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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 Nikolo 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.)\textsuperscript{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 Aporeta\textsuperscript{2}.
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 criticism\textsuperscript{3}. 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

\textsuperscript{1} The Georgian translations of Gregory’s poetry are studied in the thesis and articles of K. Bezara-
shvili, გოგი თეოლოგიაც გამოქვაბული ქორწილი, ქართული ღია ღონისძიებები [The Georgian Version of
Gregory Nazianzen’s poems and its commentaries], ხაროგი ირინიანი, თბილისი, Diss., Tbilisi, 1989; K. Bezara-
shvili, გოგი თეოლოგიაც გამოქვაბული ქორწილი, ქართული ღია ღო

\textsuperscript{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. Bezarashvili, The Problem of the so-called „Aporta” in the Georgian Corpus of the works

\textsuperscript{3} For the Classical sources of Gregory’s poetry studied by European researchers see A. Came-
A. Kambylis, Gregor von Nazianz und Kallimachos, in Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Phi-
lologie, 110 (1982), p. 120-122. Q. Cataudella, Il prologo degli Aetia (Ἀετία) e Gregorio Naz-
ianzeno, 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 Boe 

1993, p. 235-252. For the attitude of Christian poetry
to Classical sources see Č. Milovanović-Barham, Gregory of Nazianzus: Ars Poetica (In suos
century. The artistic and rhetoric data of Gregory’s works had been analysed in both Western and Georgian sciences. 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 Georgia. 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 Georgia.

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 roots. Studying Biblical and Christian literature and poetry in particular, is a prerequisite for un-

---


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 topoï in the European and Georgian linguistic and artistic world.

8 E. Dubout, 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 ideas or adaptation of a theme stemming from a common Biblical source. 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). 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 Kohelet. 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 literature, 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

foundation for the genre of Christian elegy and to introduce into it the sentiment of grief that is different from the melancholy of elegies of ancient and other poetries (such as those of romanticists). Grief in Christian poetry does not stem from fleeting earthly dream or the vanity of worldly knowledge (cfr Eccle. 1, 18). The melancholy of Christian poetry transcends the temporary earthly grief. What remains eternal for a Christian is the true and deep internal grief arising from the struggle between flesh and soul, from the dual mind inclined to the light and darkness, as Gregory puts it (Carm. I, 1, 45, vv. 71-76). This is the grief for a heavenly home, caused by the pursuit of the truth and the incognizance of God. This is the divine grief due to contemplation and, at the same time, inability to fathom the beyond, the eternal, and the hidden, which is attained through subordinating the personal will to that of the God, and concentration, which, in its turn, means relieving the person from the grief of sin while ascending a higher level, i.e. contemplating the Divine. Thus, the wise is liberated from the grief of the earthly life for the sake of the divine grief, the grief of the soul, which – as perfection enhances – is filled with the feeling of insufficiency in the same way as excessive cognition and knowledge expose human ignorance. Gregory’s poetry on the whole is that very divine vision and divine grief. And it is exactly this feature that makes Christian poetry essentially different from other poetries.

11 For typological parallels see A. Gatscheria, თარიღური ორგანულობის მოქალაქობა [The Problem of Historical Modification of Poetical Expressions], in Poetry and Stylistics, Tbilisi, 1977, p. 63-87.
12 G. Asatiani, "სამეორის მკვლევარები" "ბახთრიშის ტოტური" [From “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin” to “Bakhtriani”], Tbilisi, 1874, p. 44 (= Asatiani, From „.The Knight in the Panther’s Skin” to “Bakhtriani”).
13 See I. Meunargia, წიგნის გამოცვალება [The Life and Poetry of N. Baratashvili], Tbilisi, 1945, p. 17-50. It is not only the motifs of Baratashvili’s poetry that show the absorption of Christian poetry but also the archaic style of his language. As often noted, what matters most is not whether N. Baratashvili resorts to old forms as such but the issue as to what extent does he modify them putting in them a new meaning and how effectively he manages to express his massage by using them. This is what creates to his poetic individuality as well, see G. Kiknadze, მოქალაქობა ორგანულობის კლასიკა [The Problems of Style of Speech], Tbilisi, 1957, p. 218. This view also pertains to the hymns of Gregory of Nazianzus who had expressed a completely novel Christian meaning through ancient form already archaic by his time. On the correlation of Attic and Keine styles of Gregory’s language see P. Gallay, Langue et style de saint Grégoire de Nazianzus dans sa correspondance, Paris, 1933.
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 Barataishvili; 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 Barataishvili’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: Ἀπελθῇ ὀπελθε, πνεύμα συμπνίγον, κοκά (Carm. II, 1, 64) – Ἑλκίζομαι, ἡ πνευματικά ἐθικότομον (Tbilisi, S-2568, f. 56r); Φεύγω, ὑμνώντος τοῦριον, βροτοκτόνον (Carm. II, 1, 56) – Ἑλκίζομαι, ἡ ἔννοια, ἔννοια, ἔννοια (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. Barataishvili’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 Barataishvili 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 Barataishvili’s work is rendered in a rather generalized form. As regards the image of the evil spirit, Barataishvili 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 Barataishvili’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

¹⁷ A verintsev, Analytical Psychology, p. 135.
¹⁸ A verintsev, 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 “Bakhtrioni”, 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 J. Bezara shvili, Symbols in Gregory of Nazianzus’ Poetry, in თბილისის სახელშემწყობი [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):

'Ἡλθες μὲν, ἦλθες, ὁ κώστα', ἀλλ' ἐσχέθης...

Σταυρόν δ' ἐφίστημ', ὁς φύλαξ ζωῆς ἔμης,
'Ος πάντα κόσμον συνδέων, Θεῷ φέρει.
Τούτον φοβηθεῖς, εἴκε, μὴ πάλιν φονῆς.
Καλεὶ μ' ἀχραντὸν ἡ χάρις παραστάτην

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

Crucem autem attollo, quae custos est vitae meae,
Quae universum mundum, ceu vinculo constringens, Deo offert.
Hanc pertimescens, cede, nec amplius appareas.
Vocat me purum gratia astitem.

Tbilisi S-2568, f. 53v

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

---

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

Et hoc tuae est, o pessime, impulsionis.
In mentem irrepis subdolis artibus,
Suadens mollitiem arripere voluptatis:
Verum minime suadebis: hoc Adam suasit mihi.
In terram revertere, ut pedibus caput tuum conteratur.
Si autem praevalneas, ut tantillum pedi morsum infigas,
Aheneum te suspendam, ut conspiciens noxam vitem.

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)

Theon bo. Ti toito; feugé mou tāxos,
Feug', ōkawstos thaniōν,
βροτοκτόνων,
Ti mou diocheios ouðèν
ηδικημένος; ...

'Εμοί δ' ἀπόσχοι, μή σε τῷ
σταυρῷ βάλω,
"Ων 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

I call to God: what is this? Go
away from me quickly,
Go away, you beast, evil, manslayer;
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)

'Apeleθ', ἀπελθε, πνεύμα
συμπνύουν, κακά.

Discede, discede in malam rem,
spiritus suffocator.

Tbilisi, S-2568, f. 56r

Go away, o spirit, smother with the
evils,
2. Nikoloz Baratashvili, « O Evil Spirit »

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 woé-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 sink 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 harbinger 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!

21 ჯვრის ნოლე ჯვრის, რომ ვიდრე გამოსახულება გამო [Anthology of Georgian Poetry, translated by V. Urushadze], Tbilisi, 1958, p. 52.
22 Critical edition by A. Gatscheria – I. Lolashvili, ბოჭოდე მარქსის, მარქსი
[20] [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:

"Ἄλλας μὲν, ἡλθες, ὥ κάσιτε, ἀλλ’ ἐσχέθης; Πόσον πιέςεις δή με τοῖς κακοῖς, πόσον; Καὶ τούτο τής σῆς, ὥ κάσιτε, προσβολής. 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 θεοδρόμος – 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 λεῖον ἀρπάσαι τῆς ἡδονῆς ... Καὶ
tούτο τῆς σής, ὃ κόψαστε, προσβολής (cfr Baratashvili: Midst burning
tears and woe-resent 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 deci-
asion, and in the other, apparently, as a rhetoric question) the appeal to
the ἄπελθ', ἄπελθε, πνεῦμα συμπνίγον, κακάς; Ἐμοὶ δ' ὀπόσχου; μὴ
πάλιν φανῆς; Αἰ δοὺ τὸ λούτρον εἶξον, ὃ βροτοκτόνε. Ὀς ἡδονὴ με
πρῶτον ἐκλεψας πικρά, ἄπελθ', ἄπελθε τῆς πόλης γὰρ ἣσθόμην ... Φεῦγ',
ὁ κόψαστον θηρίον, βροτοκτόνον (cfr Baratashvili: Avaunt! Be-
gone! O demon false! You harbinger of woe). In the case of Gregory this
occurs through internal need and the faith in God (κἂν σῶμ' ἔχῃς μου,
tὸν γε νοῦν οὐ πείσομαι Καλεὶ μ' ἄχραντον ἡ χάρις παραστάτην),
whereas Baratashvili achieves it through frustration and spiritual empti-
ness 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', ὃς φύλαξ ζωῆς ἐφιμῆς. 'Ος πάντα κόσμον συνδέων,
θεώφερει, τοῦτον ὕφησεις, 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 life. 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 the mind and soul of the lyrical hero (the heart – ოჯრი, however, as unhesitating – ოჯობადმო «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 enchanting (ძოხილადი), 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 faith to evil spirit.

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-

tashvili’s case, it is not, as his lyrical personage is « open » and his spir-

itual 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.