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Translator’s Foreword

Almost a century has passed since Shalva Nutsbidze and Simon Kaukhchishvili established the first and thus far the only edition of Ioane Petritsi’s commentaries accompanying his Georgian translation of Proclus’ *Elements of Theology* (1937). Their edition was supplemented by Shalva Nutsbidze’s introductory article on the nature of Petritsi’s philosophy and its place in the context of medieval philosophy in Byzantium and Georgia. Despite raising some controversial points, in his comments on this work, which was one of the earliest of Petritsi’s studies, Nutsbidze provided pertinent and precise insights, especially in pointing to Petritsi’s unique and pioneering role in the development of philosophical thought in Georgia and in discerning Renaissance features in his philosophy. In fact, preceding Pico Della Mirandola and Marcilio Ficino by several centuries, Petritsi espoused an attitude towards the relationships between Christianity and Greek philosophy that not only opened the way for conceiving the possibility of rapprochement, but that even declared such a rapprochement as necessary. For Petritsi, Plato and the Neoplatonists were in touch with the eternal truth of the order of reality. He found the study of their philosophy to be indispensable for Christians. Moreover, he thought it appropriate to interpret the Bible in the light of Neoplatonic philosophy.

There were similar traits in the philosophy of Petritsi’s immediate Byzantine predecessors, Michael Psellus and John Italus. Yet Petritsi was able to reach an even bolder synthesis, creating a comprehensive project of philosophizing Christianity, that is to say, of building a common discourse on truth for both Christian revelation and Neoplatonic metaphysics. One can find many instances of this trend in Petritsi’s commentaries on Proclus’ *Elements of Theology*, including, to mention only one example, his identification of the Biblical trees of paradise with the Platonic world of immaterial perfections. This trend, however, emerges most saliently from a text that in all the extant manuscripts immediately follows the commen-
taries on Proclus. Nutsubidze and Kaukchishvili believed that this text formed an addition to and an integral part of the commentaries, and thus they gave it the title “Epilogue.” All subsequent scholarship regarded this text as the true epilogue of the commentaries on Proclus, until Edisher Chelidze proved convincingly that, in fact, this text was a preface to Petritsi’s annotated translation of King David’s Psalms and thus was a completely different text, one that belonged to another stage of Petritsi’s literary activities. Unfortunately, the annotated translation of the Psalms itself has been lost, so the preface constitutes the only remains from this grand opus. Given this situation, we are fortunate that this preface is preserved in its entirety. Perhaps one might also take this as an indication that the loss of the annotated translation of the Psalms itself was not the result of the destruction of the manuscript by accident or the loss of pages over time, but rather that it was caused intentionally. In all probability, Petritsi’s annotated translation of the Psalms was banned and destroyed by overly cautious Church officials who became alarmed at the prospect of the appearance of a new translation that pitted itself consciously against the canonical one. Petritsi stated in writing that it was his aim to mend the shortcomings of all previous translators. Yet his philosophical-metaphysical interpretation of the Psalms as one of the crucial foundational texts of Christian worship might have presented authorities and others with an even more fundamental challenge.

The main body of Petritsi’s work seems to have been destroyed, whereas the preface—representing a somewhat lesser danger—remained and was attached to his arcane metaphysical work, the translation of and commentaries on Proclus. In fact, since only a handful of Georgian intellectuals could read this text, the vast majority of Christians in the Georgian kingdom would have been steered away from its novel and perilous ideas in any case.

For modern scholarship on Georgian literature and intellectual thought, the preservation of the preface is a blessing, for it reveals Petritsi’s main

---

1 Tinatin Tskitishvili gives a good summary of the history of scholarship and scholarly assessments of the “Epilogue”: “Concerning the essence and meaning of one original work of Ioane Petritsi” [T. e’k’iti’svili, “ioane petric’is erti originaluri na’stomis raobisa da mniśvelobist’vis” (Concerning the essence and meaning of one original work of Ioane Petritsi)], *Kut’aisis universitetis moambe* 4 (1995): 121–139.

goal and his firmly held position: to provide a philosophical and metaphysical interpretation of the Biblical text and its images, which, for Petritsi, were full of metaphors, and to show the basic affinity between philosophy (that is to say, dialectical inquiry through ‘ratio,’ which he calls ‘logos’) and Christianity. In order to demonstrate this latter point, he showed that the Bible articulated the same ideas that Plato and the Platonists expressed; however, the Bible veiled its ideas behind a heavy curtain of metaphors that had to be uncovered through dialectical efforts by philosophers in order to reveal the metaphysical visions behind them.

From the same preface, one may learn that Petritsi also strove to encourage the study of the liberal arts (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy)—the necessary preliminaries for metaphysics—for they also attest to the Trinitarian vision of the Divine nature. It is difficult to say why he theologized about the liberal arts; perhaps they, too, were objects of attacks by contemporary church authorities and he tried to vindicate them through theology. The reasons for the rejection of Petritsi’s work, which he lamented also in the text under discussion, could be the same as those put before John Scottus Eriugena by his contemporaries in the Frankish kingdom of the ninth century: authorities may have objected to a seemingly too-heavy reliance on the methods of dialectic and reason in discussing theological issues. Indeed, Petritsi did not hide his intentions of being a pioneering Georgian thinker and of creating a proper philosophical language\(^3\) that would make it possible to fully actualize one’s “inner dialectical logos” in order to undertake the great journey from the physical to the metaphysical world. In view of this journey, such dangerous, even damning, questions might have presented themselves with a new vigor: was it possible for those who were not part of the Church to achieve the heights of metaphysical contemplation? Was achieving this level of metaphysical contemplation equal to achieving salvation in accordance with the more radical and absolute Christian understanding of salvation? If not, then what was the difference between contemplating the divine world of perfect ideas, something Petritsi apparently thought Plato and the Platonists were able to do, and gaining salvation in the Christian sense? It is true that Petritsi admitted that Christ had raised human souls to a status that was higher than that

---

\(^{3}\) Two independent translations of John of Damascus’ philosophical chapters from his *Source of Knowledge*, one by Eprem Mtsire and the other by Arsen Ikhaltoeli, had already introduced a philosophical language and terminology into the Georgian world of thought. Petritsi, however, was dissatisfied with the existing philosophical language, finding that it fell short in its precision.
which the loftiest of them (i.e., Greek philosophers, Hebrew prophets, and Babylonian mathematicians) had reached, but beyond this, just what he meant in this context was anything but clear. This lack of clarity is especially obvious with regard to Petritsi’s understanding that his Plato and his Proclus rejoiced in divine visions, and, moreover, that Christ himself was the “life-giver”/“savior” or inspirer of such visions in Petritsi himself and, synecdochically, in all true philosophers of the Platonic tradition.

Christian philosophers, especially those belonging to the Alexandrian tradition (i.e., Clement and Origen), emphasized the presence of truth in Greek philosophy. In his First Apology, the early Christian thinker Justin Martyr asserted boldly that Christians worshipped the same Logos that had enlightened Socrates and taught him the falsehood of pagan worship. Yet Petritsi seemed to go even further. In his discourse, any radical difference between Christianity and Platonic philosophy grew quite faint. He claimed, in fact, that if a human being actualized his or her inner logos, or inner dialectical powers, the Trinitarian Deity would come immediately and assist him/her. Now, the actualization of inner dialectical powers was not reserved for Christians only, but was an intrinsic duty of the human being as one who had been made in the image of God and possessed an intelligent soul. Through such a tireless inner actualization of dialectical powers, as Petritsi claimed for himself, he had received an illumination from Christ. Did Plato not also receive such an illumination? Did Proclus not receive one? And did they not receive such an illumination even if they were unable to identify the source of their philosophical inspirations with Jesus? Although there is firm evidence that Petritsi’s inclination was to answer such questions in the affirmative, his reader has to decide for himself.

Notwithstanding the Christian theological problems concerning the fallen state of human nature and our capacities to mend this condition through private intellectual efforts (a question that was at the heart of the Pelagian controversy), such a discourse then opened up new and broader perspectives on human dignity through the doctrine of the ubiquity of the universal logos, the philosophical principle indwelling in all humans. It is remarkable that this new perspective appeared in the context of the medieval proclivities towards denigrating and belittling “others,” either heretics or representatives of heterogeneous religious or intellectual cultures.

---

4 In fact, for Petritsi, contemplating the perfect ideas was the same as “touching” them and engaging in erotic intercourse with them, as he wrote in his commentaries on the last chapter (ch. 211) of Proclus’ Elements of Theology.
The present (unabridged) translation of the Old Georgian text is based on selective readings from the manuscripts that Shalva Nutsubidze and Simon Kaukchishvili used in producing their edition of the text that was mentioned above. I have also consulted the oldest manuscript (H-1337) which is from the thirteenth century and which was not available to those editors. At times, I have chosen to adopt readings that the authors of the 1937 edition relegated to the footnotes, or readings that are given in the thirteenth-century codex; in other cases, I followed the edited text directly, yet I used different punctuation, which then resulted in differences in what the text said and meant.

My thanks to Professor John Dillon (Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland), who kindly read the translation, corrected it where necessary, and offered valuable suggestions.

Ioane Petritsi

(A Preface to His Annotated Translation of the Psalms)

[Proem]

The Innate Logos

Our Creator God has implanted in us the dialectic logos,\(^5\) which is within us, called by us the “judge indwelling in our heart”; [He has established it in us] as a balance for measuring weights and as that stone through which the quality of gold is estimated. This is the [soul’s] innate logos, not accidental [to it] or instrumental to it,\(^6\) and it is destined to the purpose that we may discursively judge actions of our souls: i) virtues; or ii) actions that have become part of our nature through habit—among which there can be both good and valuable [actions] and the opposite ones. Those actions are judged in our nature by God, who has created the soul, and, thus, [through this judgment] destiny is immediately prepared for all human

---

\(^5\) Innate Logos, that is, the innate rational principle. Stoic philosophers called it logos. In his letter to the Romans, the Apostle Paul, who was familiar with Stoic doctrine, alluded to this rational principle (although without using the term ‘logos’) through which all humans, Jews and pagans alike, judge their conduct as good or bad. See Rom 2:14–15.

\(^6\) Petritsi implies that this logos belongs to the soul essentially, and is not a product of human convention or invention; neither is it simply a spoken language, for such a language differs from nation to nation, whereas the innate logos of the soul is universal and is of the same nature in all humans.
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beings, who receive their destiny according to their merits.\textsuperscript{7} In fact, the Lord, the Maker of created nature, attached to Himself our human nature precisely through this power of judgment, having distinguished the \textit{logical} soul from the \textit{illogical} one [of animals and plants]. Certainly, if we, in accordance to our natural lot, will contemplate through our reason the deeds of our Creator God and the compositions of [the created] nature, He will give us the kingdom of his Hand, which is the Son, and will communicate to us the Power issuing from Him, \textbf{which is the Spirit}.\textsuperscript{8}

Therefore, how exceedingly appropriate it is for us to start reasoning (contemplating) and thus to undertake the yoke of our Creator God in the innate council of our souls! And whoever will facilitate us in doing that, let us consider them as intellects of our souls and as eyes of our bodies. But whoever will darken the daylight and destroy our intellects, let us get rid of them, no matter whether evil will approach us from the left or from the right, since in both cases it will be vanquished, for this is what is from the beginning destined [for the evil] from the holy ones (or: “as it was from the beginning prophesied by the holy ones”).

And now, we have pursued this aim, and through the support of the Word of God the Father we reasoned about and touched upon this book of prayers,\textsuperscript{9} which is like a sentry or a guardian of the vineyard of Christ’s Father. In fact, Christ, who is flawless in His promises, will come for pressing (or: squeezing) them (i.e., the grapes of this vineyard), and He will give to all human beings according to their merits, let them only offer the wine of their prayers to the High One, for [David] says: “pray and offer to the Most High” (cf. Ps 75:12). With regard to this instrument of the Holy Spirit (i.e., King David), we can say the following: who is able to describe the goodness of the compositions of the book of our Orpheus,\textsuperscript{10} for he is this corresponds to the end of the first Georgian page (p. 199)

\textsuperscript{7} Petritsi seems to be implying that judgment of our actions is a synergic co-action of our innate logos with God and that our destiny—merit or dishonor—depends on this divine-human co-(or inter-)activity.

\textsuperscript{8} Note that for Petritsi, our being attached to the Trinitarian Deity is directly related to our philosophical contemplation, the activation of our rational principle.

\textsuperscript{9} That is, the Book of Psalms of the biblical King David.

\textsuperscript{10} “Our,” that is to say, the “Christian,” Orpheus. Petritsi compares the Biblical David to the mythical Greek poet Orpheus. Neoplatonists, like Proclus (fifth century), believed that Orphic tradition was in tune with their philosophy. Likewise, some modern scholars think that Platonic philosophy derived from Orphic mysticism (cf. Bertrand Russell, \textit{History of Western Philosophy} [London: Unwin Paperbacks, 1990], 149). In view of Petritsi’s project of combining the Biblical and the Platonic traditions, this comparison is quite understandable.
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supremely victorious?! And no wonder, for the Spirit of the First Intellect has chosen this offspring of Jesse for activation of His Holinesses, finding in him His good pleasure, saying “he is a man according to My heart”; and the Holy Spirit stirred His musical strings in this man and the king for embellishing this book, which represents a road for souls leading them to the Father of souls.

[Spiritual knowledge is revealed to humanity before the advent of Christianity and the presence of this knowledge in the Book of Psalms]

And [we may adduce such a comparison]: as many separately standing towers are united by a top-stone that links all of them, so also he [David], being in no wise abandoned by any good, calls [Christ] the Head of all extremities, who links to each other different extremities and towers. May you understand as “towers” all those graces and bestowals that the Holy Spirit vouch safed upon humankind from Above—I mean the intellectual wisdom, which was revealed to humankind at certain moments of time according to the heavenly benevolence on our behalf: i) to Abraham, ii) to the Chaldeans, and, furthermore, iii) to the Greeks; in fact, the teacher of our Church, Paul, says that [Greek wisdom] derives from the same [Holy] Spirit, calling it, accordingly, ‘divine wisdom.’ And now, we dare say, that our Tower, Christ, who is Great and transcendently higher than anything which is accounted for as being “high,” has linked together all other towers and pulled them to Himself, as disciples to their Master, in order that they may attune their voices to the shining of His teaching. In fact, all of them (i.e., the pre-Christian manifestations of wisdom), yes, in a way, did elevate souls upwards; however, finally, the Sun originated from the Father elevated the souls of us human beings higher than any of the highest ones among them.

In this way, now my Orpheus (i.e., David), associates with all those sages, who are wise in virtue of the Spirit, the following things: the passions, which

11 Here God the Son is called the First Intellect, that is to say, the Wisdom of the Father (cf. 1 Cor 1:24). At the same time, “the First Intellect” refers to the Neoplatonic principle: the Intellect that emanates from the Transcendent One.
12 The father of the biblical David.
14 Cf. 1 Cor 1:21: “For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, God decided, through the foolishness of our proclamation, to save those who believe.”
15 Cf. Tit 2:13 (“Our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ”).
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Christ has undergone on their and on our behalf; His divine supra-courage; and His soul-saving ventures; thus, he [Orpheus] makes from all those intellectual towers a single beam of light, affixing the extremities of those towers to the Light of the Word of God.

[Discussion of how the Book of Psalms corresponds to and contains in itself different pre-Christian wisdoms: i) Old-Testament wisdom, ii) Babylonian (astrologic-astronomic) wisdom, and iii) Greek (philosophic) wisdom]

a. Presence of the Biblical Prophecies in the Psalms
What shall we say about Moses and the other prophets? What other than that all their prophecies are entirely contained in it (i.e., in the book of the Psalms): i) concerning the providential Incarnation of God, and concerning the establishment of the future temples, and concerning, o woe to me, the judgment of the Ancient of Days, for it is said “the fire will be kindled before Him and around Him is great wind and hail.”

b. Correspondence of Psalms with the Astronomy of the Chaldeans (or Babylonians)
Furthermore, as far as the Chaldeans are concerned, in fact, their doctrine was partially true: for instance, with regard of the seven heavenly bodies. Verily, also David says, “The sun knows [the time of] its setting,” and if it knows [the time of] its setting, it is clear, that neither is it ignorant of [the time of] its rising—in fact, the sun conducts its movements between those two extremes and through this movement the time is apportioned according to the measures of the movement. And, also he says, “He made the moon for the sake of times”; the meaning of those words is that the moon, which receives everything—both lights and powers—from the higher realities, contains in its cycle the rhythms (phases) of construction of all of us, who are of flowing and transient nature; thus, by the stirring of the strings [of David’s harp] it incites all souls to praise its great work.

---

16 Perhaps Petritsi implies that Christ underwent His passion on the Cross for all humanity, even for those philosophers and sages who lived before His Crucifixion.
17 Cf. Isa 30:27–33.
18 Ps 103:19. I provide all references to Psalms according to the LXX numeration.
19 Ibid.; see also Gen 1:14–19.
20 In Aristotelian cosmology the changing world of transience and flux is situated beneath the moon; above the moon there are unchanging substances of planets and stars which, by periodic circular motions, imitate the changeless eternity of the incorporeal Intellect (“nous” in Greek), identified by Aristotle with God.
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In his annotated translation, Ioane Petritsi sets out to provide a comprehensive and detailed study of his source text. He begins by outlining the context and background of the work he is translating. Petritsi emphasizes the importance of understanding the cultural and historical context in which the text was written. He notes the challenges of translating from one language to another, and how this can affect the meaning of the original text.

Petritsi then provides a detailed analysis of the text, breaking it down into its various components. He examines the structure of the text, the themes it explores, and the characters that populate it. Petritsi’s approach is rigorous and thorough, and he provides numerous examples to illustrate his points.

Throughout his translation, Petritsi is careful to maintain the integrity of the original text. He avoids making unnecessary changes, and instead focuses on accurately conveying the meaning of the source text. Petritsi’s translation is a valuable resource for scholars and students alike, providing a valuable insight into the literature of the period.
everything that moves does so either being influenced from outside and by coercion, or intrinsically and naturally, as it is allotted to it from the Creator. This corresponds to the ending of the p. 205

c. Trinitarian Vision of God and the Divine Providence in Psalms and in Plato’s Thought

As concerns the Trinitarian vision of the divine Nature, my theologian [David] accords with Plato, who is the myrrh of theology, because when he says with reference to the Father: “In Your light have we seen the light,” what David implies in this address to the Father is that “in Your Spirit have we seen the light—Your Son”22; and the Philosopher23 (i.e., Plato) attunes his voice to him, when in the Timeus and the Parmenides24 my Attician25 hangs his golden necklaces [of syllogisms]. Because, [Plato] says “the Monad has moved from the beginning and has stopped in Three.”26 This accords well with the great prophet David, for in the “Monad” [Plato]

21 Cf. Ps 35:10.
22 This Trinitarian interpretation of the verse from the Psalms is found in the writings of the Greek Church Fathers, for instance in Gregory the Theologian, who provides this interpretation in his Fifth Theological Oration 31.3 (Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 [Discours théologiques], ed. Paul Gallay, Sources Chrétiennes 250 [Paris: Cerf, 1978], 280).
23 Petritsi refers to Plato simply as “The Philosopher.” This term is reserved exclusively for Plato and the referent is understood immediately.
24 Timaeus and Parmenides—two of the most metaphysical dialogues of Plato; especially Parmenides, which treats the reality of the One.
25 Petritsi intimately refers to Plato as “My Attician.”
26 In fact, those words are not Plato’s, but belong to Gregory the Theologian: διὰ τούτου μονάς ἀπ’ ἄρχης εἰς δύαδα κινεῖται, μέχρι τριάδος ἐστι (Orat. 29, 2 [Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 [Discours théologiques]], ed. Paul Gallay, Sources Chrétiennes 250 [Paris: Cerf, 1978], 180). This source was first identified by Damana Melikishvili: გვ. დამანა მელიქიშვილი, შენახვალის შიქმენი ბინამდების ჯილდო ნაცვლის დამარჯობა და სომეხი მოქვედება დ. მელიქიშვილი, “Ioane Petritsi’s ‘gannmartebis’ bolo sitqavobis šedgenilobisa da zogi axali cqarosat’vis” (D. Melikishvili, “Concerning the Contents and Some New Sources of the ‘Epilogue’ of Ioane Petritsi’s Commentaries”) [Dama Melikishvili, Philological Works (Collected Papers)] (Tbilisi: Ga‘at’leba, 2009), 348–363. It seems strange that Petritsi placed Gregory’s words followed immediately by those of Proclus (cf. the following footnote) in Plato’s mouth. But perhaps one may discern a deeper meaning: Petritsi may have thought that both Gregory and Proclus made explicit what was implied in Plato’s philosophy. Both therefore appear to be mouthpieces of Plato. This is a rather daring supposition, but given the audacity of Petritsi’s visions, it is not an impossible one. That text passage in Plato, which to Petritsi’s mind might have contained a Trinitarian connotation, could be the passage on three principles in Plato’s Second Epistle (312D–313A). I owe this suggestion to John Dillon.
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See my note on the next, 208 page, here should be ზემოდან დაწამება დალითოდი ბრძოლა
implies the One and the Father, whereas His means for the *emanative motionis* the Son, and the Trinity has its *stay* and perfection in the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, [Plato] adds, “the One, the Being, and the Power”\(^{27}\)—in “the One” implying the same God and the Father, and in the “Being” implying the Son—in fact, the Father has manifested all fullness of His divinity in the Son, as my Paul attests\(^{28}\)—and in the “Power” implying the transcendent Holy Spirit, which gives holiness to the heavenly powers; actually, through this Spirit, which is the Power, the being of all existent things is sustained in the Son, who is the Being and the Essence and who transmits down the providence that derives from the Father. And, since we have mentioned Providence, he [Plato] says, also in his dialogues, with regard to the universal Providence, positing this Providence in the One and the Monad, whom we (i.e., Christians) call the Father, as the Summit of the springs of goodness. As if [Plato] is David’s co-witness with regard to the emanation of God’s goodness! As if he had listened to the holy prophet! The latter namely calls [the emanation of the divine goodness] the “torrent of pleasures and the Light of God and the eternal Light”\(^{29}\)—whereas the Attician [i.e., Plato] says that the proper cause for the generation of beings is the Transcendent Good. In fact, he [Plato] affirms boldly, for the attention of everyone, that the goodness of the God of all has failed to be contained in Himself in the solitude, but has been bestowed from the transcendent Above with no other purpose but that of making others also sharers and partakers of His transcendent goodness; for, actually, goodness is untainted by envy.\(^{30}\) This is how the Attician [i.e., Plato] attunes his voice to that of King David.

On Divine Providence in the Psalms and Plato

As concerns the theme of Providence, and of exerting the actions of Providence even down to our extremity,\(^{31}\) [David] now and again cries out, saying, “Leave your troubles to God,”\(^ {32}\) and “I preferred to go to the house

---

\(^{27}\) Cf. Proclus, *Platonic Theology*III. 24. 84. 20–23 (Proclus, *Théologie Platonicienne*, ed. H. D. Saffrey et L. G. Westerink [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1978], 84), where the one, the power, and the being are described as terms of the highest intelligible triad (*Τριὰς οὖν ἐστιν αὕτη τῶν νοητῶν ἀκρότης, τὸ ἑν, ἡ δύναμις, τὸ ἄνθρωπον*).

\(^{28}\) Col 2:9: “For in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily.”

\(^{29}\) Cf. Ps 35:9.

\(^{30}\) *Timaeus* 29e3.

\(^{31}\) “Extremity”—that is to say, the earthly dwelling of human beings is the last extreme where the heavenly Providence reaches its rays.

\(^{32}\) Ps 54:23.
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of the Lord and to go to the light of the God of hopes,”33 and “your faces will not be ashamed”34; and he also says that a righteous man who hopes in God is preferable to thousands; and, indeed, the Hope in God is invested even with such a great and abyss-deep goodness and power. Furthermore, [David speaks] again with regard to the guidance [of the God] of Israel and with regard to the greatness of His deeds. To all these he adds also other, more powerful words, like “my bones were not hidden from You,”35 or “Where can I hide from Your face,”36 and by such expressions as “ascending up to heights and descending to depths”37 he tries to communicate in many different ways that man cannot be abandoned by the providences of God; in fact, in the “hidden bones” [David] implies the faintest movements of our thought. Now, the Attician [i.e., Plato] also joins his words [to the prophet David], and through his robust, adamantine arguments sends a sundering to the Epicureans, who deny [divine] providence and who do not worship God,38 and he says that there is the holy and supra-wise providence of God: may you start from the One Himself—for [Plato] says that the Intelligible Monads of Providence are fixed in the One—and from the One all heavenly designs are adorned and maintained according to their essences and operations. Thus, may you start a downward course [of providence] from Above There, which will bring you down to the fifth essence, which we call the “sky,”39 and all the celestial ornaments that were adorned by their Creator Wisdom. In fact, he [David] says, “[concerning those ornaments] which He created in His benevolence,” and delegates to them (i.e., to the ornaments) the authority over days and nights acknowledging in them operative powers.40 For [David] says: “He called all of them by names.”

What theory is concealed in those words? Does God give names like [we do]: “Peter,” “John,” or not? No, of course!—because this artificial name-giving pertains to us and our perishable nature. On the contrary,

33 Cf. Ps 121:1 and Ps 83:11.
34 Ps 24:3.
35 Ps 138:15.
36 Ps 138:7.
37 Ps 138:8.
38 For the Epicurean school of philosophy, reality consists only of atoms; gods also consist of atoms and are destructible; they do not care at all about the earth and humans. Plato could not directly attack the Epicureans, who lived almost a century after him. But Neoplatonists frequently and fervently attacked Epicurean philosophy.
39 In accordance with Aristotle (and perhaps also with Plato), apart from the four elements (earth, water, air, and fire) there is a fifth element—quintessence—of which the heavenly bodies and the sky consist.
40 See again Gen 1:14–19.
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არის თუ სად მიგულუხუმობა მომართა, რათა თქვენ გამოსახა, თუმცა, არა არ გამოთა? არა! თანამერები ეს ჰქონდა და შეიძლოდა ამის სრულყოფა, მაგრამ სად ჰშორთოდ შეიძლოდა ჰქონოდა და ჰგავედა, ამ საბურვო-ალბათობა ჰყოფდა ამ მარილმოთხოვოდ ახალ და მიმოქცევებს. თუმცა სახელმწიფო უზრუნველყოფთა სახალხო ფიქრობის დამწვარობა, რომ მოგველვანი გაბარება ჰყოფდა ამ მარილმოთხოვდ ახალ და მიმოქცევებს. თუმცა სახელმწიფო უზრუნველყოფთ სახალხო ფიქრობის დამწვარობა, რომ მოგველვანი გაბარება ჰყოფდა ამ მარილმოთხოვდ ახალ და მიმოქცევებს.
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when we deal with the [divine] Simplicity that transcends all simplicities, then naming expresses the very natures of things in their simplicity and in their essential operations; in fact, the names allotted to them by God become both their essence and operation.  

This is the prophet’s physical theory concerning the fifth essence (the quintessence), which is the entire ornament of the sky. As we have said, the Philosopher adds to this his theories in saying that “from the Producer God first were established the First Intellect and then the Soul with all the particular souls, for, in fact, they (i.e., souls) envelop themselves with the fate and [he]imarmene  from Providence, which comes from Above, and they move according to the will of the Power that proceeds from the Only One, and all concord to the will of their Mover, even the very extremity of matter.  

In fact, from this Providence, which can be identified with the Intellect and the First Being, and which is also the Son, the Place of all Ideas, through the transcendently Truthful Spirit, derive those ideas that introduce and sustain plurality of forms in the otherwise formless matter. This is how he [Plato] attunes his voice to the Prophet David through the adamantine power of his arguments.  

This corresponds to the ending of the p. 211

e. Correspondence of Psalms and Greek Philosophy (Neoplatonism and Aristotle) with Regard to the Lack of Substance of Evil and Petritsi’s Original Demonstration

As concerns the lack of substance of evil and the acknowledgment of the one Universal Cause: in our variously adorned garden [i.e., the book of the Psalms], is asserted the supremacy of the One God. Verily, [David] speaks about the instantaneous vanishing of all hand-made idols [before the sight of God]. The prophet thus says with reference to the God of all: “Our God created everything that pleased Him in the heavens and on earth,” and again: “Praise the God of heaven with the God of Abraham”—as if inviting all beings to praise their Creator God and His always operative Power. In fact, when he says “praise Him heavens and sun and all the stars, the

---

41 In this sense, God’s ‘naming’ something means God’s creating something.
42 Heimarmene—a Greek word for “fate.”
43 The formless, first Matter (the Aristotelian “materia prima”) is the last extreme to which the divine emanation can reach, according to the Neoplatonists.
44 That is, according to Petritsi, the Son of God is the immaterial place of all the ideal forms.
45 Ps 134:6.
46 Perhaps Ps 46:9-10.
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earth and all the earthly beings,” he implies the initiation of natural praising and not of an instrumental one. However, when he adds “Praise him with the sounding of the trumpet, praise him with the harp and lyre,” he invites us to praise God [also] with instrumental and accidental performance, and then adds “the skies declare the praise of God,” and “all kinds of idols of the pagans either golden or silver—or of any other material—are devils, whereas God has created the skies—thus [David] convokes to praise [of] God all who worship anything other than His Transcendent Supremacy. And he also says “the darkness is His cover,” implying thus the [divine] unattainableness and incomprehensibility and, furthermore, he says: “as is His darkness, so is also His light”—the Prophet says so, because of the blinding of the eye of our passive and not active intellect in the divine perceptions, and by “light” he means the joys in the company of the eternal and blessed beings. On which concern also the poet Hesiod accords his voice saying: “Once there were Chaos and Erebos,” which means a hollow of darkness and waste, which the Creator has enlightened by the imprinting of metaphysical ideas on the formless, chaotic matter; and again he (i.e., David) adds, “Who, except for God, is the sole Cause of everything?” And how brilliantly there do accord with him Plato and all the Platonic successors of the Academy, of whom one is Proclus Diadochus! In fact, they launch such mighty arguments against Mani and all supporters of his heresy that through them even the smoke of their extinguished fire vanishes; in fact, according to the Manichean heresy there are two principal causes: the Good and its opposite, Evil; that is to say, to the latter is granted an essential existence similar to that of the Good; with reference

47 Ps 148:3.
48 Ps 150:3.
49 Ps 18:1.
50 Ps 95:5.
51 Ps 17:12.
52 Ps 138:12.
53 According to the Neoplatonists there are passive (lower) and active (higher) intellects; the passive intellect cannot contemplate the higher realities (i.e., is “blinded”) that the active intellect can.
55 Cf. Ps 76:3–14 or Ps 103:24–25.
56 Among the Neoplatonists, Proclus was especially admired by Petritsi.
57 Mani (3rd century AD) proclaimed himself as prophet and established a new religion. According to Mani there are two unoriginated causes—good and evil. Thus he asserted the substantial nature of evil.
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to this stupidity, indeed, it fits well what our luminary says: “a fool said in his heart: ‘there is no God.’”

Let us, in passing, entertain a couple of arguments in proof that there is only one source and cause of both the production and sustaining of beings. First of all, the word “good” pertains to the divine Nature. In fact, “good” in any particular [that is to say, not primary and universal] sense pertains to beings, both intellectual and perceptible, corporeal beings—they all receive their goodness from the Good that transcends all goods. And, moreover, all the multitude of beings reverts to the same One. With this regard our sun that enlightens all the earthly things is a fortunate example: in fact, its rays have one disc from which they derive and to which they return, which we call the “eye of the sun.” Now, show me the same one place of origin and returning for the darkness! [I bet] you will always fail in the endeavor to spot such a harbor of the darkness.

Add to it another example: from the very outset I confidently promise you, that whatever thing my opponent will claim as being evil, I shall demonstrate that this thing is either good or bears a likeness of good. Be it known, that everything that is regarded as evil pertains either to a lustful desire, or to anger, or to the science of logic, namely, to fallacious reasoning. Now see, o thinker, that God has put love within us for two purposes: on the one hand that we may desire and cleave to God—the Father of our souls, and on the other hand that we may leave our nature to our successors, for we all have a fluid nature. Now, see this in the perspective of [different] species and their perfections: in fact what is regarded as the perfection for illogical beings at the same time is an error and a degradation for man, since the best of what manpossesses is his logos and contemplation of the First blessed Nature of God and of everything that is created by Him; and if he directs his activities to this end he will be free of any error. Yet, if he puts aside his proper perfection, which is the logos and the love of God, and, on the contrary, embraces the perfection of illogical and intellect-less beings, and connects a schesis, which is a part, of his soul to coarse sexual tastes and pleasures, then this will be evil for him. Yet, that which is seen as a sin for a human being is at the same time the highest virtue of illogical beings, namely, leaving their likenesses in the next generation. Actually, the highest good for illogical beings is achieved exactly in this: in fact, they have only such a kind of love which is confined to natural boundaries, being divested of supra-natural love. Do you see therefore that evil

---

58 Ps 13:1.
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ათ. ხოლო თუ ბუთულება თუმცა, რომელიც აქ სიმულაცია და გაფრთხილება ნიშნავს, იმისთვის თანხმები და გამჭვირვალობა რომელი გზაზემობა ჰქონია სურათით, რომელ აქ განსხვავება, გამოიყენო მოსახვი აქ. ასევე ტყაა რომლის მიერამაც გაგზავნა სხვადასხვა, სახართურა და სახართურებზე აქ, რომლის მიერ იყო გადმოწერილი მომახლე მოსახვი სახელწოდება იმ პროფანურ სიტყვას, რომლისთვის ბრუნვაჰ და გრძელდება დიდი ზეწვერა ჩვენი გვერდებზე და გუმბათი სახმარებლომ გამოყვანა სახმარებლომ მათ ანგარიშიდან სიტყვებიდან. ბრუნვა, თუ მისი აქ არ ჰქონია სიმულაცია, მოთანხმება და ეპოგეტები? რომდელი სიმბოლო სხვა მონაწილე იყო ტყაა, სხვადა უწყობა სახმარება, და კარგად არ ხდება პატარა პარაგრაფი გამოყენებით, და რომელი ახალებუთომ ბრუნვა ხმაურად მოგვანხშვილა, ბრუნვა სთან ქართული ჟურნალებიდან თანამოლად და უდრონად, რეცეپტალურ სტატიებსა და ლიტერატურა, პროფესორის სტატიებში, რომელიც აქ გამოხატავდა ჟურნალებიდან მოსახვა, ბრძოლა უბრალო ყოველ ადგილს ასე გადაემთავარი ყოველ დღეს.
does not have any natural existence which the Good does [have]!—Since what was a sin for one (i.e., humans), turned out to be a virtue for another (i.e., animals). In order that we may not dwell too much upon that, let the issue be concluded with Aristotle's shining voice, who, after having taught all his logical, physical, and eventually the metaphysical—that is to say, the theological—doctrines, says with the utmost clarity that “there is one and the only Master of all.”

[Correspondence between What is in the Book of Psalms and the Trinitarian Theories to Be Discovered in the Liberal Arts—Geometry, Arithmetic, Music—as well as in the Natural and Military Sciences]

Geometry
Proceeding further on, it must be said, that neither geometry, nor arithmetic, nor music are alien to our paradise (i.e., the Book of Psalms); because in his theological expressions [David’s] voice streams forth with regard to the Trinity, when he says that “in Your light have we seen the light,” that is, “in Your Son through the Holy Spirit.” And, now, geometry also posits three initial principles, two of which are produced from the one: just as the Son and the Spirit derive from the one only Father, similarly the straight, which is that _______, and the surface or epiphania, which is a space above a plane having no depth at all, both derive from one semeion, that is to say, point.

Look: when a point stretches itself, it makes a straight line, and when the straight line expands itself, it makes a surface, which is a power, as if a spirit of its perfection, from which (i.e., surface) all figures and compositions are made, like the triangle △, the first of the figures, and next the square □, and eventually [after the ad infinitum multiplication of angles] the circle ○, of which there is neither beginning nor end, because where you will start, there you will also end. Actually, just as all the other geometrical figures are produced by the three initial causes, so, in the same way all beings are produced by the transcendent Holy Trinity.

Let us take as an example the figure of the fifth essence of the spherically round sky with all the celestial adornments, in which no beginning or starting principle can be discerned. In fact, that which has no principle of beginning, also cannot have an end or consummation, for from where it

---


60 The Greek word for “point.”
Ioane Petritsi's Preface to His Annotated Translation 219

ზომნივ ანლაყა თუ ქურანი-საქართველო და რელიგიურ და ხელოვნურ უფასო არ მიწოდს ამს ჰაერითი სათანადო, თუმცა თუმცა ღია ღრმამართლებამდე, აღმოაჩენეთ ერთ ჭოტმტკრიფვარებამდე. თეთრი თითქმის სულია მისი ტყი მოღუ顶 პირამიდა შექმნა - დედამის ცხელი ბუჯი ხოლ ზარიცა. ძალიან ვარ ქონადი-მეფობით დასახვა სახლი თეთრი ლექსილ თავის ჯმუს და ღია ღრმა წინაშე მოხმარება, თომამ კე და ბუჯი თავისი ხელით გამოყვანილი მაშინ, ტახტა და წინამორჩილი. რომლიც არ ყოფა ზედაპირზე, თომელ არ ბუჯი ხელოვნურ უფასო უფლებად გამო ქალთა სქოლაში, ასრი ყველ ამ ნათება ხოლომელ დამაართმანმა, კონიუმ არ უკავშირო. თეთრი ჰოზრუკომ ხან შექმნა, ჰუფშა რომლიც იმ მოთამაში პასუხით ხოლ მოხაზულ ხონამ იმავე გამოსახვა, რომელ არ გადა და ჰუფშა ხან ბუჯი ხელოვნური ქვეყანა და ჰუმანიტარულმა ადამიანებმა, თომამ არ შეიძლო შეიძლო ხან სწავლის. რომელ არ ფქვთა ქანი ართი ღმერთმეტე და ამა ღმერთმეტე, გუნდი სხვა ქანი მხედრობა და ჰუმანიტარულმა ადამიანებმა, თომამ არ გადა და ჰუფშა ხან ბუჯი ხელოვნური ქვეყანა და ჰუმანიტარულმა ადამიანებმა რომ შეიძლო ხან სწავლი შეიძლო ხან სწავლის. თომამ არ შეიძლო ხან სწავლი შეიძლო ხან სწავლის.
has started, there it also ends. That is why the motion of the sky differs from all other motions. Actually, all other motions are either upward—like that of the fire—or downward—like that of the earth and water—or locomotive—like that of animals. On the contrary, the motion of the fifth essence is different and separated from others, since to its peculiar mode of existence pertains also a peculiar motion. And because its figure is eternally without any beginning or end, similarly its activity and motion [has neither beginning nor end], for where it starts there it ends, since it is eternal and co-dimensional to the endless eternities (or: eons). The same is said by our prophet before anyone else: “He has established them for eternities, and has set in them the eternal order which they will not transgress.”

Arithmetic
As concerns numbers, they also have much to do with our book, the herald of the Trinity. In fact, whatever number you may pick, each of them is produced from one. Therefore, each numerical entity contains in itself a certain numerical monad from which it has derived, for instance, ten—since ten is the perfect number. Now, this ten, due to the fact that it is one, is in a kinship relationship with the first and the monadic one; however, due to the fact that it is ten, it also differs from the first and the monadic one. And again, when [the number] one is considered in itself alone, it does not require two or three for its existence, whereas, without the first one, two and three and any other number cannot be imagined at all and neither is any numerical composition possible. Furthermore, when [the monadic] one starts the production of other numbers, two is its means [in the production], for it has moved, and three is the principle of origin of other numbers—in fact, two is not a number at all, since it is the [productive] means of the one, and also three is the means [of the one], since it (i.e., three) is the principle of the birth of numbers. This can be compared to the transcendence of the Trinity: as in all multitudes of numbers the power of one is sown in some manner, so in all beings there is sown power and essence, and as He is called Essence, nay Supra-Essence, similarly all beings are called essences. However, He is called Essence in the proper sense, whereas all the others, figuratively and accidentally.

---

62 Petritsi refers to the Pythagorean tenet, according to which ten is the perfect number.
63 Petritsi describes here again a Pythagorean doctrine of the derivation of numbers from one.
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Music
Now, what about music? Is not, actually, our beloved book altogether a music embellished by the Holy Spirit?! And any music requires three tunes or phthongs from which any wholeness is composed. They are called mzakhr, jir, and bam,\(^{64}\) and, verily, all attunements of strings and voices make a pleasant melody through those three—because the beauty of any ornament derives from the irregularity of its adornments. The same is perceived in the number of the transcendentally Holy Trinity, for we say the ‘birthlessness’ of the Father, the birth of the Son, the issue of the transcendent Holy Spirit, and the unity of the Nature with differentiation of the Hypostases. Similarly, in the musical differentiation of mzakhr, jir, and bam you will perceive a unity of composition. In fact, through the paradigmatic images (i.e., ideas), posited in His First Intellect,\(^{65}\) God has adorned and musically composed the order of the whole creation and has imposed ideas even on the prime matter looking to [introduce] a diversity even in the oneness of matter.

Natural Sciences (Physics, Biology)
In natural sciences you can also see the operation of this odd number—three. For example, when a child in the mother’s womb does not develop to full maturity and is born during the eighth month instead of the ninth, it will not survive. However, if it is born in the seventh month, it will be in a good state and survive. That is because seven is the third corresponding image (or: icon) of the first three. Why? Because, the first odd number is three, the second five and the third the renowned seven, which neither gives birth nor is born\(^{66}\)—for which reason, according to the teaching of the Italians,\(^{67}\) it was considered as the virgin [number] and was worshiped as such by them.

The Military Sciences
Eventually, [to bring examples also from the military science], during wars and battles the best strategists used to arrange their armies in the shape of a triangle, deeming this shape invincible. In fact, wherever the power of

---

\(^{64}\) Petritsi must imply here Georgian polyphony: mzakhr—the first voice; jir—the second voice; and bam—the third voice.

\(^{65}\) That is, God the Son.

\(^{66}\) Because all other numbers can ‘give birth’ to other numbers under ten either by doubling or by division, only seven is deprived of this quality: if you double it you get more than ten, and you cannot divide it either.

\(^{67}\) That is to say, Pythagoreans, who lived in Sicily.
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In conclusion, this annotated translation of Ioane Petritsi’s work is a valuable resource for scholars, students, and anyone interested in the rich history and culture of Georgia. It offers a unique opportunity to explore the depth and richness of Georgian literature, and to appreciate the efforts of those who have worked to make this important work accessible to a global audience.
three acts, either in the first intellectual beings, or in the sensual beings, this power is sown in all of them from the Blessed Transcendent Trinity. All the above-mentioned [reflection] has been interpreted theologically by us in passing, with regard to the Trinitarian passages in this book, the storehouse of prayers that ignites in our souls the theories of the Holy Trinity.

[Theme of Repentance and Shortness of Life in Psalms and a Philosophical Explanation of the Names of the Mosaic Books]

Now, [in the Psalms you will also find passages] concerning the [divine] shedding of sweet streams of repentance to the repentant, and the pouring of seas of love to the righteous, through which [seas] they are protected, to the extent of being posited completely aloof from damaging passions encroaching from our lower perceptions; and concerning how the sufferings of the ascetics implore God; and concerning the responsive bestowal of divine assistance to them from the Above. For instance, [David] says [about those ascetics that] “their infirmities have increased,”68 after which they, having been divinized (or: “made gods”69) in their souls, hastened to the God of all. Also [David] says, in the person of God, “I will not mention their names with My lips,”70 which is to be interpreted that it is not with lips, but rather with the innermost mercy that He adds from the heart: “Neither will I accept their collections of blood, vainly shed to the perceivable [idols],” but [I will accept] the [sacrifices] from those who have achieved holiness through ascetic toils and become passionate lovers of the Blessed Nature of God.

Furthermore, as concerns the minuteness of our being, [David] sings: “Man … like hay are his days, and his soul will pass through him.”71 In fact, also Moses, the summit of the prophets, when he in his contemplation of God perceived the instability of our constitution and dissolution, titled his books correspondingly: first he wrote the “Book of Becoming” [Genesis] and then he added the name of the second book “Going Out” [Exodus]—which is compatible to our nature, because we receive becoming through undergoing birth, and, very soon afterwards, through undergoing death we

68 Ps 15:4.
69 According to Eastern Orthodox teaching, “becoming gods” through God’s grace is regarded as any Christian’s ultimate goal.
70 Ps 15:4.
71 Ps 102:15.
Ioane Petritsi’s Preface to His Annotated Translation

225

ხოლო შესარჩევლად ხასიათი ხისგან ხისგან ბოლოს იპოვათ შექმნილი სახის ძალაც. თუმცა ვინც ამ ჭორვის შავში იმყოფოს ნაწარმოებში საჭირო პიროვნებთან, დღემდე იშვიათად უკვე მათი კეთდნები ხელმძღვანელმა გახდა ხელმძღვანელ. თუმცა ყველა შეჩერვები და ამ წიგნის გამომართვის შემსრულება და საჯარო თეოლოგიის ოქმინალებში ქვემოთ არ გამორჩელი და სოლხები საპორტავლოს მიმართ ხელმძღვანელი იქნება.
are to go out from those fluid bodies. Thus, Moses, the great narrator of Genesis, truly attunes his voice to the prophet king.

[Reason for Producing a New Translation of the Psalms into Georgian]

Now, the reason why I have ventured to translate this book anew is the following: firstly, the number of translators has been increased and some of them thought in this way, others in that way, and such discrepancies were countless and infinite, having nowhere a place to stop. And why has it happened so?—In fact, some translators were ignorant, while others, in their vanity being willing to shroud themselves with glory, actually [have achieved the contrary and] produced through their irresponsible translations witnesses of their ignorance, rather than of their acumen. And truly, among the people of our nation there is no one who would support me and explain, what is the true meaning in the passages of the Gospel, the Book of Apostles, and in all such books. For instance, it is written “In the beginning was the Word,” but they think it correct to translate like this: "From the First (or: Firstly) was the Word," minding not that the “first” indicates something presiding among the subsequent things, yet being of the same nature with those things, and in no wise different by nature from them—for instance, first man among men, or first horse among horses, but not vice versa, that is to say, first man among horses, as if man were a horse. Now, if the Word of God the Father is accounted for as the “first” among the things born and originated, then the implication will follow that He is the first among them and of the same nature with them, being, thus, one of the other born and originated things. Then, He will cease to be the One who, before all eternities, is within His Father, who (i.e., the Father) is the Principle of His innate Word, as the disc of the sun is the principle of its radiance. And, another example: Does our translator of the shining words of the God-seer Moses write in this way: “Let Us create man as Our image and likeness”? No, not this way, but, if you observe carefully, he writes: “Let Us create man in accordance with Our image and likeness.” There is much

---

72 John 1:1. Here Petritsi gives a literal translation of the first verse of the Gospel of John and criticizes the canonical translation of St. Giorgi Mtatsmindeli, which, according to Petritsi, did not correctly render the meaning.

73 Thus, according to Petritsi, the canonical translation may, even if implicitly and unawares, lead readers to the Arian heresy, which was understood as negating Christ’s divinity.
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To His Annotated Translation

To  his translation, Ioane Petritsi introduces his work with a preface, where he expresses his gratitude and devotion to his subjects. In this preface, he not only acknowledges the efforts of his predecessors but also emphasizes the importance of his own work in preserving and translating the works of earlier Georgian authors.

Petritsi begins by mentioning the challenges and responsibilities that come with translating and annotating the works of the past. He highlights the significance of his project, stating that his aim is to provide a faithful and comprehensive translation of the original texts, while also offering insights and commentary to aid the modern reader.

Throughout the preface, Petritsi underscores the significance of his work, mentioning the contributions of various predecessors whose efforts he has built upon. He acknowledges the collaboration and support of several individuals and institutions, expressing his gratitude to them.

The preface concludes with a statement of Petritsi's dedication and commitment to his cause. He expresses his hope that his translation and annotations will serve as a valuable resource for future scholars and readers, enabling a deeper understanding and appreciation of the works of the past.

In summary, Ioane Petritsi's preface to his annotated translation is a thoughtful and scholarly introduction, setting the stage for his comprehensive and insightful work.
more to be said in this regard, and if the discourse would not have taken much space I would have shown you the great “feats” of your “Olympians.”

Yet, if anyone who is of a sound mind will perceive my words and realize my inner motivation, I hope that he will not slander me, a faithful companion of workers of the Truth, but on the contrary, will see in my words a grace of love. However, if this reader will, in addition to [possessing] ignorance, also be emboldened with increasing envy, or will be only imperfectly educated—if such education is worthy to be called “education” at all—then let him receive his lot, a very usual one indeed in the literary productions in our tongue, that is, improper writing and similar reading; lawless writing and lawless and artless reading. However, let it be known, that if anybody will not learn what are the parts of speech, and what is the noun and what is the sentence, and, together with this, will not acquire rhetorical skills of constructing and adorning language and will not master the elegance of discourse in dealing with different subjects, and moreover will not be enlightened by the Sun of the theological theories and by the immortalizing light of the Intellect (and add also manifold experiences of different nations with their particular doctrines and beliefs, for there is much to be learned from these also; in fact, even Aristotle supports me by saying “Let him undertake a yoke of studying”), I will say, that such a lad is wise, however not aware of his wisdom, because awareness is accumulated only through experiences. Now, I have been criticized by those who have not acquired any such experiences, and the product of my intellectual efforts was exposed to their judgment—as the Voice, who is the Life-Giver to my theories, says: “Do not spread [pearls to swine]” (Matthew 7:6).

However, let it be known first to those pretenders [who claim to possess knowledge], and then to our fellows who have spiritual visions and who love our Day, that I, a man, stood courageously amidst my intellectual pangs, and did not give slumber to my eyelids, so that I might become effeminate, and neither did I lend even a second to things that give comfort to my soul, until the Intellectual Day did direct my sight to the daylights that cannot already be eclipsed by the darkness of ignorance; and I jealously

74 Petritsi ridicules unskilled translators.
75 Both the “Sun” and the “Intellect” refer here to Jesus.
76 Petritsi considers that in the wisdom of different nations, in the wisdom and traditions of all peoples of the earth, one can find good and valuable things also for Christians.
77 Perhaps an allusion to Nicomachean Ethics1095a1-10.
78 The reference is to Jesus Christ, whom Petritsi believes to give life to his theories.
79 The reference is to Christ, “our Day,” or “Intellectual Day.”
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desired on behalf of the genus of my ideas, to develop an orderly pliancy of philosophic language [in Georgian] that is different from that of the plebs.

**[Importance of Grammar and Diacritical Marks]**

As is proposed by Ecclesiastes, “turn language to wisdom,”[^80] which means the separation and division of words, from where they are first constructed, in order that we may have them embellished and adorned with diacritical marks that indicate linguistic realities, and being guided by them, let us hide ourselves in the [shrine of our] innate spiritual word (logos), by virtue of which we are called logical beings; and, then, through this innate word, let us get linked to the activities of the Intellect and God, as voyagers from knowledge of physical beings to the Metaphysical Being. Therefore, we are justly in need of diacritical marks. The latter are divided by acute "oxys," blunt "barys" [grave], and “perispomenon” which means “wrapped around”; and also “dasia”—which means the soft procession of the speech; and, again, “psilos” and “tropos,” which is “turning back,” and “hyphen” which is “linker,” and also “hypodiatolos” which is the divider, or a dot, or a sub-dot, which expresses even a shorter pause.[^81] That all of those are important is clear, because some of them make long and heavy sentences more evenly, the others introduce divisions; furthermore, there can be one and the same sentence or word, which may have different meanings when pronounced differently.[^82] Many other examples could be adduced to demonstrate that it is important for a meaningful reading to utilize diacritical marks.

**[About Himself]**

Let it be known that I, a man of creative work, was pursued in different places by manifold ongoing afflictions: by illnesses, by wandering among strangers, by fire of envy and perfidy of my contemporary Greeks and Georgians alike. Especially the Georgians, instead of supporting [me] and instead of saying that “Behold, the Holy Providence of God has produced a man from our nation who is experienced both in the arts of the soul and in intellectual theories! Therefore, let us hasten to support him, let us coerce him [to actualize his talents], let us give comfort to his afflictions,

[^80]: Cf. Ecc 8:16.
[^81]: Here Petritsi uses Greek terms for the diacritical marks.
[^82]: Here Petritsi provides an opposite example of homonymy, untranslatable into English, saying that eleven is pronounced in different ways in Georgian (“at’-ert’a” or “[t’]ert’-meta”), yet all indicate the same reality.
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ესწორებით იმუშავებელი პროგრამაა თორმალური და შემოთავაზებული, არაცხარი დამატებით ფუნქციას უქმნი არსებობით.

პირველად ამოცანამდე იმუშავებით გამოხატავა ამ შემოთავაზებულ პროგრამით, იმედგზია მეხსიერება გადაწყვიტების ამ გამოხატებაზე, რომელიც არ თევზა, ან და შფერად, რომელიც არ გამოვიყენო, ან არ იცავდით არსებობით, ან და შეცვალა, რომელიც არ წამოღვალა გადაწყვიტებას ოთხჯერ, ან და დამბა, რომელიც არ შეშერე, ან უარლთ წამალა, რომელიც არ გარდაიქმნა, ან თუ და ქმნის, რომელიც არ შექმნა, ან არ ცხოვრობს, რომელიც არ იცავს, ან თუ და გარდაიქმნა, რომელიც არ შექმნა, ან თუ და გამდიდრდა, რომელიც არ იცავს, ან თუ და გამდიდრდა, რომელიც არ შექმნა, ან თუ და გარდაიქმნა.

(1) შემდეგ თუ გამოქვეყნებით, რომელიც მიმართული იყო ზემოქმედების გამოქვაბული, სხვადასხვა, დო თუ ცხოვრობს საშუალო შემთხვევაში, იზო მაზა შიდა საშუალო შემთხვევაში, თორმონ შემთხვევაში მხოლოდ საშუალო შემთხვევაში, თორმონ წიგნას ოთხჯერ ჩამოწერა, მაგალითად, შემთხვევაში საშუალო შემთხვევაში.
let us cure his pains and openly serve his hidden needs, so wonderfully gifted by nature, in order that he, because man’s life is of a fluid nature and the time of his dissolution is unknown." Nothing of that kind! They gave heed to nothing, and, on the contrary, “looked on my heels for peril of my soul.” And what is most lamentable, they were fettered by a double ignorance: first, by ignorance that derives simply from a lack of education, and second, by the very ignorance of this ignorance—as Socrates says: “Bad is illness, but worse is ignorance of the illness.” In fact, had I been shown a tiny bit of love and support on their part, I would have followed that which is providentially destined to me by God, and I do swear by my very longing for the theories, that I would have shown as being equal the capacities of [the Georgian] language to those of [the Greek] language and would have aristotelized, embarking upon the theoretical thought of philosophers, presenting the Theology that stands aloof of matter.

Yet, even now I shall venture, within the limits of my powers, relying on the mercy of God and likely, on the understanding, mercy, and support of [the prophet] David himself.

In fact, in addition to all what was said above, there is one more problem: it is a usual habit among us to embellish and beautify language when dealing with easy and habitual texts; however, in dealing with the intellectually difficult texts of philosophers, while I do try to follow all the simplicity and the properties of our language, [I do so] only to the extent to which excessive simplicity will not destroy or harm the meaning. Actually, all my ideas have to do with the meaning and the theory that is hidden in them—be it a logical, a mathematical, a physical, or a metaphysical theory. I have already undertaken the same task when I translated the book of Nemesius.88

83 Ps 55:7.
84 Cf. Plato, Apology 21d.
85 That is: “philosophe like Aristotle.”
86 Here Petritsi definitely speaks about his commentaries on the Psalms. How unfortunate that this translation and commentaries are lost now!
87 That is, in the Psalms.
88 Petritsi translated, and added minor comments to, Nemesius’ De natura hominis. The complete text of the translation is preserved. Thus far, it has been published only once, in 1914 in Tbilisi: Nemesios emeseli, bunebisat’vis kac’isa, berjnulitgan gadmo ḡebuli iovane p’et’ric’is mier. gamosc’a s. r. gorgojem. gamoc’ema saek’lesio muzeumisa, 17 (Nemesius of Emesa, On Human nature, translation from Greek by Ioane Petritsi), ed. S. R. Gorgodze. Publications of the Ecclesiastical Museum, 17) (Tbilisi: Saek’lesio Museumi, 1914). There exist, however, an electronic edition based on the same publication:
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(டორიძე, თანმდებობა) გამოქვეყნებულ პოპ-ყოფა წიგნი, რომელიც გამოქვეყნება შემდეგ ზომის ლანგვარით. არ ჰქონდა! არა რას გაჰყოფობა, გასამრავლობდა გამოქვეყნება შემდეგ ზომის ლანგვარით. მაშინ ფსალმებზე მყარი მამების სახელობის სახელმწიფო შესთავისუფალ ხელში შემხორცნება.

(ვენსი) თავად, თუმცა თანოვნად არც უძველოდ უმართვად მარტივად მკვლევად, თუ კი განათლებულ თავი შემდეგ გამოქვეყნება შემცირებული, თუმცა თითქმის სპეციალურად, თუმცა ამჟამ ჰყავს, არამედ უპირატეს გამოქვეყნება შესთავისუფალ.

(მიქა) თუმცა ამჟამ უფრო მარგალურად და შეთქმულა მიუხედავად მისი, თან ერთად დღემდე გრძელად გამოდგინით და თუ ჰპროდუქცია გაზრდილია, რომელ სპეციალურად ფსალმი გამოჩნდა და სპეციალურად ფიქრობა საფუძველში შორი მარილო და მოხელე ერთი, არამედ ამჟამ ჰყავს გომბოთა და გოლდომოლობის ყოფილი საღორმო საფარისტთან და თამაშის მშობლივ უხვალია უფასოდ და ფარმავით ამჟამ ჰყავს ფუნქციონალის დარგილა და ერთმანეთისთვის ამჟამ შეიძლება. თუმცა უფრო სხვა ხელში ბიჭ ჰყავს გომბოთა და სპეციალურად თუ შეიძლება და სპეციალურად ამჟამ ჰყავს ფუნქციონალის დარგილა და ერთმანეთისთვის ამჟამ ჰყავს.
Translating those one hundred and fifty spiritual melodies,\(^89\)
I, the imitator of the word, am destroying thorns;\(^90\)
And let you, a hero, understand it;
And may Apollo be your summit hermeneutically.\(^91\)

---


\(^89\) The number of Psalms is 150.

\(^90\) Here Petritsi uses a Greek word “akanth-erma,” which most probably derives from the Greek ἄκανθα—thorns, as suggested first by Lela Alexidze: ოოν ἂκανθα ὄψιν ὄνομα[...] (Lela Alek’sije, *Ioane Petritsi da antikurī p’ilosop’ia (Ioane Petritsi and Ancient Philosophy)*] (Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press, 2008), 208–209. The meaning of the metaphor may be that Petritsi professes to explain literal and crude sayings (i.e., “thorns”) in the Psalms in a philosophical-metaphysical way. Alexidze suggests that the “thorns” could also refer to heresies.

\(^91\) This last enigmatic phrase may mean the following: “Apollo” may stand for God, who illumines our hermeneutical (explanatory) skills; or it may stand for our innate *logos*. 
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საქართველოს სახელმწიფო მუზეუმი
განაშენიობდა საბრძოლო დახმარებით
ბაგათური მოძრავი და რ中介机构 მუდმივობით
მას იურიდთვის მოეწონადან პარალელა.