

**BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS IN THE GEORGIAN TRANSLATION (K14) OF ST. MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR'S DOGMATIC-POLEMICAL TREATISES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN RELATION TO OLD GEORGIAN VERSIONS OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT<sup>12</sup>**

**David Iobidze**

Doctor of Philology,  
Akaki Tsereteli State University,  
Kutaisi, Tamar Mepe Street №59, 4600, Georgia,  
+995551627062, d.yo777bi@gmail.com  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4758-1258>

**Abstract.** The article examines biblical quotations in the Gelatian translation (K14) of the dogmatic and polemical treatises of the eminent seventh-century theologian, Saint Maximus the Confessor. The study aims to analyze the translation style and principles applied to rendering biblical texts. The biblical citations found in the Georgian text are compared with Old Georgian versions of the Bible, including the Pre-Athonite, Athonite, and Gelatian recensions.

The Gelatian translator disregards the textual tradition of earlier Georgian versions and translates the biblical quotations with a high degree of literalism, adhering closely to the Greek source. The Gelatian translation represents a prominent example of a highly Hellenophile school of translation, distinguished by its remarkable linguistic precision. It exhibits a deliberate effort to preserve the stylistic features, terminology, and structural composition of the Greek original to the greatest possible extent.

This analysis highlights both the translator's approach to Scripture and his style, while also reflecting the textual plurality and circulation of biblical versions within the Georgian literary tradition.

A comparison of the biblical quotations used by Maximus the Confessor with the critical editions of the Greek Bible reveals that he frequently draws on variant readings that diverge from the standard Old Greek versions. These findings offer valuable material for the study of the textual history and variation of the Old Greek biblical tradition.

**Keywords:** Saint Maximus the Confessor, Dogmatic-polemical treatises, Gelatian manuscript (K14), biblical quotations, textology.

### **Introduction**

The patristic legacy of the eminent seventh-century theologian and philosopher, Saint Maximus the Confessor, constitutes a major intellectual achievement within the Christian tradition. Distinguished by his profound philosophical reflections on Trinitarian theology, Christology, anthropology, and other core doctrinal issues, Maximus's thought played a pivotal role in shaping the dogmatic self-consciousness of the early Church. His writings continue to serve as a vital source for contemporary theological and philosophical scholarship. Maximus the Confessor's corpus provides a foundational framework for the synthesis of Greek patristics, Neoplatonism, and biblical theology.

The literary corpus of Saint Maximus the Confessor is the subject of ongoing scholarly investigation within academic circles. His works have consistently been translated and studied across

---

<sup>1</sup> კვლევა №YS-24-496 განხორციელდა შოთა რუსთაველის საქართველოს ეროვნული სამეცნიერო ფონდის მხარდაჭერით.

<sup>2</sup> This research №YS-24-496 has been supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG).

a range of linguistic traditions, including Greek, Latin, Syriac, Slavic, and modern European languages. Moreover, Maximus's writings are actively examined from a text-critical perspective and are approached through interdisciplinary methodologies, further underscoring his universal and transnational significance within the broader landscape of Christian thought.

In the field of dogmatic theology, particular significance is attributed to the twenty-seven dogmatic-polemical treatises of Maximus the Confessor, which primarily consist of anti-monophysite and anti-monothelite arguments. The Old Georgian translations of these treatises are preserved in the twelfth-century Gelatian codex (K14), housed at the Kutaisi State Historical Museum. This manuscript contains Old Georgian versions of twenty-four works attributed to Maximus the Confessor. Among these are:

- *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* (Questions and Answers to Thalassios);
- *Interpretatio Orationis Dominicae* (Explanation of the Lord's Prayer);
- *Disputatio cum Pyrrho* (Dialogue with Pyrrhus);
- *Opuscula Theologica et Polemica* (ten dogmatic-polemical treatises);
- *Epistulae* (eleven Letters).

The aforementioned Gelatian manuscript (K14) is the only extant witness that preserves Old Georgian translations of Maximus the Confessor's polemical treatises. This codex contains translations of only 10 out of the 27 polemical treatises of Maximus the Confessor.

The article examines the textual relationship between the biblical quotations employed by Maximus the Confessor in his polemical treatises and the critical editions of the Greek Bible. It also offers a text-critical and philological analysis of the biblical fragments preserved in the Georgian manuscript in comparison with the traditional Old Georgian versions of the Bible.

#### Note on the Biblical Quotations

All biblical quotations are cited according to the following critical editions:

- The Georgian Old and New Testament texts are cited from:
  - Ilia Abuladze et al., *Biblia, dzveli aghtkma*, Vols. I–II, Tbilisi, 2017:
    - G – The Gelatian Bible (12th–13th centuries);
    - S – The Saba Bible (17th–18th centuries);
    - B – The Bakari Bible;
    - O – Oshki Bible (978 AD);
    - J – The Jerusalem Bible (11<sup>th</sup> c.).
  - Ivane Imnaishvili, *Kartuli otkhavis ori bolo redaksia*, Tbilisi, 1986:
    - F – The Urbnisi Gospels = Euthymius the Hagiorite redaction (Athonite) (11<sup>th</sup> c.);
    - G – The Palestinian Gospels = Euthymius the Hagiorite redaction (Athonite) (1048 AD);
    - H – The Vani Gospels = George the Hagiorite redaction (Athonite) (12<sup>th</sup> c.);
    - I – The Echmiadzin Gospels = George the Hagiorite redaction (Athonite) (12th–13th centuries);
    - K – The Gelati Gospels = George the Hagiorite redaction (Athonite) (12<sup>th</sup> c.).
  - Akaki Shanidze, *Kartuli otkhavis ori dzveli redaksia sami shatberduli khelnats' eris mikhedvit*, Tbilisi, 1945:
    - C = Adishi redaction (pre-Athonite) (897 AD);
    - D = Jruchi redaction (pre-Athonite) (936 AD);
    - E = Parkhali redaction (pre-Athonite) (973 AD).
  - K. Dzotsenidze and K. Danelia, *P'avles ep'ist'oleta kartuli versiebi*, Tbilisi, 1974:
    - AB – The pre-Athonite redaction;
    - C – George the Hagiorite redaction;
    - D – The Ephrem the Lesser redaction.
- The Greek Old Testament (Septuagint) is cited from:
  - Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, Editio altera, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979 (LXX).
- The Greek New Testament is cited from:
  - *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed., edited by B. Aland et al., Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1993 (GNT).
- The biblical quotations in the polemical treatises of Maximus the Confessor are taken from:

- *Patrologiae Graecae*, vol. 91, edited by J.-P. Migne, Paris, 1865 (PG 91).
- The biblical quotations in the Georgian translation of the polemical treatises of Maximus the Confessor are taken from:
  - The 12th-century manuscript K14 is preserved at the Kutaisi State Historical Museum (This manuscript has not been published) (K14).

In the body of the article, biblical references are given in abbreviated form (e.g., Zech. 2:6-7; Matt. 26:39; Luke 22.42; Phil. 2:8), without repeated mention of the edition.

**Methods**

The study employs a complex and partially interdisciplinary methodology that integrates text-critical and philological approaches. The principal research methods include a comparative analysis of Greek and Old Georgian texts aimed at identifying the accuracy of translation and the underlying principles of textual transmission, as well as the examination of biblical quotations in relation to other traditional Old Georgian versions. Through philological analysis, the study examines the linguistic and stylistic features of the biblical fragments preserved in the text, with a particular focus on the translator’s use of linguistic devices across various levels of language, including lexical, morphological, and syntactic.

**Results and Discussion**

Maximus the Confessor extensively employs fragments from biblical texts in his dogmatic and polemical treatises. Naturally, these fragments are also reflected in the Georgian translation. During the translation process, the Gelatian translator would have been familiar with the traditional Georgian versions of the biblical books that circulated within the theological milieu of the time. Accordingly, to facilitate the translation process, it would have been expected that the translator relied on these established Georgian biblical texts, especially in cases where the passages cited by Maximus closely align, in terms of wording and structure, with the text of the Greek Bible as represented in modern critical editions.

However, the material under consideration demonstrates that the Gelatin translator did not employ the traditionally known Georgian versions of the biblical books available in the twelfth century. Instead, in all cases, he rendered the biblical fragments anew.<sup>3</sup>

• **Matthew 26:39, 41; Luke 22:42**

The episode of Christ’s supplication to the Father in the Garden of Gethsemane, attested in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, manifests textual variation within the Georgian translation tradition:

**Table 1.**

GNT	DE	C	FG HIK	ENG.
<i>Πάτερ μου, εἰ δυνατὸν ἔστιν, παρελθάτω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο</i> (Matt. 26:39).	<i>მამაო ჩემო, უკუეთუ შესაძლებელ არს, თანა-წარმჯედინ სასუმელი ესე ჩემგან (ჩემგან სასუმელი ესე D).</i>	<i>მამაო ჩემო, მარჯუე თუ არს, თანა-წარმჯედინ ჩემგან სასუმელი ესე.</i>	<i>მამაო (+ჩემო HIK), უკუეთუ შესაძლებელ არს, თანა-წარმჯედინ ჩემგან სასუმელი ესე.</i>	O my Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me.
<i>πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημα μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν</i>	<i>ხოლო ნუ ნებაჲ ჩემი, არამედ ნებაჲ შენი იყავნ.</i>			nevertheless not My will, but

<sup>3</sup> When citing different Georgian versions of biblical texts, we use the sigla assigned to them by the editors in their respective critical editions.

γινέσθω (Luke. 22:42).		Yours, be done.
------------------------	--	-----------------

In his Third Polemical Treatise, Maximus the Confessor cites the aforementioned passage from the Gospels in the context of his argument concerning the existence of two natural wills in Jesus Christ. The first segment of the quotation is drawn from the Gospel of Matthew, while the second derives from the Gospel of Luke. From a redactional perspective, Maximus’s citation exhibits slight divergences from the Greek critical text of the Gospels:

*Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν, παρελθέτω τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ; πλὴν μὴ τὸ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γενέσθω **θέλημα*** (Opusc. 3, PG 91, 48C).

In the cited passage, the syntactic arrangement of the clauses differs; specifically, the emphasized forms appear in a different order. Moreover, the forms **μου** and **ἔστιν** are absent from the version preserved in Maximus the Confessor’s text.

The Georgian translator does not take into account the traditional Georgian versions of the Gospels, but instead renders the text directly from that of Maximus the Confessor:

*მამაო, უკუეთუ შესაძლებელ არს, წარკედიან სასუმელი ესე ჩემგან; გარნა ნუ ჩემი, არამედ შენი იქმენინ ნებაჲ* (288rII).

In the Gelatian translation, the textual form of the Gospel fragment used by Maximus the Confessor is preserved with precision, differing from the traditional Georgian versions of the Gospels.

Maximus the Confessor also addresses the question of the coexistence of the two natural wills—divine and human—in Jesus Christ in his sixth and seventh *Opuscula polemica*. Naturally, in these discussions as well, he cites the same passage from the Gospel of Matthew (26:39):

**Table 2.**

<i>Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν, παρελθέτω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον</i> (Opusc. 6, PG 91, 65A).	<i>მამაო, უკუჭთუ შესაძლებელ არს, წარმკედიან ჩემგან სასუმელი</i> (302rI).	O my Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me.
<i>Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν, παρελθέτω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον</i> (Opusc. 6, PG 91, 65A).	<i>მამაო, შესაძლებელ თუ არს, წარკედიან ჩემგან სასუმელი</i> (302rI).	
<i>Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν, παρελθέτω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον</i> (Opusc. 7, PG 91, 80C).	<i>მამაო, უკუჭთუ შესაძლებელ არს, წარკედიან ჩემგან სასუმელი</i> (298rI).	

The examples show that Maximus the Confessor uses an identical text in all three cases; however, the Gelatian translator renders them in mutually different versions, which becomes evident when one examines the highlighted units in the Georgian text.

In the sixth treatise, Maximus the Confessor cites the same passages from the Gospels of Matthew (26:39) and Luke (22:42), drawing on a work by Saint Gregory the Theologian. In this case, the text found in Gregory the Theologian’s work differs from the Greek critical text. The Gelatian translator renders this fragment with precision as well, without taking into account the traditional Georgian versions of the Gospels. The table below illustrates the textual relationship between the relevant texts:

**Table 3.**

A citation of Maximus from	K14	GNT	DE C FG HIK	ENG
----------------------------	-----	-----	-------------	-----

Gregory's work				
<i>Οὐχ ὁ ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν ἰσχύετω θέλημα</i> (Opusc. 6, PG 91, 65B).	<i>არა [302rII] რომელ მე მხედავს, არამედ შენი ძლიერ იქმენი ნება (302rI).</i>	<i>πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ</i> (Matt. 26:39).	<i>ხოლო არა ვითარ მე (-მე E) მხედავს, არამედ ვითარცა შენ.</i>	nevertheless, not as I will, but as You will.
		<i>πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω</i> (Luke. 22:42).	<i>ხოლო ნუ ნება ჩემი, არამედ ნება შენი იყავნ.</i>	nevertheless not My will, but Yours, be done.

In this same treatise, as well as in the seventh treatise, Maximus the Confessor cites the same passages from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke on several occasions. Notably, in each instance, he employs distinct textual forms—both lexically and in terms of word order within the sentence:

**Table 4.**

Maximus	K14	ENG	Comment
<i>Οὐχ ὁ ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν ἰσχύετω θέλημα</i> (Opusc. 6, PG 91, 68A).	<i>ნუ რომელ მე მხედავს, არამედ შენი ძლიერ იქმენი ნება (302vI).</i>	nevertheless, not as I will, but as You will.	Paraphrased version of Matt. 26:39
<i>Μὴ τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν ἰσχυσάτω θέλημα</i> (Opusc. 6, PG 91, 68C).	<i>ნუ ჩემნან, არამედ შენნან სძლიებ ნებანან (303rI).</i>	nevertheless not My will, but Yours, be done.	Adapted version of Luke 22:42
<i>Μὴ τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω θέλημα</i> (Opusc. 7, PG 91, 80D).	<i>ნუ ჩემი, არამედ შენი იქმენი ნება (298rII).</i>		Paraphrased version of Luke 22:42
<i>Μὴ τὸ ἐμόν θέλημα γινέσθω, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω</i> (Opusc. 7, PG 91, 81A).	<i>ნუ ჩემი, არამედ შენი იქმენი ნება (298vI).</i>		Syntactically inverted version of Luke 22:42

**Detailed analysis of each citation:**

1. **Οὐχ ὁ ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν ἰσχύετω θέλημα.**

Added verb: **ἰσχύετω** — “let it prevail”

Textual parallel: **πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ** (Matt. 26:39, GNT).

This citation is a free paraphrase of the Matthean passage, in which the phrase **οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω** is replaced with the more abstract form **οὐχ ὁ ἐγὼ θέλω**, while **ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ** is expanded to **ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν ἰσχύετω θέλημα**.

2. **Μὴ τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν ἰσχυσάτω θέλημα.**

Added verb: **ἰσχυσάτω** — “let it be strong / prevail”

There is no exact biblical match for this form. The phrase is a contamination, but the lexical structure **Μὴ τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν...** is close to the Lukan text. The verb **ἰσχυσάτω** does not appear in any canonical biblical passage in this context. It is likely a creative reworking by Maximus himself.

3. **Μὴ τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω θέλημα.**

Textual parallel: **πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω** (Luke. 22:42, GNT).

This version is a formal paraphrase of the classical Lukan text with only minor lexical modifications:

- **μη τὸ θέλημά μου → μη τὸ ἐμὸν**
- The structure and the verb (γινέσθω) remain unchanged.

**4. Μη τὸ ἐμὸν θέλημα γινέσθω, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν.**

Textual parallel: again Luke 22:42 (see above), though here the word order is altered: Instead of **μη τὸ θέλημά μου, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν...**, we have an inversion: **μη τὸ ἐμὸν θέλημα γινέσθω, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν.**

This phrase is also a reworked, inverted version of the Lukan text. Typically, such inversions are found in liturgical and patristic texts.

The Gelatian translator generally adheres strictly to the linguistic form of the source text. He translates the texts used by Maximus with precision. However, one exception introduced by the translator should be noted: in phrases №3 and №4 shown above, Maximus the Confessor alters the word order as follows:

3. Μη τὸ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν...      4. Μη τὸ ἐμὸν ... ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν  
 3. γινέσθω θέλημα                      4. θέλημα γινέσθω

In the Georgian version, the translator does not follow Maximus's word order but renders two structurally distinct Greek texts into Georgian using a uniform word sequence:

3. Μη τὸ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω θέλημα.      4. Μη τὸ ἐμὸν θέλημα γινέσθω, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν.  
 3. ნუ ჩემი, არამედ შენი იქმენი ნებაჲ.      4. ნუ ჩემი, არამედ შენი იქმენი ნებაჲ.

In the seventh polemical treatise, Maximus the Confessor refers to a work attributed to Athanasius the Great under the title *Discourse on the Incarnation and the Trinity* (298vII),<sup>4</sup> from which he quotes a passage from the Gospel of Matthew (26:39, 41). The first part of the citation (26:39) differs from the version found in the Greek critical text, whereas the second part (26:41) is identical to it. As for the Gelatian manuscript, the translator once again does not rely on the traditional Old Georgian versions of the Gospels, but renders the exact fragment as it appears in Maximus's treatise. This is clearly illustrated in the comparative table below.

**Table 5.**

GNT	A citation of Maximus from Athanasius' work	K14	DE	C	FG HIK	ENG
Πάτερ μου, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν, παρελθάτω ἅπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο;	Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο;	მამაო, უკუჭითუ შესადლებელ არს, წარმჯედინ სასუმელი ესე;	მამაო ჩემო, უკუეთუ შესადლებელ არს, თანა-წარმჯედინ სასუმელი ესე ჩემგან (ჩემგან სასუმელი ესე D);	მამაო ჩემო, მარჯუთუ არს, თანა-წარმჯედი ნ ჩემგან სასუმელ ი ესე;	მამაო (+ჩემო HIK), უკუეთუ შესადლებელ არს, თანა-წარმჯედინ ჩემგან სასუმელი ესე;	O my Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me;
πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σύ	πλὴν μη τὸ ἐμὸν θέλημα γινέσθω,	გარნა ნუ ჩემი	ხოლო არა ვითარ მე (-მე E) მნებავს, არამედ ვითარცა შენ.			nevertheless, not as I will, but as You will.

<sup>4</sup> The work in question is *On the Manifestation in the Flesh of God the Word and Against the Arians*, traditionally attributed to Athanasius the Great. However, scholarly literature considers the attribution to Athanasius doubtful. The most likely author is thought to be Marcellus of Ancyra (Maximus Confessor, 2014, p. 564).

(Mθ. 26:39).	ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν (Opusc. 7, PG 91, 81C).	ნებაჲ იქმნებინ, არამედ შენი (298vII).		
τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα προθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής (Mθ. 26:41).	τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής (PG 91, 81C).	სული სადმე გულსმოდგინ ქ, ხოლო ჯორცი უძლურ არს (298vII).	სული გულს-მოდგინე არს, ხოლო ჯორცი უძლურ.	<i>The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.</i>

• Zechariah 2:6-7

In his Third Polemical Treatise, Maximus the Confessor addresses the problems of Christological dogmatics in relation to Monothelite theology. He exposes and refutes erroneous doctrines concerning the mode of coexistence of Christ’s natures, particularly those associated with Apollinarianism, Eutychianism, and Severianism. Maximus argues that these teachings foster a distorted understanding of Christ’s will and operations. Specifically, he opposes the view of Severus of Antioch, who claimed that Christ possessed only a single will. Maximus denounces this position, describing it as darkness estranged from the light of God, and likens its adherents to those dwelling with the daughter of Babylon — symbols of sin and spiritual obscurity. According to Maximus, the true doctrine affirms that Christ possessed two wills — divine and human — both operating within the unity of a single person. In articulating this, Maximus defends the orthodox dogma and condemns the erroneous teachings that, in his view, ultimately lead the soul into spiritual darkness.

In this allegorical exposition, Maximus the Confessor cites a passage from the Book of the Prophet Zechariah. The version of the text he quotes differs slightly from that of the Septuagint; specifically, Maximus omits the lexical unit γῆς (land), which appears in the Septuagintal version.

Table 6.

Opusc.3	LXX	ENG
Ω, ὦ φεύγετε ἀπὸ βορρᾶ... εἰς Σιων ἀνασώζεσθε, οἱ κατοικοῦντες θυγατέρα Βαβυλῶνος (PG 91, 52A).	ὦ ὦ φεύγετε ἀπὸ γῆς βορρᾶ... εἰς Σιων ἀνασώζεσθε, οἱ κατοικοῦντες θυγατέρα Βαβυλῶνος (Zech. 2:10-11).	Up, up! Flee from the <b>land</b> of the north... Up, Zion! Escape, you who dwell with the daughter of Babylon.

As for the traditional Georgian translations, they exhibit only minor textual variation. The Gelatian translator, as expected, renders precisely the version of the text used by Maximus, and accordingly, the lexical unit γῆς (land) is likewise absent from his translation.

Table 7.

K14	GSB	OJ
ჰოი, ჰოი, ივლტოდეთ ჩრდილოდით... სიონდ მ(იმა)რთ ცხოვნებად, დამკვდრებულნი ასულ[289rII]სა ბაბილოვნისასა (289rI).	ჰ, ჰ, ივლტოდე ქუწყანით ბლოართ... სიონდ ალიჩიენით დამკვდრებულნი ასულსა ბაბილონისასა.	ჰ, ოა, ივლტოდეთ ქუყანისაგან ჩრდილოდასა... სიონდმი განერენით, რომელნი დამკვდრებულ ხართ ასულისა ბაბილოვნისანი.

• John 14:30

A theological interpretation of the Christological dogma is offered by Maximus the Confessor in his Fourth Dogmatic-Polemical Treatise, which addresses the person of Jesus Christ and the co-existence of His divine and human natures. Maximus the Confessor affirms that Jesus Christ is one person in two natures—divine and human. He was born of the Virgin and assumed human nature without sin. Through the Incarnation, human nature was healed. Christ became incarnate for our salvation and is both true man and true God.

When Maximus the Confessor speaks about Christ’s sinlessness, he cites a passage from the Gospel of John (14:30) in this context. The Gelatian scribe renders Maximus’s text with precision. What is particularly noteworthy here is that in the citation given by Maximus, as well as in the Greek critical text, the action expressed by the verb appears in the present tense. This same present-tense form is preserved in the Georgian translation as well, whereas in other Georgian versions, the verbal action has been shifted to the future tense.

**Table 8.**

GNT	Opusc. 4	K14	C	DE FG HIK	ENG
ἔρχεται γὰρ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων, καὶ ἐν ἔμοι οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν (John. 14:30).	Νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἔρχεται, καὶ ἐν ἔμοι εὕρισκει οὐδέν (PG 91, 60B).	აწ მთავარი ამის სოფლისაჲ მოვალს, და ჩემთ(ა)ნა ჰპოვებს ვერარას (292rI).	მოვალს მთავარი ამის სოფლისაჲ და ჩემ თანა არაჲ პოლს.	რამეთუ მოვალს მთავარი იგი ამის სოფლისაჲ და ჩემ თანა პოლს არარაჲ (არარაჲ პოლს FG / არარაჲ პოვლს DE).	for the ruler of this world is coming, and he <b>has</b> nothing in Me.

The presented excerpts show that both in the critical edition and Maximus’s version, the emphasized elements are verb forms in the present tense. The traditional Georgian versions, by contrast, employ the optative form, which serves to express the future tense. As for the Gelatian translation, the temporal category is preserved with precision, and the present-tense form is accordingly used.

• **Philippians 2:8**

The central theme of the Sixth Polemical Treatise concerns the relationship between Christ’s two wills—divine and human—as expressed in the words spoken in the Garden of Gethsemane: “Not as I will, but as You will.” Maximus the Confessor critiques the view that Christ’s human will could have been in opposition to the divine will. He argues that Christ’s human will is not in conflict with the divine, but is in complete submission to it. Accordingly, the prayer in Gethsemane expresses not a contradiction between the wills, but their synergy—Christ’s human will follows and conforms to the will of God.

To reinforce his argument concerning the submission of the human will to the divine, Maximus the Confessor cites a passage from the Apostle Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians. Notably, this is an expanded and paraphrased citation, in which Maximus employs lexical elements that are not found in the Greek critical text. The version used by Maximus reads as follows:

*τὸ δέ, ὡς Πατρὶ διὰ ταῦτην ὑπήκοος γενόμενος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ* (Opusc. 6, PG 91, 68D) (became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross).

The emphasized elements in the sentence are additions made directly by Maximus the Confessor himself. Naturally, the Gelatian manuscript reflects the expanded version of the text as transmitted by Maximus:

*ბოლო რომლითაჲჲ მორჩილ მამისა ქმნილი ამისთვის ვიდრე სიკუდიდმდე და სიკუდილითა გუჟარისაჲთა* (303rI).

The traditional Old Georgian versions differ from the Gelatian text. This is to be expected, as the traditional Georgian versions reflect one of the Greek redactional forms of the Apostle Paul's epistle, distinct from the text employed by Maximus the Confessor:

**Table 9.**

GNT	AB	CD
γενόμενος ἰσχυρός μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ (Phil. 2:8).	იქმნა იგი მორჩილ ვიდრე სიკუდიდმდე და სიკუდილითაღა ჯუარისაღთა.	იქმნა იგი მორჩილ ვიდრე სიკუდილდმდე და სიკუდილითა მით ჯუარისაღთა.

The table presented above contains critical Greek and Georgian texts of the Apostle Paul's epistle, which exhibit redactional differences in comparison with the version used by Maximus the Confessor and the translation of the Gelatian scribe.

• **Matthew 24:21**

Bishop Nikandros is the recipient of Maximus the Confessor's eighth polemical treatise. In this text, Maximus addresses him with deep reverence and affection, honoring him as a worthy pastor who, in the words of the author, firmly upholds the Orthodox faith and has already received a well-earned crown through his toil in Christ.

In his treatise addressed to Bishop Nikandros, Maximus the Confessor cites a passage from the Gospel of Matthew to illustrate the prevailing spiritual and social turmoil of his time. Within this context, the excerpt from Matthew serves as an allusion to the contemporary challenges to the faith—heresies, hostility toward true doctrine, the destabilization of the Church, confusion among the faithful, and a general atmosphere of spiritual disorder caused by false teachings. Through this citation, Maximus intensifies his message: the times are perilous, the Church is under threat, and therefore, Bishop Nikandros—along with other spiritual leaders—is entrusted with a special vocation: to serve as a guardian of the faith and a steadfast support in a time of crisis.

For this study, it is of particular interest to examine the textual relationship between the version cited by Maximus and the critical Greek text. Likewise, we seek to explore the correlation between the Gelatian manuscript text and the versions preserved in the traditional Georgian translations.

The version employed by Maximus the Confessor differs from the Greek critical text. Maximus makes use of a paraphrased form of the given passage:

**Table 10.**

Opusc.8	GNT	ENG
θλίψις, οἷα καθάπαξ οὐ γέγονεν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται (PG 91, 92C).	ἔσται γὰρ τότε θλίψις μεγάλη οἷα οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἕως τοῦ νῦν οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται.	For then there will be great tribulation, such as has not been since the beginning of the world until this time, no, nor ever shall be.

The Gelatian scribe, in accordance with his translation principles, renders Maximus's text directly, without taking into account the traditional Georgian versions:

**Table 11.**

K14	C	D FG HIK
-----	---	----------

<p>ჭირმან ვითარი არსადა ქმნილ არს დაწყებითგან სოფლისადათ არცა იქმნეს (305rII).</p>	<p>რამეთუ იყოს მაშინ ჭირი დიდი, რომელ არა ყოფილ არს დასაბამითგან სოფლისადათ მოაქამდე, არცადა იყოს.</p>	<p>რამეთუ იყოს მაშინ ჭირი დიდი, რომელი არა იყო დასაბამითგან სოფლისადათ, ვიდრე აქამომდე (აქამდე FG HI), არცადა ყოფად არს.</p>
--	--	--

The highlighted elements found in versions C, D, F, G, H, I, and K are absent from version K14, as these elements are not present in the text used by Maximus the Confessor himself.

The observations above lead us to consider the stylistic principles underlying the Gelatian translation. The following remarks aim to articulate the translator's approach from a philological and theological perspective.

### Translation Style in the Gelatian Version

The Gelatian translator adopts a stylistically marked approach that reflects the principles of the so-called Hellenophile school of Georgian translation. This school, most active between the 11th and 12th centuries, was characterized by its unwavering commitment to literalism, formal equivalence, and structural mirroring of the Greek original. In the case of the Gelatian manuscript (K14), the translator's fidelity to Maximus the Confessor's citational Greek is so rigorous that it frequently overrides the availability of traditional Georgian biblical versions.

Unlike idiomatic renderings that seek to naturalize the source into the target language, the Gelatian style is dominated by syntactic calques, semantic borrowing, and minimal paraphrase. These tendencies manifest not only at the lexical level—e.g., through the direct transposition of Greek theological terminology—but also syntactically, where sentence order, clause structure, and verbal aspect are preserved to the extent Georgian morphosyntax allows.

This translation strategy is not the result of linguistic inflexibility but of conscious philological and theological choices. The translator seems to regard Maximus's Greek not merely as a vehicle of meaning but as a theological and exegetical authority in itself. Consequently, the Gelatian translator treats Maximus's biblical quotations as authoritative textual layers, worthy of literal replication—even when those quotations diverge from the canonical text of the Septuagint or the Byzantine textual tradition.

Moreover, the Gelatian version appears to function as a "text within a text": it embeds a secondary biblical layer into the main polemical discourse, with this layer bearing the peculiar textual and redactional fingerprint of Maximus himself. Thus, the translation style is best understood not merely as a passive linguistic transfer, but as a deliberate act of intertextual fidelity, anchored in theological reverence and philological precision.

Such literalism occasionally leads to awkward or unidiomatic Georgian constructions, but these are likely intentional. The translator prioritizes doctrinal clarity and textual alignment over rhetorical elegance. This functional literalism ensures that the translation retains the theological nuance, polemical tone, and exegetical precision of the Greek original, particularly in the context of Christological controversies over the wills and energies of Christ.

### Conclusion

The biblical passages quoted by Maximus the Confessor exhibit editorial differences from the texts of the Greek Bible as found in critical editions. This suggests that his citations are based either on an alternative textual tradition available to him or on memory-based (oral) citation.

The Gelatian translator, in rendering the biblical quotations, does not take into account the traditional Old Georgian versions of the Bible. Instead, he follows closely the text as used by Maximus the Confessor and applies a principle of highly literal translation. This translation practice indicates a close connection with the source material.

The Gelatian translation presents a functionally distinct biblical textual layer that closely follows the authorial citation and operates independently of the traditional textological trajectory of the Georgian Bible. As a result, the Gelatian manuscript effectively preserves a functional, context-specific biblical translation embedded within a polemical discourse, whose intertextual alignment is

with the authoritative citations of Maximus rather than with the established Georgian textual recensions of Scripture.

Therefore, the Gelatian manuscript not only preserves an idiosyncratic textual layer but also testifies to a theological culture wherein scriptural authority is mediated through patristic exegesis, rather than through canonical biblical versions alone.

## REFERENCES

- Abuladze, Il., Gogvadze, N., Kekelia, V. and Kurtsikidze, Ts. (2017). *biblia, dzveli aghkma, I-II [The Bible: Old Testament, Vols. I-II. Georgian Version]*. Tbilisi.
- Aland, B., Aland, K., Karavidopoulos, J., Martini, C. M. and Metzger, B. M., eds. (1993). *The Greek New Testament*. 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.
- Dzotsenidze, K., Danelia, K. (1974). *p'avles ep'ist'oleta kartuli versiebi [The Georgian Versions of the Pauline Epistles]*. Tbilisi.
- Imnaishvili, Iv. (1986). *kartuli otkhtavis ori bolo redaktsia [The Two Latest Redactions of the Georgian Tetraevangelion]*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Publishing House.
- Maximus Confessor. (1865). *Dogmatic and Polemical Treatises*. Patrologiae Graecae, vol. 91. cols. 9-286. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique.
- Maximus Confessor. (2014). *Bogoslovsko-polemičeskie sočineniâ [Theological-polemical writings]*. Russian edition translated by D. A. Chernoglazov and A. M. Shufrin. Saint Petersburg: Publishing house "RKHGA".
- Rahlfs, A. (1979). *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Editio altera. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Shanidze, A. (1945). *kartuli otkhtavis ori dzveli redaktsia sami shat'berduli khelnats'eris mikhedvit [Two Old Redactions of the Georgian Tetraevangelion Based on Three Shatberdi Manuscripts]*. Tbilisi.