

GEORGIAN AND ARMENIAN READINGS OF TOPONYMS AND ETHNONYMS IN THE BOOKS OF EZRA¹

Giorgi Kitoshvili

Phd Student

Head of Scientific Research Center of Kartvelian
Onomastics at the Georgian Language Institute of
Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University,
Tbilisi, I. Chavchavadze Ave. 1, 0179, Georgia,
+995595293854, giorgi.kitoshvili@tsu.ge,
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7500-3494>

Abstract. The Old Testament contains the names of toponyms of numerous regions. Under the influence of Hebrew, these toponyms initially appeared in the Greek translation of the Bible and, later, in other translations based on the Greek text of the Bible, including the Georgian and Armenian translations. It is important to study toponyms and ethnonyms in regarding the origin of each text of various books of the Georgian Old Testament.

In the paper, are studied the toponyms transferred into Georgian based on different methods by means of a comparative approach, taking into account the history of the texts of Ezra's books, as far as the Georgian texts of the Old Testament, that have survived to us, are ancient translations made from different languages and revised with different goals. Episodes in which a number of geographical names are transliterated are discussed.

Most of the toponyms of Georgian Bible are derived from the Greek translation of the Bible, but in the books of Ezra (I Ezra and II Ezra) there are toponyms of Ancient Near East region transliterated from Armenian translation. Armenian readings itself do not match to the Greek original, but Georgian readings of some toponyms of the Ezra's books are transliterated from Armenian versions. So, Georgian text of Ezra's books give us opinion about Armenian readings and rarely, it is possible to recover lost Armenian readings by observing to the Georgian readings.

The research shows, that Armenian translators found it difficult to identify Greek geographical names found in the Old Testament, because they did not know region of the Ancient Near East. Thus, in the episodes derived from Armenian translation, Georgians were forced to transliterate toponyms, even mistaken readings.

Key words: Toponyms; Old Testament; Georgian translation; Armenian translation; Textological relationship.

Introduction: The Bible tells the century-old history of the Jewish nation, that inhabited various territories and communicated with linguistically different peoples. Hence, the Old Testament contains the names of toponyms of numerous regions. Under the influence of Hebrew, these toponyms initially appeared in the Greek translation of the Bible and, later, in other translations based on the Greek version of the Bible, including the Georgian translation. Thus, Bible became geographical guidebook for the language of translation.



¹ კვლევა [PHDF-22-6557] განხორციელდა შოთა რუსთაველის საქართველოს ეროვნული სამეცნიერო ფონდის ფინანსური მხარდაჭერით/ This research [PHDF-22-6557] has been supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG)

The following types of toponyms are found in the Georgian translations: 1. Local names of toponyms of Asia Minor and North Africa; 2. The Greek versions of place-names of the Minor Asia, Africa and The Ancient Near East regions, that were well-known in the Hellenic period; 3. Greek versions of place-names formed by means of different morphological affixes. These names have appeared in the Georgian versions under the influence of the Greek and rarely Armenian translations of the Bible. The translators sometimes knew biblical nations and toponyms, or, on the contrary, they didn't know them at all. Therefore, geographical names transferred multidimensionally.

Methods. We have studied the toponyms transferred into Georgian based on different methods by means of a comparative approach, taking into account the history of each text of the Bible, as far as the Georgian texts of the Old Testament, that have survived to us, are ancient translations made from different languages and revised with different goals. They were also changed by the hands of copyists. We have compared the relevant textual forms of toponyms and with their related ethnonyms. We have focused on the technique of translation, the practice of copying and the method of glossing.

It is interesting to find out which tradition of naming of toponyms was familiar to the Georgian translator and shared by the latter: Greek historiographic tradition, Greek Biblical tradition, the tradition of the country to which the toponym in question belongs, native Georgian historiographic, or the translator does not follow any of the above-mentioned traditions and merely follows the text, transliterating the geographical names and ethnonyms. In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to study the technology of transfer of toponyms.

A toponym may be translated if its meaning is known to the translator or if an exact correlate exists in the language of translation. In other cases, the translator creates transliterated forms and tries to achieve maximum closeness to the original version. In such cases, "transliteration is due to the lack of information regarding the translated segment" (Tov, 1999: 503-4). In the latter case, the translator is obliged to copy the reading, which means to transfer the original word.

Toponyms transcribed in the Georgian translation of the Bible were translated by two methods: 1. Taking into account the phonetic rules of Greek (in certain cases Armenian) pronunciation; 2. By transcribing letter by letter (by transliteration). It was depended on the translator whether the transliteration would be performed. They transferred it so meticulously, that often the Greek (in certain cases Armenian) producing affixes were also perceived as part of the stem of the name and represented in the transcribed form. That is why the examples of Greek-Georgian/Armenian-Georgian transliteration of toponyms and ethnonyms indicate what kind of information the Georgian translator-reviewers possessed about region mentioned in the Bible and how much the Holy Scriptures influenced ideas of the translators.

When analyzing the Georgian versions of Biblical toponyms, alongside with the study of translation technique, we should take into account the fact, that the names containing phonemes alien to Georgian could have been changed in the process of copying.

By establishing correspondence between Georgian and foreign versions, we can identify the initial version found in the Georgian translation and the reading which is close to it. We can also find out what was changed by the copier and how authentically we have preserved the initial translation.

Results and Discussion. Thus, identification of the toponyms of the Georgian version of the Bible and textological research is an important task with reference to the study of the technique of transfer, the issues of origin and authenticity of translation and further history of the text. Identification of the Armenian-Georgian correlation of toponyms helps to analyze the knowledge and opinion of ancient Georgians and translators regarding the Biblical society and to find out the awareness of Georgians regarding the regions and countries mentioned in the Bible.

The Ancient Near East in the Greek and Georgian Translations of the Old Testament

In the Bible, The Ancient Near East is one of the major regions. The Bible provides numerous stories taking place in various epochs in the countries of the given region. The Ancient Near East embraces the main rival states of the Jews: Assyria, Babylon, Media and Elam. Out of the above-mentioned states, the most ancient and historically important was Elam. On its territory, the country of Media was formed later on. Alongside with other peoples, the inhabitants of Elam and Media formed part of the Achaemenid and, later, Sasanian Persia. Therefore, Georgians must have had

contacts with these people. It is interesting to carry out textological analysis of the Biblical toponyms in order to find out the opinions of Georgians regarding these people.

The Toponyms Derived from Armenian Found in Georgian Translation

II Ezra

According to an opinion widespread in scholarly literature, the Georgian translation of the II Ezra preserved in the Bible of Oshki dated by 978, unlike the Khanmeti fragments and later translations, originates from the Armenian source (kurtsik'idze, 1973: 54; Kharanauli, 2020: 462). Hence, it is interesting to find out how the toponyms are transferred from Armenian and how the translator manages to find the Georgian correlates of the geographical units.

The II Ezra speaks about the people of Susa, or Elam: II Ezra 4:9 Ραουμ βααλατμ και Σαμσαι ὁ γραμματεὺς και οἱ κατάλοιποι σύνδουλοι ἡμῶν Διναῖοι Αφαρσαθαχαῖοι Ταρφαλλαῖοι Αφαρσαῖοι Αρχυαῖοι Βαβυλώνιοι Σουσαναχαῖοι οἱ εἰσιν Ηλαμαῖοι (Greek text is noted from: Hanhart, 1974); ზრეუმ [Hreum], რააჟრუმ [Baaltam] ხე სამსაჟი [Samsaji] ყრჩე, ხე აჟ ხე დათაჟაჟიყე მერ, რენნუ [Deenes], სფარსაჟაჟაჟი [Afarsathak'aje], სარფაჟელ [Tarfaree], აფერსელ [Afersee], ვრუმელ [Vokrvee], რაბელონელ [Babelvonee], სუსანა [Susana] რენდაელ [keedae] Arm (The Armenia text of the Old Testament is verified from web site: [<https://arak29.org/bible/book/>]) ერეუმ [Ereum], ბაალტამ [Baaltam] და სამსაი [Samsai] მწერალმან და სხუათა მონათა და მოდგმათა ჩუენთა: დენეე [Denee], აფსათაჟაი (-ს [s] Geo^S (The are symbols and abbreviations at the end of the article) [Afarsathaqaie], ტარფალიე [Tarfalie], ალფარსიე [Alfarsie] (ალფასიე S), აჟუვე [Aqve], ბაბილვანოე [Babilvanie] (ბაბულვანოე [Babulvanie] ID), სუსა(-ნ [-n])JFS) [Susaa], ქედა(-ე [-e] S), უეღე [Ueghe] (უვეე [uvee] IDF) Geo^{JIDFS} (The Georgian text of the Old Testament is verified from the following editions: Abuladze and Kurtsikidze 2017 (v. I and v. II)).// Rehum, Baalta and Shimshai the scribe and other slaves and tribes: the Dinaites, the Apharsathchites, the Tarpelites, the Apharsites, the Babylonians, the Susanchites, Keeda, Ueghel. In the Georgian list of toponyms, there are transliterated variants which are extremely close to Armenian. Out of these, დენეე [Denee] shares the Armenian ending -ელ [-ee] (although in Armenian რენნუ [Deenes] has the ending -უ [-es], in the Georgian translation ნ [n] is shifted in the process of copying).

In the reading ქედა (-ე [-e] S) [Keeda], the Armenian ending -ელ [-ee] has not been reflected in the Georgian versions, although the Armenian stem „რენდა“ [keeda] is transliterated. In Geo^S, with the aim of closeness to the Armenian original, the ending is corrected (ქედე [Keede] S). The forms ტარფალიე [Tarfalie], ალფარსიე [Alfarsie], ბაბილვანოე [Babilvanie] are transliterated forms, that are close to Armenian. The ending -იე [-je] is an error of the copier. The -ეე [-ee] found in the initial translation was read mistakenly because -ელ was preceded by an ethnonym with the ending -იე [-je] (სფარსაჟაჟი [Afarsathakaje]). The tendency of transliteration is obvious also in the anthroponym: ერეუმ [Ereum] = ზრეუმ [Hreum].

The correlates denoting the Elamites in the Georgian translation we can consider in conditional უეღე/უვეე [Ueghe/Uvee]: II Ezra 4:9 Βαβ., Σουσαναχαῖοι] babylonis· usannachaei La 123 : cf. V ap | om Σουσαναχαῖοι—fin 125: homoiot | σουσαναχαιοι B | Δαυαῖοι] δουαῖοι 74; δαῖαῖοι 106; δεαῖοι 71: cf. V; δαυσαῖοι 119; σαυαῖοι Ald; δαυλιοι αιλαμειται (και λαμῖται 19') L; danaei· elammitae La 123 ; + ελαμῖται Compl = m; οἱ εἰσιν (προκρητ: cf. Par I 4:35, 9:8) ηλαμαιοι (ηλαμοι 55) B' Aeth (sim) Ra.: cf. m, TGE II; > 107 58; უეღე [Ueghe] (უვეე [Uvee] IDF) Geo^{JIDFS}

In the Greek variants, instead of Δαυαῖοι, there is ελαμῖται, meaning the Elamites. The Armenian translation does not contain the part in which the Elamites are mentioned. The lost Armenian version correlated to უეღე [Ueghe] is preserved in the Georgian translation. In the Armenian translation itself, one Greek variant was represented in a divided form Σουσαναχαῖοι → Σουσანა - სუსანა [Susana], ხაῖοι - რენდაელ [Keedawee] and, later, the word σαυαῖοι was devoid of *sigma* in the Armenian translation. In our opinion, the variant უვეე [Uvee] in IDF version

is closer to the Armenian translation (with the transferred Armenian ending -է) than the variant უეღე [Ueghe] found in the Jerusalem version. It may be assumed, that in both versions, the consonant appeared in the process of copying, and the initial form was “უეე” [Uee].

The similarity of Armenian and Georgian proper names proves, that the Georgian translation of the above-mentioned episode from the II Ezra imitates Armenian (“In Ezra I, there is an especially large number of proper names. With regard to the transfer of proper names, the Armenian and Georgian texts are close. This fact is important because the Georgian and Armenian translations reveal obvious difference as compared to the Greek original source“ (Kurtsikidze, 1973, p. 54)); the toponyms are transliterated and, in frequent cases, the Armenian translation errors become more vivid when observing the Georgian versions. According to Ts. Kurtsikidze, the above-mentioned translation of the II Ezra must have been performed based on the Armenian source before the 8th century, on the initial stage of Georgian-Armenian literary relations, before the Georgian and Armenian churches finally separated“ (kurtsik'idze, 1973: 65). Thus, the form უეღე/უვეე [Ueghe/Uvee] found in the Georgian version must have been transliterated from Armenian and appeared in Georgian in the given period (not later than the 10th century).

If we observe the Georgian Biblical correlates of the Medians, we will pay attention to the word ბატანაიელ//[Batanaiel]//Batanaians, which greatly differs from other versions and is found in the text only once. This vague form can be explained based on the comparison with Armenian: **II Ezra 6:2** Եւ գտեալ յԱմաթստի քաղաքի **Բատանացոյ** და პოვა იამათიას, ქალაქსა **ბატანაიელთას** // and found Jamatia, a city of **Batanaians** Geo^{JIDFS}; lac. Geo^O cf. Gr: καὶ εὐρέθη ἐν πόλει ἐν τῇ **βάρει τῆς Μήδων** πόλεως|.

In the Armenian version, **Μήδων** is not transferred. Instead, the proper name **Բատանացոյ** [Batanatswots] is used. In this case, like the first reading of Ezra, the Georgian version repeats the errors of the Armenian one. Instead of the correlate in the language of translation, the Medians are represented by an incorrect transcribed form ბატანაიელ//[Batanaiel]//Batanaians.

The reading **Բատանացոյ** [Batanatswots] has been precisely transliterated into Georgian, although the vowel of the Armenian affix -աց is considered as part of the stem, and the Georgian correlate of this affix -ელ [-el] is added. The vowel -ო [-i] appearing between the affix and the “stem” vowel should be considered as a restored marker of the nominative case: **Բատանաց** [Batanats] → ბატანაიელ [Batanaiel].

I Ezra

I Ezra 6: 22 Եւ գտաւ 'ի Բատան քարիտենի, 'ի **Սարաց** աշխարհին] და იპოვა ბტანს ბაროტენისსა, **მართა** სოფელსა Geo^{JIDFS} // and found in Btans of Bariten, the village of the Mars|

In the Armenian version, the translation from Greek is not precise. Part of the stem denoting the capital of Media Ekbatana - Έκ is considered a preposition, while **βάρει τῆ ἐν** (**βάρει** – “palace“ with the following article **τῆ** and preposition **ἐν**) is transcribed.

As it is obvious, in the Armenian translation, the proper names are wrongly transliterated from Greek, while the Georgian translation repeats the mistakes of the Armenian version: **Ἐκβατάνου**^a **βάρει τῆ ἐν**^b **Μηδία**^c → **Բատան**^a **քարիտենի**^b, 'ի **Սարաց**^c [**batan**^a **bariteni**^b **i Marats**^c] → **ბტანს**^a **ბაროტენისსა**^b **მართა**^c [**Btans**^a **Baritenissa**^b **Marta**^c]...

The Georgian versions of the II Book of Kings (with the exception of the Oshki and Bakar Bibles) use the ethnonym მარნი [Marni] to denote Medians. This ethnonym might have appeared as a result of the influence of Armenian. This opinion is proved by the reading (mentioned above) of the Book of Ezra. In the transliterated part of this Georgian edition, there is a stem მარ- [Mar-] which is similar to the Armenian version.

Conclusion

Thus, in some Georgian versions of the Old Testament (I Ezra, II Ezra) contain toponyms transliterated from Armenian. This points to the fact that Armenian translators used the Greek

version as a geographical guidebook, like Georgians. However, the translators found it difficult to identify certain toponyms. Therefore, in the Georgian versions of the Book of Ezra, there are wrong variants, differing from the Greek words but similar to the readings used in the Armenian translation. In some readings it is possible to remain the Armenian reading defending to the Georgian

Sources of the Georgian Bible

O//Geo ^o Ath. 1	(Oshki Bible, 978 y.)
J//Geo ^J	Jerusalem Bible (Patriarchal Library of Jerusalem N7/11), XI c.
G//Geo ^G	A- 1108, Gelathy Bible, XII c.
I//Geo ^I	A-570 (1460) y.
F//Geo ^F A-646	(XV-XVI yy.)
D//Geo ^D	H-885 (XVII y.)
S//Geo ^S A-51	(Bible of Saba, XVII-XVIII yy.)
B//Geo ^B	Bible of Bakari, 1743 year edition

Symbols and Abbreviations

>	decrease
+	increase
tr	transposition
[]	restored
∩	omission based on a similar acrostic
°	the number of words of the same form in a clause
*	the initial version of the manuscript
]]	lemma
	end of the lemma
ante	before
app	apparatus
°	corrector
cf.	compare
codd	codex – manuscript
coni	coniecit – conjecture
corr.	correxit, correctum – corrected
ditt	dittographia – doubling

homoiar	homoiarcton – similar acrostic in the beginning
homoiot	homoioteleuton – similar acrostic at the end
init	beginning
M	Masoretic text
om.	omisit – omission
omnes	all
p.	pagina – page
post	after
pr	praemittit – addition ahead
rel	reliqui – the remaining (manuscripts)
lac.	lacking
Ra	editor’s version
s.s	puora scriptum – written above
tr	transposuit – transferred
vid	ut videtur – pay attention
ubique	everywhere
<i>o’ //LXX</i>	Septuagint
Greek/Gr	all the Greek manuscripts
Geo	the readings of all the Georgian manuscripts coincide
Arm	Armenian (Zohrab’s edition, Venice, 1805)
Syh	Syro-Hexaplar (Syrian library, Lagard Edition)
?	doubtable
<i>O</i>	Hexaplar review
※	Hexaplar asterisk
*	original reading of the manuscript
A	Codex Alexandrinus, London, Brit. Mus., Reg. I. D. v-viii.
B	Codex Vaticanus, Rome, Vatican, Gr. 1209.
E	Codex Bodleianus, oxford, Bold., Auct. T. infr. ii. I.
L	Codex Purpureus Vindobonensis. Vienna, Libr., Theol. Gr. 2
V	Codex Venetus, Venedig, Bibl. Marc., Gr. 1, VIII
Q	Codex Marchalianus, Rom, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2125, VI.
Thdt	Theodorit

REFERENCES

- abuladze, i., gogvadze, n., k'ek'elia, v., & kurtsik'idze, ts. (2017). *biblia, dzveli aghtkma [The Bible. Old Testament]*. Vol. I. Tbilisi: Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts.
- abuladze, i., gogvadze, n., k'ek'elia, v., & kurtsik'idze, ts. (2017). *biblia, dzveli aghtkma [The Bible. Old Testament]*. Vol. II. Tbilisi: Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts.
- kurtsik'idze, ts. (1973). *dzveli aghtkmis ap'ok'ripuli (arak'anonik'uri) ts'ignebis kartuli versiebi [The Georgian Versions of the Apocryphal (non-canonical) Books of the Old Testament]*. Book II. Tbilisi: Publishing House „Metsniereba“.
- Hanhart, R. (1974). Septuaginta, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Autoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum. Esdrae*. vol. VIII, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht.
- Tov, E. (1999). Transliteration of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the old Testament, A Further Characteristic of the Kaige-Th. Revision, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, Brill, pp. 501-12.
- Kharanauli A. (2020). The Deuterocanonical Scriptures, Ezra, Georgian, Volume 2B, BRILL, Leiden| Boston, pp. 461-466.