

GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS AND
NIKOLAZ BARATASHVILI.
CHRISTIAN SOURCES
OF GEORGIAN ROMANTICISM

by Tamar Lomidze and Ketevan Bezarashvili
Tbilisi

Texts from bygone remote centuries do not linger only in the past, but are also transmitted to the culture of every other epoch that follows. They are processed through the prism of the mentality and *Weltanschauung* of a given epoch. Ancient texts instead of remaining unchanged are modified in accordance with the world-view (epistema) and mentality specific to each period of historical development. Thus, the succession and continuity of culture does not suggest that the meanings of one and the same concepts conveyed in different epistema are absolutely identical. Examining cultural contexts will help to determine the meaning of a concept at different cultural stages.

The present article endeavours to explain the specifics of certain concepts in Christian poetry as well as in Georgian literature. We will devote special attention to Gregory Nazianzen's personal and individual poetry which, on the one hand, meant a novelty in Greek Christian poetry and marked a transition from ancient to Byzantine literature in the 4th century and, on the other hand, might have been a presumable source for Nikoloz Baratashvili, an outstanding representative of the 19th c. Georgian Romantic literature (1817-1845).

On the history of studies of old Georgian translations of Gregory Nazianzen's poetry and its impact on Georgian poetry

Gregory of Nazianzus' non-liturgical religious poetry had been translated into old Georgian several times: by Euthymius the Athonite

(10th c.), Ephrem Mtsire (11th c.), and later by two anonymous pro-Hellenic groups in the form of short and extended versions (12th-13th c.)¹. The earliest translations are for the most part samples of Gregory's gnomic poetry, whereas the vast anonymous translations of the late 12th-13th centuries together with his gnomic poetry contain most significant samples of his hymnographic confessional poetry. A part of Gregory's non-liturgical poetry was also called in Georgian Aporeta². That very last anonymous pro-Hellenic translation was intended for educational purposes. Therefore it is not uncommon at all that this poetry had influenced the Georgian poetry of the subsequent period. Old Georgian translations of Gregory's poetry were again transcribed and disseminated in Georgia in the 18th-19th century. The movement was primarily supported by the interests of the school of Catholicos Anton, who, in his turn, endeavoured to restore, revive, and disseminate the literary productions of the 12th-13th c. pro-Hellenic school. The manuscript collections of the later periods containing the old Georgian translations of Gregory's poetry surpass romanticism in overcoming Eastern trends and establishing European traditions in the Georgian literature.

It should be noted, on the other hand, that classical sources of Gregory's poetry had been studied by the European literary criticism³. The theological significance of his poetry was analysed in the 19th and 20th c. Russian works and appeared even in modern European works of the 20th

¹ The Georgian translations of Gregory's poetry are studied in the thesis and articles of K. Bezashvili, გრიგოლ ნაზიანზელის პოემების ქართული ვერსია [The Georgian Version of Gregory Nazianzen's poems and its commentaries], სადისერტაციო ნაშრომი, Diss., Tbilisi, 1989; K. Bezashvili, გრიგოლ ნაზიანზელის პოემია ქართულ მწერლობაში [The poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus in Georgian literature], in Macne, 3, Tbilisi, 1986, p. 87-112.

² Alongside Gregory's poetry, this term in the Georgian marginal notes, however, turned out to be also the title of his non-liturgical prose in regard to the terminology absorbed through Greek, see K. Bezashvili, The Problem of the so-called „Aporeta” in the Georgian Corpus of the works of Gregory the Theologian, in *Le Muséon*, 108 (1995), p. 131-142.

³ For the Classical sources of Gregory's poetry studied by European researchers see A. Cameron, *Gregory of Nazianzus and Apollo*, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 70 (1969), p. 240-241; A. Kambylis, *Gregor von Nazianz und Kallimachos*, in *Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie*, 110 (1982), p. 120-122. Q. Cataudella, *Il prologo degli Aetia (Αἰτια) e Gregorio Nazianzeno*, in *Rivista di filologia e d'introduzione classica*, 56 (1928), p. 509-510; V. Frangeskou, *Gregory Nazianzen's Usage of the Homeric Simile*, in *Hellenika* 36 (1985), p. 12-26. See also some works concerning Gregory's usage of Sappho: K. Demoen, *The attitude towards Greek Poetry in the Verse of Gregory Nazianzen*, in J. Den Boeft – A. Hilhorst (ed.), *Early Christian Poetry. A Collection of Essays*, Leiden, New York etc., 1993, p. 235-252. For the attitude of Christian poetry to Classical sources see Č. Milovanovič-Barham, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Ars Poetica (In suos versus: Carmen 2. 1. 39)*, in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 5, 4 (1997), p. 497-510.

century⁴. The artistic and rhetoric data of Gregory's works had been analysed in both Western and Georgian sciences⁵. Especially the influence of the old Georgian translations of his poetry on Georgian authors (for instance king Archil, David Guramishvili, and partially Nikoloz Baratashvili) had been studied in Georgia⁶. Here we aim to explore its parallels with Georgian romanticism, in particular with the poetry of Nikoloz Baratashvili – the poet most fully expressing the idea of romanticism in Georgia⁷.

The correlation between Christian Church poetry and Romantic poetry: similarities and dissimilarities

Biblical and Christian poetry is commonly acknowledged to be the basic source from which romanticism takes its roots⁸. Studying Biblical and Christian literature and poetry in particular, is a prerequisite for un-

⁴ For some new European researches see also D.A. Sykes, *The Poemata Arcana of Gregory Nazianzen*, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 21 (1970), p. 32-42; K. Demoen, *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen. A Study in Rhetoric and Hermeneutics (Corpus Christianorum; Lingua Patrum, 2)*, Turnhout, 1996; P.L. Gilbert, *Person and Nature in the Theological Poems of St. Gregory of Nazianzus*, Washington, D.C., 1994.

⁵ K. Bezarashvili, *The interrelation between the classical literary form and Christian contents interpreted by Gregory the Theologian in his poem «On his own Verses»*, in *Motivi e forme della poesia cristiana antica tra scrittura e tradizione classica. XXXVI Incontro di studiosi dell' antichità cristiana*, Roma, 3-5 maggio 2007 (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, 108), Roma, 2008, p. 281-292.

⁶ For studying the attitude of the Georgian king and poet Archil to Gregory's didactic poetry see L. Menabde, არჩილის ერთი თხზულების წყაროსათვის [For the Source of one Work of Archil], in *Proceedings of the Georgian Academy of Sciences*, 32/3 (1963), p. 723-728; K. Bezarashvili, გრიგოლ ნაზიანზელის თხზულებანი და ქართული სამწერლობო ტრადიციები [The Works of Gregory Nazianzen and Georgian literary traditions], in *Macne*, 1-4, Tbilisi, 1994, p. 73-114, esp. p. 78, 103; K. Bezarashvili, “სწავლა მოსწავლეთას” პრობლემატიკა, როგორც “დავითიანის” ორგანული ნაწილი [On the problem of “Teachings to Disciples” as an organic part of D. Guramishvili's poem “Davitiani”], in *დ. გურამიშვილი – 300. სამეცნიერო შრომების კრებული* [David Guramishvili - 300. A Collection of Scholarly Researches], Tbilisi, 2005, p. 13-31; K. Bezarashvili, ნ. ბარათაშვილის ქრისტიანული წყაროებიდან [The Christian sources of N. Baratashvili's poetry], in *ნ. ბარათაშვილისადმი მიძღვნილი კრებული* [A Collection dedicated to N. Baratashvili], Tbilisi, 2006, p. 19-33; K. Bezarashvili, *The significance of Gregory the Theologian's works for the Georgian literary tradition*, in *Le Muséon*, 118 (2005), p. 269-298; K. Bezarashvili, სააზროვნო მოდელები ბიზანტიურ კულტურაში, ელინოფილობა და ქართული საერო ლიტერატურის წარმოშობის პრობლემა [The Thinking Models of Byzantine Culture. Hellenophilism and the Problem of Development of a Georgian Secular Literature], in *Semiotics*. Ilia Chavchavadze State University, 3 (2008), p. 51-96.

⁷ Researching Gregory's poems with respect to romanticism is a preparatory stage of research, which we hope to expand further. It is important to study the opposition between the European, in general, and specifically the Georgian theological and artistic mentality regarding Greek metaphors, motifs, word assimilation and styles of mentality. Such a study has to explore Greek topoi in the European and Georgian linguistic and artistic world.

⁸ E. Dubedout, *Le sentiment chrétien dans la poésie romantique*, Paris, 1901.

derstanding the 19th century European and Georgian romanticism. Sometimes, the similarity between the Romantic and old Christian literatures is explained through a certain parallelism of ideas⁹ or adaptation of a theme stemming from a common Biblical source¹⁰. Religious and subjective sentiments are portrayed through similar eternal Biblical and symbolic images and Christian models expressing self-knowledge. This happens because it is characteristic for Romantic poets to incorporate Biblical and Christian sentiments, albeit the images and dispositions acquire already a new, Romantic character. Centuries before the establishment of romanticism as a literary school, those Biblical and Christian concepts had already existed in the translated and original Georgian poetry by way of tradition as an entire poetical system whence they had been inherited by romanticism.

The works of Romantic poets reflect thus a strong tradition of Biblical and Christian motifs. It is very likely to reveal a system of typologically akin images in both Christian hymnography and Romantic poetry. Typological kinship with the Biblical-Christian as well as the system of images has been reflected in the works of both Georgian and European romanticists (themes, motifs, vocabulary, and phraseology)¹¹. Many of these images acquire new bearing and significance in Romantic poetry (e.g. heaven, evil, soul etc.).

It is commonly believed that the poetry of Nikoloz Baratashvili, the most outstanding representative of Georgian romanticism, is permeated with Biblical stream (Job, Solomon's Wisdom, and the Gospels). The Old Testament themes that Baratashvili resorts to most frequently are the Psalms and the book Kohelet¹². Therefore, Baratashvili's meditative creations cannot be duly understood without taking account of Christian poetry. Several Biblical-hymnographic motifs take lead in Baratashvili's lyrics. We will focus on one of them and its correlation with Gregory the Theologian's poetry. In view of the fact that Baratashvili's education was based on old Georgian literature¹³, and given that Gregory's poetic collections in Georgian translation were widely spread, one should not rule out the possibility of the direct link between Baratashvili's poetry and Greek literature in Georgian translation.

It is commonly held that Gregory of Nazianzus was the first to lay

⁹ G. Kikodze, ნ. ბარათაშვილი [N. Baratashvili], I, Tbilisi, 1963, p. 102.

¹⁰ G. Kalandarishvili, ბიბლიის ლიტერატურული ადაპტაცია ქარტველ რომანტიკოსთა პოეზიაში [The Literary Adaptation of the Bible in the Poetry of Georgian Romanticists], in Macne, I, Tbilisi, 1981, p. 15-29.

¹⁵ It is believed that personal religious experience, poetic rhetoric contemplation and metaphysical speculation first appear in Gregory's autobiographic poetry as opposed to Greek intellectual narrative, thus shaping the literary form of confession; see G. M i s c h, *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*, vol. II, London, 1950, p. 526-537, 600-624 (= M i s c h, *A History of Autobiography*).

Hence, it is only in terms of the human freedom of mind and profound mistrust that Gregory's elegies can be compared with the Romantic poetry of Nikoloz Baratashvili; they differ not in how they pose a problem but in the ways of solving it. The Romantic conflict is not only about the Christian disharmony between soul and flesh, the earth and the heaven but the tragedy of mind, the internal duality, the aesthetics of the romantic orphaned soul, the incongruity between dream and reality, the scepticism of the new time, something so frequently exposed in the works of certain Romantic poets.

The perception of the « evil spirit » in Gregory's and Baratashvili's poetry

Gregory is the author of a series of poems, hymnographic confessions dealing with the struggle against the Evil. These poems, in a dialogue form, bring forward a « lyrical hero » struggling for moral perfection and unbreakable faith: Ἀπελθ' ὄπελθε, πνεῦμα συμπνίγον, κακά (Carm. II, 1, 64) – წარველ, ჟ სულო, ბოროტამცა შეაშთობ (Tbilisi, S-2568, f. 56r); Φεῦγ, ᾠκόκιστον θηρίον, βροτοκτόνον (Carm. II, 1, 56) – მეველგე, ჟ მკეცო, ბოროტო, კაცისმკლველო (Tbilisi, S-2568, f. 54r).

Romanticists typically employ a poetic symbol of Biblical origin – the personified image of Satan, Lucifer, or evil spirit – that in their works acquires a special importance and sense. The peculiarity of Georgian Romantic demonism is that unlike the European romanticism it does not personify the demon, the evil spirit. There are no personages named Mephistopheles or Lucifer in Georgian Romantic poetry. Baratashvili's poem « Evil Spirit » is closer to the traditional Christian understanding and together with the spiritual horse and raven has become a symbol of national imagery (often pointed out by Georgian scientists).

Nikoloz Baratashvili was a student of Solomon Dodashvili, a brilliant Georgian thinker, logician, and philosopher – an outstanding representative of the philosophy of romanticism, permeated by the philosophy of the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte. This might provide clues to the fact that the Romantic *Weltanschauung* in Baratashvili's work is rendered in a rather generalized form. As regards the image of the evil spirit, Baratashvili does not see it as a personified personage with certain properties – like Lucifer, Mephistopheles or Satan – but rather as a component of the lyrical hero's inner world, a dark, inexplicable, mysterious part of his 'ego' – the inner 'non-ego'.

Exactly this distinction in the depiction of the image of the evil makes it interesting to juxtaposing the different concepts of it: on the one hand, as portrayed in Baratashvili's poem and, on the other hand, as presented in Christian literature,

namely in Gregory of Nazianzus' poetry. Consequently, we are interested how the specific method of personal depiction is realized in them which S. Averintsev termed as «pluralistic psychologism»¹⁶ and which, according to the same scholar, was characteristic for the artistic thought of all epochs ranging from Ancient mythology and literature to Modern art. This implies the portrayal of the person's internal world, the world that can be said to have a multi-component structure. S. Averintsev notes that the concept of a human soul as a unified, secluded, self-sufficient, and undivided 'monad' emerged very late and was used only in a very restricted circle of literary facts. The great literary epochs of the past had been drawing on other concepts¹⁷, i.e. literary personage, as a rule, was not characterized by a unified, monolithic 'ego', but was instead manifest as a system comprising the 'ego' and its doubles. In support of his view Averintsev brings relevant arguments from such materials as mythology, classical Greek literature, medieval literature, and the 19th century realistic art¹⁸.

Let us now compare Gregory of Nazianzus' poems of repentance and one of N. Baratashvili's most significant poems, the "Evil Spirit", as it best expresses his Romantic view. Essential semblance between the two is noticeable regarding terms, composition, attitudes, images, and phraseology. Alongside the emptiness, darkness, and the black and anxious thoughts inflicted by the evil spirit¹⁹, the poems of both poets have common biblical grounds as well, for even in the Georgian translations of the New Testament the expulsion of the demon from the man is rendered by similar linguistic expressions («Get away from me/him», *Marc.* 1, 25; 5, 8; *Luc.* 4, 35; 5, 8). Nevertheless, equally significant differences are also manifest. Gregory's struggle against the demon, the evil, is logically nurtured by Christian views. The leading theme is that of repentance and mercy and considered by Christians as the most perfect state. In the case of Baratashvili, on the other hand, the struggle against the evil force, the

¹⁶ S.S. Averintsev, *Аналитическая психология К.Г. Юнга и закономерности творческой фантазии* [*The Analytical Psychology of K.G. Jung and the Law Norms of the Activity of Fantasy*], in *О современной буржуазной эстетике* [*About modern Bourgeois Aesthetics*], Moscow, 1972, p. 136 (= Averintsev, *Analytical Psychology*).

¹⁷ Averintsev, *Analytical Psychology*, p. 135.

¹⁸ Averintsev, *Analytical Psychology*, p. 139.

¹⁹ As often noted, in spite of the fact that no color is given in the poem, Evil Spirit invokes associations of the «black and anxious» underworld element (Asatiani, *From „The Knight in the Panther's Skin” to “Bakhtioni”*, p. 168); this is nothing unexpected as in the hymnography, in general, and in Gregory's poetry, in particular, the evil Satan is associated with the underworld waters. See ქ. ბეზარაშვილი, გრიგოლ ნაზიანზელის პოეზიის სახისმეტყველება [K. Bezashvili, *Symbols in Gregory of Nazianzus' Poetry*], in *თსუ შრომები* 261 (ლიტერატურათმცოდნეობა) [*Transactions of Tbilisi State University ; Literary Research*, 261], Tbilisi, 1986, p. 121-142.

evil double, is differently understood and we do not see features typical of penitentiary lyrics: self-punishment, lamentation, enumeration of sins, fear of God, and hope; neither do we see the internal need for purification and striving to light so typical for Gregory of Nazianzus. Baratashvili's poetry implies the tragedy of the mind that kills youthful «blind faith», «sincere intentions», romantic youthful illusions, and shatters the peace of soul, the tragedy of an intellectual person «faithless by mind», «distrustful by heart», lonesome and «pointless» as a result of his blind faith in the evil. This is quite natural, as the two authors have different perceptions regarding the semantics of the evil spirit. It is beyond doubt that the comparative analysis of the two superb poetic pieces allows us to derive a clearer and deeper insight into the disparity in understanding the concepts of a person materialized in the works of these authors.

1. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina*

Carm. II, 1, 60 (PG 37, 1403):

Ἦλθες μὲν, ἦλθες, ὦ κἀκίστ',
ἀλλ' ἐσχέθης...

Venisti quidem, venisti, **o pessime**,
sed repressus es...

Σταυρὸν δ' ἐφίστημ', ὅς φύλαξ
ζωῆς ἐμῆς,

Crucem autem attollo, **quae custos**
est vitae meae,

Ὅς πάντα κόσμον συνδέων,
Θεῷ φέρει.

Quae universum mundum, ceu
vinculo constringens, Deo offert.

Τοῦτον φοβηθεῖς, εἶκε,
μὴ πάλιν φανῆς.

Hanc pertimescens, cede, **nec am-**
plius appareas.

Καλεῖ μ' ἄχραντον ἡ χάρις
παραστάτην

Vocat me purum gratia astitem.

*Tbilisi S-2568, f. 53v*²⁰

მოხვედ, ბოროტო,
არამედ დაეყენე. ჯუარსა წინ
გიყოფ ცხორების ჩემის მცვე-
ელსა,

Now that you have come, **o Evil**,
stay within. I place before you the
cross, **my life protector**

²⁰ For the critical edition of the old Georgian translation see გრიგოლ ნაზიანზელის ჰიმნების ანთონიურის ქართული თარგმანები (ტექსტი გამოსაცემად მოამზადა და წინასიტყვა დაურთო ქ. ბეზარაშვილმა [Anonymous Georgian Translations of the Hymns of Gregory of Nazianzus (texts prepared for publication and edited with introduction by K. Bezarashvili)], in *Transactions of Tbilisi State University; Literary Research*, no. 323, Tbilisi, 1997, p. 138-155.

სოფლის შემკრველსა და ღმრ-
თისად ძლუნად მიმროთმელსა.
ამას მიჰრიდე, ნუ კუალად გა-
მოხნდები.
მიწოდს მე მაღლი უხრწნელსა
წინამდგომსა.

That binds the world together and
offers it to the God.
Fear it, and **don't show yourself
again.**
The grace standing in front beck-
ons me pure.

Carm. II, 1, 58 (PG 37, 1402)

Καί τοὔτο τῆς σῆς, ὦ κἀκίστε,
προσβολῆς.
Τὸν νοῦν ἐφέρπεις εὐστρόφοις
ἐλίγμασι,
Πείθων τὸ λείον ἀρπάσαι τῆς
ἡδονῆς.
Ἀλλ' οὔτι πείσεις τοῦτ' Ἀδὰμ
τέπεικέ με.
Εἰς γῆν ἀποστράφηθι, καὶ κάραν
πατοῦ...
Εἰ δ' ἰσχύς ἐστι μικρὸν ἐγρίφαι
ποδὶ,
Κρεμῶ δε χαλκοῦν, ὥς βλάβῃν
ὀφῶν φύγω.

Et hoc tuae est, **o pessime**, impul-
sionis.

**In mentem irrepis subdolis arti-
bus,**
Suadens **mollitiem** arripere **volup-
tatis:**

Verum minime suadebis: hoc Adam
suasit mihi.

In terram **revertere**, ut pedibus
caput tuum conteratur.

Si autem praevaleas, ut tantillum
pedi morsum infigas,

Aheneum te suspendam, ut con-
spiciens noxam vitem.

Tbilisi, S-2568, f. 54r

ესე შენისა ზაკუვისა უფლისა,
ბოროტო,
მიმპარავ გულსა მაცთურითა
ლიქნიითა,
მარწმუნებ ტკბილთა გემოთა
შეტკბობასა.
ვერ მარწმუნო შენ, ესე ადამ
მარწმუნა.
მიწად მიიქეც და თავდათრგუნ-
ვილ იქმენ,
რაითა... მე განვევლტო ვნება-
სა.

And thus insulting the Lord,
o Evil,

**With your tempting flattery
sneaking to my heart**

You try to convince me **to taste the
sweetness of bliss.**

But you will not persuade me, as
Adam persuaded me.

Turn back to earth and subdue
yourself,

As I shall distance myself from
harm.

Carm. II, 1, 56 (PG 37, 1401)

Θεὸν βοῶ. Τί τοῦτο; **φεῦγέ** μοι
τάχος,
Φεῦγ', ὠκίστον θηρίον,
βροτοκτόνον,
Τί μοι διοχλεῖς οὐδὲν
ἡδικοῦμενος; ...
Ἐμοῦ δ' ἀπόσχου, μή σε τῷ
σταυρῷ βάλῃ,
Ὅν πάντα φρίσσει καὶ τρέμει
φόβῳ κράτους.

Deum inclamo. Quid hoc? **fugito**
mihi celeriter,
Fugito, pessima bestia, hominum
necatrix,
quid mihi molesta es, nihil a me
laesa? ...
A me autem abstineto, ne te cruce
feriam,
Quam omnia verentur, ac contrem-
iscunt summo timore.

Tbilisi, S-2568, f. 54r

ვკმობ ღმრთისა მიმართ, რაჲ
ესე? მსწრაფლ განმევლგე,
მევლგე, ჰ მკეცო, ბოროტო, კა-
ცისმკლველო;
რასა მაშფოთებ, არა ვნებული
ჩემგან?...
ჩემგან შორს იქმენ, ნუსადა
გწყლა ჯუარიოთა,
რომლისა ძალსა უძრწის ეშ-
მაკთა ძალი.

I call to God: what is this? **Go**
away from me quickly,
Go away, you beast, evil, manslay-
er;
Why do you agitate me, not been
wronged by me? ...
Stay away from me, or I will put
the cross over you,
The power of which cannot be re-
sisted by the devilish power.

Carm. II, 1, 64 (PG 37, 1406)

Ἀπελθ', ἀπελθε, πνεῦμα
σμπνῦγον, κακὰ.

Discede, discede in malam rem,
spiritus suffocator.

Tbilisi, S-2568, f. 56r

წარველ, ჰ სულო, ბოროტთამცა
შეაშთობ

Go away, o spirit, smother with the
evils,

2. *Nikoloz Baratashvili, « O Evil Spirit »*²¹

O evil Spirit! You fiend of hell! who bade you/, be my guide,
To **storm** my **life**, to burn my **brain** and every **joy** to hide.
Why did you steal my peace and calm, my **soul be steep** in grief?
Why did you crush my youthful heart and kill its [i.e. **blind**] **faith**, belief?
Is this the **pledge**, the promised **bliss** my youth did hope from thee; you had the store for me,
My soul to wing in fancied joy to realms of liberty? [i.e. **of this life**]
Midst burning tears and woe-rent fears **bright smiles** I thought to find;
In hell I sought a paradise – to truth my eyes were blind.
Your words so false, though wondrous bright, where have they gone or fled?
Why did you tempt my wishes **true** – to be by **furies** led?
Reply! You fiend! You are silent now? 'Tis late to slink away;
Your power to charm, to lure, to blind, why has it lost its sway?
O cursed be that day when I blindly placed my faith and trust in thee,
And yielded up my **fondest hopes**, and let them **martyred be**!
Henceforth my soul 'does sob and sigh'; its **peace** I flung away;
Its raging fires, its hopes, desires, no **passion's flame** can slay!
Avaunt! Begone! O demon false! You har-binger of woe!
At random driven, my **tortured** soul no safe retreat does know.
My **mind** lacks faith, my **heart** mistrusts, my **soul** in pain sinks low.
O woe to him who feels the sting of your **deadly smiting blow**!

ნ. ბარათაშვილი, სულო ბოროტო²²

სულო ბოროტო, ვინ მოგიხმო ჩემად წინამძღვრად,
ჩემის გონების და სიცოცხლის შენ აღ-
მამუოთრად?
მარქვი, რა უყავ, სად წარმიღე სულის მშვიდობა,
რისთვის მომიკალ ყმაწვილის ბრმა სარწმუნოება?
ამას უქაღლი ჩემს ცხოვრებას, ყმაწვილკაცობას?
თითქოს მაძლევდი ამა სოფლად თავისუფლებას.
განჯვათა შორის სიაშეთა ღამისახ-
ავდი,
და თვით ჯოჯოხეთს სამოთხელა გარ-
ღამიქცევდი!
მარქვი, რა იქმნენ საკვირველნი ესე აღთქმანი?
რად მომიხიბლე, აღმირიე წრფელნი ზრახვანი?
სად ხარ, აღმუოთო, მიპასუხე, რად იმალები?
რაგომ გაცუღდა ძალი შენი მომ-
ჯადოები?
წყეულიმც იყოს ღლე იგი, როს შენთა აღთქმათა
ბრმად ვუმსხვერპლიდი, მივანდობდი ჩემს გულისთქმათა!
მას აქეთ არის, დავუკარგე მშვიდობა სულსა
და ვერც ღელვანი ვნებათანი მიკლვენ წყურვილსა!
განვედი ჩემგან, ჰოი მაცთურო, სულო ბოროტო!
რა ვარ აწ სოფლად დაშთენილი უსა-
გნოდ, მარგო,
ჭკუით ურწმუნო, გულით უნდო, სუ-
ლით მახვრალი?
ვაი მას, ვისაც მოჰხვდეს ხელი შენი მსახვრალი

²¹ ქართული პოეზიის ანთოლოგია, თარგმნილი ვენერა ურუშაძის მიერ [*Anthology of Georgian Poetry*, translated by V. Urushadze], Tbilisi, 1958, p. 52.

²² Critical edition by A. Gatserelia – I. Lolashvili, ნიკოლოზ ბარათაშვილი, თხზულებანი [Nikoloz Baratashvili, *Writings*], Tbilisi, 1972, p. 65sqq.

3. Commentary

To render the parallels and distinctions clear we shall analyse the composition of both works. Gregory's series of hymnographic confessions begins directly with addressing the evil:

Ἦλθες μὲν, ἦλθες, ὦ κἀκιστ', ἀλλ' ἐσχέθης; Πόσον πιέζεις
 δὴ με τοῖς κακοῖς, πόσον; Καὶ τοῦτο τῆς σῆς, ὦ κἀκιστε,
 προσβολῆς. Baratashvili likewise starts his poem with the same
 address to the evil spirit: *O Evil Spirit! You fiend of hell! Who bade
 you be my guide.*

Why is it not possible to argue that the deceptive evil spirit in Gregory's text is the intrinsic double of the person fighting it? Probably because the person attains his spiritual strength exactly in the fight against the evil spirit, i.e. the peace of mind and soul – subordinating the stream of ideas to one cognizant purpose, the God – is achieved through faith without a second thought, « blindly ». In this case, a person appears, in fact, as a unified 'monad', an indivisible 'atom' struggling against the destructive force, and it is the person's faith in God that stands as a guarantee of retaining or attaining his internal integrity in this struggle. To achieve such internal state is the supreme ideal for a Christian, while striving to achieve this is the finite purpose of his spiritual attempts.

Let us now examine closely the initial lines in Baratashvili's poem: the poet characterizes the evil force as the one that storms his mind and life: *To storm my life, to burn my brain and every joy to hide.* Then, immediately following this, the poet says that the evil spirit has killed his youthful blind faith, *crushed his youthful heart and killed its faith.* It follows that the faith in God – the guarantee of the internal integrity – is already lost, i.e. the hero can no longer protect himself by means of faith, and stands defenceless facing evil forces. Thus, the prerequisite for achieving personal pluralism – not only as a means of depiction but also as a form of self-cognition is already given in Baratashvili's poem, and it is even named.

Next we see that the evil spirit, the *guardian of life*, the φύλαξ ζωῆς (cfr წიხამღვარი – *guide* in Baratashvili's poem) according to Gregory's poems upsets the lyrical hero's soul: Τί μοι διοχλεῖς (cfr Baratashvili: *who bade you be my guide? To storm my life, to burn my brain and every joy to hide? You fiend! You are silent now?*). The soul tries to tempt

him by *relishing sweet tastes* – τὸ λειῖον ἀρπάσαι τῆς ἡδονῆς ... Καὶ τοῦτο τῆς σῆς, ὦ κάκιστε, προσβολῆς (cfr Baratashvili: *Midst burning tears and woe-rent fears bright smiles I thought to find; I blindly placed my faith and trust in thee, and yielded up my fondest hopes, and let them martyred be; Why did you steal my peace and calm?*).

Finally, both poets have (in one case in the form of a strong decision, and in the other, apparently, as a rhetoric question) the appeal to the ἄπελθ', ἄπελθε, πνεῦμα συμπνίγον, κακά; Ἐμοῖ δ' ἀπόσχου; μὴ πάλιν φανῆς; Αἰδοῦ το λοῦτρον εἶξον, ὦ βροτοκτόνε. Ὡς ἡδονῇ με πρῶτον ἐκλεψας πικρᾷ, ἄπελθ', ἄπελθε τῆς πάλης γὰρ ἡσθόμην ... Φεῦγ', ὦ κάκιστον θηρίον, βροτοκτόνον (cfr Baratashvili: *Avaunt! Begone! O demon false! You harbinger of woe*). In the case of Gregory this occurs through internal need and the faith in God (κἄν σῶμ' ἔχης μου, τὸν γε νοῦν οὐ πείσομαι Καλεῖ μ' ἄχραντον ἡ χάρις παραστάτην), whereas Baratashvili achieves it through frustration and spiritual emptiness resulting from the bitterness of life (*At random driven, my tortured soul no safe retreat does know. My mind lacks faith, my heart mistrusts, my soul in pain sinks low*).

What other differences could be identified between the texts of Gregory of Nazianzus and Nikoloz Baratashvili and what preconditions the unity of Gregory's 'ego' and the mobilization of the internal forces in such a way that overcoming the evil force is beyond doubt, whereas Baratashvili's weakness vis-à-vis that force is indubitable? Gregory's words addressed to the demon are very characteristic: Τὸν νοῦν ἐφέρπεις εὐστρόφοις ἐλίγμασι – *you steal my heart by inducing temptation*. To shatter the saint's faith, the demon threatens his heart in the first place and not his mind; to protect his faith (heart), Gregory resorts to the cross: Σταυρὸν δ' ἐφίστημι, ὅς φύλαξ ζωῆς ἐφμῆς. Ὅς πάντα κόσμον συνδέων, Θεῷ φέρει, τοῦτον φοβηθεῖς, εἶκε, μὴ πάλιν φανῆς. The cross is the symbol of faith and God, more precisely, of the faith in God. Therefore, heart, cross, and faith make an inseparable union, they are substitutes to one another. Gregory is fighting the evil from the very outset; he is aware of its intensions, of the ways it is going to act as well as of the painful outcomes. At the same time, he is also familiar with the ways and means to fight the demon, as the idea of the Redeemer is essential for Christian believers. For instance, Gregory knows the Savior, he has the cross that evil forces dread, and he has the prayer, the call for God and his love, and the light. This is the most essential feature that distinguishes Chris-

tian poetry from Romantic poetry in spite of their external resemblance. As to Gregory's struggle against the evil, this is a completely different issue. It is acknowledged that this is not his personal conflict with the world but the Christian antinomy, the conflict between religious views and real life²³. Experienced in spiritual strife, he does not speak about killing the thirst by « anxieties of passions », and about the « blind youthful faith » as Baratashvili does. These views are characteristic and « youthful » for a romanticist for they do not signify the perfect mind and cognising the divine truth, they rather represent a romantic dream, illusion, mental youthfulness, youthful naive judgement about the fundamental nature of the universe, a blissful future. Due to adolescence the mind's eye is blind to see the sins, sin is foreign to it, it does not comprehend it thoroughly. Therefore, inexperienced and unrefined in spiritual struggles he can't face the evil which easily kills his « blind faith ». Subsequently, in Baratashvili's work, the evil spirit *storms* (აღამურობებს) the mind and soul of the lyrical hero (the heart – გული, however, as unhesitating – უცოცმანო « blind faith, is already killed »). The evil spirit in his poem is the person's internal double, an internal duality being a necessary provision for self-reflection. Therefore, it has a positive function as well, and, in this sense, it is *enchanted* (მომხიბვლელია), it attracts the lyrical hero, which is absolutely impossible in Gregory's poetry, where evil spirit is portrayed only in negative light. The Romantic 'ego' from the very beginning is doomed to preserve its dual nature eternally, to have the « suspicion » of his internal life being driven by mind, self-analysis, rather than faith. If in Gregory's works we see the hope to preserve the unified internal world fused by faith, this is not the case in Baratashvili's poem; his lyrical hero is unable to oppose *unyielding* (მტკიცე) faith to evil spirit²⁴.

It is the faith in God that determines the person's internal unity and rigidity in Gregory's texts, while the mistrust in Baratashvili's poem accounts for the « temptation » by the evil spirit of the lyrical hero and, subsequently, his internal duality. Likewise noteworthy in both cases is that the evil is presented as a destructive force set against a person. In Gregory's case, it is, nevertheless, possible to fight him, while in Bara-

²³ See Misch, *A History of Autobiography*, II, p. 609.

²⁴ T. Lomidze, ნიკოლოზ ბარათაშვილის პოეტური სტილის პრობლემა [The Problem of Nikoloz Baratashvili's Poetic Style], in *New Paradigms*, 1 (1998), p. 99-103; ID., მხატვრული აზროვნების თავისებურებანი ქართულ რომანტიზმში [Specific Features of Artistic Thought in Georgian Romanticism], in *Literary Researches; Rustaveli Institute of Literature*, 19 (1998), p. 245-250.

tashvili's case, it is not, as his lyrical personage is « open » and his spiritual shaping takes place amidst a constant dialogue with his own 'alter ego'. The concept of a person in Gregory's poetic confessions differs from that of Baratashvili's poetic piece: although in both cases, the evil spirit is reproduced as a force opposing the lyrical hero. In the first case, however, the opposition is directed against a unified, monolithic person (in his faith), while in the second case, the opposition implies ongoing internal destruction, a constant internal dialogue between the 'ego' and the internal 'non-ego', an uninterrupted process of self-reflection.