

ISSN 2523-4684
e-ISSN 2791-1241

ҚАЗАҚ ҰЛТТЫҚ ХОРЕОГРАФИЯ АКАДЕМИЯСЫ
KAZAKH NATIONAL ACADEMY OF CHOREOGRAPHY
КАЗАХСКАЯ НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ
ХОРЕОГРАФИИ

Ғылыми
журналы

scientific
journal

научный
журнал

ARTS ACADEMY

3 (3) 2022

Қыркүйек 2022
September 2022
Сентябрь 2022

2022 жылдың наурыз
айынан шыға бастады
published since March 2022
издается с марта 2022 года

жылына 4 рет шығады
published 4 times a year
выходит 4 раза в год

Астана қаласы
Астана city
город Астана

Редакциялық алқаның төрағасы

Асылмұратова А.А. - Қазақ ұлттық хореография академиясының ректоры, Ресей Федерациясының Халық әртісі, Ресей Федерациясы Мемлекеттік сыйлығының лауреаты.

Редакциялық алқаның төрағасының орынбасары

Нүсіпжанова Б. Н. - педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Қазақстан Республикасының Еңбек сіңірген қайраткері.

Бас редактор

Толысбаева Ж.Ж. - филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор.

Редакциялық алқа

Кульбекова А.К. - педагогика ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан);

Саитова Г.Ю. - өнертану кандидаты, профессор, Қазақстан Республикасының еңбек сіңірген әртісі (Қазақстан);

Ізім Т.О. - өнертану кандидаты, профессор, ҚазССР-ның еңбек сіңірген әртісі (Қазақстан);

Жумасейтова Г.Т. - өнертану кандидаты, профессор (Қазақстан);

Казашка В. - PhD, қауымдастырылған профессор (Болгария);

Вейзанс Э. - PhD (Латвия);

Туляходжаева М.Т. - өнертану докторы, профессор (Өзбекстан);

Фомкин А.В. - педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент (Ресей);

Дзагания И. - филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Грузия);

Таптыгова Е. - PhD (Әзірбайжан).

Жауапты редактор: **Жунусов С.К.**

Қазақ ұлттық хореография академиясының ғылыми журналы.

ISSN 2523-4684

е ISSN 2791-1241

Қазақстан Республикасының Ақпарат және қоғамдық даму министрлігі Ақпарат комитетінің мерзімді баспасөз басылымын, ақпарат агенттігін және желілік басылымды есепке қою туралы **02.02.2022 жылы берілген**

№ KZ77VPY00045494 куәлік.

Шығу жиілігі: жылына 4 рет

Тиражы: 300 дана

Редакция мекен-жайы: Астана қ., Ұлы Дала даңғылы, 9, 470 офис

Тел.: 8 (7172) 790-832

E-mail: artsballet01@gmail.com

Chairman of the Editorial Board

Asylmuratova A. A.

- Rector of the Kazakh National Academy of Choreography, People's Artist of the Russian Federation, laureate of the State Prize of the Russian Federation.

Deputy Chairman of the Editorial Board

B.N. Nusipzhanova

- Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Honoured Worker of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Editor-in-Chief

Zh.Zh. Tolysbaeva

- Doctor of Philology, Professor.

Editorial Board

A.K. Kulbekova

- Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan);

G.Yu. Saitova

- Candidate of Art History, Professor, Honored Artist of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Kazakhstan);

T.O. Izim

- Candidate of Art History, Professor, Honored Artist of the Kazakh SSR (Kazakhstan);

G.T. Zhumaseitova

- Candidate of Art History, Professor, (Kazakhstan);

V. Kazashka

- PhD, Associate Professor (Bulgaria);

E. Veizans

- PhD (Latvia);

M.T. Tulyakhodzhayeva

- Doctor of Art History, Professor (Uzbekistan);

A.V. Fomkin

- Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor (Russia);

I. Dzagania

- Doctor of Philology, Professor (Georgia);

E. Tptygova

- PhD (Azerbaijan).

Executive editor: **Zhunossov S.K.**

Scientific journal of the Kazakh National Academy of Choreography

ISSN 2523-4684

e ISSN 2791-1241

Certificate of registration of a periodical, information agency and online publication of the Information Committee of the Ministry of Information and Public Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan **No. KZ77VPY00045494, issued 02.02.2022**

Frequency: 4 issues per year

Printing: 300 copies

Editorial Office: Astana city, Uly Dala avenue 9, 470 office

Phone: 8 (7172) 790-832

E-mail: artsballet01@gmail.com

© **Kazakh National Academy of Choreography, 2022**

Председатель редакционной коллегии

Асылмуратова А. А. - Ректор Казахской национальной академии хореографии, Народный артист Российской Федерации, лауреат Государственной премии Российской Федерации.

Заместитель председателя редакционной коллегии

Нусипжанова Б.Н. - кандидат педагогических наук, профессор, Заслуженный деятель Республики Казахстан.

Главный редактор

Толысбаева Ж.Ж. - доктор филологических наук, профессор.

Редакционная коллегия

Кульбекова А.К. - доктор педагогических наук, профессор (Казахстан);

Саитова Г.Ю. - кандидат искусствоведения, профессор, Заслуженная артистка Республики Казахстан (Казахстан);

Ізім Т.О. - кандидат искусствоведения, профессор, Заслуженный артист КазССР (Казахстан);

Жумасейтова Г.Т. - кандидат искусствоведения, профессор, (Казахстан);

Казашка В. - PhD, ассоциированный профессор (Болгария);

Вейзанс Э. - PhD (Латвия);

Туляходжаева М.Т. - доктор искусствоведения, профессор (Узбекистан);

Фомкин А.В. - кандидат педагогических наук, доцент (Россия);

Дзагания И. - доктор филологических наук, профессор (Грузия);

Таптыгова Т. - PhD (Азербайджан).

Ответственный редактор: **Жунусов С.К.**

Научный журнал Казахской национальной академии хореографии.

ISSN 2523-4684

e ISSN 2791-1241

Свидетельство о постановке на учет периодического печатного издания, информационного агентства и сетевого издания Комитета информации Министерство информации и общественного развития Республики Казахстан № **KZ77VPY00045494**, выданное **02.02.2022 г.**

Периодичность: 4 раза в год

Тираж: 300 экземпляров

Адрес редакции: г. Астана, пр. Ұлы Дала, 9, 470 офис.

Тел.: 8 (7172) 790-832

E-mail: artsballet01@gmail.com

© **Казахская национальная академия хореографии, 2022**

Mikhaeil Khutsishvili¹, Miranda Todua²
Sokhumi State University¹
(Tbilisi, Georgia)

EPISODIC ISSUES «IN THE LIFE OF ST. DAVID GAREJELI»

Annotation

One episode of «the life of Saint David Garejeli» is discussed in the work, in which it is narrated how Saint David Garejeli (6th century) converted to Christ an unrighteous man named Bubakr, who threatened to kill David, but after a miracle performed by David, he turned to Christ.

From the work, we can see that David speaks to Bubakr in Armenian, which indicates that Bubakr is Armenian. But the author only hints about the Armenianness of this person and does not say it directly. In the present work, the attention is focused on the fact that in the Middle Ages the word 'Armenian', along with the ethnic one, also had a confessional meaning and that it was also used in the meaning of Monophysite. The authors of the article express the opinion that in the previous text, which the creator of «Life of St. David Garejeli» (10th century) relied on when writing his work, Bubakri was presented as a person of Monophysite confession. The text showed that the Monophysite was going to kill the holy monk and he changed his mind only after Bubakr and his son were cured of their illnesses by this monk.

According to the authors of the article, as Monophysitism was presented in a negative context in the Bubakr episode, the creator of the new monument about St. David Garejeli did not mention the word «Armenian» at all. After the church split between them, they tried to repair the broken relationship, and presenting Monophysitism in a negative context would not contribute to the improvement of this relationship.

Bubakr is presented as a positive person in the monument, it is shown that he showed strong faith in God and became a true Christian.

Key words: *David Garejeli, confession, Armenianness, Monophysite, Diophysite.*

Михаил Хуцишвили¹, Миранда Тодуа²
Сухумский государственный университет¹
(Тбилиси, Грузия)

ЭПИЗОДИЧЕСКИЕ ВЫПУСКИ «ИЗ ЖИЗНИ СВЯТОГО ДАВИДА ГАРЕДЖЕЛИ»

Аннотация

В произведении обсуждается один эпизод «Жития святого Давида Гареджели», в котором рассказывается о том, как святой Давид Гареджели (6 век) обратился ко Христу несправедливого человека по имени Бубакр, который угрожал убить Давида, но после чуда, совершенного Давидом, он обратился ко Христу.

Из работы мы видим, что Дэвид говорит с Бубакром по-армянски, что указывает на то, что Бубакр армянин. Но автор только намекает на армянство этого человека и не говорит об этом прямо. В настоящей работе внимание акцентируется на том факте, что в средние века слово «армянин», наряду с этническим, имело также конфессиональное значение и что оно также использовалось в значении монофизит. Авторы статьи высказывают мнение, что в предыдущем тексте, на который опирался автор «Жития св. Давида Гареджели» (10 век). Бубакр был представлен как человек монофизитского исповедания. Текст показал, что монофизит собирался убить святого монаха и передумал только после того, как Бубакр и его сын были исцелены этим монахом от своих болезней.

По мнению авторов статьи, поскольку монофизитство было представлено в негативном контексте в эпизоде с Бубакром, создатель нового памятника святому Давиду Гареджели вообще не упомянул слово «армянин». После церковного раскола они попытались восстановить разрушенные отношения, и представление монофизитства в негативном контексте не способствовало бы улучшению этих отношений.

Бубакр представлен в памятнике как позитивный человек, показано, что он проявил сильную веру в Бога и стал истинным христианином.

Ключевые слова: Давид Гареджели, исповедание, армянство, монофизит, диофизит.

Михаил Хуцишвили¹, Миранда Тодуа²
Сухум мемлекеттік университеті¹
(Тбилиси, Грузия)

«ӘУЛИЕ ДЭВИД ГАРЕДЖЕЛДІҢ ӨМІРІНЕН» ЭПИЗОДТЫҚ ШЫҒАРЫЛЫМДАР

Аннотация

Шығармада «Сент-Дэвид Гареджелідің өмірі» атты бір эпизоды талқыланады. Сент-Дэвид Гареджели (6 ғасыр) Дәуітті елтіремін деп қорқытқан Бубакр есімді әділетсіз адамды

Мәсікке қалай бұрғаны туралы айтылады, Бірақ Дәуіт жасаған ғажайыптан кейін ол Мәсікке жүгінген туралы айтылады.

Шығармадан біз Дэвидтің армян тілінде Бубакрмен сөйлескенін көреміз, бұл Бубакрдың армян екенін көрсетеді. Бірақ автор тек осы адамның армяндығына нұсқайды және бұл туралы тікелей айтпайды. Бұл жұмыста орта ғасырларда «армян» сөзі этникалық тілмен қатар конфессиялық мағынаға ие болғанына және оның монофизит мағынасында да қолданылғанына назар аударылады. Мақала авторлары алдыңғы мәтінде автордың өмірі туралы пікір айтады. Дэвид Гареджели» (10 ғасыр) өз жұмысын жазу кезінде сүйеніп, Бубакри монофизиттік конфессияның адамы ретінде ұсынылды. Мәтін монофизиттің қасиетті монахты өлтірмек болғанын және ол Бубакр мен оның ұлын өз ауруларынан сауықтырғаннан кейін ғана шешімін өзгерткенін көрсетеді.

Мақала авторларының пікірінше, Монофизитизм Бубакрмен болған эпизодта теріс контексте ұсынылғандықтан, Сент-Дэвид Гареджелидің жаңа ескерткішін жасаушы «армян» сөзін мүлдем айтқан жоқ. Олардың арасындағы шіркеудің бөлінуінен кейін олар жойылған қатынастарды қалпына келтіруге тырысты, ал теріс контексте монофизитизмді ұсыну бұл қатынастардың жақсаруына ықпал етпес еді.

Бубакр ескерткіште позитивті адам ретінде ұсынылған, Ол Құдайға қатты сенім білдіріп, нағыз христиан болғандығы көрсетілген.

Түйінді сөздер: Дэвид Гареджели, конфессия, армян, монофизит, диофизит.

Introduction. There is such an episode in the life of Saint David Garejeli: David used to go to the edge of the rock and pray alone. One day «a barbarian came from a place close to Rustavi and started hunting». He chased his hunting hawk for one partridge. The frightened partridge sat down in the place where the monk was praying. «The barbarian» came there, saw the monk, and asked him for his identity. At this point in the text, we read that David: «Answered him in Armenian: «I, a man, a sinner, a servant of our Lord Jesus Christ, and I implore His mercy so that all my sins may be forgiven me. He then told the hunter to leave the partridge alone because the bird had come to the monk to save his life. Hearing this, the barbarian replied and said, «I want you to die, and how can you save the partridge from death?» David replied that he could not kill him or his partridge. Hearing these words of the monk, the barbarian, riding on a horse,

raised his sword against Saint David. And at that moment, when he wanted to swing his sword and strike, he inadvertently froze. Then, they say, the barbarian realized his wickedness, dismounted from his horse, fell at the feet of the monk, and begged with tears for the forgiveness of his sin.

David had mercy on the «barbarian» and prayed to the Lord to heal this man: «Give us Thy grace and mercy and heal him and let Thy name be glorified», and after these words he was healed, Barbarian, with hot tears, prayed to the holy monk for a son, lame on both legs. The monk said, «Go, and if God wills, you will see your son get well.» We read further: «And the man went with a joyful face, because he had hunted the prey, and when he came home, he saw his son limping along, and joyfully met his father. The man glorified Christ God!

The father thanked God, and then asked: «What time did my child get healed?» They answered him: «On the third day he got out of bed and jumped around like a rabbit.» It was then that the man remembered that three days ago the monk had told him: «If God wills, your son will recover.» Everyone thanked the Lord.

The next day, the «Barbarian» came to David with a big gift, along with his healed son and two other sons, and said: «Truly, I have found you a healer of soul and flesh. And now the child is standing in front of you. , he was legless, and today he is healed and unharmed by your prayers, and these two sons of mine I brought before your holiness so that they can touch your robe and be blessed by you. Then David Garejeli laid his holy hand on him and said: «May God, who blessed Jacob, bless you and your children throughout life.» After that, we find out what the name of the Barbarian was. The narrator of the life of Saint David informs us that «Bubakr ordered the slaves (that was the name of the barbarian) to bring to the monk everything that he could get for him. And the monk gathered all the brothers, and they ate and drank until satiety. After the feast, David asked Boubakr, «What do you want to do in the future? Barbara begged David to baptize herself and her entire family: David told Bubakr to bring a gift to monk Dodo and to receive the blessing of christening from him: «Take some precious

gifts and go to monk Dodo so that he can share with the brothers who are with him and be blessed by them all you and your family too: «And he knows an honest priest and he should ask to him so that he can go with him and he will enlighten you and all your household». David accompanied the monk Lucian to Dodo, and he said the following to the priest: «Then Lucian stood up and told him to bring the priest along with him so that they would christen Bubakr and all his family.»

Then it is said that «Saint Dodo did it, as the monk ordered». After he was Christened, Bubakr built a church for the monks, that «the last saint and God-clothed Hilarion spread and blessed the church... This man, named Bubakr, is mentioned as «the son of light»' [1, p.234-236].

Main Discussion Korneli Kekelidze considered the monuments telling the story of Ioane Zedazneli, Shio Mghvimeli, and Evagre to be written by Arseni II (10th century; according to Korneli Kekelidze [2, p.955-980; 159-163; 532-537], Arseni is represented in some places as the bishop of Nekresi, which is why they sometimes believe that two different persons are named in the texts, but, as Mariam Chkhartishvili rightly points out, For Arseni, being from Nekresi does not exclude being a Catholicos.... [3, p.22-23]. According to Korneli Kekelidze, the above-mentioned monuments depicting the life of the Assyrians are constituent parts of one work, which is evident from the fact that the story of Shio Mgvimeli is included as an organic part in the story about Ioane [2, p.536], «In the life of Shio and Evagre». It tells about the death of Ioane (due to the mentioned circumstances, these monuments were considered as constituent parts of one work by Ilia Abuladze, Enrico Gabidzashvili...). The organic part of the same work can be seen in «The Life of St. David Garejeli», - the author tells us about the life of John Zedazneli and other Assyrian fathers, after narrating one period of John's life, he informs us about other disciples and begins to tell about all of them in the same style, which creates the impression that the previous story It continues with the mentioned words (this circumstance has already been noted in science): «And the blessed and divinely enlightened father our holy Shio

came with the guidance of the Holy Spirit and settled in the west, namely in the capital Mtskheta» [1, p.217], «and the holy father David to discipline himself went in the desert and the waterless place» [1, p.219], in the same «The Martyrdom of St. Abibio of Nekreseli» is perceived as a constituent part of the work, giving the impression that it is also a continuation of the previous story: «However, there is a little bit more to mention the holy and chaste priest-teacher and martyr» [1, p.240]; Face of St. John Zedazneli is drawn in such a way that he remains the main character of the work even after death. What is St. John is «alive even after his death, and has boldness before God» [1, p.238], «in the life of St. Shio and Evagre» «where his body was buried, the earth shook violently» [4, p.228], and then the monks moved his parts to where John wanted. John leaves this world, but his presence is felt, and even if they do not mention him later when telling the life of the monks while reading the stories of David Garejeli or Abibo Nekreseli, the reader should still feel that the spirit of John exists with these monks. And while reading the lives of others, his face should be raised in readers' minds.

The «lives» of Ioane Zedazneli, Shio Mghvimeli, and Evagre, Davit Garejeli are referred to as archetypal monuments in science to the extent that they were the basis for other, metaphrastic, works. Obviously, this does not mean that nothing was written about the Assyrian monks before the creation of these «lives». According to Korneli Kekelidze, it is inconceivable that «for four centuries nothing was written about these fathers», according to him, «If nothing else, this is suggested by the words of Basil catholicon, who says that the reports on the miracles of Shio Mghvimeli told by others and others were found by me [2, p.162]; The fact of the existence of other books is confirmed by the words preserved in the text of the life of St. John Zedazneli, according to which «there are many miracles that have already been described» [1, p.198]; It can be assumed that all these different monuments were united by the catholicon Arseni and he did it in such a way that in this unified work St. John Zedazneli was presented as the main figure. The reader could clearly see that he was the

spiritual leader of these monks; That he would enrich the text with his words and separate references when combining the monuments, we think it is clear and understandable, although we also see that the «lives» are stylistically different from each other, which, naturally, should be explained by the fact that the works were written by different authors about different Assyrian fathers at the time. That's why when they were combined, the original style was clearly preserved... The study of the interrelationship of «lives», in general, and the investigation of the problems related to the texts, is a future task, this time the most important thing that comes under our attention is that the mentioned monuments narrating the lives of the Assyrian fathers do not resemble the ones created for the first time in the 10th century and, as the historical sources make it clear they must be based on other, older monuments... Let's look back to the episode of «Life of St. David Garejeli» in which the story of Bubakr's christening is told:

As we can see, David addresses Bubakr in the Armenian language, as if the text clearly and emphatically focuses on the fact that David answered Bubakr in the Armenian language: «He answered him in the Armenian language: «I, a man, am a sinner, a slave of our Lord Jesus Christ». One of the reasons for the address in Armenian seems to be that David wants to appease this man, whom he probably claims to have come as an enemy. It seems that Boubakr is Armenian by nationality, and it is this circumstance that determines the fact that David addressed him in Armenian.

The text does not explicitly say that Bubakr is Armenian, it seems that the author knows his nationality, but does not say anything about it, the word «Armenian» is not mentioned in this text. Why what should be the reason? In our opinion, the reasons seem to be related to confessional issues.

We have presented the situation as follows: we think that a circle has gathered around the author of «The Life of St. David Garejeli» who is trying to regulate the relationship between the two countries and wants to find some way to fix the strained relationship created between Georgians and Armenians after the church split.

As long as it will be possible to find a way and somehow warm up the relations, it is not excluded that such an attempt comes from both sides, that in some period of the 10th century beneficial trends for both countries appear, that e. i. They strive to regulate the relationship, and this is one of the main reasons why the narrator of the life of St. David Garejeli does not mention Bubakr's Armenianness; In the Middle Ages, the word «Armenian» had not only an ethnic, but also a religious meaning, this word also denoted denominationalism and served as a synonym for monophysitism. In the previous text of «Life of St. David Garejeli», it was told how this man promised to kill St. David, which he did not do only after the words of St. David first made him sick and then healed him. And, we think, if Bubarkh's Armenianess was mentioned, it would be presented in a negative context. The story that a Monophysite threatens to kill a holy monk and after a miracle happens to himself becomes a Diophysite and thus gets away from the darkness of sins, obviously presented Monophysitism in a negative context, and maybe because of this, the author avoided mentioning the word «Armenian». Maybe they wanted to fix the relationship and didn't want to talk about Monophysitism in a negative context, in our opinion, this should explain the main reason why the word «Armenian» is not mentioned in relation to Bubakr in «the life of St. David Garejeli». Although, as the monument itself indicates, the author, apparently Arseni, knows that Bubakr was an Armenian by nationality; Obviously, he would have learned from the previous text, he would have read there that an Armenian man promised to kill David, to whom David spoke in Armenian, that this man converted to the faith of the latter after he and his son were healed by the monk with his prayer; The word «Armenians», together with the ethnic one, would undoubtedly have a confessional meaning in that text. We thus explain the fact that the word «Armenian» is not even mentioned in the text in relation to Bubakr, despite the fact that the author of the monument obviously knows about his nationality.

By the way, it is felt that not mentioning this word has created an inconvenient situation for the author.

When something is written about a person who is still not christened in Orthodoxy, the reader should know what religion this person was before conversion: a Jew, a pagan, a representative of some branch of Christianity, or something else... It can be seen that he does not need to mention Bubakr's Armenianness or Monophysite, he cannot say that Bubakr is a pagan, because he knows that this man was not a pagan, and he cannot tell us what specifically caused Bubakr's irreligious behavior: being a Jew, paganism, heresy, or some other reason, and this puts him in an awkward position and creates a danger that the text will come out inaccurate. But we see that, by using a general term, the author achieves this situation at least to some extent. In order to find some explanation for Bubakr's behavior from a religious point of view, he mentions him as a Barbarian and, one way or another, manages to explain to the reader why Bubakr intended to kill Saint David, giving the text a more or less correct appearance. He says that this person was a barbarian before the christening, and he doesn't think it is necessary to clarify what Barbarian means. Which religion has this person? He thinks that the mention of «Barbarian» with a general meaning is enough to get out of a difficult situation. It is felt that this word was invented to get out of the awkward situation, which in this case is very general and cannot specify, in particular, which denomination Bubakr belonged to.

In connection with the above, the part of «Life of St. David Garejeli» draws attention, in which it is said that Bubakri was «one of the places related to Rustavi». «Related» is a term that refers more to ethnicity and, therefore, «related to Rustavi» takes the form of a somewhat strange expression. One gets the impression that the author starts talking about Bubakr's nationality, but does not clearly name this nationality. This part of the text also makes us think that the author does not want to mention the word «Armenian» and therefore moves the word to Bubakri's residence. He starts talking about ethnicity, but doesn't finish, he is going to say it, but he doesn't say it, we even get the impression that the author is playing with us - he hides it, but he points out what he wants to say; Perhaps the reason for writing in this way is

that the author tried to arouse the interest of the reader, perhaps that is why he uses such an unusual expression «Related to Rustavi». It is possible that the mention of «Relation» draws attention to ethnicity, but since it does not explicitly say anything about ethnicity, it prompts the readers to think for themselves about what nationality, and what place this man should be from. An impression is created that the understandable and knowledgeable people are still aware by the author that this person is Armenian, which will make it clear to many that he was an anti-Chalcedonian before meeting Saint David.

Thus, in our opinion, Bubakr's monophysitism must be deliberately hidden in the text of «Life of St. David Garejeli» and it must be caused by the desire to improve the relationship between the two countries. There will be other reasons: if in the period when the new text of «The Life of St. David Garejeli» was being written, the word «Armenian» was perceived by the people not so much in a religious, but more in an ethnic sense, if many of the people living in that period no longer understood that Bubakr's confessionalism was meant by it, Then, along with transferring this word from the previous text, the author would have to add explanations that this word also has a religious meaning. It would also be necessary to clarify that «Armenian» was meant the confession that does not recognize the human nature of the Savior and does not recognize the creed accepted by the Church of Chalcedon, and different definitions would take the text too far and complicate the text, the previous text would be changed too much, and, in addition to the fact that such explanations would not help to regulate the relations between the two countries. It would happen that the text would be damaged from a purely literary point of view, «The Lives of the Assyrian Fathers» for the most part has a clear, simple, and plain look, such a style of narration about them is established, and in some episodes, to deviate too much from this style, in general, to solve it in philosophy, would make the text more complicated and would not suit the text; If we assume that in the 10th century this word was mostly understood by the people only in an ethnic sense, and if we assume that the author did not want to impoverish its meaning,

then we can consider these facts as the reason for not mentioning this word in the text, mentioning the word without explanations would contribute to the impoverishment of its meaning.

Therefore, in our opinion, in the previous text of the «Life of St. David Garejeli» it was shown that David converted a Monophysite to Diophysitism, and if this is so, then the opinion expressed in science, according to which the Assyrian fathers were Monophysites and that in the monuments that tell about their lives, becomes even more doubtful. The traces of Monophysitism have been erased (see Kekelidze [5, p.34-44] ... about these issues). «In the life of St. Davit Garejeli», as we have seen, there is a mention of «the honest priest», who gives light to Brubakr. The priest had to perform the rite of christening, and therefore he asked David to send it to the monk Dodo. The words «honest priest» may simply mean that a decent person was needed to perform the rite of christening, although it is also not impossible that in the Assyrian circle they distinguished between honest and dishonest priests depending on which one was Chalcedonian and which one was not. (Assyrian fathers worked in an era when followers of different denominations could be found in the same circle for a certain period of time) and it is possible that a trace of this situation is preserved in the expression «honest priest».

Here we might be criticized and told that this episode of «the life of St. David Garejeli» could have been interpreted in a different way so that a completely opposite situation was presented; At first glance, the episode might be interpreted as David being a Monophysite, everything should be painted in such a way that David converted Diophysit to Monophysitism, or maybe we should think that Bubakr was an ordinary pagan and David converted him to Monophysite Christianity? At first glance, it is possible to assume that the reality was like this: Bubakri was a Diophysite Christian and Davit Garejeli spoke to him in Armenian because he himself was a Monophysite and by addressing Bubakri in Armenian he emphasized this very fact. i. In this case, we must consider that he was not afraid and acted bravely, even defiantly, he made it clear to the Chalcedonian who was standing in front that

he was an anti-Chalcedonian, and thus he showed great courage and loyalty to his faith, because of which Bubakr of Chalcedon promised to kill him, but God saved David, faithful to his faith. saved him, and then, when David miraculously healed Bubakr's son, Bubakr and his whole family also converted to Monophysitism; we can assume that in the previous text a picture was drawn according to which the Diophysite Bubakr was impressed by the Monophysite David Garejeli, due to which he became a Monophysite along with his whole family; Maybe this is reality? Why is it impossible that such a situation was presented in the early text, that Davit Garejeli was depicted as a faithful Christian of Monophysitism, maybe later the traces of David's Monophysitism were erased, however, because David addressed Bubakr in Armenian, this revealed the truth that Davit Garejeli supported the anti-Chalcedonian doctrine?

At first glance, it is not impossible that it is really so, but it only seems so at first glance, because in this case, the following question arises before us: if they wanted to erase something, then why did they mention the words «in the languages of Armenians» at all, should they have known, that the mention of the Armenian language would raise suspicions, it would create an opportunity to understand the text that the Monophysite was St. David of Garejeli, why did they create a dangerous situation by mentioning these words, they did not utter these two words at all, who forced them, why did they put themselves in a disadvantageous position?! It is very hard to believe that people who want to erase David's closeness to Monophysitism, who try to hide his connection with the Armenian Church, cannot take into account the simple truth that by mentioning the «Armenian language» they create a basis for a different understanding of the text, nor can we believe that they carefully remove the traces of closeness to the Armenian Church They get confused and don't even notice that, when they transfer the words «Armenian language» from the previous text, with such, one might say, careless action, they create a way to create an opinion about David's Monophysitism; No, if they wanted to erase the traces of closeness to the Armenian Church, we think

they would not have mentioned the Armenian language at all, would not have created a way to interpret the text differently, would not have written the words «in the language of Armenians»; It is also completely improbable that they copied these words from the old text due to carelessness, in our opinion, there is no reason to believe that they wanted to delete something in the description of the life of Saint David Garejeli. And it becomes conceivable that they avoided aggravation of relations with Armenian church circles, and this should be the main reason why they chose not to mention the word «Armenian» in the text at all; Since everything points to the fact that Bubakr's Armenianness was presented as stated in the previous text, which has remained only as a trace in the text we have, we think it is completely permissible to assume that Bubakr was a Monophysite, that he belonged to the Armenian Church; We cannot accept the idea that Bubakr was an ordinary pagan if he was a pagan, it is not clear why they had to hide it. The narrators of «The Life of St. David Garejeli» would say this directly, the word «pagans» is mentioned in «The Life of St. John Zedazneli» [1, p.211] and it would not be difficult to write it here either. If he was a pagan, they would have said so explicitly, so that the readers would not mistakenly think that he was a Christian of some direction. However, it seems that he was not a pagan and they could not call this word for no reason, everything points to the fact that Bubakr was mentioned as «Armenian» in the previous text, that E. i. He was a Monophysite Christian and, mainly because they didn't want to strain relations with Armenia, they didn't mention his Armenianness anymore, they hid his nationality and, therefore, - his confession, even when we were told that David addressed him in the «language of Armenians» and when They mentioned to us that he was «Related to Rustavi», they actually pointed out to us that he was Armenian, that he was of the Monophytic faith, a man named Bubakr, who first came to Saint David as a monk, and then became his follower. (We will say here that the name, Bubakr, seems to be derived from the Arabic AbuBakr: Abu Bakr... Bubakr.. This person may

have had another name either after his christening by David or before that).

Thus, our main conclusions take the following form: from the text of «The Life of St. David Garejeli» it can be seen that the person represented in this work - Bubakr was an Armenian by nationality, that is, a Monophysite, which was known by the author of the work, as is conceivable, the Catholic Arseni II, but he did not say it explicitly and only He told us this with hints, the reason of which must be that, in our opinion, Arsen's circle wanted to regulate the Georgian-Armenian relationship, and this regulation could not be helped by including the Bubakri episode in the work in such a way that Monophysitism was presented in a negative context; This must be due to the fact that in the mentioned episode we are not shown to which denomination Bubakr belonged. The analysis of the discussed episode gives us a reason to assume that there are traces of the history of conversion of the anti-Chalcedonian to his confession by Davit Garejeli of the Chalcedonian confession, and if this is the case, then the validity of the statement that the Chalcedonians were Assyrian monks, as most scholars believe, becomes more certain.

Bubakr is considered by the Georgian church to be among the persons who deserve great respect, he is seen as a person who was first in the darkness of sin and then came out into the light of goodness. The parallels with the gospel help us to see some aspects of this person's character. The text is written in such a way as to point us to the Gospel, based on the Gospel paradigms, the episode of the conversion of Bubakr and his family is narrated: When this man heard that Jesus had arrived in Galilee from Judea, he went to him and begged him to come and heal his son, who was close to death. «Unless you people see signs and wonders,» Jesus told him, «you will never believe.» The royal official said, «Sir, come down before my child dies.» «Go,» Jesus replied, «your son will live.» The man took Jesus at his word and departed. While he was still on the way, his servants met him with the news that his boy was living. When he inquired as to the time when his son got better, they said to him, «Yesterday, at one in the afternoon, the fever left him.»

Then the father realized that this was the exact time at which Jesus had said to him, «Your son will live.» So he and his whole household believed. Bubakr is compared to the father of a son healed by the Lord, both have a sick son at home, both are healed by the Lord from outside, both ask at what time the sick man was healed and they pay attention to the fact that it was at this time that, in one case, Jesus said, and in the other, the saint of Jesus, Healing words. Bubakr's whole family turns to God, just like the courtier. Bubakr is similar to the centurion mentioned in the Gospel of Matthew [6, p.47-53]. When Jesus had entered Capernaum, a centurion came to him, asking for help. «Lord,» he said, «my servant lies at home paralyzed, suffering terribly.» Jesus said to him, «Shall I come and heal him?»

The centurion replied, «Lord, I do not deserve to have you come under my roof. But just say the word, and my servant will be healed. For I myself am a man under authority, with soldiers under me. I tell this one, 'Go,' and he goes; and that one, 'Come,' and he comes. I say to my servant, 'Do this,' and he does it.» When Jesus heard this, he was amazed and said to those following him, «Truly I tell you, I have not found anyone in Israel with such great faith. I say to you that many will come from the east and the west, and will take their places at the feast with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But the subjects of the kingdom will be thrown outside, into the darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.» Then Jesus said to the centurion, «Go! Let it be done just as you believed it would.» And his servant was healed at that moment [7, p.5-13]. centurion shows great faith by believing that the Lord will heal his slave even from afar, when the Lord utters the words to heal the slave, the slave is healed.

The existence of parallels in the events narrated in the Bible and hagiographic monuments does not mean that the stories described in the hagiography did not actually happen and were invented by the hagiographers, no - obviously, these stories happened, the hagiographers try to make a connection between the events in the Bible and the life of this or that saint to find a similarity and, as soon as they see it, they immediately

start writing with references to the Bible, in order to clearly show the reader that he is on the godly path, that his follower is a saint; In many cases, the people who are mentioned in the Bible and in this or that hagiographical reading are similar to each other personally, and the Bible helps us to see the characters of the hagiography in this way. Bubakr, for example, is similar to the evangelical doorman and centurion by the power of faith, and it is possible to find other similar signs of character, which will better show us the face of this person mentioned in «Life of St. David Garejeli».

In connection with the Gospel paradigms, the place in «The Life of St. David Garejeli» draws attention, to which the father is informed about the healing of his son and they say: «Today at the third hour had risen:»; It is clear that it is said here: «Today at three o'clock he got up», but the order of words is such that another association is born, obviously, the resurrection of the Christ from the dead on the third day is remembered by the reader when reading the mentioned words, and the goal of the narrator is to create this exact association.

Conclusion. Thus, in our opinion, the episode of the «Life of St. David Garejeli» in which the conversion of Bubakr to Christ by the saint is described, gives rise to the idea that in the old text describing the «life of St. David Garejeli» the story of the conversion of a Monophysite man to Diophysitism by St. David Garejeli was conveyed, which It makes the view that the Assyrian fathers were anti-Chalcedonian, Monophysites, even more doubtful.

References:

1. *Monuments of old Georgian hagiographic literature, prepared for printing:* Ill. Abuladze, N. Atanelishvili, N. Gogvadze, L. Kajaya, c. Kurtsikidze, c. Chankiev and T. Jghamaya - under the direction and editing of Ilia Abuladze. – Tbilisi, **1964.**

2. Korneli Kekelidze. *History of Ancient Georgian Literature.* – Tbilisi, **1980.**

3. Mariam Chkhartishvili. *Source knowledge analysis of Georgian hagiography; IV-VII centuries.* Monuments depicting history, auto-abstract for obtaining the scientific degree of doctor of historical sciences, Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. – Tbilisi, **1997.**

4. Enrico Gabidzashvili. *Of the lives of Assyrian figures*. Year for the interrelations of archetypes. – Matsne, Language and Literature Series, 4. – Tbilisi, **1982**.
5. Korneli Kekelidze. *Etudes from the history of ancient Georgian literature*. – Tbilisi, **1956**.
6. The Gospel of Matthew 4, verses 47-53.
7. The Gospel of Matthew 8, verses 47-53.
8. Revaz Siradze. *Christian Culture and Georgian Literature*. Volume I. – Tbilisi, **1992**.