”), Theodore's writings against Origen, which attest that Theodore could not have confessed the doctrine of apocatastasis, Theodoret's favourable mentions of Origen, as “Ὀριγένην τὸν ἡμέτερον” (*Graecarum Affectionem Curatio*, 6.60, PG 83, col. 977B), “Ὀριγένης, ὁ πολυμάθειαν ἀσκήσας” (*Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, PG 83, col. 345), “ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διδασκάλων... καὶ Ὀριγένους” (ibid, col. 340), “...καὶ Ὀριγένης, τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπερμαχοῦντες” (ibid, col. 349), listing him among other blessed fathers (*Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG 81, col. 32), allows to assume that the lost work which Photius mentions in his *Bibliotheca or Myriobiblon* belonged in fact to Theodoret and not to Theodore (this statement does not rule out that Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote his own work on Persian Magicians), though he knew the book under the former's name.

Part II

² Brok, p. 181.

³ Karo G., Lietzmann J. “Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus”. *Nachrichten Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*. Philologisch-historische klasse, heft I. Göttingen 1902, p. 18; Opitz, p. 1798; G.Bardy, 1946, p. 307; Brok, p. 181; TMH 1, p. 27, n. 4.

⁴ *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. Ed. M. Geerard. Vol. III. Brepols-Turnhout: Fabrieken Brepols, 1979, p. 205.

⁵ PG 81, col. 381.

Georgian Translations of Theodoret's Writings

This part deals with the studies related to Georgian translations of Theodoret's writings and the printed editions of contemporary Georgian translations.

Chapter I – Exegetical writings.

1.1. The *Commentaries on the Octateuch*, from the *Leviticus* including the *Ruth*, is fully translated from Greek into Georgian.

The Georgian translation is found only in the *Ghelati Catena Bible* (A 1108, the 12th c. and its copy: Q 1152, the 12th-13th cc.), which includes all of his 185 commentaries being translated literally, except the 41th-42th of the Deuteronomy, which are slightly revised. A 1108 is incomplete. The translator notes that it lacks at least the *Exodus* (the translator asks a reader to check the *Exodus* for the commentaries, which he had no time to write again). At this stage of the research, on the basis of comparing the A 1108 commentaries with the Greek Catena Collection of Nikephoros Hieromonachos Theotokis, the N. Fernandez Marcos' and A. Saenz-Badillos' edition *Theodoretii Cyrensis Quaestiones in Octateuchum* and PG Greek texts, it can be stated that the translator-editor of the *Ghelati Catena Bible* used the manuscript close to (but definitely different from) version C 37 (Par. gr. 842) of the Marcos-Badillos' edition and the Greek Catena collection of Nikephoros Hieromonachos Theotokis. The Georgian manuscript contains the commentaries that are not included in the edition of Nicephoros and list of Devreesse and, vice versa, the Georgian text lacks some commentaries, included in these editions.

Variations of textual forms of the words and variations in translating methods in some parts of the manuscript text offers grounds to suppose that it was not translated by a single translator-editor. Evidently, a whole group used to be working on the translation of the manuscript – different individuals rendered into Georgian small parts of the Greek text. Later a chief translator, having compared with the Greek text the fragments translated by the group, edited them and included in the manuscript. This way of working on the manuscript can explain why the few pages of the Deuteronomy are not rendered literary, as the whole manuscript is. Another reason that may account for imprecise rendering can be a damaged source. The mentioned group might have translated the *Commentaries on Amos* and *Commentaries on Micah* prophets (cf. below).

1.2. *Commentaries on Prophets.*

1.2.1-2.2. The fragments from the *Commentaries on Isaiah* (66.19) and *Commentaries on Ezekiel* (32.26, 38.1-2, 38.6, 38.10-12) represent a modern word-for-word translation by Simon Kaukhchishvili (*Georgica*, vol. I).

1.2.3. The second part of the *Ghelati Catena Bible* (A 1108) includes the translation of “expositions” (ὑπόθεσις) from the commentaries on Joel, Amos, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah. A few extracts from the main texts are represented on margins indicating that its source(s) preserved the full text of the commentaries.

The second part of the *GhCB* includes the books of Baruch and of 14 prophets (except Daniel and Malachi). The structure of the second, prophetic part of the *GhCB* differs from its first part. In the first part, commentaries are written around the Biblical text, while in the second part each book of the Lesser Prophets is intended to contain 4 chapters: Theodoret's *Exposition, Chapters* by Pseudo-Hesychius of Jerusalem, the Biblical text and the *Life of Prophet* by Pseudo-Hesychius of Jerusalem. The maintenance of the second part of the *GhCB* resembles that of the *Catena Philothei* (cf. CPGr 4, p. 215). Nevertheless, the Georgian translation does not fully correspond to the *Chapters* and the *Lives of Prophets* by Pseudo-Hesychius of Jerusalem edited in the PG 93.

1.2.4. *Commentaries on Amos* (S 417, 12th c.; K 3, 16th c.) and *Commentaries on Micah* (K 1, copied in 16th c.), are completely translated. K. Kekelidze (1980, p. 466) mentioned the Georgian translations of commentaries on Zechariah (K 4), Habakkuk and Zephaniah (K 5); however, indicated translations present only the Bible text.

The style and vocabulary of the commentaries on Amos and Micah resemble each other, both being of the 11th-12th cc., and seem to be rendered by one and the same translator.

Commentaries on Amos and Micah could be the sources for the corresponding parts of the *GhCB*, since despite the changed word-order, the use of words is mostly identical. On the whole, the second part of the *GhCB* reveals that the editor used existed translations, revised them and included in the manuscript.

1.2.5. *Commentaries on the Habbakuk's Prophecy from the Odes Collection*. There is no evidence that Theodoret composed *Commentaries on Odes*. However, the Greek *Catena* in Odes preserve fragments under the name of Theodoret (cf. CPGr 4, pp. 212-213). The Georgian *Catena* Collection of psalms, Q 37 includes a fragment under the name of Theodoret written in the 11th c., with the calligraphy distinct from the handwritings of other texts of the manuscript (340rv). It represents an excerpt from *Odes* 4.2-13 and refers to the 3.2-13 comments of Theodoret's *Commentaries on Habakkuk*. The fragment is the largest and the oldest Georgian translation of Theodoret's *Commentaries on Habakkuk*; besides, it is the only text of his *Commentaries on Odes* and was unknown until now. Apparently, the fragment was copied to Q 37 from another unknown Georgian *Catena* Collection.

1.3. There are three translations of the *Commentaries on Psalms* in Georgian, and all of them are incomplete.

1.3.1. *Commentaries on Psalms* of the *Shatberdi Collection* (S 1141, 10th c.) is the earliest one. The work, attributed to Epiphanius of Cyprus, was rendered into Georgian from Armenian in the 10th c. by a Georgian writer Dachi. The translation includes comments on 1-6, 9.1-15 (except 9.16-21), 44-50, 67 psalms. The translation was published by Ilia Abuladze (*Georgian and Armenian Literary Relations in the 9th-10th cc.*, Tbilisi, 1944, comm. on 1, 4.9-10, 5.1-8, 6, 44.1-11 ps., Armenian-Georgian texts) and by B. Gigineishvili and E. Giunashvili (*The 10th c. Shatberdi Collection*, Tbilisi, 1979). The original name of the author was restored by B. Outtier (Outtier, 1977; *The 10th c. Shatberdi Collection*, p. 425).

The Georgian translation represents a different edition of the Greek original. But for a few mistakes, the text is literally rendered from the Armenian source. However, as compared with the Greek original, the translation is not homogeneous, some parts being literal and some – partly or entirely different from the Greek source published in the PG (especially with regard to the issues concerning Theodoret's theology, preserved in the Georgian translation and lacking in the Greek original). The differences often arise on account on the Georgian translator, who, willing to make literal translation, did not pay attention to grammar rules and preserved the word order of Armenian source sentences. Nevertheless, the translating method of Dachi makes it possible to determine what was included in his Armenian source and what was missing as compared to the Greek original. Although Dachi's translation abounds in blemishes, together with its Armenian source, it nevertheless represents a version of Theodoret's *Commentaries on Psalms*, different from the known Greek edition. The note of Dachi is also important. He stated that before getting down to translating, he checked Armenian and Greek sources and they were “of the same order” (*The 10th c. Shatberdi Collection*, p. 365). On this account Dachi's translation can be valuable for revealing an unknown, different Greek version of Theodoret's *Commentaries on Psalms*. Recently a new, unknown manuscripts has been discovered, which includes the longer versions of Theodoret's *Commentaries on Psalms*.⁶ After the manuscripts are published, some of the versions may appear to be “of the same order” as Dachi's translation.

1.3.2. The oldest Georgian *Catena* Collection of psalms is preserved in Q 37 (1091) and Jer. 1 (13th c.) and is translated by Ephrem Mtsire. The manuscript includes numerous anonymous fragments from the *Commentaries on Psalms* by Theodoret. The Ephrem's preface to the manuscript reveals that he did not intend to translate the commentaries by this author. However, it appeared that along with the comments of Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria, his source also included Theodoret's commentaries, sometimes in compilation with their commentaries, sometimes separately. Some of the commentaries are altered, as the Greek *Catena* Collections being the source (cf. Corderius' edition), some are translated literally. On the whole, the manuscript preserves

⁶ Блаженный Феодорит Кирский. Изъяснение Псалмов, p. 5.

parts of Theodoret's following commentaries: exposition (ὑπόθεσις, 2 fragments), 2-3, 5, 7-12, 14-18, 20-51, 53, 57-59, 62-64, 66-67, 71, 73-74.

1.3.3. Another version of *Commentaries on Psalms*, "Selected Translations", that is "Gamokrebuli", the 12th c. Catena Collection of psalms (K 29, 13th c.; S 1472, 1786, etc. Part of the K 29 manuscript is published by Nino Doborjginidze in 1996 and 2007). It was composed by the representative of the Ephrem Mtsire school. The collection was compiled from a few different sources, one of them being the afore-mentioned Ephrem's Catena Collection (Q 37), and was enriched with the commentaries of other authors translated into Georgian. The most part of Theodoret's commentaries preserved in the Gamokrebuli Collection differs from the same comments from Ephrem's Catena Collection. This fact leads to the conclusion that by the time when the Gamokrebuli Collection was composed, there existed another, presently unknown Catena Collection of psalms. Theodoret's name in the Gamokrebuli Collection is mentioned only once (78.6-7; K 29, 189r). His other commentaries are anonymous or are written under the names of other authors, such as Athanasius of Alexandria and Cyril of Alexandria, Hesychius of Jerusalem and Basil of Caesarea. In comparison with Ephrem Mtsire's translation, Theodoret's commentaries from the Gamokrebuli Collection are rendered more precisely. However, they also include free (51.pr.), abridged (51.2) or mixed translations of comments by Theodoret and other authors (25.8). The translation includes parts of Theodoret's following commentaries: exposition (ὑπόθεσις, 2 fragments), 2, 5-6, 9-12, 14-18, 21-22, 24-51, 54, 57-59, 63, 67-74, 76-78, 80-83, 85, 87-89, 98, 101-103, 105-108, 115, 117-127, 129, 131-134, 136, 138-141, 144-145, 148.

1.4. *Commentaries on Canticum Canticorum*. This modern translation is incomplete. A few fragments (1.4-5, 1.8, 1.13, 1.14) were rendered from the Greek original by L. Kvirikashvili. The translation is published in the *Handbook of Byzantine Literature*. Vol. I. Tbilisi, 1994, pp. 176-182.

1.5. *Commentaries on Epistles of St. Paul*. Theodoret's few commentaries on St. Paul's epistles are preserved in the catena collections translated by Ekvtime Athoneli. The catena collections are composed under the name of Cyril of Alexandria (Ath. 39, 11th c.; extensive collection, contains the text till 1Cor. 8.1-3) and of John Chrysostome (A 445, 11th c.; S 4579, 1814; K 234, 18th-19th cc.; short, selected redaction). Both collections are published by Tamaz (Ekvtime) Kochlamazashvili: *პავლეს ეპისტოლეთა განმარტება. თბილისი, 2003 (The Exegesis of St. Paul's Epistles*. Tbilisi, 2003). Theodoret's name is mentioned neither in the manuscripts, nor in the edition. However, the comparison with the above-mentioned works reveals the author. Some of the commentaries are rendered precisely while others are elaborated, as, for example, Rom. 4.16 and 4.17 are translated as one elaborated commentary. Cyril of Alexandria's Collection contains Theodoret's subsequent commentaries: Rom. 1.9, 1.11, 1.24, 4.16-17, 5.9, 6.6, 7.5, 8.39 and 1Cor. 1.17, 7.8. As for the John Chrysostome's Collection, it contains the following fragments from Theodoret's work: Rom. 1.9, 1.24, 1.25, 6.6; 1Cor. 15.23; 2Cor. 4.4, 5.1; Gal. 4.20; Ephes. 2.17, 3.10, 6.14; Philip. 2.10, 3.2; Col. 1.18, 1.19, 2.16-17, 2.20; 1Thes. 4.15; Hebr. 9.11, 10.1.

Chapter II – Dogmatic and controversial writings.

2.1. *Refutation of the Twelve Chapters*. The Georgian translation of the work, condemned by the 5th Ecumenical Council, is preserved in A 618 (1778) and A 266 (18th c.) manuscripts that represent the *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (ACO). Philippe Kaithmazashvili and Anthony the Catholicos rendered it from an Armenian source in 1776, as stated in the manuscripts, (A 266, 224v). However, P. Peeters called this statement "les surprises du mirage oriental" (AB 49, 1931, p. 431) and found it less credible that Anthony, having been Catholic, could rely on an Armenian work, i.e. the source of non-Orthodox provenance when translating such an important collection as the ACO. Some fragments of the Georgian translation are much closer to the Latin rendition published in the PG, than to the Greek original; however, the divergences of the Georgian translation from the Greek text cannot be fully explained by the Latin source. Nevertheless, it can be stated that the piece was not translated from Russian although Anthony knew this language. That the translation had been made from Armenian source, can be stated relying on the Armenian *ԿԻԽԻՔ ԽԱԼԱԿՐՈՅ*, were the same mistakes that occur in

the Georgian text can be found (cf. ‘ამაღლებულისა კაცისა... თაყუანისცემაჲ’ – τὸν ἀναλιφθέντα ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι (8th anath.), ქრუანთაჲ მარინს ერკრუაყაყსიჲ (Cyrilus hierosolymitanus, p. 237¹⁹⁻²⁰).

While working on the translation of the *Refutation of the Twelve Chapters*, Anthony the Catholicos used the anathemas of Cyril, formerly translated by him in the Epistle of Cyril of Alexandria and Egyptian Bishops to Nestorius (H 307, 1751) in rendering of which he relied on Cyril's anathemas translated by Arsen Vachesdze Ikaltoeli in the *Dogmaticoni* and revised them according to his source. On the other hand, the 1th, 2nd and 12th anathemas of Arsen are close to the 3rd, 6th and 12th ones from Ekvtime Athoneli's *Tsinamdzgvri*.⁷

The Georgian translation of the *Refutation* in comparison with the Greek original sometimes reveals inaccurate rendition of terminology. Some of the terms are rendered through a few synonyms, whereas a few different terms have the same Georgian equivalent: ‘განკორციელა’ – σαρκωθῆναι (3rd answer), ἄνθρωπος γεγωνῶς (8th ans.); ‘გარდაქმნა’ – ἀλλοίωσις (1st ans.); ‘ქცეულებით’ – ἀλλοίωσις (10th ans.); ‘ქცეულებისა’ – τροπῆς (2nd ans.); ‘ცულება’ – τροπῆς (1st ans.), μετάστασις (5th ans.); ‘დაიმდაბლა’ – ἐκένωσεν (1st c-st.); ‘დაცალიერება’ – ἡ κένωσις (3rd ans.); ‘გუამთა’, ‘გუამოვნებითისაებრ’ – ὑποστάσεω (1st ans.), καθ’ ὑπόστασις (2nd c-st.); ‘არსებათა’ – ὑποστάσεω (1st ans.), etc. Besides, upon comparing it with the ACO text, a dogmatic difference can be found in the 1st counter-statement of the Georgian translation, where “οὐκ ἀνθρωποτόκον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Θεοτόκον τὴν Παρθένον προσαγορεύομεν” is rendered as “ვინაჲცა ამის მიგვმისათჳს უწმიდესსა ქალწულსა კაცისმშობელ, და ღმრთისმშობელ სახელ-ვჰსდებთ” (“we call the Holiest Virgin – mother of man and mother of God”), the Georgian text being fully adequate with the Antiochian School doctrine and Theodoret's other works, and being preserved only in the Georgian translation.

Chapter III – Apologetical Works.

3.1. *Cure of the Greek Maladies*. This modern translation is incomplete and includes only 1.10-11, 2.47-48, 9.14-15, 9.35-36 fragments of the work. It was literally rendered from the Greek source by S. Kaukhchishvili and published in the *Georgica*. Vol. I. Tbilisi: 1961, pp. 226-228.

Chapter IV – Historical Writings.

From Theodoret's historical writings, there are translated into Georgian *Historia Philothea* (complete and partial, early and modern translations) and *Historia Ecclesiastica* (3 short fragments, two early and one modern translations). See vol. II for more explicit research.

4.1. *Historia Philothea.*

4.1.1.1. The complete and literal translation from the Greek source into Georgian was made by Ephrem Mtsire (11th c.). The work is preserved under the title: the Godloving Story or the Activities of Ascetics (ღმრთისმოყვარებითი თხრობაჲ ვინათჳ მოღუაწეთა მოქალაქობაჲ). The translation is preserved in two main manuscripts: A 689 (12th c.) and A 682 (13-14th cc.), and in the two-leaf manuscript A 1545a (17-18th cc.), which in the actual process of the research was identified as a part of the *Historia Philothea*, the so-called “renewed folia”, lacking A 689 between 246v/247r. Certain passages in the Georgian translation do not correspond to the Greek text and to its versions, which suggests the use of different manuscripts. There can be also found few extended fragments or simply those of unknown redaction (1.7, A 689, 193r; 2.22, A 689, 203r).

4.1.1.2. Two fragments from the same translation by Ephrem Mtsire (26.11, 26.13), from the A 689 manuscript (260r, 261r) are published in the *Georgica* (vol. I, p. 225, n. 1).

4.1.2. The complete modern Georgian translation under the title: the Godloving History (ღვთისმოყვარეთა ისტორია) was made by N. Tatishvili in 2003 from the Russian source: Блаженный

⁷ A.Chantladze. *Antinestorian Treatises of Arsen Vachesdze in the 'Dogmaticoni'*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press, 1997 (in Georgian), p. 206; N. Chikvatia. “Eptvime Mtatsmindeli against heresies (14 condemnations preserved in the *Tsinamdzgvri*)”. *Mravaltavi* 18 (1999) (in Georgian), pp. 147-150.

Феодорит Кирский. 'История Боголюбцев' с прибавлением 'О Божественной Любви'. Пер. А. Сидоров. Библиотека Отцов и Учителей Церкви, vol. III. Москва: Паломник, 1996. The translation is complete; however, it contains quite a number of errors on account of the Russian source, as well as on account of the translator.

4.1.3. Life of Jacob from Nisibis (*ცხორება და განგება წმიდისა იაკობისი, რომელი ებისკოპოს იქმნა ქალაქს ნისიბისს*), the extended version of the 1st chapter of the *Historia Philothea* is preserved in two manuscripts: S 1141, the so-called *Shatberdi Collection* (10th c., lacks a leaf between ff. 250/251, consequently 1.5-7 chapters) and A 165 (17th-18th cc., preserves 1.1-2 and 1.10-11). It is rendered by an anonymous translator, who did not indicate the name of the author. Some parts of the work are extended with dialogues and changed for didactical reasons. The work is evidently copied from a damaged source and some fragments are obscure or are lacking.

It is very difficult to determine the language the translation was made from, since the text and proper names in it do not give any hint. However, it is clear that the Life was not rendered from the Armenian source as indicated by P. Peeters;⁸ moreover, there is no evidence that the work was translated from this language. The Life also differs from the Greek original. At this stage of the research it can be suggested that the Life was most probably rendered from the Syriac.

4.1.4. Life of Julian-Saba, the 2nd chapter of the *Historia Philothea*, rendered by an anonymous translator, is preserved in Sin. 6 (copied in 981 by an anonymous copyist). The work was published by S. Janashia (*Arili Festschrift*, 1925; *Works*, vol. III, Tbilisi, 1959), who did not have an access to the Greek original and compared the Life to another Georgian translation (A 689). He pointed to the differences and admitted that they represent two different versions. The most important differences from the Life and its Greek source are the sickness of Saba's disciple, two descriptions of the drago murder, etc. Despite the extended and detailed fragments, on the whole, the Life follows the Greek original. On the basis of comparing it with the Syriac text published by Bedjan, we may assume that the Life was rendered from the Syriac source, however not from the versions of *AMS*.

4.1.5. Life of Palladius, the extended and altered version (so-called "metaphrasis") of the 7th chapter of the *Historia Philothea*, is preserved in four manuscripts of the 19th c. (A 469, H 2386, H 286, H 1370). The work was accomplished by an anonymous translator. It was rendered or copied on Mount Athos (A 469, 6v). On the whole, the orthography of A 469 follows the rules of the 18th-19th cc.; however, it frequently includes a number of much earlier grammatical forms and words, which were out of use at that period (ევედრებოდინ, შეწუხნა, აღუარებდა, აღმოსცენდის, შთავიდის, პანდუქიონი, სარკუმელი, მიშვილი, უგევან, სივლგოლა, ელისე აღაღგინა ძე სომანიგელისა). This provides grounds to suggest that the first translation of the Life could have been made in the 11th-12th cc. The Greek words presented in the text indicate that the translator of the Life had a Greek source.

4.2. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Three fragments of the work are translated from Greek into Georgian

4.2.1. *On the Conversion of Iberians* (1.23). The fragment is translated by Ephrem Mtsire. It is included in his work: *On the Conversion of Georgians* (*უწყება მიმეგსა ქართველთა მოქცევისასა, თუ რომელთა წიგნთა შინა მოიხსენებდის*). The fragments are preserved in six manuscripts (A 24, 12th c.; K 25, 13th c.; H 256, 1782, etc.) and in four editions: E. Takaishvili. *The New Version of the Life of St. Nino*. Tbilisi, 1891, xxxix-xliii; T. Zhordania, *Chronicles*. Vol. I. Tbilisi, 1892, 34-36; Ephrem Mtsire. *A Narration on the Reason of Georgians' Conversion, in which Books is Mentioned*. Ed. T. Bregadze. Tbilisi, 1959, 4-8; *Georgica*. Vol. I. Ed. A. Gamkrelidze, S. Kaukhchishvili. Tbilisi, 1961, 215-217. Apart from two lacking short phrases, the Georgian translation represents a literal rendition. It follows the main texts of PG and Parmentier's edition.

4.2.2. *On the Messalians* (4.10) is another fragment from the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. John Damascenus included the fragment in his *On Haereses* (chap. 80, PG 94, col. 736-737), where the passage is incorporated

⁸ P. Peeters. *Le Tréfonds Oriental de l'Hagiographie Byzantine*. Bruxelles, 1950, p. 209.

almost without changes. It was rendered from Greek into Georgian together with the *On Haereses*. The translation is preserved in A 205 (13th c.), H 601 (1746) and A 64 (1751). The Georgian translation is close to the main text of the edition. From the versions of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* (PG), it corresponds to the *cod. Augustanus* (not included in the edition of Parmentier), and nearly to all of its scholia.

4.2.3. *The Banishment of John Chrysostom to Pitsunda* (5.34). The fragment was literally rendered from Parmentier's edition by S. Kaukhchishvili and published in *Georgica* (vol. I, p. 224).

Chapter V – Sermons.

5.1. *On the Divine Love*. The sermon is preserved in A 689 and A 682 manuscripts. It was literally rendered from Greek by Ephrem Mtsire together with the *Historia Philothea*. The treatise deals with the aim and cause of asceticism.

5.2. *The Speech made in Chalcedon*. The speech is preserved in A 618, and A 266. It was translated from Armenian by Philippe Kaitmazashvili and Anthony the Catholicos together with the *acta* of the 3rd Ecumenical Council. The Greek original of the *Speech made in Chalcedon* contains the text till the words ὅσον ὑμῶν προνοούμενοι, and instead of the lacking section adds καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα, which is prolonged with the fragment beginning with Ἐπιθεῖς ἑξέστη ὁ οὐρανός. The same omission is found in the Georgian translation, which follows the main text of ACO 1.1.7. It lacks also the rhetoric questions (ἐπὶ τῷ τί ποιῆσαι; καὶ ἴδετε; ποῖα τοιαῦτα) and two sentences (ἐπιστρέφητε – ποῖα τοιαῦτα; εἰ ἀλλάξονται – Χεπτειίμ), the second one being reduced as it is reduced in the Latin Λc (*Collectio Casinensis* 125) version (the Georgian text is close also to Λw, *Collectio Winteriana* 25). Besides, the title of the Georgian version differs from the Greek one (*სიგეყათა თეოდორიგოს ეპისკოპოსისა კჳროსისა, თქმული ხალკიდონს შინა, წინამჟე პოგიორიგოსთა მწუჟალეებელთა და მოწაფეთა ნესვტორიგოსთა*, cf.: Μέρος ὁμιλίας Θεοδωρήτου ἐπισκόπου Κύρου λεχθείσης ἐν Χαλκηδόνι ἐν τῷ μέλλειν αὐτοῦς ἐκδημεῖν).

Chapter VI – Epistles.

Theodoret's 17 epistles (ep. 150, 152-161, 164, 165, 169-171 and 229) are translated from Greek into Georgian. They are preserved in A 618 and A 266 manuscripts, in the *acta* of the 3rd Ecumenical Council, literally rendered by Anthony the Catholicos and Philippe Kaitmazashvili.

6.1. The Epistle to John of Antioch (ep. 150; A 618, 85rv and A 266, 53v-54r; ACO 1.1.6, p. 107-8; PG 76, col. 389-392; PG 83, col. 1413-6) is close to the main text of the ACO 1.1.6 (*cod. Atheniensis Societatis Archaeologicae Christianae* 9, 13th c.), sometimes is close to *b* (*cod. Basil.* 3, A 4, 14th c.) and *V* (*cod. Vaticanus* 830, 15th c.) versions. It contains an instance of divergency from the Greek text. The preaching of heresy and blasphemy by Cyril (τὰς αἰρετικὰς καὶ βλασφήμους ῥήξαι φωνάς) is translated as the presentation of “the doctrine and blasphemy” (“*მოდღურეებისა და გმობის სიგეყათა წარმოახიბებს*”, A 618, 85v).

6.2. The Epistle to Alexander of Hierapolis (ep. 169, A 618, 273r-274r; A 266, 166v-167r; ACO 1.1.7, p. 79-80; PG 83, col. 1473-6) lacks three fragments: ἀλλὰ κελεύσαι μόνον – σὺν Θεῷ δὲ εἰρήσθω, ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν τοῦτον – οὐκ εἰσπράττεται δίκας, ὁ δὲ λαός ἅπας σὺν Θεῷ – τὰς διαλέξεις ἐποιησάμεθα, ending with the words: καὶ πολλοὺς τραυματισθῆναι. The translation is close to the J manuscript (*cod. Vallicellianus* F 22, 15th c.).

6.3. Another Epistle to John of Antioch (ep. 171, A 618, 330r-331r; A 266, 203r-204r) is translated till the words: “ac minime intellecta confessione contentus” (PG 84, col. 711A; ACO 1.4, col. 132), according to the Λc manuscript. The text sometimes is close to X₁ (*cod. Parisini* 1115 additamenta recentia, 12th c.). The epistle lacks some words that can not be explained by the ACO (Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀναγορεύεται, παθητὸς δὲ ὁ ναὸς, τῶν μὲν ἀποστολικῶν σπερμάτων ἀλλότρια) or *Synodicon* versions (“*rogamus tuum sanctum caput*”).

6.4. The Epistle to the people of Constantinople (ep. 229, A 618, 319r-320v; A 266, 197rv). The Greek version is lost. The Georgian translation is close to the Latin *Lupus* version (ACO 1.4). The epistle lacks three

fragments: “inspectis namque – custodit in omnibus”, “credimus igitur unam – non inimicis offerimus”, “Haec vobis iterum – till the end”. Two phrases of dogmatic maintenance are also omitted: “antequam nasceretur, non erat”, “passibilem circa id quod visibile est” (ACO 1.4, p. 83³⁵⁻³⁶, 84⁴⁰⁻⁴¹).

6.5-17. The letters written under the name of Antiochian synod (ep. 152-161, 164, 165, 170, they are ascribed to Theodoret in the PG) were also rendered together with the collection of the ACO. All epistles are fully translated from Armenian; however, 3 of them lack some fragments: ep. 164 (lacks the fragment from “Proposuiimus igitur” till the end of the epistle), ep. 165 (lacks 3 fragments: “juraverimusque saepius pientissimo regi – salvatoris nostri futuro saeculo”, “Porro ut vestra sanctitatis – manifeste redarguendas” and “Omnem que vobiscum est” till the end of the epistle), ep. 170 (lacks 3 fragments: ἔπαυσε γὰρ ἂν παραγενομένη – συμφέρεται δὲ λίαν τῇ τῶν αἰρετικῶν διδασκαλίᾳ, γινωσκέτω δέ σου ἡ ἀγιότης ὡς οὐκ ἤρκεσε συνήθως τῆς εὐσεβείας ὑπερασπιζούσης and μὴ τοίνυν καταφρονήση – till the end of the epistle). It is remarkable that the Greek collection of the ACO includes a full version of these epistles and their abridgement can be ascribed either to the (Armenian) source of the Georgian translation, or to the initiative of the translators. The divergences can be found also in the Greek/Latin and Georgian epistle titles. Some titles are close to the Greek ones (ep. 152-154, 157, 161), and some – are not (ep. 155, 156, 159, 160, 164, 165), while two are not close to the titles of the ACO, but in accordance with those in the PG (ep. 158, 170). The Georgian texts of epistles are closer to the Greek A (cod. *Atheniensis Societatis Archaeologicae Christianae* 9, 13th c.) and V (cod. *Vaticanus* 830, 15th c.) versions; however, they do not fully correspond to them.

Chapter VII – Attributed Writings.

7.1. From the works attributed to Theodoret only the *Epistle to Sporacius* is translated from Greek into Georgian. It is preserved in the *Dogmaticoni* versions (S 1463, 12th-13th cc.; K 24, 16th c. and etc), as the 14th question of the work of Theodore Abuqurra, *σοσιολογῶν ἀσθῶν* (*Capitulorum Diversorum seu Dubitationum Solutio*). The work was published by A.Chantladze (*Antinestorian Treatises in the Dogmaticoni of Arsen Vachesdze*, Tbilisi, 1997, p. 178-180). The epistle is rendered literally; however, it lacks the beginning (till Ἑλληνικοῖς συνταράπτων σοφίσμασι), the middle part (καὶ πόλεμον ἀντικρυσ – ποιήσομαι μάρτυρα) and the end (from the words Ταῦτα μὲν ὡς ἀπὸ πολλῶν).

Chapter VIII – Doubtful Works and Those Falsely Ascribed to Theodoret.

8.1. The *Creed of the True and Sinless Christian Religion* is a work attributed to Theodoret by Georgian manuscripts. M. Tarkhnishvili refers to Michael the Syncellos (8th-9th cc.) as the author of the work.⁹ Three versions of the *Creed* are preserved in Georgian: the *Creed* of “Theodoret” (preserved by 6 manuscripts, the best being Borgia Georg. 4 of 1123 and Jer. 23 of 12th-13th cc.), that of “Michael the Syncellos” (5 manuscripts, the best being Jer. 151 of 11th c., Ath. 79/72 of 1042-1044 and A 584 of 1083) and that of “Maximus the Confessor” (8 manuscripts, the best being Q 34 of 1028-1031 and H 1663 of 11th c.).

The *Maximus’ Creed* is different from the original *Creed* of Maximus, edited in PG 98, col. 1237-1240. In Georgian manuscripts (except A 66) it is included in the Georgian translation of the *Life of Maximus the Confessor* by Theodosius of Gangra. The *Theodoret’s Creed* is translated by Theophile Khutsesmonazoni, and two other creeds – by Ekvtime Athoneli. From the *Creed* versions only that of “Maximus” was published, three publications of it being of the ancient translation, and one – of the modern.

The textual analysis of *Creeds* revealed that all the three creeds are translated from Greek. The Greek original of these *Creeds* had been published by Bernard de Montfaucon in 1715, as a work by Michael the Syncellos,

⁹ M.Tarchnišvili. *Geschichte der Kirchlichen Altgeorgischen Literatur*. Studi e Testi 185. Citta del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1955, p. 179, n. 3.

Λιβέλλος περὶ τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Πίστεως (*Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, pp. 90-93).¹⁰ The publication is based on the Greek manuscript, *Coisl.* 34 (20v). It is noteworthy that such an encyclopedic edition as the CPGr, does not mention the *Creed* among the works of Michael the Syncellos.

All the three creeds contain the list of the Ecumenical Councils. The *Theodore's Creed* counts first 7 Councils, the *Michael's Creed* – 6 Councils (the only manuscript, A 67, adds the 7th Council), and the *Maximus' Creed* indicates 5 Councils. None of these *Creeds* mention the churches where the Councils gathered. As to the number of bishops present, the number of the first 4 Councils is the same in all the three *Creeds*, while the numbers of the rest – vary. It seems that the list of the first 4 Councils was included in the archetype source of the *Creeds*, while the rest of the Councils are, probably, later additions, since the number of bishops present at the Councils and descriptions of the Councils do not coincide. Therefore, the archetype source of the creed could be written after the 4th Ecumenical Council, or after the 5th – the last one mentioned in the *Maximus' Creed*. As to the edition/compilation of the text, it could be dated to any time from the 5th-6th cc. till the 10th-11th cc., to the period of Ekvtime Athoneli's activity, when the first translation of the *Creed* appeared in the Georgian sources. Its editor could be Michael the Syncellos, who is referred to by Georgian and Greek sources as the author of the *Creed*.

The *Theodore's Creed* is the longest version, while the *Maximus' Creed* is the shortest one. In comparison with other *Creeds*, the *Theodore's Creed* contains some additional parts: an introduction, the reason for convoking the Councils, condemnations of heretics declared by the Councils and some other fragments, which are not included in other creeds. The Georgian *Michael's Creed* and that of “Maximus” also preserve some extra and lacking fragments and changes. Despite additions, the *Theodore's Creed* proves to be the best version of the *Creeds* as it represents the best translation and includes literally rendered terms.

In the *Creed*, the most discussed issues dealt with the Trinity, the incarnation of the Savior, his natures, etc. Such disputes were especially intensive in the 5th-6th cc. As to the will, it is mentioned as if incidentally in a very few fragments. In the 5th-6th cc. Alexandrian and Antiochian theological schools preached the same teaching on such dogmatic questions as the Trinity, incarnation of the Savior, His two perfect natures, both unconfused, unseparated, and etc., though with some differences. Georgian *Creeds* are distinguished for an interesting synthesis of both, but not all fragments that represent the synthesis can be found in the Greek original, especially, in the *Theodore's Creed*: “remained what he was... became what he was not *and assumed the form of the slave*” (“ეგო რაჲ იგი იყო... იქმნა, რაჲ იგი არა იყო და მიიღო ხატი მონისაჲ”, cf.: μέινας ὅπερ ἦν, γέγους ὅπερ οὐκ ἦν, Montfaucon, p. 92), “thus, we confess our Lord, Jesus Christ, *the same one as the Son of the Living God and as the Son of the Virgin Mary*” (“ამისთვის აღვიარებთ უფალსა ჩუენსა იესუ ქრისტესა ძედ ღმრთისა ცხოველისა მასვე და ძედ ქალწულისა მარიამისა”, the corresponding Greek text is lacking; *ibid.*), “*and we preach the Lord inhumanated from her*, eternal the same and temporary, begotten the same and unbegotten, passible the same and impassible, mortal the same and immortal” (“და მისგან განკაცებულსა უფალსა ვქადაგებთ საუკუნოდ მასვე და ქამიერად, დაბადებულად მასვე და დაუბადებულად, ვნებულად მასვე და უვნებულად, მოკუდავად მასვე და უკუდავად”, αἰώνιον γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐπίσταμαι καὶ πρόσκαιρον, κτιστὸν καὶ ἄκτιστον, παθητὸν καὶ ἀπαθῆ, θνητὸν καὶ ἀθάνατον, *ibid.*). Together with these fragments widely used in the writings of the Antiochian theological school representatives, there are also sentences which point to the Alexandrian style of teaching: “*and had been born* (γενηθεῖς) in a ineffable manner” (“და იშვა გამოუთქუმელად”, γενηθεῖς ἀρρήτως, *ibid.*), “we confess her the perfect Godbearer” (“სრულად ღმრთისმშობლად აღვიარებთ”, the corresponding Greek text is lacking; *ibid.*). In the middle of another fragment, which expresses the Antiochian teaching: “*the perfect God and the perfect man, not other and other, but one and the same... with two natures*” (“ღმრთად სრულად მასვე და კაცად სრულად, არა სხუასა და სხუასა,

¹⁰ I would like to express my deep gratitude to Natalie Janelidze-Fluitt, Mark Fluitt and Anna Kharanuli for the photocopies of this rare edition.

არამედ ერთსა და მასვე... ორითა ბუნებითა”), there is a sentence traditional to the Alexandrian school: “before the inhumanation and after inhumanation, one *united* (‘mixed’, the *Maximus’ Creed*) hypostasis (μίασ σύνθετον ὑπόστασιν)” (“პირველ განკაცებისა და შემდგომად განკაცებისა, ერთსა შეერთებულსა (cf. ‘შეზავებულსა’, the *Maximus’ Creed*) გუაშსა”, *ibid.*). It should be pointed out that the term σύνθετος concerning the natures of the Savior was used by Cyril of Alexandria in the same sense (cf. Cyril’s Περὶ τῆς Ὁρθῆς Πίστεως, ACO 1.1.5, p. 60).

It is also noteworthy that the Georgian term ‘განკაცება’, which is the equivalent of Greek ἐνανθρώπησις, has a different recurrence rate in these creeds. In the *Theodoret’s Creed* it is widely used even as the equivalent of Greek σάρκωσις (‘incarnation’ ‘განკორციელება’), in the *Maximus’ Creed* it is not mentioned at all, while in the *Michael’s Creed* it occurs only once, instead of ‘incarnation’ (“ჩვენთვის განკაცებულსა მის ღმრთისა სიგყვასა”, cf. τοῦ δι’ ἡμᾶς σαρκωθέντος θεοῦ λόγου, Montfaucon, p. 92). In this connection, we should recall Meyendorf’s opinion. According to his research, the Antiochian Theological School preferred to use the term ἐνανθρώπησις ‘inhumanation’, while the Alexandrian school preferred the term σάρκωσις ‘incarnation’.¹¹

The Greek creed of Michael Syncellos, and especially its Georgian version, the *Theodoret’s Creed*, is close to the original creeds of Theodoret. There are sentences that coincide with those used in some writings of Theodoret, for example, “remained what he was... became, what he was not *and assumed the form of the slave*” (“ეგო რაჲ იგი იყო... იქმნა, რაჲ იგი არა იყო და მიიღო ხაგი მონისაჲ”, cf.: μείνας ὅπερ ἦν, γέγονεν ὅπερ οὐκ ἦν), is very similar to the fragment of Theodoret’s lost work, *Pentalogos*: Μένωσ γὰρ ὁ ἦν, ἔλαβεν ὁ οὐκ ἦν... ἔλαβε τὴν τοῦ δούλου μορφήν (PG 84, col. 68C). The main difference between these two sentences lies in the use of γέγονεν in the Greek text of the Michael’s Creed, the term, which usually caused the protests of the Antiochian side, stating that this term implied the change and confusion of the divine nature of the Savior. Another fragments: “*the perfect God and the perfect man, not other and other, but one and the same... with two natures*” (“ღმრთად სრულად მასვე და კაცად სრულად, არა სხუასა და სხუასა, არამედ ერთსა და მასვე... ორითა ბუნებითა”), “reasonable and intelligent soul, not first-begotten, received from him” (“სული სიგყვერი და გონიერი, არა პირველ დაბადებული, მიიღო მისგან”), correspond to Theodoret’s epistle 151 and to the formula of 433 Union, being, according to scholars, composed by Theodoret: θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος (ACO 2.1.1, p. 108), cf. ep. 116: Οὐκ ἄλλον... καὶ ἄλλον..., ἀλλὰ τὸν αὐτόν, ὕϊον μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ γεγεννημένον.

On the whole, since the *Creeds* emphasize the teaching about two natures, it can be assumed that their archetype, especially that of the *Theodoret’s Creed*, could be compiled in the Antiochian theological circles (perhaps even by Theodoret) approximately between the 5th and 6th cc., in the meantime between the Chalcedon Council and the 5th Ecumenical Council - in the period, when the teaching of two natures became the issue of the most live debates. The dogmatic content of the text and the Georgian manuscripts, which mention Theodoret as the author of the creed, are also significant. On the other hand, it is clear that the work was subjected to a serious revision. Despite the authorship of the *Creeds*, it is clear that all the three creeds originated from one and the same archetype and are to be researched together.

8.2. *Laudations of Euphemia and Barbara* are preserved in A 85 (13th c., 119v and 135v-136r). The textological analysis reveals that the text is rendered from the Greek source. However, the style of these encomia is similar to the standard style of laudations and differs from that of Theodoret. Therefore, the laudations, most likely, do not belong to Theodoret – neither among the works of Theodoret, nor among the notes of other authors about his writings, is there any encomium or a mention of an encomium written by him.

¹¹ I.Meyendorf. *Vvedenie v Sviatootecheskoe Bogoslovie (Konspecty Lekcii)*. New York: RBR, 1985 (in Russian), p. 249.

8.3. *On Investigation (გამოძიებისათვის ყოვლისა საქმისა)*. This short work is preserved in A 112 (18th c., 307v-308r). The author states that nobody must be punished unless the case is closely investigated and cites the events from the Bible when for similar behavior some people are punished by God and some – glorified.

The manuscript represents the Georgian translation of the Russian collection entitled as *Пролог, или Свойственное Речи Синаксариу* or *Книга Пролог, си речь Всепрелестного Собрания*, rendered into Georgian approximately between 1690-1713. A. Demin, researcher of this Russian collection (*Пролог, Литературный Сборник XVII Века*. Ред. А. С. Демин. Москва: Наука, 1978) mentions the name of Theodoret a few times; however, the person with this name is not Theodoret of Cyrus.

8.4. *On the Divine and Philosophical Words (თუ ვითარ სთიანდლო არს გულისკმის-ყოფა საღმრთოსა და ვარემისა ფილოსოფოსობისა სიგყუათა*, A 267 of 1778 and A 269 of 1785). The work is attributed to Theodoret by mistake, owing to the likeness of his name with that of Theodore Abuqurra, to whom the work is ascribed in Georgian manuscripts. The Greek original of the work is published among the writings of Leontius of Byzance under the name *De Sectis* (Λεοντίου σχολαστικοῦ Βυζαντίου σχολία ἀπὸ φωνῆς Θεοδώρου, τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου ἄββα καὶ σοφωτάτου φιλοσόφου τὴν θειὰν καὶ ἕξωτικὴν φιλοσοφίσαντος γραφήν, PG 86/1, col. 1194-1268).

In the conclusion, it is pointed out that the most famous and important writings of Theodoret were completely or partially translated into Georgian. Some of his works are translated under his name and others under the names of another Church fathers. Theodoret's name bear only non-dogmatic translations (for example, the *Historia Philothea*). As concerns the rest of the translations, they are either ascribed to the other authors, or are included in their writings, they are either preserved in the ACO, or were rendered as anonymous writings. This can be explained with the fact that after the dogmatic controversy with Cyril of Alexandria and condemnation of some of his writings, a suspicion in heresy equally fell on his other works and Georgian translators restrained from translating them (cf. Ephrem's colophon on the Georgian Catena Collection of psalms (Q 37, 323v). Therefore, each Georgian translation of his writings is of a paramount importance. Moreover, the study of the Georgian translations of Theodoret's works revealed their importance with regard to the extant Greek and even Armenian texts.

Part III

Old Georgian Literature about Theodoret of Cyrus

Georgia and Georgian scholarly circles have continuously taken interest in the life and writings of Theodoret of Cyrus from about the 7th c. till nowadays. His works were often cited and used by Georgian writers. Theodoret was characterized as “truthful and faultless Theodoret, Antiochian philosopher” (Nikoloz Gulaberisdze, 12th c.),¹² “the leader of Orthodoxes... for the strength of his words and for the splendor of his life” (Ephrem Mtsire, 11th c., A 689, 187rv), “the father of Orthodoxy” (Ephrem Mtsire); however, the same writers did not translate some of his writings due to his theological dispute with Cyril of Alexandria (cf. Ephrem Mtsire, Q 37, 323v).

1. Ephrem Mtsire. The earliest and the most extensive narrations about Theodoret belong to Ephrem Mtsire (11th c.). They are presented as introductions to his translation of the *Historia Philothea* (A 689, 187rv) and of the Catena Collection of psalms (Q 37, 323rv). These encyclopedic notes present to the reader precise, accurate information about Theodoret and his *Historia Philothea*. Some sentences from these introductions can be considered to be attempts to prove Theodoret's theological faultlessness. Ephrem writes: “they regarded the opposition to Cyril as the support of Nestorius and drove him out of the Church”. It is remarkable that Nestorius

¹² G.Sabinin. *The Paradise of Georgia*. Sanct-Petersbourg, 1882 (in Georgian), p. 96.

was supported not only by Theodoret, but by the entire Antiochian school, and Theodoret was “driven out” of the church in the so-called “*Latrocinium Ephesinum*” not by Orthodox fathers, but by monophysites. In another note included in the introduction to the *Catena* Collection of psalms Ephrem praises Theodoret as the blessed father, honored as “the father of Orthodoxy”; he praises his commentaries on the Old testament and Psalms, but indicates that despite this he will not translate his commentaries on Psalms because of his theological dispute with Cyril of Alexandria (anyway, his translation contains Theodoret’s anonymous comments). This fact clearly reveals different attitudes towards Theodoret on the part of Georgian church and scholarly circles. Ephrem’s another note is also significant: “Theodoret condemned twelve chapters that he wrote against pious Cyril”. This message is not truthful, as Theodoret had never condemned his writings. It seems that Ephrem made an attempt to prove to his contemporaries a trustfulness of Theodoret’s works.

2. Nikoloz Gulaberisdze. The fragment of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, included in the work *On Conversion of Georgians* written by Ephrem Mtsire (see part II, 4.2.1), was used as a source by other Georgian writers. One of them is Nikoloz Gulaberisdze (12th c.). In the third chapter of his work *On Svetitskhoveli* (*საკითხავი სუცვის ცხოველისა, კუართისა საუფლოსა და კათოლიკე ეკკლესიისა*), the author makes a mistake when he considers Ephrem’s note that follows Theodoret’s fragment to be the follow-up of Theodoret’s text. He writes: “Theodoret says that Constantine the King sent the bishop Eustathius of Antioch”. However, neither Theodoret and nor even other writers such as Rufinus (*Church History*, 1.10), Socrates (*Church History*, 1.20) or Sozomen (*Church History*, 2.7) mention the exact name of the bishop sent to Iberia.

3. Arsen the Monk. When writing the *Inscription* (*ძველისწერაჲ წმიდისა და ღმრთივ შეკრებულისა კრებისაჲ, რომელი შემოკრბა ბრძანებითა კეთილად მსახურისა და ღმრთივ დაცვულისა მეფისა ჩუხნისა დავით აფხაზითა და ქართველთა, რანთა და კახთა მეფისასა*) and *The Life of St. Nino*,¹³ Arsen the Monk (12th c.) used the work by Ephrem Mtsire *A Narration on the Reason of Georgians’ Conversion, in which Books is Mentioned* (*უწყებაჲ მიზეზსა ქართველთა მოქცევისასა, თუ რომელთა წიგნთა შინა მოიქცენების*) and together with it, the afore-mentioned fragment of Theodoret (*On the Conversion of Iberians*, from his *Church History*, 1.23); however, he did not cite the author of his source.

4. Theodoret in the writings translated by Arsen Ikaltoeli. Writer’s attitude towards Church Fathers can be revealed not only by references he makes, but also by the writings that attract his attention and the works he translates. Theodoret figures in two works by Arsen (11-12th cc.):

4.1. *Dogmatikoni*. This collection includes the work by Pamphile of Jerusalem (Theologos) *Capitulorum Diversorum seu Dubitationum Solutio* (*თითოსახეთა თავთა*). Its 14th chapter¹⁴ aims to affirm that the Chalcedon Council did not receive Theodoret into communion without discussion but received him after the condemnation of Nestorius and Nestorian teaching by him. The work also indicates: “Theodoret, condemned by Dioscorus, went up to Rome... and after affixing the signature on condemnation of Nestorius and his ungodly teachings, was received by him (by Leo the Pope)”.¹⁵

The note most probably implies the epistle (ep. 113) sent by Theodoret to Leo the Pope from the monastery, reporting on the events happened at the second council of Ephesus (later the council became famous under the name “*Latrocinium Ephesinum*”, after the epistle of Leo). Theodoret was imprisoned in the monastery under the order of the Emperor Theodosius II that excluded his travel into another country. A similar sentence is mentioned by Zachariah the Rhetor who also stated that “Theodoret went up to Leo of Rome, and informed him about all these matters; and, with the gift which blinds the eyes of the soul, he got the better of him. As a result,

¹³ *The Life of St. Nino, compiled by the Great Arsen, the Catholicos of Kartli, in the 10th c.* Tbilisi, 1903, p. 34-35. K.Kekelidze admits that this work is not written by Arsen Catholicos, but by Arsen the Monk and is written in the 2nd half of the 12th c. (*The History of Ancient Georgian Literature*. Vol. I. Tbilisi, 1980 (in Georgian), p. 311).

¹⁴ Chantladze, p. 176-181.

¹⁵ Chantladze, p. 181.

Leo composed that letter which is called the Tome, and which was ostensibly written to Flavian against Eutychianism” (3.1). Perhaps these two notes had one and the same archetype, where “went up” to Leo was used figuratively meaning “reached”.

The note is followed by a detailed translation of the *acta* from the Chalcedon Council, the session where Theodoret condemned Nestorius and his teaching and was rehabilitated. After the *acta* comes the *Epistle to Sporacius* attributed to Theodoret to affirm that “Theodoret hated disgusting teachings of Nestorius. And for this he was received by the Chalcedon Council”. Evidently, the translation of this part of the work aimed to rehabilitate Theodoret’s name in the Georgian scholarly circles.

4.2. *On the Divine and Philosophical Words* (ἡ θειὰ καὶ ἑξωτικὴ φιλοσοφίασαντος γραφή), translated by Arsen Ikaltoeli, contains a few fragments where the most specific moments from Theodoret’s life are commented on. It is explained that the reason, why Theodoret wrote answers to Cyril’s anathemas and named the latter as the supporter of Arius’ and Apollinarius’ teachings, was that Theodoret thought Cyril confessed one nature of Christ. However, as the text continues, Theodoret is not presented as the supporter of Nestorius, but only as accuser of Cyril for his disrespectful behaviour towards John of Antioch. The work mentions that there exist false epistles of Theodoret and Nestorius, that present them as each other’s supporters and that these epistles were written by heretics who fought the Chalcedon Council. Moreover, the text further states that whoever wants to know that Theodoret hated Nestorius, must read the book of heresies by Theodoret (PG 86/1, col. 1221C).

It is clear that the text is written as an apology of Theodoret and the theological discussion among Cyril and Theodoret is reduced to the disrespectful behavior towards John of Antioch, which is not right, since the discussion had had dogmatic background. The mentioned epistles, which the author considers to be false, are written by Theodoret himself (ep. 172); as to the “book of heresies”, that is, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, and the Epistle to Sporacius included in it, as implied by the author, is really false. Anyway, the author’s apology of Theodoret and Arsen’s translation of this kind of work is noteworthy and significant.

The translation mentions that in the epistle to Proclus, Cyril of Alexandria wrote that it was not fair to condemn Theodoret since Orientals considered him to be a great teacher and it could cause a conflict with the Oriental Church. The citation of the epistle contains an error. Cyril does not speak about Theodoret but about Theodore of Mopsuestia (PG 77, col. 345C; PG 86/1, col. 1237B).

The text deals with the condemnation of Theodoret’s writings by Justinian. According to the author, Justinian desired to join the Monophysites to the Orthodox Church and for this reason condemned two persons; nevertheless, the Monophysites did not accept the Chalcedon Council. The reason trustfully presents the historical fact and reveals Theodoret as the victim of incorrect religious politics of Justinian, which he really was.

The fragments translated by Arsen Ikaltoeli are significant as they represent the writings which used to build the attitude of Georgian scholarly circles towards Christian authors.

5. Anthony the Catholicos. Anthony the Catholicos (18th c.) presents two notes concerning Theodoret in the *Tskobilsitkvaoba*. He mentions that when narrating about Georgians’ conversion, Ephrem Mtsire used the work by Theodoret as a source:

“He truthfully told us the history
about the conversion from idols to Christ the God
and about the virgin apostle Nina’s
sermon, verily narrated
(relying) on the works of great Theodoret” (strophe 746).¹⁶

Anthony indicates also that Theodoret’s writings were condemned by the 5th Ecumenical Council:

“615 fathers, gathered

¹⁶ Anthony Bagrationi. *The Tskobilsitkvaoba*. Tbilisi, 1980 (in Georgian), p. 270.

in August, in Justinian's times,
condemned the writings of Origen,
again – writings of Theodoret, Iba,
and Severus, tortured by Moon, with them” (strophe 94).¹⁷

It must be mentioned that the 5th Ecumenical Council did not condemn the “writings” of Theodoret, but only some of his works written against Cyril of Alexandria.

6. Mose Janashvili. In his *History of the Orthodox Church* Mose Janashvili (1855-1934) also mentions the condemnation of the 5th Council:

“The Fourth Ecumenical Council repeated the condemnation of the Nestorian heresy, but did not say anything about the writings of Iba of Edessa, Theodoret of Cyrus, Theodore of Mopsuestia. These three teachers of the Syrian Church in these writings supported the heresy of Nestorius. Nestorians used this fact and explained the decision of the Council in their favour. For this reason the adherents of Eutyches became more irritated by the Chalcedon Council. Justinian, having an aim to put an end to the disagreement concerning the Chalcedon Council, convoked in Constantinople the 5th Ecumenical Council in 533 and assigned it to discuss the writings by the Syriac Church teachers. The Council consisted of 165 bishops. They investigated in detail the circumstances of the case, disapproved and condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia and his work. They condemned some writings from the works of Theodoret and Iba; however, their persons were left without condemnation”.¹⁸

It is remarkable that when narrating about the 3rd and 4th Ecumenical Councils, Mose Janashvili does not mention Theodoret, but refers to him only with respect to the 5th Council. The note represents only the statement of condemnation, and as it lacks a detailed account of the matter, it resembles a bare listing of facts.

7. John Bagrationi. Theodoret is mentioned in the *Kalmasoba* by John Bagrationi (1768-1830). When narrating about Ephrem Mtsire, John mentioned that “He translated a sermon of the great Theodoret”.¹⁹ Probably, John Bagrationi implied Theodoret's sermon *On the Divine Love*, an appendix to the *Historia Philothea*, the only sermon of Theodoret translated by Ephrem.

8. Anthony Tsagerel-Chkondideli. The famous Georgian rhetor Anthony (the 19th c.) frequently cited in his sermons Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and Theodoret together with them. The name of Theodoret can be found in the very first piece (*On Confession*) of the 1898 edition of his sermons. He cited the sentence: “The eyes of the Lord are much lighter than the sun”.²⁰ The sentence does not exactly match any extract from Theodoret's writings. On the other hand, it can be a paraphrase of Theodoret's *Commentaries on Isaiah*: “The eyes of the Lord are high” (Οἱ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ὑψηλοί),²¹ or of *De Sancta et Vivifica Trinitate*: “What can be more exact than these words? What is clearer than this teaching? However, it seems that the mind of heretics is covered by the Judeans' veil, which is the reason why they do not want to see the lights of the sun”.²²

The afore-listed notes on Theodoret and citations of his writings are very few; nevertheless, the attitude toward his works and the number of Georgian translations can attest that Theodoret “is quite a well-known

¹⁷ Anthony Bagrationi, p. 150.

¹⁸ M. Janashvili. *The History of the Orthodox Church*. Tbilisi, 1889 (in Georgian), p. 68.

¹⁹ John Batonishvili. *Kalmasoba*. Vol. II. Tbilisi, 1948 (in Georgian), p. 174.

²⁰ Anthony Tsagerel-Chkondideli. *Sermons*. Ed. T. Zhordania. Kutaisi, 1898 (in Georgian), p. 11.

²¹ J.-N. Guinot. *Théodoret de Cyr. “Commentaire sur Isaïe”*. SC 295 (1982), p. 202.

²² Τί τούτων τῶν ῥημάτων σαφέστερον; τί τῆς διδασκαλίας ταύτης φανερώτερον; Ἄλλ', ὡς ἔοικε, τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὸ κάλυμμα εἰς τὴν τῶν αἰρετικῶν μεταβέβηκε διάνοιαν· διὸ τὰ τοῦ ἡλίου φανερώτερα συνορᾶν οὐκ ἐθέλουσι (PG 75, col. 1172).

author in old Georgian literature” (I.Lolashvili).²³ It is significant that almost all Georgian writers who mention Theodore, indicate to the fact of condemnation and all of them highly esteem him and attempt to make his apology.

²³ Anthony Bagrationi, p. 344.