The writings of the Great Cappadocian Fathers — Gregory of Nazianzus (the Theologian), Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa were of great significance for Oriental Christian culture of the Middle Ages which was closely connected with Byzantine culture. Namely, the writings of the Fathers have deeply influenced and even determined the development of culture and literary processes for centuries in Georgia.

The present paper attempts to show the ideological and conceptual influence of St. Gregory the Theologian’s writings on the development of Georgian thought, literary processes and original Georgian literature itself.

1. The history of translation of Gregory the Theologian’s writings into Georgian

Some works of the Cappadocian Fathers were translated before the 10th century by anonymous translators. Later these writings as well as other exegetic, ascetic, homiletic and epistolographic works of the Fathers were translated by the outstanding Georgian translators — Euthymius the Athonite (i.e. Euthyme Athoneli, 10th century), George the Athonite (i.e. Giorgi Athoneli, 11th century) and Ephrem Mtsire (i.e. the Lesser, 11th century).


The lack of the translation of Gregory Nazianzen’s whole corpus in Georgian literature before the 10th century can be explained by the following reasons. The first is the character and volume of Georgian culture till the 10th century. It was, in its turn, conditioned by the Jerusalem liturgical practice (Bibliology, exegetics, Lectionary, Tropologion, Policephala, Ascetics-mystics, Apophthegmata patrum, hagiography, etc.). At that period Georgian literature could not compare with Constantinople literature. The second reason is the complicated composition and structure, Hellenistic rhetorical form and the contents of Gregory Nazianzen’s homilies (except the festive character of 16 liturgical homilies his work are also of private character; these are the “aporeta”, i.e. non-liturgical homilies; the panegyric, epitaphic genre of the homilies as well) unlike some writings of John Chrysostom, Basilius the Great, Ephrem the Syriac, etc., created on the grounds of exegetic, didactic subjects widely spread at the first stage of the development of the Georgian literature, especially in the Policephala. The third reason is a secret character of theological terminology and highly elevated theological-rhetorical style of Gregory’s writings (see Michael Psellos). The same may be said about the works of Maximus the Confessor, John of Damascus, and other saint fathers. Euthymius the Athonite — the famous Georgian scholar, translator and the enlightener of Georgians at the end of the 10th century was the first to get down to translating these works. The orientation of the Georgian church to Constantinople liturgical practice was started on Mt. Athos by Euthymius’s literary activity.

That is why Euthymius’s activity is of such great significance in the process of serious complex study and translation of Gregory Nazianzen.

zen’s writings. Euthymius was the first who translated and compiled the minor corpus of Gregory the Theologian’s works (liturgical sermons and a few theological homilies) with some commentaries of Pseudo-Nonnos and Maximus the Confessor. Later this corpus was replenished with Gregory’s other works translated in Euthymius’s translation manner by David Tbeli (10th-11th centuries). Euthymius’s translations are of the type of dynamic equivalence in order to improve the understanding of readers not well learned in theology, to make them acquire and develop the skills of abstract theological thought. For this purpose Gregory’s complicated texts are simplified, explained, interpolated, abridged or paraphrased by Euthymius.

The aim of Euthymius’s literary activity was to bring Georgian literature into line with the Byzantine norm. As is well known, the work and activity of Euthymius the Athonite determined the development of the future trends of Georgian culture. Euthymius’s way of adopting Greek culture reached the highest point in the works of the later Georgian translators called “Hellenophiles”. Translations of Gregory the Theologian’s works as well as of the writings of other Byzantine authors had not been made before, and the writings completely unknown to Georgian literary genres are good examples of Euthymius’s purposeful orientation towards Byzantine culture. Many researches show that Euthymius the

---


7 According to Georgian scholars, if the Iviron monastery on Mount Athos had not existed, the history of Georgian culture could have acquired quite a different character. See K. Kekelidze, History of Old Georgian Literature, I, Tbilisi, 1980, p. 101. M. Tarchnichvili, Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur (Studi e Testi, 185), Citta del Vaticano, 1955, p. 70-72.
Athonite’s scholarship and literary activity have responded to the thinking processes that took place in Byzantine literature 8.

On this sound ground founded by Euthymius the work of transmitting Gregory’s theological thought to Georgia was mainly completed by the prominent and most accomplished Georgian theologian and scholar Ephrem Mtsire of the Black Mountain at the end of the 11th century. He translated the Corpus of Gregory’s works containing 51 sermons (including the earlier translations by Euthymius the Athonite and David Tbeli). The collection was of a unique composition. It reflected not only the typical structure of Greek collections with traditional and key appendices — the Life of Gregory, commentaries by Basilius Minimus and Pseudo-Nonnos —, but also the appendices which are rare for Gregory’s Greek collections (Niceta the Philosopher’s paraphrase of Basil the Great’s epigram by Gregory, Gregory’s gnomic poems, etc.). Ephrem seems to have selected the texts from different Greek collections and added all of them to the main part of Gregory’s sermons 9.


The structure and attributes of the Ephremian corpus — its colophons, the signs of punctuation, prosody, stichometry, illustrations, marginal notes and signs, also mythological, theological and rhetorical commentaries by Greek authors enriched with Ephrem’s original colophons — literary-theoretical, stylistical-poetical, grammatical, lexicological-etymological notes etc., make obvious that the Georgian collection conforms to the high level of the Byzantine manuscript tradition. It is also clear that Ephrem’s work is on the equal level with Byzantine literary-theoretical thought, and its author tries to make Georgian literature to keep up with it. In this colophons Ephrem formed his theoretical views on the basis of Byzantine theory of rhetoric.

Ephrem’s translations of Gregory’s sermons are mainly of formal equivalence, charactarized by transmission of all nuances of the original text — theological-philosophical and linguistic-stylistical constructions, rhetorical devices, precise theological terminology, etc. The style of the translation shows that it is made not for common parish, but for the
learned who are already used to abstract theological thought. It is interesting that Gregory’s Greek corpus of 16 liturgical sermons with the commentaries and the proemium by Basilius Minimus were dedicated to Constantine Porphyrogennetos, the king and scholar. The Georgian corpus which was of the similar character corresponds with the requirements of Georgian readers of that period though the number of the readers could be only few.

After Ephrem the interest towards Gregory’s works is shown by the Georgian hellenophile school of the 12th century. Few of Gregory’s works are translated then: one homily for the third time (or. 2), the fragment of Epitaph on Basil the Great (or. 43) with the commentary by Niceta of Herakleia and some poems with the commentaries by Niceta of Paphlagonia (the Philosopher).

Most important is the fact that the history of translating Gregory’s works into Georgian show the step-by-step development of Georgian literature (translated and original) from plainness to complicated Hellenophile style. It should be noted that Ephrem’s translations of Gregory’s works (mainly liturgical sermons) are highly hellenized in comparison to his other translations (Gregory the Theologian’s non-liturgical homilies, John of Damascus’s “Expositio Fidei”, Areopagetic corpus etc.)\textsuperscript{14}. Here he is at the height of his translation technique, his cultural orientation on Byzantine literary processes is fully expressed. Ephrem became the head of the Hellenophile trend in Georgian literature. The Hellenophile translation method as a new translation conception and Hellenophile outlook — grammatical-hermeneutic and literary-theoretical conceptions and terminology which were worked out mainly in the process of translating Gregory’s works by Ephrem — formed the basis for further literary processes in Georgia (the Hellenophile translations after Ephrem, original literature etc.). That is why Gregory’s works translated by Ephrem are so significant in studying the problems of Georgian literature.

2. Rendering some conceptions and paradigms of Cappadocian Fathers (mainly Gregory Nazianzen’s) into Georgian theological and literary writings

After the general review of the translation tradition, let’s now try to emphasize some conceptions and models (paradigms) worked out by Cappadocian Fathers, namely by Gregory Nazianzen that present the ideological roots which had influenced Georgian theological and literary writings during centuries.

It is known that Cappadocian Fathers were one of those first Christian authors (along with the Alexandrian Fathers Clement of Alexandria, Origen etc.) who received a classical education, accepted classical literary forms and philosophical terminology and used them in the service of Christianity\textsuperscript{15}. It was the period when the classical rhetorical


style was compatible with Scripture and its plainness in Christian literature (the literary value of the latter was emphasized with the word ἀπλότης\(^{16}\)). According to Michael Psellos, St. Gregory managed to connect unconnectable things — the Christian plainness with classical rhetorical style and conceptual-terminological apparatus of Greek philosophy, and thus worked out the special style called “theological” by Psellos (Περὶ τοῦ θεολογικοῦ χαρακτῆρος, c. 20; 377-383)\(^{17}\). In this sense Gregory and all Cappadocian Fathers were Hellenophiles\(^{18}\). Through their activity Hellenistic rhetorical forms and theories gradually became the norm for Christian writings.

It should be mentioned that at that period the Christian Fathers’ attitude to classical tradition was dualistic: on the one hand, they declared “Sermo Piscatorius” to be the high truth\(^{19}\) and, on the other hand, they denounced the falseness of the pretty ornaments of rhetoric, and of the subtleties of philosophy. The Christian authors, and among them the Cappadocians, used the classical forms of their own classical training, but they repudiated them from a theoretical point of view as mendacious rhetoric. Sometimes they declaimed against rhetoric in a highly rhetorical way. Thus theoretically “eloquentia” was repudiated as means, but it was practically used by Christian authors to serve the needs of Christian ideas\(^{20}\).


\(^{19}\) “The fishers” is the symbolic name of the Apostles (Matth. 4, 18-19; Marc. 1,17). cf. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, s.v. ἀλεισμός, ἀλεισμὸς. They have to enclose the whole world into the net of the Divine Word. Their words are plain (Gr. Naz. or. 41, c.14. PG 36, 448 C 5; or. 5, c. 25. PG 35, 693 B 9; or. 5, c.30. PG 35, 701 C 8-10 etc.).

\(^{20}\) Basil. in Gord.h. 1. PG 31, 492 BC; Greg. Nyss. in Ephr. or. PG 46, 824 A. Greg. Naz. in Gorg. (or. 8). PG 35, 792 C; cf. Bas. in Mam. h. 3. PG 31, 593 A; Greg. Nyss. in XL mart. h. 1. PG 46, 753 BC; Greg. Naz. or. 43, c.3. PG 36, 497 BC, etc. Greg. Naz. or.
The above mentioned antinomy (interrelation between pagan form and Christian contents, on the one hand, and interrelation between reception and repudiation of rhetoric, on the other) lies in the background of the whole Byzantine literature. The antinomy of attitude mentioned above has been clearly formed in the Byzantine literary-theoretical thought of the 9th-11th centuries (Photius, Basilius Minimus, Michael Psellos, etc.)\(^{21}\). That is why it is not surprising that it can also be traced through the following works:

- \(\text{PG} 35, 504\) B 6 — C 2; or. 4, c. 100.
- \(\text{PG} 35, 53\) A 8 — B 1; or. 6, c. 5.
- \(\text{PG} 35, 728\) B; or. 19, c. 10.
- \(\text{PG} 37, \text{c. II, 1, 39; c. II, 1, 12, vv. 302-308; c. II, 1, 11, vv. 112-114; cf. c. I, 2, 10, vv. 40-44; or. 2, c. 104. PG 35, 504 B 6 — C 2; or. 4, c. 100.}\)
- \(\text{PG} 35, 504\) B 6 — C 2; or. 6, c. 5.
- \(\text{PG} 35, 597\) B 10-12; or. 4, c. 73.


in the original writings of the renowned 11th century Georgian theologian and scholar, the translator of Gregory’s works and the founder of the Hellenophile trend in Georgian literature, Ephrem Mtsire. The most important problems of Byzantine rhetorical theory are considered in his works mainly under the influence of Gregory’s works. He could have also found these ideas in the commentaries of Basilius Minimus and Michael Psellus on Gregory’s writings (the latter was not translated into Georgian, but it is evident that the problems of Psellus’s tracts were well known to Ephrem Mtsire). In the notes and colophons which are appended to his translations Ephrem emphasizes the above-mentioned dual antinomy. On the one hand, he speaks about the plainness of Holy Script (in the colophon added to the translation of John of Damascus’s ““Dialectics”) and the

22 From the times of the official conversion to Christianity of the Georgian state (4th century) the tendencies peculiar to Byzantine literature were more or less reflected in Georgian literature. The most important side of Christian ideology, the pointed dualistic attitude towards Hellenism, was similarly reflected in Georgian writings. Though the theoretical comprehension of the problem is beginning only from the second half of the 11th century since the whole attention before then had been drawn to translating the theological and liturgical literature.

23 BEZARASHVILI, Michael Psellus on Theological Style. J. ชำระณิชูposites, พระสันตะกรานยนต์มีพระยุทธสมุนทร์ในพระยา พระญา และ พระภูฏภูฏนิยม พระรูปพระโกรธหรือที่ (K. BEZARASHVILI, The Tracts of Michael Psellus Concerning Theological Style and their Importance for Georgian Literature), in "Theological-Philological Collection", Tbilisi, 1997, p. 82-86. BEZARASHVILI, Traditional Classical Concept of Imitation; BEZARASHVILI, New, Christian Aspect of the Concept of Imitation.

24 ""เป็นพระยาสันตะกรานยนต์ในพระยาพระญาที่ พระภูฏภูฏนิยมพระรูปพระโกรธหรือที่" (cod. Thilisi A 24, s. XII, f. 3 v). พระญาสันตะกรานยนต์ในพระยาพระญาที่ พระภูฏภูฏนิยมพระรูปพระโกรธหรือที่ (John of Damascus, Dialectics, ed. M. RAPA), Thilisi, 1976, p. 68 (= John of Damascus, Dialectics).
writings of the first Christian authors, calling them “the first writers”. He also touches the problem of the rhetorical-philosophical form of the Hellenophile Fathers calling their writings “grammatical and philosophical” in contrast to the “first writers” (in the colophon added to the translations of Gregory the Theologian’s liturgical homilies)25. In Ephrem’s colophon Euthymius the Athonite’s translation of Gregory’s works is ascribed to the first group, but Ephrem’s own translations made in rhetorically and philosophically elevated style, belong, according to himself, to the second group. On the other hand, Ephrem also talks about the antinomy of another kind. He repudiates the rhetorical-philosophical character of his writings and at the same time (just in the same colophon — cod. Jer. Georg. 43) he declares that in his translations he observed the rules of philosophy (exactly: “by running at the door of philosophers”26; by the word “philosophy”, according to its meaning in the Middle Ages, rhetoric is also meant, and vise versa27). The study of the

25 “...ara sa˚ramatikoso¯a, arwa safilosofoso¯a, aramed ˙emdgomni ¯argmanni

26 “ukue¯u lomi ver widamtkavlebr xldeboda karebsa filoso-

27 HUNGER, Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur, p. 4-11, 42-54; NORDEN, Die antike Kunstprosa, p. 670-685. LEMERLE, Byzantine Humanism, p. 89, 186, 190, 199; 48-
two Georgian translations of Gregory’s works reveals the rightness of Ephrem’s reasoning (his opinions about translation and literary theories).

Another conceptual influence of Gregory’s works on Georgian thought is seen in the understanding of the word and concept ἐλληνιζεῖν. This word has several meanings in Medieval Literature (see below). It is known that in the early period of Byzantine culture there even was an ideological struggle for classical education. By according to the decree of Julian the Apostate in 362 A.D. Christians were forbidden to receive classical education. This gradually resulted in forming a counter-program aimed at creating diverse Christian literature equal to the classical writing in its refined form (classical norms, the genre, the metre, poetic-rhetorical devices etc.) and superior to it in Christian contents. In his Homily IV “Contra Iulianum” Gregory the Theologian distinguished the linguistic and cultural Hellenism from that of religious one, and argued that the Hellenic education (ἐλληνιζεῖν) belonged to Christian Greeks as well28 (or. 4, c. 4-5. PG 35, 536 A 1 — B 13. cf. Vita Gregorii Nazianzeni. PG 35, 304 A 5 — B 5. cf. In suos versus. PG 37, c. II, 1, 39, vv. 48-49: ὁδὸν ἐν λόγοις πλέον διδόμεν τοὺς ξένους ήμῶν).

The struggle for linguistic and cultural Hellenization from the beginning of Byzantine culture was ended in putting Hellenic literary and philosophical forms in the service of Christian ideology. Ἐλλήν from its New Testament sense of “pagan”, which it had retained throughout the earlier Byzantine period29, came to mean “Greek”, “Byzantine” in the 11th-12th centuries. Ἐλληνισμός was already identified with “Christian” and has since been understood as the common Christian education within the Byzantine culture30. Classical rhetorical and philo-

sophical forms and classical education became accessible for Christian authors. The important information about the great meaning of classical education for Christians is given in Gregory’s sermon to Basil the Great (or. 43, c. 12. PG 36, 509 BC. See also the commentaries on it: cod. Vat.Gr. 437, s. XI, f. 18 v; cod. Tbilisi A 109, s. XII-XIII, f. 22r).

The problem of coexistence of the pagan rhetorical form and the high divine wisdom is discussed many times in Gregory the Theologian’s homilies and correspondingly in their Georgian translations (especially in Ephrem Mtsire’s translations). This problem is also discussed in Gregory’s poems, but exactly these poems were not translated into Georgian. However, Ephrem’s translations of Gregory’s other poems (gnomic poems) showed his close familiarity with the mentioned problems. The fact is also seen in the title of Gregory’s gnomic poems (PG 37, c. 1, 2, n. 3, n. 39, n. 40; n. 19). The title is composed by Ephrem himself: “μουμελεια ιαμβικοι σασαινταηναι μου εις ευλογιαναι, κατοικοδομη δε καλοναις, ουδεναιες γενής θεολογοφυτος ουδεναιες γενεμποτομηιν” (The Iambic Verses instead of Pagan Teaching, from which Julian the Apostate isolated the Christians). This title also carries information of cultural and historical character. This namely concerns one important episode of the history of Byzantium, the problems concerning the education of Christians during Julian’s repression.

Ephrem Mtsire also introduces his own literary-theoretical term denoting the mentioned opposition. He uses the rhetorical device which was widespread in Byzantine literature of that period, namely, using of rare geographical and ethnical terms in wider, general meaning. This is the term “Hindian”, which implies “non-Christian”, “pagan”, “secular”31. According to Ephrem’s interpretation of Gregory Nazianzen’s words, St. Gregory gives out “high divine Christian Spiritual Wisdom” by means of “Hindian” (i.e. pagan) literary form — classical metre (τετραστυχην δε γνώμαις πνευματικαις μυθομοσυνον φυλάπτω

Under the influence of Gregory’s works and their translations the term “Hellenism”, “Hellenic” — “Ἐλλήν, Ἑλληνικός, Ἑλληνισμός (which in the New Testament and in the writings of St. Fathers had the meaning of “pagan, non Christian”) lost its strictly negative connotation in Ephrem’s original and translated works, as well as in the 11th century Georgian letters in general. It acquired the meaning of high rhetorical-philosophical style in Christian literature and of good rhetorical-philosophical education among Christians. It should also be taken into consideration that Hellenic education was a part of Christian education, which had a function of “ancilla theologiae”\(^33\). This way of thinking,
rooted in the writings of the Cappadocian Fathers and initiated by Ephrem in Georgia, appeared to be the determiner of cultural orientation during the following period in Georgian literature. E.g. the word "ელინური" (elinuri, elinuri enidan), etc. denoting “translation from Greek into Georgian” had become widespread since Ephrem’s translations, while before the 11th century the term “ელინური” (Hellenic) expressed something pagan (of classical Greek), and the word “ბერძული” (berzuli) was used mainly in the sense of Christian. Hellas and Athens as symbols of secular wisdom also became widespread under the influence of Gregory the Theologian’s works. E.g., in Gregory’s works Athens is announced as the center of philosophy and secular education where Basilios the Great and Gregory himself studied (or. 43, c. 12. PG 36, 509 B 3-8. or. 43, c. 14. PG 36, 513 A 5-8). This information is kept in both Georgian translations of Gregory’s works (Ephrem Mtsire = cod. A 109, 123v; Euthymius the Athonite = cod. A 1, 139r). The same is told in “Vita Gregorii Nazianzeni” and its Georgian translations: თინ მიტერა თით ლოგით თან "მთიანი მეთადოები" (PG 35, 248 D 5). “ჰელისანი თორნითი — მთიანი მეთადოები” (cod. A109, 238r). “და პანთიკი მცენარე მთიანი ათლეთი ქალაქი...” (and he came to Athens which is the mother of philosophy) (cod. A 1, 139r). In Georgian sources the high school of the 12th century in Gelati is called “second Jerusalem and another Athens” (ჰელისანი თორნითი ... ახალი ჰელანი). Here the coexistence of theological and secular teaching is made explicit (“History of King David the Builder”). Gelati is also called “Hellas” : ჰელანი თორნითი — სოფელ ჰელანი. “Gelati — Hellados” — Ioane Shavtheli, v. 105, 4; 12th century). “Attic and Patristic” contemplation (’ატიკული, პატრისტიკული თორნითი”) are mentioned together expressing dual wisdom (pagan and Christian) in Shavtheli’s poetry (v. 53, 1); “the wise man from Athens praise” Queen Thamar in secular poetry (ჰელისანი თორნითი... ათლეთი...იურმე...). Further education is discussed, and the functions of grammar, rhetoric and philosophy as educational subjects are characterized (or. 43, c. 23. PG 36, 528 A 3-10. M = cod. A 109, s. XII-XIII, f. 29r; E = cod. A 1, s. XI, f. 145v), whereas Euthymius the Athonite omitted some pieces concerning other rhetorical and “outer” problems in translation of the same homily.

34 The term “ბერძული” (berzuli) in Georgian translations is mostly used as an equivalent of Ποσιμίος of Greek originals. It implies the cultural affiliation to Eastern Roman Empire. See the Materials of Byzantine-Georgian Documented Lexicon, edited by Prof. S. Kaurikishvili. The lexicographic material is kept in the Department of Byzantine Studies at the Institute of Oriental Studies, Georgian Academy of Sciences.
Georgian translations of Gregory’s works introduced the problem of the Hellenization of language (γλώσσαν ἐξελληνίζειν — ἐλληνικοῦ λόγου ἐξελληνίζειν — Rustaveli, v. 694, 4)35. It has implied stylistic norm as a part of ἀρεταί λέξεως in the rhetorical and poetical theories since Aristotle (Rhet. III, 12, 1413 b 1; III, 5, 1407 a 19 etc.). This concept could become known to Georgian scholars mainly with the help of Gregory’s homily 43, the Epitaph on Basil the Great and commentaries on it (Basilius Minimus’s and Niceta of Herakleia’s; in Dionysius Thrax’s definition of Grammar this piece does not exist). In Byzantine rhetorical theory this term implies the inheritance of Greek civilization in Byzantine literature, which shows itself in using archaisms, atticisms, imitation of literary forms36. It also implies the knowledge and usage of the high style, pure language (αἱ ἐλληνικαί βοηθοὶ γίνεται τῆς Ἑλλάδος γλώσσης), pagan philosophical terminology and rhetorical devices (χράσθαι καὶ λόγους τούτον — λογομετρία — λόγους τούτον — λογομετρία). The quotations are from Gregory Nazianzen, Basilius Minimus and Niceta of Herakleia. PG 36, 528 A 3-12. cod. Paris. Coisl. 240, s. XI, f. 27r. cod. Oxon.Coll.s.Trinit.Gr. 44, s. XII, f. 178v-179v). According to


37 For the functions of the parts of hermeneutic grammar see GUDEMAN, Grammatik. ROBINS, The Byzantine Grammarians. HUNGER, Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur, Bd. II, p. 10-50 (Die elementaren Voraussetzungen der byzantinischen Philologie).
the above mentioned explanations the Hellenization of language for Georgian translations meant the employment of the high rhetorical style, rhetorical ornaments, it meant the laconism of philosophical terms composed according the Greek wordbuilding models using the rich capacities of the native Georgian language, it also meant syntactical and linguistic calques in order to shorten the phrase like in Greek. Sometimes it implied the interpretation of the peculiarities of classical metre formed in the notes added to the translations\(^{38}\).

The Hellenic (i.e. secular) education (rhetoric, grammar, philosophy etc.) as a prestigious education for Christians acquires more importance in Georgian literature. The third translation of the fragment of Gregory’s or. 43 concerning this problem is not accidental. The use of rhetorical devices, grammatical commentaries, philosophical terminology became more obvious at this period. The new rhetorical and grammatical terminology is used in Ephrem’s translation of Basilius Minimus’s commentaries and in his own notes. Later the classical Neoplatonic philosophical monuments — Ammonius, Nemesios of Emessa, Proclus were translated for the students of the Georgian Hellenophile School (i.e. Gelati theological school).

Thus, as is shown above, the early Byzantine literary processes took place in Georgia much later — in the 11th century. This had many causes. One of them is characterized by the Old Georgian scholars themselves. The discussions of George the Athonite, Ephrem Mtsire, Arsen of Iqaltho make it clear that the faith of Georgians, and accordingly, their literature had been homogenous and straight without any heresy since its beginning till the 11th-12th centuries, the period of their activities. Nothing from the pagan, secular or heretical (\(\partial\)zwqen) literature was translated in this period, because of the spiritual plainness of the Georgian “reader” in St. Paul’s meaning of this word (I Cor. 3, 1-2; Hebr. 5, 12-13)\(^{39}\). According to Ephrem Mtsire, Georgian literature was

\(^{38}\) **BEZARASHVILI**, The Problem of Classical Greek Versification. **OTKHEMEZURI, BEZARASHVILI**, The Greek Original of One Fragment (the texts are prepared for publication and analyzed by OTKHEMEZURI; the interpretation of the sources and conceptual view belongs to BEZARASHVILI).

rising to new highs from plainness to complication, from spiritual naïveté to intellectual accomplishment (cf. the colophon added to the liturgical homilies of Gregory Nazianzen)\textsuperscript{40}. That is why most complicated theological-philosophical works were translated later, especially the works of Hellenic literary-philosophical forms. Orientation to Hellenic literature and philosophy have become more significant since the 11th century because of the higher intellectual level of the readers in comparison to previous periods. These readers had been prepared for understanding the rhetorical and philosophical depth by the gradual movement towards it. Such reader could appreciate the problem of the correct use of secular wisdom in the service of Christianity (this was the peculiar feature of scholasticism in the Middle Ages).

Another cause of this process in Georgia along with the spiritual requirements of Georgian thought were the processes in contemporary Byzantine literature. As is known, in the 11th-12th centuries the scholarly-critical research methodology of the Byzantine and classical texts was worked out in Byzantium, striving for the literary-theoretical thinking, profound interest to the Hellenic rhetorical theory and grammar, commentary writing activities, etc\textsuperscript{41}. These problems of Byzantine literary-theoretical thinking (or rhetorical theory, as termed in the Middle Ages) influenced Georgian literature. This is the second cause why the theoretical comprehension of the above-mentioned process began in the 11th century Georgia.

The problems studied by Ephrem Mtsire are the following: the relations between the theological contents and the refined pagan classical rhetorical imagery of Christian writings; classical versificatory forms; grammar and prosody; new theory of theological-rhetorical style and new, the Christian aspect of the concept of imitation unlike the traditional classical theories of styles and traditional classical concept of imitation; two aspects of the concept of beauty etc. Ephrem analyzed these

\textsuperscript{40} “მამა ნინოდა, წინა προ παντι, ორნაგადის რენესანსი სიკვდილი და ზევით, თუმცა ამ მოქ აღწერილი უხ შიგითიდან მართლაც მეორეი მხარედ იროვა მარადი ზევით” (cod. Jer. Georg. 43, s. XII-XIII, f. 2v). S. Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera, Versio Iberica I, p. XXXIII-XXXIV.

problems using analogous paradigms mainly from the works of Gregory the Theologian.\[^{42}\]

The most important problem connected with the above-mentioned movement at the end of 11th century Byzantium and correspondingly in Georgia is the establishment of the celebration of the feast of the Three Hierarchs of the Church: Gregory Nazianzen, Basilios the Great and John Chrysostom, as the paragons of a true rhetoric, based not only on the style but also on the theological contents.\[^{43}\] These wise men became not merely the philosophical and theological ideals of Byzantium, they were considered as rhetorical ideals as well. In these characters the two levels came together: the charm of their words, their human “logos” and the grace of the divine “Logos”. Through these the true harmony of word and spirit, rhetoric and theology, natural and supernatural is restored.\[^{44}\] It is noteworthy that Michael Psellos characterizes Gregory Nazianzen’s style as the coexistence of rhetoric and philosophy (Psellos, Περί τοῦ θεολογικοῦ χαρακτήρος, c. 13, 243-245,340; c. 17, 317-318). Rhetoric and philosophy sometimes regarded as a unity in classical literature (cf. Plato’s true rhetoric as philosophical rhetoric — Gorg. 517a; Phaedr. 261a) is changed into the unity of theology and rhetoric in Christianity in a broader sense, into a true theological rhetoric.\[^{45}\]

The glory of these Fathers influenced greatly the further development of literature, as it included the idea of theological-rhetorical style as a subject of imitation (“mimesis”) to form a new trend in Byzantine literature, the metaphrastics. That is why the vision of the three Saints by a pious man is mentioned in Ephrem Mtsire’s colophon in connection with Symeon Metaphrastes; here Symeon’s rhetorical-philosophical style is regarded as equal to the three Hierarchs.\[^{46}\] Ephrem’s opinions show not

\[^{42}\] See the works of Bezrashvili and Otkhmezuri mentioned above.

\[^{43}\] As is known, the Cappadocian Fathers and John Chrysostom developed the philosophical basis of the Christian doctrine to a high level of sophistication; they utilized their Attic language and style in order to be taken seriously by an educated audience. See G.A. Kennedy, Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors, Princeton, New Jersey, 1983, p. 50, 185 (= Kennedy, Greek Rhetoric).


\[^{46}\] გვთხოვთ მიყენეთ, “შორსაგვრული ხილით დამუშავებული სწორწილით მიწისქვეშა”. K. Kekelidze, Симеон Метафорасти по грузинским источникам (K. Kekelidze, Symeon
only the religious cult of Gregory established in Byzantium at that period, but also the importance of his theological doctrines and rhetoric for the Middle Ages. At the same time Ephrem’s views (in the colophon to his translations of the 16 liturgical homilies by Gregory the Theologian) about Gregory’s theological-philosophical ideas addressed only to the few learned is in accordance with Psellos’s ideas on combining philosophy with rhetoric as a rare achievement not meant for the common crowd.

Thus Ephrem’s works are on the same level with the Byzantine thought. Having in mind the Greek literary processes in connection with the mentioned problems, Ephrem agrees with the Byzantine approach of relations between rhetoric and philosophy, on the one hand, and their attitude towards theology, on the other. Ephrem’s opinions expressed in his translations and colophons had great influence on establishing the idea of combining rhetoric with philosophy in Georgian literature. The further development of Georgian Hellenophile literature is a clear illustration of it. This tendency is also traced in the original literature.

As rhetoric and theology are considered as one in Byzantium, rhetoric was also regarded as a sacred art. This opinion was also accepted in Georgian thinking. In the masterpiece of Georgian secular poetry, Rustaveli’s “The Knight in the Panter’s Skin”, the art of poetry (which was often understood as the art of rhetoric in the rhetorical theories) is regarded as a part of divine wisdom, theology (v. 12, 1).

3. The direct and indirect quotations and hidden paradigms from Gregory the Theologian’s works in Georgian Literature

The direct and indirect quotation of Gregory the Theologian’s phrases in the works of Georgian authors is closely connected with the conceptual influence of Gregory’s works on Georgian thinking. It is known that Gregory’s wording deeply influenced Christian authors which was caused by Gregory’s great popularity. His phraseology was famous and

48 H. Hunger, Aspekte der griechischen Rhetorik von Gorgias bis zum Untergang von Byzanz, Wien, 1972, p. 3-27 etc.
clear for every educated person\(^49\). Besides numerous direct use of maxims or dogmatical formulas from Gregory’s works (Gregory says the Theologian or simply Theologian) in Georgian literature (mainly in ascetic and hagiographic\(^50\)), there are a lot of hidden quotations, theological-philosophical or rhetorical expressions without direct mentioning of the author.

The 12-13th century Hellenophile philosopher and translator Ioane Petritsi quotes some phrases from Gregory’s theological orations (or. 31, or. 29) in his preface of the commentaries on Psalms. It is noteworthy that he calls Gregory “my Theologian” and “my Attician”\(^51\) to distinguish him from the classical philosopher Plato who is mentioned simply as “Attician”\(^52\). The co-occurrence of the possessive pronoun which means “ecclesiastical, Christian” in Patristic literature\(^53\) with the pagan

\(^49\) The importance of this problem is studied in J. N ORET, Grégoire de Nazianze, l’auteur le plus cité, après la Bible dans la Littérature ecclésiastique byzantine, in II Symposium Nazianzenum, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1981, Actes édités par J. MOSSAY (Forschungen zu Gregor von Nazianz, Bd. II), Paderborn, München, Wien, Zürich, 1983, p. 259-266.  

\(^50\) Besides numerous direct use of maxims or dogmatical formulas from Gregory's works (Gregory says the Theologian or simply Theologian) in Georgian literature (mainly in ascetic and hagiographic), there are a lot of hidden quotations, theological-philosophical or rhetorical expressions without direct mentioning of the author. The 12-13th century Hellenophile philosopher and translator Ioane Petritsi quotes some phrases from Gregory’s theological orations (or. 31, or. 29) in his preface of the commentaries on Psalms. It is noteworthy that he calls Gregory “my Theologian” and “my Attician” to distinguish him from the classical philosopher Plato who is mentioned simply as “Attician”. The co-occurrence of the possessive pronoun which means “ecclesiastical, Christian” in Patristic literature with the pagan

\(^51\) "awumides olyromivbara maası cemi igi attikeli, rameisu, viarmed:

ethnic name “Attician” in the phrase “my Attician” is most unusual. Ioane Petritsi thus underlines the Hellenic aspect of Gregory’s works and their supposed classical philosophical source. At the same time the Georgian philosopher emphasizes his personal attitude towards this aspect.

Besides, Ioane Petritsi used a part of Gregory’s famous phrase: ἀλειτικὸν, οὐκ Ἀριστοτελικὸν (or. 23, c. 12. PG 35, 1164 C 12 — D 1), which was widespread in the Middle Ages. He wished he could contemplate in the Aristotelian manner («σοφούρωσιν») and create the pure theology not having matter. The well-known distinction between the monastic spirituality, experiential theology, or the fishers’ plainness, on the one hand, and philosophical syllogism or the intellectual method of scholastic theology, discursive logical thinking, on the other, i.e. the distinction between faith and reason is meant here. With

these words Ioane Petritsi develops activity and desire of his predecessor, Ephrem Mtsire. In the preface to his translation of “Dialectics” by John of Damascus (which presents Aristotle’s logical methods to serve Christian theology) Ephrem Mtsire says that “nothing philosophical had been translated into Georgian during the earlier period.” Ioane Petritsi wishes to approach Georgian thought to dogmatic, scholastic theology, after Georgian thought had already progressed through ascetic, monastic theology. In the interrelation of faith and reason Ioane Petritsi and the whole Georgian Hellenophile school (i.e. Gelati school), is based on the thought of the Alexandrian and Cappadocian Fathers.

The role of Gregory’s writings is significant for the understanding of some literary processes and the outlook of Medieval Georgian writers. Gregory’s works, the commentaries on his writings, namely the Pseudo-Nonnian’s Commentaries, were well known and much used in medieval Georgian literature. For Georgian scholars the collection of the mythological histories was one of the best means of access to the classical world and to Greek mythology. Mythological characters and the names of Greek philosophers and pagan gods mentioned in the commentaries can also be found in original Georgian writings of the 12th and 13th centuries (in the Odes by Chakhrukhadze and Shavteli and in the historiography “Life of David the King of Kings” and “History and Eulogy of the Monarchs”). All this opened a new outlook for the medieval Georgian reader and prepared a foundation for the development of the Georgian secular literature.

The use of rhetorical, mythological paradigms in Georgian secular literature (historiography, eulogies) and the models of interrelation of pagan and Christian, worked out in the writings of the Cappadocian Fathers, namely in Gregory the Theologian’s, also the importance of Ephrem’s activity based on Cappadocian thought seem to have fairly great influence on determining literary processes in Georgian culture. The direction of Ephrem’s thinking prepared the basis for establishing favorable attitude of the original literature towards the Hellenic education and the forms of its literature and philosophy. In the 11th-12th cen-

Some Passages from the so-called Epilogue by Ioane Petritsi: “mearistotelura”) (presented at the conference “Classical Evidence in World Literature and Art” held at the Institute of Classical Philology, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies of Tbilisi State University, 27-28, XII, 2004 is being published in Logos, 3 (2005).

58 “mearistotelura” (cod. Tbilisi A 24, s. XII, f. 1v). John of Damascus, Dialectics, p. 66.

turies these processes ensured very high level of Georgian secular literature and especially the outlook of its most important monument “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin” by Shota Rustaveli.

As we have seen, one of the important features of Gregory the Theologian’s writings was the problem of coexistence of pagan literary form and Christian contents. He calls it “to sweeten the bitterness” of the commandments with the help of art (τέχνη γλυκάων το πίκρον τῶν ἔντολῶν — c. I, 2, 39, v. 41) with the purpose of showing the younger generation the path to virtue (vv. 37-43). The “young” in Gregory’s writings is used in St. Paul’s spiritual meaning of this word (Hebr. 5, 13-14). The source of this phrase is pagan: Lucretius intends to sweeten bitterness of philosophy for older children in “De rerum natura” (I, 936-943). The superiority of theology in the Middle Ages took the place of the superiority of philosophy of the classical period. The reason is that the concept of beauty and charm for Christians is not in the words, but in contemplation, in divine idea (τὸ κύκλος ἡμῖν ἐν θεωρίᾳ — Gr. Naz. PG 37, c. II, 1, 39, v. 51). Michael Psellos calls it providing the Pearl of Gospel (Matth. 13, 45-46) with gold frames. He meant to express the beauty of mystic contemplation and wisdom with rhetorical ornaments (Psellos, Περὶ τοῦ θεολογικοῦ χαρακτήρος, c. 5; 85-90). Both of these Christian authors call this way of connecting pagan form and Christian contents a “different” (ἄλλην) or “new”, “unusual” (καινῆ) way of rhetoric (λόγος): ἄλλην τῶν λόγων ὁδὸν (Gr. Naz. PG 37, c. II, 1, 39, v. 22; 64); καίνον τούτ’ ἂν εἶν τὸ νόημα (Psellos, Περὶ τοῦ θεολογικοῦ χαρακτήρος, c. 232). The coexistence of classical literary form and Christian contents corresponds to a new concept of style, named by Psellos “theological” (θεολογικὸς χαρακτήρ).

In accordance with the above-mentioned antinomy characteristic of Byzantine literature, theological style presupposed the existence of two aspects of the concept of “mimesis” (imitation). According to the norms of classical theories of rhetoric — also accepted by the Byzantine theory of rhetoric, the concept of “mimesis” implied the imitation of the best rhetorical art of classical authors — κατὰ ζῆλον ἀρχαιῶν (Psellos, Περὶ τοῦ θεολογικοῦ χαρακτήρος, c. 230); ἐμιμεῖτο ξύμπαντα (Psellos, PG 122, 905 A 9, c. 2)60. In Byzantine literary monuments the new, Christian understanding of the concept of imitation is also traced. This meant the imitation of divine thought, heavenly wisdom in the sense of

the Apostle Paul (cf. I Cor. 4, 16; 11, 1; 14, 1). On the one hand, in its literary-theoretical sense the term meant the imitation of Apostle Paul’s semantic obscurity; this is demonstrated by the example of Gregory the Theologian (cf. τὸν ἑκείνοῦ Παῦλου μιμούμενος — Psellos, Περὶ τοῦ θεολογικοῦ χαρακτήρος, c. 15291-292). On the other hand, it meant the imitation of stylistic plainness of the Apostles; the example is again Gregory the Theologian’s writings (οὐ κατὰ τὸν τὸν ἐξωθεν σοφὸν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μίμησιν ἀτεχνώς τὴν ἀποστολικὴν — Nicet.Paphl. Enc.Gr.Naz.)61. In connection with the translations of Gregory the Theologian’s liturgical homilies the two aspects of the concept of imitation are commented on by Ephrem Mtisire in his colophons62. The same problem is thoroughly thought out by Ephrem in connection with the poetry of the Theologian. In the translation of the “Life of Gregory Nazianzen” Ephrem suggests his own understanding (added to Greek original) of the problem. Here he talks about the imitation of the classical, secular literary forms in Gregory’s poetry for expressing Christian contents63.

The problem of the causes of development of secular literature in Georgia arises here. To my opinion, along with other causes of this process discussed in Georgian scholarship, the main cause is the above-mentioned dualistic attitude towards classical literary forms. Christian contents in famous classical secular form (or in any pagan/secular form) became the main background for introducing allegory into Georgian secular poetry. This basic frame/model may include all other causes


62 Typologically as well as in imagery Ephrem’s idea of classical aspect of imitation is close to Michael Psellos’s understanding of this concept displayed in his tract on the style of the St. Fathers. Here Michael Psellos talks about imitating the expressive literary forms of classical authors by the Cappadocian Fathers and John Chrysostom (Psellos, PG 122: BEZARASHVILI, Psellos’s Tract on the Style of Cappadocian Fathers). Ephrem’s interpretation of the new aspect of the concept of imitation is close to the interpretation given in Psellos’s monographic tract where he underlines the advantages of the beauty of the divine contents in Gregory’s works in comparison to classical authors (Psellos, Περὶ τοῦ θεολογικοῦ χαρακτήρος; BEZARASHVILI, Michael Psellos on Theological Style).

63 τὸν εἰδὸς παιδευσάμενος τοῖς ἴδιοις λόγοις ἀπετυχόστατο (Vita Gr.Naz. PG 35, 265 A 11 — B 9): add. “ἀνεμφάνισεν ἅμα βλέποντα, ἰδοὺ παρωνοθέτεται καὶ θυμάσθησα, ἵππους μετετραγμένα ἐπηανάμειν κεφαλατείας πεπληκτεῖ καὶ ἀμέναλτεσαμεπάμεθαι... καὶ τρομερῶς ἀποκαθόμηκα... παρασκευάζει τερατωτέρως πλεύσατο (θεολόγιον)” — Gregory imitated the “outer” (literary) forms, genre, versification, but he took the contents of his writings from the teaching of Holy Scripture; and he spread the theological ideas everywhere (cod. Tbilisi A 109, s. XII-XIII, f. 245 rv).
mentioned before in scholarly literature: the influence of Persian poetry\textsuperscript{64} (which flourished at that period and which also was “outer” — წითელ for Christian thinking), the development of national pre-Christian pagan folk literature\textsuperscript{65}, the imagery, genres and some other literary forms of Ecclesiastical Literature transferred to secular\textsuperscript{66}.

It becomes obvious that the above-mentioned thinking of the models and paradigms of Cappadocian Fathers and their commentators help to define the national origin and place of “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin” in the context of Christian Literature. The literary criticism of the Soviet ideology criticizing Euopecentrist approach (rejecting “European type of literature”) mistakenly attributed the monument to the type of the Persian novelistic epos (V. Jirmunski, V. Shishmarjov, E. Meletinski)\textsuperscript{67}.

The model — Christian contents in non-Christian, pagan, secular literary form, which was widespread in Gregory’s writings, makes clear the same esthetical point of view for Rustaveli. That is why he calls his poem “Persian tale”\textsuperscript{68} which is to be understood as the best literary form for

\textsuperscript{64} Н. МАР, Возникновение и расцвет древнеегретинской светской литературы (N. MARR, The Development and Golden Age of Old Georgian Secular Literature), in Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения (Journal of the Ministry of Public Education), XII, 1899, p. 251.

\textsuperscript{65} წ. ინგოროქვა, კოჩქველის პაგუნის საფეხისმაგრეული შემღერებები (P. INGOROQVA, The Literary Inheritance of Rustaveli’s Epoch), in კოჩქველის პაგუნის საფეხისმაგრეული კოლექცია (The Collection Dedicated to the Anniversary of Rustaveli), Tbilisi, 1938, p. 1-2.


\textsuperscript{68} “ესი ფიქა სპროწინო პაგანულო ანალოგია” (this Persian story translated into Georgian — v. 9). The term “Persian” is not used here in its direct lexical meaning as a geographical and ethnical name. It does not denote here the ethnic origin of the poem. In scholarship it is already known that the same plot has never been found in Persian-language literature. “Persian” means here “non-Christian”. “secular” in the generalized meaning of a literary-theoretical term; cf. “hindian” as the literary-theoretical term in the same context in Ephrem Misire’s writings based on Gregory Nazianzen’s poems (see here above ch. 2 and BEZARASHVILI, Ephrem Misire on the Relations). It is noteworthy that Rustaveli’s first commentator king and poet Vakhtang VI (17th-18th centuries) correctly understood and interpreted Rustaveli’s mentioned formula as “the imitation of Persian literary form” and confirmed non-Persian origin of the poem (“ჯოხ ღიას გმობით, თისოლილი შხალანთი ევროპას არმენიაში თეატრს შეუწით, რომ პარალელურად გათროთხობა; თუმცა სპროწინო ეს არმენია თავად არყოფ; არყოფ თეატრს გათროთხობ და უკანით თავად გმობით უნდა განლინდო, რომ საქართველოს უნივერსო რაოდენობა როლამ უდევა. საქართველო აქმა სპროცხილო თავად გმობით” — In “translation from Persian” Rustaveli means the imitation of Persian poems which was ordered to him by king
“divine contemplation”, “the imitation of divine love” (cf. I Cor. 14, 1)⁶⁹. Thus the coexistence of the two aspects of the concept of imitation is evident in the poem. The poem is based on Byzantine esthetics just as its Christian contents is mainly based on Patristic theology.

The above mentioned model/paradigm of the interrelation of secular literary form and Christian contents was also in use in the 18th century Georgian literature which was still set in the frame of Christian ideology. The famous Georgian metaphysical poet of this period David Guramishvili employs the paradigm of interrelation between secular and spiritual wisdom (sweet esthetical form and divine contents) for the same purpose as Gregory used it — for enlightening younger generation (γηνήματα — νέος) which is young not only of age, but also in spirit (cf. Hebr. 5, 12-14; I Cor. 13, 11; 14, 20)⁷⁰.

The last point of Gregory’s influence on Georgian literature is the 19th century romanticism. As is well known, Biblical and Christian poetry is regarded to be the source of romantic poetry ⁷¹. So it is only natural that typologically similar images are found in the poetry of Gregory Nazianzen and the Georgian romantic poet Nikolos Baratashvili. The phraseology, composition, motivation of Baratashvili’s poem addressed to the evil spirit remind of Gregory’s famous cycle of poems “Ad diabolum” (though the attitude of the monk and the young poet are different to one and the same problem). It should be taken into considera-
tion that the collections of Georgian translations of Gregory’s poems were widespread not only in the church libraries but also in the aristocratic families of the 18th-19th centuries Georgia\textsuperscript{72}.

Today the interest on Gregory the Theologian’s works in Georgia is moved from literature to scholarship. At the Institute of Manuscripts (Georgian Academy of Sciences), a group of Georgian scholars is working on the old translations of Gregory Nazianzen’s works. In collaboration with European scholars — the International group of Gregory Nazianzen Studies — the Georgian team has already published the four volumes of the Georgian translations of St. Gregory’s liturgical homilies which are included in the “Corpus Christianorum”. Further volumes are almost ready for publication. We would allow to make one parallel here: according to Ephrem Mtsire’s colophons, while translating Gregory’s works he used to go to the rich libraries of the Antioch Churches and ask for the consultations of educated ecclesiasts. As is known, he received the advice even from the patriarch of Antioch concerning the Greek collections, commentaries, theological terminology, mythological questions etc.\textsuperscript{73}, with the purpose of bringing Georgian literature into line with the

\textsuperscript{72} BEZARASHVILI, The works of Gregory the Theologian.

Byzantine norms. He fulfilled this difficult work with great success in spite of hard times in Antioch at that period. The author of this research would also like to thank the Belgian colleagues for giving her the opportunity of working in the libraries of the Centre for the Study of Gregory of Nazianzus at the Oriental Institute of the Catholic University of Louvain (Louvain-la-Neuve). Working in this library and studying Gregory’s works from different points of view helped the author in his research to get a wider outlook about the literary processes in Georgia. It helped to evaluate the development of secular literature in Georgia on the basis of Byzantine esthetics originated in Gregory’s writings, which resulted in presenting this work concerning one of the most interesting and significant events of the Georgian literature, the process of the translation and assimilation of Gregory Nazianzen’s works by Georgians.
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Abstract — The article analyses the conceptual influence of Cappadocian Father’s, namely Gregory Nazianzen’s works, on literary processes in Georgia in the Middle Ages. For this purpose the history of translation of Gregory’s works into Georgian is presented. The way from Athos’ literary-theological school to the Hellenophilism in Georgian literature obviously shows the development of Georgian literature (translated, as well as original) from plainness to a complicated Hellenophile style. The latter implied the cultural orientation towards Byzantine literary processes. The Hellenophile outlook renowned Georgian theologian and translator Ephrem Mtsire’s (11th century) and his grammatical-hermeneutical and literary-theoretical concepts and terminology which were worked out mainly in the process of translating Gregory the Theologian’s writings became the basis for the further literary processes in Georgia. The direction of Ephrem’s thinking prepared the basis for the favorable attitude of the original literature towards Hellenic education and its literary-philosophical forms.

The conceptual models and paradigms of the Cappadocian Fathers on the interrelation between pagan, classical literary-philosophical form and Christian contents were rendered into Georgian literature mainly with the help of Ephrem’s translations of Gregory’s works and its commentaries. These models also deeply influenced the development of secular literature in Georgia and defined its origin from Byzantine esthetics. Thus Ephrem Mtsire’s activity based on Cappadocian thought is of great importance for determining the tendencies in Georgian culture.