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Mravaltavi – A Special Type of Old Georgian Multiple-Text Manuscripts

Since 1971, the Წ. ᴷeḳeliże Institute of Manuscripts of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, now styled the Korneli Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts, in Tbilisi, Georgia, has published a scientific journal devoted to ‘philological-historical studies’ under the title of ‘Mravaltavi’.

The title was well chosen indeed, given that the term mravaltavi has for long been used in Georgian to denote a special type of manuscripts. In his 1975 book on the ‘Oldest Georgian Homiliaries’, the most extensive investigation on the topic so far, Michel van Esbroeck argued that it was originally conceived as the designation of ‘collections’ of homilies, sermons, and panegyrics ‘quite close to the Greek homiliaries’, which were used as ‘lections’ for the ‘feasts of the mobile year’. In the following treatise, I intend to reinvestigate the usage and meaning of the term mravaltavi on the basis of some more recent findings.

1 The formation and use of the term mravaltavi

In an article of 2001, the Georgian scholar Tamila Mgaloblishvili equated the term mravaltavi with Greek ‘polykephalon’. This suggests that mravaltavi, just as its proposed Greek equivalent, can be interpreted as an exocentric compound meaning ‘multi-head(ed)’, consisting of the elements mraval- ‘many’ and tav- ‘head’. As a matter of fact, this kind of formation is not alien to the Georgian language at all. As a comparable case, we may adduce the word mraval-tuali which appears as an epithet of the cherubs in a prayer contained in the legend of St. Arethas and his companions;

---

1 22 volumes have appeared between 1971 and 2007.
2 See van Esbroeck 1975.
3 van Esbroeck 1975, 5: ‘... un équivalent assez approchant des homéliaires grecs. Conçu pour donner les lectures de la tradition aux fêtes du Seigneur et de la Vierge, ce type de collection a pour ar- mature l’année mobile...’.
4 Mgaloblishvili 2001, 229–236. Long before, P. Peeters had proposed that mravaltavi was modelled upon Greek πολυκεφάλιον (1913, 324), obviously under the influence of Წ. ᴷeḳeli že (1912, 341) who had translated the term by Russian многоглав in the article reviewed by Peeters; see n. 62 below as to the context in question.
5 Par. 74 of the redaction comprised in the mss. Sin.georg. 11 and (Tbilisi) H–353; see the edition by Imnaišvili 2000, 18, l. 17–21. The second redaction (from the Tbilisi ms. H–341, ib. 23–38) does not
its meaning can be determined to be ‘multi-eye(d)’, in accordance with its elements, mraval-i ‘many’ and tual-i ‘eye’, and its Greek equivalent in the legend, πολυόμματος.\(^5\)

See the text passage in question, which contains one more exocentric compound, ekus-ekus-prte- ‘with six wings (each)’, corresponding to Greek ἑξάπτερος as the epithet of the seraphs.

1.1 In a similar way, mraval-tavi, too, is attested as an adjectival attribute in several Old Georgian sources. Two attestations are met with in the Old Georgian version of John Chrysostom’s Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. In chapter 71 of this work, which relates to Mt. 22,34–46, it is used – alongside boroṭi ‘bad, evil’ – to mark the Pharisees’ haughtiness as being a malady or suffering (vnebay); the Greek text of the commentary, albeit quite distant from the Georgian version and by no means its immediate model, does confirm this expression by using δεινόν for ‘evil’ and πολυκέφαλον for ‘multi-headed’ in the same context. See the passage in question:\(^7\)

---

contain the prayer, nor does the Armenian version of the legend as edited in Awgerean 1813, 480–510.

\(^6\) Cap. VII, 30. in the edition in Acta Sanctorum 1869, 747C.

\(^7\) See the edition by Çamalaşvili 1999, 269, 15–18, and the new edition by M. Šaniže 2014, 326, 19–22; for the Greek text see the edition in Migne 1862a, 664.
In the chapter preceding this in the Commentary (ch. 70, ‘On the monks’ life and their being soldiers’), the term *mraval-tavi* appears two times, once with *mqeci* ‘beast’ and once, with *vešapi* ‘dragon’. In addition, the notion of ‘having many heads’ is met with in the same context in a decomposed form, applied to ‘drunkenness (to which) many evil heads are attached’ (*mtrvalobay, mraval asxen tavni boroṭni*). In this case, too, the Georgian version matches the Greek text (ἐπὶ τῆς μέθης πολλὰς ἔστι κεφάλὰς ἰδεῖν). See the synoptical arrangement of the passages in question, which also shows that the ‘multi-headed dragon’ of the Georgian text is a periphrasis of Scylla and Hydra as appearing in the Greek:

1.2 With *mraval-tavi* ‘multi-headed’ appearing as an epithet of sufferings, drunkenness, beasts, and dragons, we are still far from the use of the term in referring to a special type of manuscripts. In this context, we must first of all consider that *tavi* ‘head’ has been used in Georgian since olden times to denote parts of texts (and books), possibly based as a loan translation on Greek κεϕάλαιον, in the same way as Latin capitulum, which yielded German Kapitel and English chapter. In particular, *tavi* was the designation of the four individual Gospels, which were usually referred to in the form *saxarebay matēs tavi* = ‘Gospel, Matthew’s chapter’ etc. in the manuscripts. It is on this basis that we have to analyse *otx-tavi*, lit. ‘four-head(ed)’, the Georgian equivalent of the Greek term Tetraevangelion denoting Gospel manuscripts (see the examples given below). As an exocentric compound (lit. ‘having (the) four

---

‘heads’ = chapters’), this is built in exactly the same way as *mraval-tavi*, except for the cardinal number *otx-i* ‘four’ representing its first member.\(^9\) By the way, this type of compound formation with numerals was in no way restricted to the figurative use of *tavi* denoting ‘chapters’, as *or-tavi* ‘two-headed’ proves which appears as the epithet of a dragon in another context.\(^10\)

1.3 The use of the term *mraval-tavi* in denoting manuscripts can be documented since the Middle Ages, too. A striking example is found in the typicon of the Georgian monastery of Petritson (Bačkovo) in Bulgaria, which was founded in the second half of the 10\(^{th}\) century by Grigol BaḳurianisGeorgia, a Georgian nobleman from the province of Tao-Ḳlarǯeti in East Anatolia, who executed the office of a μέγας δομέστικος τῆς Δύσεως in the Byzantine Empire.\(^11\) Ch. 34 of this text, which is likely to have been authored by the founder himself, summarises the precious items that were donated by him to the monastery, among them several manuscript codices. In the enumeration, which comprises 16 such items, there is one entry that names a ‘big *mraval-tavi* book’, listed between ‘St. Basil’s Ethics’ and the ‘Life of St. Symeon’; see the following extract from the inventory which begins with several Gospel codices (*saxarebay*; note that the term *otxtavi* is used for the evangeliaires under nos. 22 and 23):\(^12\)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21)</td>
<td><em>saxarebay erti berʒuli okroyta da Šemeptonita Šekzmuli romelsa zeda sxenan tualni did-pasisani:</em> one Gospel (codex), in Greek, adorned with gold and coloured glass, with precious stones embedded;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22)</td>
<td><em>sxuay saxarebay erti kartulad čerili otxtavi vecxlita Şeč̣edili okro-curvebuli:</em> another Gospel (codex), a <em>Tetraevangelion</em> written in Georgian, forged with silver, gold-plated;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23)</td>
<td><em>sxuay saxarebay erti mcire otxtavi vecxlita mocuaruli:</em> another Gospel (codex), a small <em>Tetraevangelion</em>, forged with silver;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^9\) M. van Esbroeck even proposed that *mraval-tavi* might have been modelled upon *otx-tavi* (‘l’adjectif «polycéphale» paraît calqué sur celui de «tetracéphale»’; 1975, 7).

\(^10\) In the Georgian chronicle *Kartlis Cxovreba* (ed. Qaučişvili 1955–1959, vol. II, 68: *ortavi igi vešapí*). – Note that the reduplication of the numeral *ekus-i* ‘six’ in the formation of *ekus-ekus-prte* ‘six-winged’ (see p. 48 above) conveys the meaning of distributionality (‘six each’).

\(^11\) In Georgian: *sevasṭosman da didman demestikosman ğovlisu dasavaletisaman*; see the edition by A. Šaniže 1970 / 1986, chap. 1, 2 (p. 63, l. 33), and the edition by Tarchnişvili 1954, chap. 1, 10 (p. 8, l. 15); other occurrences ib., Ind., 2 (p. 55, l. 12 / p. 1, l. 14), and chap. 36, 1 / 109 (p. 119, l. 31 / p. 79, l. 28). As to the person see A. Šaniže 1971, 133–166; as to the title, Gippert 1993, 109 n. 6. In the chronicle *Kartlis Cxovreba*, the same person is styled a ‘commander of the East’ (*zorvari aģmosavalisa*; ed. Qaučişvili 1955–1959, vol. I, 318, l. 8).

The typicon has not only survived in Georgian but also in a Greek version of which at least two copies are known. This version does contain the inventory, too, but with a peculiar difference just at the position under concern, given that it shows but one entry between ‘St. Basil’s Ethics’ and the books of St. Maximus:

(21) Εὐαγγέλιον ῥωμαϊκὸν διὰ λίθων πολυτίμων καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ χειμεύσεως.
(22) Τετραευάγγελον ἀργυρὸν διάχρυσον ἰβηρικὸν.
(23) Ἐτερον τετραευάγγελον μικρὸν μετὰ ἀργυρῶν μικρῶν καρφίων.
(27) Βιβλίον ἔχον τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην.
(28) Βιβλίον ὁ θεολόγος.
(29) Βιβλίον ἔχον τὰ Ἠθικὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλείου.
(30-31) Βιβλίον ἐκλογάδιον ἔχον τὰ θαύματα τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεών.
(32) Βιβλία τοῦ ἁγίου Μαξίμου δύο.
(33) Βιβλία τοῦ Κλίμακες δύο.

(21) one Gospel (codex), in ‘Roman’, with precious stones and gold and enamel;
(22) a Tetraevangelion, silver, gold-plated, in ‘Iberian’;
(23) another small Tetraevangelion, with small silver inlets;
(27) a book containing the Explanation of St. John’s Gospel;
(28) a book (by Gregory) the ‘Theologos’;
(29) a book containing the Ethics of St. Basil;
(30-31) an eklogadion book containing the miracles of St. Symeon;
(32) two books of St. Maximus;
(33) two books (by John) Climacus.

---

13 For details see Gautier 1984.
15 There is no doubt that ῥωμαϊκὸς means ‘Greek’ here, given that the Georgian text has beržuli ‘id.’.
It seems likely off-hand that the Greek version has conflated the two entries no. 30 and 31 of the Georgian text by omitting the beginning of the latter, the *mravaltavi* and the Vita of St. Symeon thus merging into one ‘book’.\(^{16}\) If this is right, we are led to assume that the Greek term (*Βιβλίον* ἐκλογάδιον) is the exact equivalent of (*cigni*) *mravaltavi* ‘multi-head(ed) book’ here; see the following synopsis where compliant elements are printed in bold:

| Ἑκλογάδιον | sxuay cigni erti didi mravaltavi: | ‘one more book, a big mravaltavi;’ |
| ἐχον τὰ θαύματα τοῦ ἁγίου | sxuay cigni erti ecoreba cmidisa | one more book, the *Vita of St. Sy-*
| Συμεών. | swmeonisi: | *meon;’ |

1.3.1 What, then, does the term ἐκλογάδιον mean? According to a dictionary of 1835 (Fig. 1),\(^{17}\) ἐκλογάδιον, as well as its variant ἐκλογάριον, was primarily used in the sense of French ‘extrait’, denoting collections of pericopes from the four Gospels to be read in church throughout the ecclesiastical year and thus being equivalent to εὐαγγελιστάριον, i.e. ‘Evangeliary’. Secondarily it could be synonymous to the term ἀπάνθισμα, lit. ‘florilegium’, used metaphorically in the sense of French ‘recueil’.\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{16}\) In the edition by Qauxčišvili 1963, ‘*[Βιβλίον]*’ is supplied in square brackets at the given position (p. 242, l. 10), obviously on the basis of the Georgian text.

\(^{17}\) �cychta 1835, 61; the formation is missing in all modern dictionaries (Pape, Liddell-Scott, etc.).

\(^{18}\) It is this latter term that is used by Gautier in rendering ἐκλογάδιον in the Greek version of Bakurianišze’s Typicon (1984, 120: ‘Un livre: un recueil des miracles de saint Syméon’). The Modern Greek translation by Musaeus 1888, 206 omits the term (‘*βιβλίον* τα θαύματα τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεών’).
Both these usages are well attested in Medieval Greek sources. For ἐκλογάδιον in the sense of εὐαγγελιστάριον we may quote a typicon from the Vatopedi monastery on Mt. Athos which contains a similar list of books as part of an inventory as that from Petritson. Here, the edition provides the alternate spelling ἐκλογάδην: 19

| ἔτερον κατὰ Ματθαίον δεύτερον- | another (book), a second (Gospel of) Matthew; |
| ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ιω(άννην) ἐκλογάδην- | another one, the Gospel of John, *eklogadên*; |
| τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια διὰ τοῦ Βουλγαρί(ας) ἔρμηνευμένα- | the four Gospels, explained by (Theophylact of) Bulgaria; |
| ἔξαήμερος τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου- | the Hexaemeron of (John) the Chrysostom; |
| ἔτερα τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου-... | other (books), of Basil the Great ... |

Apart from this attestation, where ἐκλογάδην is clearly connected with a Gospel text, the word could be used in a wider sense, relating to other parts of the Bible, too. This is true, e.g., for another monastery inventory where ἐκλογάδην appears in connection with the term ἀπόστολος which usually denotes the lections from the Epistles of the New Testament (or, in the sense of πραξαπόστολος, the ensemble of Acts plus Epistles): 20

| Βιβλίον ἀπόστολος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ καθημερινός, καὶ ἕτερον βιβλίον ἀπόστολος ἐκλογάδην. | An apostolos book for all days of the year, and another apostolos book *eklogadên*. |
| Προφητικὰ βιβλία δύο τῆς ἀκολουθίας. | Two books of the prophets for the *acolouthia*. |
| Πραξαπόστολος βιβλίον ἓν μετὰ κεφαλαίων... | One praxapostolos book with (large) initials... |

1.3.2 While this usage still complies with the basic notion of ‘collection of pericopes’, there are other occurrences of ἐκλογάδιον which suggest that the word had the more general meaning of ‘collective volume’. For this we may adduce an example from the Greek version of Grigol Baḳurianisʒe’s Typicon again. At the end of the list of manuscripts he had donated to his monastery, we find ἐκλογάδιν (sic!) used in connection with μηναῖον, i.e. a term denoting the collections of liturgical prescriptions for every single month: 21

19  The typicon (of the monastery of the Theotokos at Skoteine / Boreine in Lydia) of CE 1247 is edited in Bompaire et al. 2001, here: 157; a former edition was provided by Gedeon 1939, 271–290 (here: 280).
20  The typicon of the Monastery of the Theotokos Eleousa in Stroumitza, ed. by Petit 1900, 114–125 (here: 121).
Here again, we observe a mismatch between the Greek version of the Typicon and the Georgian text, the latter adding one more item. See the following synopsis which suggests the equivalence of gamokrebuli iadgari with μηναῖον ἐκλογάδιν, as davitni ertni following this clearly represents an entry in its own right (one ‘David’s’, i.e. one ‘Psalter’ book):\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Georgian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>sxuay cigni erti ćmidisa isaḳisi:</td>
<td>44) one more book, of St. Isaac;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>sxuay ćigni erti, gamokrebuli iadgari:.</td>
<td>45) one more book, a gamokrebuli iadgari;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>davitni ertni:.</td>
<td>46) one Psalter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>duray sameupoy oksikastori otxi, erti ertir matgani ıkro-ksovili ars:..</td>
<td>47) Four royal gowns, from violet silk, one of them is interwoven with gold...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Greek μηναῖον can be equated with Georgian iadgari,\(^2\) we are left with the correspondence of ἐκλογάδιν and gamokrebuli-i here. Within Georgian, the latter term has a clear structure, being the regular passive participle of the root kreb- ‘collect’ with the preverb gamo- ‘out’; a structure that matches well with the formation of Greek ἐκλογαδι(ο)ν which contains the preverb ἐκ- ‘out’ and the root λεγ- ‘collect’. Both terms may thus be taken to have denoted ‘collective’ volumes containing materials that were ‘extracted’ for liturgical purposes.\(^4\) However, we must underline here that the usage of ἐκλογαδι(ο)ν was wider in that it could be used both with μηναῖα and with εὐαγγελία and the like, while Georgian had to apply different terms in these cases; at least, mravaltavi was obviously not usable in connection with iadgar-i.

---


\(^{23}\) See the explanation given in Aleksidze et al. 2005, 480, according to which iadgari is ‘the name of ... an universal collection, including chants for the whole ecclesiastical year – (for the Menaia, the movable feasts and the Octoechos)’; according to Lomidze 2015, 74, the term Iadgari denoted ‘eine hymnographische Sammlung ..., die im altjerusalemer Gottesdienst vor dem 8. Jh. in Gebrauch war und vom 8. bis zum 11. Jh. von der georgischen Kirche übernommen wurde’, Iadgari being ‘eine Übersetzung des liturgischen Tropologions der Kirche von Jerusalem’. The term itself is of Iranian origin (Middle-Persian ayādgār ‘memoir’).

\(^{24}\) In the passage quoted above, Gautier translates ἐκλογάδιν by ‘recueil’ again (1984, 122: ‘Un autre ménée: un recueil’); Musaeus simply uses the term ‘ἀνθολογίον’ (1888, 206).
1.3.3 That Greek ἑκλογάδιον had a wider usage is also proven by some attestations in juridical contexts. Here, too, it seems to have had, as an attribute of βιβλίον ‘book’, the meaning of ‘collective (volume)’, but in this case referring to laws and decisions. From the edition of such texts by D. Simon and Sp. Troianos,25 we may quote the following title:26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Τίτλος ιζʹ τοῦ β(ιβλί)ου ἑκλογαδίου.</th>
<th>Title no. 17 from the ‘ἐκλογάδιον book’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Μηδεὶς τὸν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφεύγοντα βίᾳ ἀφαιρείσθω, ἀλλὰ τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ πρόσφυγος κατάδηλον ποιείτω τῷ ιερεῖ καὶ παρ’ αὐτοῦ λαμβανέτω τὸν προσφυγόντα...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nobody shall lead away by force a (person) that has fled into a church. Instead, he shall report the guilt of the refugee to the priest and seize the refugee together with him...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.4 All in all, Greek ἑκλογάδιον proves to have had a much wider distribution as a *terminus technicus* in referring to ‘collective’ codices or books than Georgian *mravaltavi* had. It is important in this context to note that there is no witness available yet that would attest the equivalence of *mravaltavi* and Greek πολυκέφαλον (or -κεφάλιον) in relation to written materials, in spite of the pursuant formation of both terms. To determine the exact meaning of *mravaltavi* in this sphere, it is therefore necessary to investigate its autochthonous usage in more detail.

## 2 The Old Georgian *mravaltavis*

According to Michel van Esbroeck’s definition quoted above, *mravaltavi* books were ‘collections’ of homilies, sermons, and panegyrics which were used as ‘lections’ for the ‘feasts of the mobile year’, a definition that complies but for parts with the usage of ἑκλογάδιον in the examples discussed so far. Nevertheless, van Esbroeck’s definition can be shown to be well founded, all the more since it agrees with the autochthonous tradition. As a matter of fact, the term *mravaltavi* has been applied by Georgian scholarship27 to a restricted set of codices only, most of them matching the concept of ‘homiliaries’ in the sense of van Esbroeck. This is true, first of all, for the most famous of these *mravaltavis*, viz. that of Mt. Sinai (ms. Sin. georg. 32–57–33), which is the oldest dated Georgian codex known so far (of 864 CE, see below).28 Besides this, the

---

26 The edition contains seven further titles of this type.
28 The texts of the codex were edited by A. Šaniże 1959. As to (undated) older mss. see below.
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set usually comprises the mravaltavis of Mt. Athos (ms. Ath. 11, 11th c.), Udabno (ms. A–1109, 9th–10th cc.), Klărjeti (ms. A–144, 10th c.), Ṭbeti (ms. A–19, 10th c.), and ʿArxali (ms. A–95, 10th c.). Common to all these codices is that

a) they contain various individual texts, intrinsically linked to calendar dates that are indicated in the respective titles (e.g., ttuesa deḳembersa ṭv = 26.12., or ttuesa ianvarsa ʿm ṭmidisa basilisi = 1.1., (day) of St. Basil),

b) the texts they contain are mostly homilies authored by Church Fathers (e.g., tkmuli iovane okropirisay natlis-ġebisatws uplisa ʿcuenisa iesu krisṭēsa ‘Speech by John Chrysostom on the baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ’),

c) more rarely, they may also contain hagiographical accounts (this is especially true for the ʿArxali mravaltavi), but
d) they contain no pericopes or lections from the Holy Scriptures.

It is especially the last-mentioned feature that distinguishes the ‘canonical’ mravaltavis from εὐαγγέλια ἐκλογάδια and the like as mentioned in the Greek typica.

2.1 The Georgian tradition, which styles these codices ‘mravaltavis’, is well-founded, too, as it is based upon authentic attestations of this term in the codices in question. The most striking testimony is provided by the ‘Sinai Mravaltavi’ as the most prominent representative of this class of multiple-text manuscripts (MTMs). This codex, stored under three numbers (32–57–33) in the library of St. Catherine’s Monastery after having broken into three parts (Fig. 2 showing its outer appearance of today), comprises on 279 pages (140 fols.), written in beautiful majuscule letters in two columns, 50 different texts extending from the ‘Speech of St. Gregory, Bishop of Neo-κesariel episḳopostgresql xarebisatws ʿmridisa ʿmrtis-ṃsobelisa), to be read as the first
of three lections on this topic (saḳitxavni xarebisani, ‘Lections of the Annunciation’) on March 25th (t(tues)a marṭsa ḏ: fol. 1r, Fig. 3), up to the account of the ‘Life of the holy and blessed Fathers who were killed by the Barbarians on Mt. Sinai and in Raita’ by one St. Ammonios (cxorebay ćmidata da neṭarta mamatay romelta moisrnes mtasa sinasa da raits barbarostagan, aģc̣era ćmidaman amonios: fol. 255v), 33 which is followed by a set of colophons (see below).

2.1.1 Albeit the beginning and the end of the codex seem to have survived, it has not been preserved in its entirety as several folios must be lacking in the breakages between the three parts. 34 Luckily, the four pages missing between fol. 84v, the last folio of the part assigned no. 32, and fol. 85r, the first folio of no. 57, have recently been rediscovered in the so-called ‘New Collection’ of Mt. Sinai, i.e. the bulk of manuscripts detected in St. Catherine’s Monastery after a severe fire in 1975. 35 That the two folios constituting the manuscript now catalogued as ms. Sin.georg. N 89 do pertain to the mravaltavi, can easily be proven even though they have been damaged and some characters of the text are missing, given that they provide first the end of the Third Catechesis in Illuminandos by Cyril of Jerusalem, 37 which begins on fol. 77v in no. 32, and second, the beginning of the (Third) Sermo in Hypapanten by Hesychius of Jerusalem, which continues on fol. 85r, the first folio of no. 57. In both cases, the transition from the one codex to the other falls into a given word. The two letters ęṭ- at the end of fol. 84v of no. 32 with no doubt pertain to the verbal form ěṭq̇odes ‘they said (to him)’, corresponding to λέγουσι of the Greek text of the sermon; on fol. 1r of Sin.georg. N 89, the subsequent letters have been lost (Fig. 4), but the context clearly continues at the given position as shown in the following transcript:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32, 84v,</th>
<th>(romel)ni-igi mouqdes petres</th>
<th>samatasni</th>
<th>da ęṭq̇oda mat, (romel)ta</th>
<th>-igi ʒuars-ecua k(ris)tį.ę.</th>
<th>(romel)nigi mouqdes petres</th>
<th>samatasni</th>
<th>da ęṭq̇oda mat, (romel)ta</th>
<th>-igi ʒuars-ecua k(ris)tį.ę.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>those 3000 who came to</td>
<td></td>
<td>and he talked to them,</td>
<td>who had crucified Christ.</td>
<td>Toίς γάρ προσελθοῦσι τοὺς σταυρώσασιν τὸν Κύριον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τρισχιλίος ἔλεγεν ὁ Πέτρος,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 Apart from A. Šaniège’s edition 1959, 266–279, the Georgian text was published, alongside an Arabic version, by Gvaramia 1973, 3–19. A metaphrastic Greek version can be found in Τσάμης / Κατσάνης 1989, 194–236.
34 Šaniège assumes a lacuna of ‘ca. 75 leaves’ (daaxloebit 75 purclis ćeqsti) for the breakage between fols. 57 and 33 (see the edition 1959, 151).
36 See the Catalogue of Georgian Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 by Aleksidze et al., p. 432 f. (in English) / p. 305 f. (in Georgian) / p. 149 ff. (in Greek).
They asked him and said to him: What shall we do, men, brethren, for a big wound you have added, Peter, upon our sins...

puñθanoméνοις καὶ λέ-

They asked him and said to him: What shall we do, men, brethren, for a big wound you have added, Peter, upon our sins...

They asked him and said to him: What shall we do, men, brethren, for a big wound you have added, Peter, upon our sins...

In the same way, the transition from fol. 2v of Sin.georg. N 89 to the first folio of ms. no. 57 (fol. 85r of the Mravaltavi codex according to the pagination applied earlier) can be proven to be consistent. In a passage alluding to the miracle of Jesus healing the blind man (Jo. 9.1–18), the text of the newly found manuscript ends in the middle of the name of the lake Siloam, which continues with its third syllable on fol. 85r (Fig. 5). The homily is not available in any other language; however, it is contained in the Udabno Mravaltavi, which is collated here for the passage in question. It is obvious from this collation that there are but minor differences between the two mravaltavi versions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N89, Owko​wetow vinme kori​kozi</th>
<th>If someone were an unedu-&lt;br/&gt;cated (U: ignorant) lands-&lt;br/&gt;man, 42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2v , 19-25</td>
<td>Uku​etu vinme kure​kozi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iq̇os owsc̣avleli,</td>
<td>iq̇os umecari,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 Written with a large initial indicating a new sentence.
39 The edition by Reischl/Rupp (repr. 1967, 84) as well as that in the Migne 1857, 445) inserts a full stop after τραῦμα and begins a new sentence with ἐπέστησας, which yields an awkward wording.
40 The Sermo in Hypapanten printed in Migne 1865, 1468–78) and re-edited by Aubineau 1978, 1–43 is too distant to be compared here.
41 See the edition by A. Šaniže and Z. Č̣umburiže 1994, 117, l. 5–8.
42 The term kori​kozi-i / kure​kozi-i seems not to be attested elsewhere in Old Georgian. The proposal by Z. Č̣umburiže (in the lexicon attached to his edition of the Udabno Mravaltavi 1994, 329) to take this as a corrupted form of korepiσκοποζι ‘local bishop’ is now rendered improbable by the attestation in the Sinal Mravaltavi. As korepiσκοποζι clearly reflects Greek χωρεπίσκοπος ‘id., kori​kozi-i may accordingly be identified with Greek χωρικός ‘rural’ (Abulaże 1967, 84: ‘paysan, campanard, rustique’), which could well be used to denote a ‘village idiot’ here; see, e.g., the script ‘De sacris imaginibus contra Constantinum Cabalinum’ ascribed to John Damascene (but allegedly authored by Joannes IV of Jerusalem) in Migne 1864, col. 329 line 17, for a similar usage (ἐὰν ἀπαντήσῃ ἄνθρωπος χωρικὸς, ἄγνωστος τῆς βασιλικῆς ἀξίας καὶ τιμῆς, ἄνθρωπον τοῦ βασιλέως...). – In his dictionary, the 17th-century founder of Georgian lexicography, Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani defines korikozi as a ‘king’s deputy who would not dare to name himself a ‘king’, but translates as a ‘shepherd’ (monacvale mepisa, ro-<br/>melman ver ikadlos meped saxelis-deba, aramed gamoitargmanebis mç̣gęmsad; Orbeliani 1966, 232). The passage quoted in mss. D and E of his dictionary, ascribed to one ‘Eusebius presbyter’ (evesbi xuci), is the one from Hesychius of Jerusalem in the wording of the Udabno Mravaltavi, which proves that Saba must have known this codex (or a copy of it): ŭketu vinme (< E) korikozi iq̇os (iq̇o D) umecari, mived (movides E) betlemad da isçav[os] (<< D). The definition ‘(king’s) regent (in Kakhetia)’ provided
mivedin betlemd da isçaven: owkowetov vinme brmay iq̇os šobitgan, mivedin silo-amd mis pirvelisaeb sarçmunoebit da manca igive xedvay moipoven.
he should go to Bethlehem and study; if someone were blind from birth, he should go to (lake) mivedin betlemd da isçaven. ukuetu brmay iq̇os šobitgan, mivedin silo-amd mis pirvelisaeb sarçmunoebit da manca igive xedvay miiğos.

The close relationship between the two versions of the text is also visible in the title of the sermon, which is now available for collation on fol. 1v to 2r of Sin.georg. N 89 (Fig. 2). In the following synopsis, elements that are written in rubrics in Sin.georg. N 89 are printed in bold; elements that are missing in either one of the two versions are printed in italics, elements that differ otherwise (except for mere graphical differences) are underlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S(a)ŋ(i)tx(a)vni migebebisani</th>
<th>Lections of the Hypapante</th>
<th>migebebay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S(a)ŋ(i)tx(a)vni migebebisani</td>
<td>On the day when Symeon took the Lord upon his arms</td>
<td>dğesa, romelsa miikua swmeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tk(owmowlli), ç(mi)disa da neṭarisia</td>
<td>Sermon of the holy and blessed</td>
<td>tkumuli çmidisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mamisa, č(owe)nisa, evswki, xow-cisa,</td>
<td>Father of ours, Hesychius, Presbyter</td>
<td>evsuki xucisay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iē(rowsa)(e)misay, meormeocesa of Jerusalem, on/of the twentieth</td>
<td>ierusalêmelisay meormeocisa mis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dğesa, šobitg(a)n k(a)ç(ow)lisay, day from the virgin birth</td>
<td>dğisa šobitgan kalçulisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for koriḳozi in Rayfield 2006, vol. II, 2092 is clearly based upon Saba’s entry, as is that of Tschenkeli 1970, Bd. II, 1576 (‘Stellvertreter des Königs’); the addendum ‘in Kakhetia’ is likely to reflect the occurrence of the term in the 18th century ‘Description of the Kingdom of Georgia’ by prince Vaxuṭi Bagraṭioni (Qauxčišvili 1973, 524, l. 5-6 and 557, 18–21: grigoli... içoda ḳaxta mtavrad anu koriḳozad ‘Grigol ... named himself a ruler of the Kakhetians or a koriḳozi’; further attestations ib. 129,18, 130,23, 798,18, and, for the derived verb koriḳozoba ‘be / act as a k.’, 558,7 and 16).

43 The title clearly indicates that the homily is by Hesychius, not Timotheus of Jerusalem as still presumed (in accordance with Marr 1940, 93) in Garitte’s Catalogue (no. 17, 1956, 78). In A. Šaniže’s edition (1959.90), the title was supplied from the Udabno Mravaltavi.
2.1.2 The transition from fol. 2v of the newly found manuscript N 89 to fol. 85r of the Mravaltavi is all the more evident if we take into account that the two pages bear coherent quire numberings, in the given case nos. ፃ a = 11 and ፃ b =12. The numberings are applied, as usual in Old Georgian manuscripts, in the middle of the bottom margin on the last page of one quire, and in the middle of the top margin on the first page of the next; see Fig. 7 where the respective numbers are highlighted in contrast to each other. Sin.georg. N 89 can thus with confidence be regarded as part of Sin.georg. 32–57–33, representing the last two folios of its 11th quire.

2.2 Returning to the question of the original meaning of the term mravaltavi, the Sinai codex becomes especially important because of its colophons. All in all, it is four individual colophons that were added after its last text, the first of them written down by the scribe immediately after the completion of his work, in the same majuscule characters as the main text (fols. 273v–274ra); it tells us that the codex was written by a certain Amona, son of Vaxtang ‘the Sinewy’ (?), on behalf of a donour named Maḳari Leteteli in the Laura of St. Sabbas in Jerusalem. At the bottom of the same column (fol. 274ra), the scribe added a second colophon, in minuscules, which is on his own behalf. The third colophon, written by the same hand in minuscules again (fol. 274rb), must have been added some time later as it is about the donation of the codex to Mt. Sinai (Fig. 8). The fourth colophon (on fol. 274v) is as well written in minuscules, but by a different hand and at a much later time. Its author is Ioane Zosime, one of the most productive Georgian scribes who lived and worked in St. Catherine’s Monastery in the second half of the 10th century; in the present colophon, he reports about the fact that he accomplished the third binding of the codex. On the leaf following this (fol. 275r), Ioane Zosime added the ‘Praise and Exaltation of the Georgian Language’, a hymn-like text possibly authored by himself, which is found in a few other manuscripts from Mt. Sinai as

---

44 The epithet mozarguli is not attested elsewhere; the assumption that it may be derived from zargvi ‘sinew, vene’ is tentative.
well (Fig. 9 and App. 1 below). As the present binding of the codex (Fig. 2) is likely to be Ioane’s, he is also likely to have applied the front and back flyleaves, which stem from a Palestinian-Aramaic Gospel manuscript (Fig. 10).

2.2.1 One important feature of the colophons is that they provide us with at least two remarkable dates – that of the completion of the codex and that of its third binding. As in many other Old Georgian manuscripts, both dates are styled in two ways, once in counting the years since Creation, and once, according to the reckoning of ‘chronicons’, i.e. cycles of 532 (= 19 × 28) years. In the following transcript of the first dating, characters that are in red in the original are printed in bold again:

| Daçera ese çigni i(ero-wsa)lêms, | This book was written in Jerusalem, |
| lavrasya didsa ç(mi)disa | in the big Laura of our Holy |
| da neçarisa mamisa | and Blessed Father |
| ç(owe)nisa | Sabā, in the days |
| sabay(s)sa dğeta | of the God-loving |
| q(mr)tis m(o)q(owa)risa | Theodosius, |
| tevdosi | the patriarch, and |
| pâtreâxisata da saba- | the venerable and |
| ç(mi)d(i)q(tiosnisa da | blissful Solomon, |
| sanatrelisa solomon | abbot of St. Saba’s (Laura). |
| mamasaxlisisata. | |

Da daçera çmiday ese çigni |

| dasabamitgan çelta: | And this holy book was written |
| xwyê | in the year(s) after |
| Kronikoni iça: | Creation |
| pd: | 6468, |

The text of the flyleaves has been edited by Smith-Lewis 1894, 118–120 (no. 54); it comprises passages from Matthew (14.5–13) and John (2.23–3.2). For the Arabic note overwritten on the back fly-leaf see Garitte 1956, 97 (‘Liber habens homilias, cuius prima de Annuntiatione. Excommunicatus qui amovebit eum e Monte Sina’).

The ms. has çerta instead of çelta, probably by perseverance of (dai-)çera ‘was written’.

---

45 The text of the flyleaves has been edited by Smith-Lewis 1894, 118–120 (no. 54); it comprises passages from Matthew (14.5–13) and John (2.23–3.2). For the Arabic note overwritten on the back fly-leaf see Garitte 1956, 97 (‘Liber habens homilias, cuius prima de Annuntiatione. Excommunicatus qui amovebit eum e Monte Sina’).

46 The ms. has çerta instead of çelta, probably by perseverance of (dai-)çera ‘was written’.
2.2.1.1 To account for this dating, it is necessary to consider that the Georgian tradition used a peculiar calculation for the date of Creation, which differed from that of the Byzantine Era by 96 years, the first year of our era (1 CE) falling together with year no. 5605, not 5509 as in the latter. The year indicated in the colophon, 6468, is thus equal to 863 CE or, to be more correct, 863–864 CE as the year began on the 1st September as in the Greek tradition. The same information is also contained in the ‘chronicon’ calculation: by subtracting 84 from 6469, we arrive at 6384 (= 12 × 532), which equals 779–780 CE as the last year of the 12th cycle of 532 years after Creation. Ioane Zosime even addresses the Georgian time reckoning explicitly, in dating his binding to the ‘years after Creation, in Georgian, 6585, and the chronicon 201’, i.e. 980–981 CE (dasabamitganta celta kartulad: xpe-sa da kronikosa: ša-sa). That he was well aware of the peculiarity of the ‘Georgian style’, is proven by the ‘Praise of the Georgian Language’ because according to this text, Georgian ‘has 94 (recte: 96) years more than the other languages since the coming of Christ up to the present day’ (akus otxmeoc da atotxmeṭi çeli umeṭēs sxuata enata kristēs moslvitgan vidre dgesamomde; see App. 1 below for a transcript of the complete text).

2.2.1.2 A third dating seems to be contained in the scribe’s personal colophon, which is appended like a signature to the main colophon at the bottom of fol. 274ra. This remains obscure though, as it is introduced by an otherwise unknown formula which combines çeli ‘year’ with preceding z, usually the abbreviation of the postposition zeda ‘on, up, above’. Georgian does know a compound zedaceli but this cannot be meant here as it denotes some kind of ‘jacket’, in accordance with its being built upon the homonymous word çeli meaning ‘waist, loins’ (lit. ‘above-the-loins’). The number, if read correctly as sē, would mean 208, i.e. the year 987–8 CE if falling into the same chronicon; this, however, would be much too late to fit into the scribe’s lifetime. It seems rather possible that the dating might have been added by Ioane Zosime as he may still have lived by that year, even though the ornamentation of the line is quite the same as that of the main dating while Ioane Zosime’s dating in the binder’s colophon is without any peculiar decoration (see the excerpts provided with the transcripts below). And possibly, Ioane Zosime left his trace another time on this colophon, in writing l(o)c(va) q̇a(va) t ‘pray!’ over the closing dots of its last line.

---

47 It would be less promising if the number were to be read as s in which would yield 250, i.e. the year 1029 CE
2.2.2 The datings are crucial indeed for our topic as the colophons provide several attestations of the term *mravaltavi* in referring to the codex itself, thus constituting a *terminus a quo* for its use. This is true, first of all, for the main colophon provided by Maḳari Leteteli through the hand of the scribe, Amona, in the year 863–4. The following extract covers about one half of the text (three fourths of fol. 273v):

---

| By the charity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit ... | Pray for Amona the scribe, the very sinful one, Saints! |
| By the mercy of the Holy Resurrection from the grave of Our Lord Jesus Christ ... | Pray for Amona the scribe, the very sinful one, Saints! |
| and with the support of all prophets, apostles, evangelists ... | and with the support of all prophets, apostles, evangelists ... |
| I, Maḳari Leteteli, the son of Giorgi Grζeli, a very sinful (man), was considered worthy by God to create this holy *mravaltavi* book with the help of my brother in spirit, P̣imen Ḋaxa, and by the hand-writing of the son of my mother’s brother, Amona, the son of Vaxtang ‘the Sinewy’ ... | |
---

The term is taken over in unaltered form by Ioane Zosime in his colophon of 980–81 CE:
Kyrie eleison! In the name of God!

This holy Mravaltavi book was bound (lit. clad) for the third time in cowskin on Holy (Mt.) Sinai

by the hand of Ioane Zosime, the very sinful (man), in the days of my being badly aged,

by order and under very zealous instigation of Michael and Michael, the venerable priests,

in the year 6585, Georgian style, after Creation and in the chronicon 201.

In his second colophon, which reports about the transfer of the codex to Mt. Sinai, Maḳari uses the term once more himself. Here, however, he adds explicit information on the contents of the book, in a form that may well be taken as a definition of the meaning of mravaltavi:

And I, poor Maḳari, have offered this holy Mravaltavi to Mt. Sinai, the most holy of all, for the remembrance and benefit of ourselves and our souls.

And in it is the adornment of all feast days of the year (as) preached by the holy leaders.

Let, Lord, our sinful souls find your compassion on that day...

2.3 The information provided by the colophons of the Sinai Mravaltavi is by and large confirmed by two later witnesses. One is the Mravaltavi of Udabno, which was already referred to above. For this codex, which is datable to the 9th–10th cc. as well, a scribe’s colophon has not been preserved; however, it does contain several later notes in the margins, two of which mention a mravaltavi mrguloani, i.e. a ‘mravaltavi (written in) round (letters, i.e. majuscules)’, obviously in referring to the codex itself. The

48 The binder’s colophon contains a rather enigmatic marginal gloss at the given position, which reads zroxa kacisa (in two lines). Probably the first word mirrors zroxi- in zroxisayta ‘of the cow’ of the text, while kacisa, gen. of kaci ‘man’, will pertain to Ioane’s self-designation as being ‘very sinful’ appearing just to the right of it. Taking it in isolation, the gloss would mean something like ‘the cow of man’, which barely makes any sense. See Gippert 2015, 102 with no. 6.

following transcripts are quoted from Zurab Ҫumburiẓe’s introduction to the edition of the Mravaltavi, according to which they were written by the same hand in an early Mkhedruli script (adrindeli periodis mxedrulit: p. 13). It will be evident off-hand that the second note is an extension of the first one, possibly showing the complete text of what was meant to be an aphorism.  

| 75v | k(risṭe) mravaltavi mrguloani da sepis piri  
gmertman ucqis da natlis mcemel-
man | Christ! The mravaltavi in round (letters) and noble (lit. noble person)  
God and the Baptist knows. |
| 126r | k(risṭe) mravaltavi mrguloani da sepis piri  
gmertman icis da natlis mcemelman,  
romel razom ḳargi ars | Christ! The mravaltavi in round (letters) and noble (lit. noble person),  
God and the Baptist knows how nice it is. |

The second witness is the famous Gospel manuscript of Adishi which, according to the scribe’s colophon appended on fol. 387r, was written in 897 CE (6501 after Creation / chronicon 117). A secondary note on the same page, written by a much later hand in nuskhuri minuscules, reports the removal, by a certain Niḳolaos, of the Tetraevangelion together with some other codices from Šaṭberdi, one of the centres of Georgian eruditeness in Ṭao-Ḳlarǯeti in East Anatolia, to Guria (Fig. 11). The list comprises, besides the otxtavi itself, a lectionary (qelt-ḳanoni) and other ‘books’, a mravaltavi that is not further specified. There is good reason to believe, however, that it is just the Udabno Mravaltavi that is meant here as this is likely to have been written in Ṭao-Ḳlarǯeti and was detected in the early 20th century in the Gurian monastery of Udabno.  

The following transcript comprises lines 6–14 of the note.  

50 Interestingly enough, a comparable wording is found in the introduction to the Visramiani, i.e. the Georgian prose translation of the Persian epic Vis u Rāmin, which was compiled by the 12th c.; here we read (p. 34, ll. 19–21 in the edition by A. Gvaxaria and M. Todua 1962): me q̇uela vici da masmia si̱kte da sepispiroba mati, romel ḳargi hamo ambavia brzenta da mecnieragan tkumuli da šec̣q̇obili palaurita enita ‘I know all (that) and I have heard (of) their goodness and nobleness, which is a nice (and) pleasant story, told and arranged by wise and learned (people) in the Pahlavi language...’. Together with several other attestations of sepis piri (e.g., in the chronicle of Queen Tamar’s age by Basili Ezosmoqguari in Qauξišvili 1955–1959, vol. II, 149, l. 27; the chronicle of the Mongol invasions by an anonymous ‘Ẓamtaqmc̣ereli’ = ‘Chronicler’, ib. p. 196, l. 4; or the Georgian prose translation of the Persian Šāhnāme, Šah-Names anu mepeta čignis kartuli versiebi, vol. III, ed. Ḳobi̱ʒe 1974, p. 510, l. 21), this seems to suggest the note in the Mravaltavi to have been added after the 12th century.  


Jost Gippert

Me n(i)ḳ(o)l(a)oṣ odesme ǯumatisa m(a)m(a)s(a)xlis-q̇opilm(a)n uģirsman da s(u)lita s(a)c̣q̇(a)l(o)belm(a)n: I, Nikolaos, formerly the abbot of (the monastery of) Ǯumati, unworthy and pitiful with (my) soul,
p(ria)dita xarḳebita – ašenēn ġ(mertma)n – klărǯetisa monasterni ševiarex da ševkriben ķ(mida)ni ese ġignni: with much endeavour I have visited the monasteries of Klărǯeti – may God build them up – and collected these books:
p(irvela)d ķ(mida)y ese saxarebay oxtavx: first, this holy Tetraevangelion, da mr(a)v(a)lt(a)vvi da qeltḳanon and a mravaltavi and a lectionary, m(a)m(a)ta ġigni da kibxva-migebay... a book of the fathers and a questions-and-answers (book)...

3 Taking all this information together, we arrive at the following conclusions:

a) the term ‘mravaltavi book’ was in use in Old Georgian as early as the late 9th century and continued to be used in the following centuries, and
b) it denoted codices that primarily contained texts authored by Church Fathers for the feast days of the year.

This agrees well with van Esbroeck’s definition according to which mravaltavis were ‘collections’ of homilies, sermons, and panegyrics ‘quite close to the Greek homiliaries’, which were used as ‘lections’ for the ‘feasts of the mobile year’. The question remains, however, whether and to what extent mravaltavis could also contain hagiographical texts. This question has recently been raised anew by M. Šaniţe53 according to whom the incorporation of hagiographical accounts was but a later feature of the Old Georgian mravaltavis.

3.1 First of all, it must be stated here that all mravaltavis treated so far do contain hagiographical materials. In the case of the Sinai codex, this concerns St. Stephen the Protomartyr, St. James, St. Peter, St. Paul, the 40 martyrs of Sebaste, and, at the end of the codex, the fathers of Sinai and Raita.54 The Udabno and Ṭbeti Mravaltavis con-

53 See the entry ‘Mravaltavi’ in the list of ‘Some Georgian terms used in the text’ added to the English part of the Catalogue of the ‘New Collection’ of Georgian manuscripts in St. Catherine’s Monastery, Aleksidze et al. 2005, 482; for a more thorough discussion see Esbroeck 1975, 5.
54 Texts no. 9 (fols. 56ra–59vb), 8 (54ra–56rb), 44 (234ra–239vb), 45 (239vb–244rb), 21 (109va–119va), and 50 (255vb–273rb) of the Sinai Mravaltavi. There are also two anonymous texts on St. Basil the Great in the codex, viz. nos. 11 (67ra–68va) and 12 (68va–70vb).
tain one of the few autochthonous hagiographical texts from first millennium Georgia, viz. the legend (by Ioane Sabanisže) of St. Habo of Ṭpilisi, as well as accounts of the life of St. Anthony.\textsuperscript{55} To all these we may add the legends on the Apparition of the Holy Cross, the Finding of the nails used in the crucifixion, or the Finding of the relics of St. Stephen, which are represented in most of these codices.\textsuperscript{56}

3.2 The mravaltavi of Parxali, allegedly the latest of the ‘homiliaries’ investigated by van Esbroeck, adds about 50 lives and legends after the last homily it contains (i.e. the sermon by Ioane Bolneli on ‘Lazarus and the Lord’s sitting down on the donkey’s foal and his entering Jerusalem and meeting the children’, to be read on Palm Sunday),\textsuperscript{57} among them the autochthonous legend of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century Georgian martyr, St. Šušaniḳ.\textsuperscript{58} The arrangement suggests that this set of texts is not part of the mravaltavi proper but represents a peculiar type of martyrology added to it secondarily,\textsuperscript{59} this is all the more likely as the hagiographical texts that are met with in the other mravaltavis are not included in the ‘extra’ collection of the Parxali codex but in its first part.\textsuperscript{60} We may therefore assume that there was a fix reservoir of ‘basic’ hagiographical texts that did pertain to the mravaltavi materials traditionally and that the mravaltavis were thus not restricted to homilies in the proper sense right from the beginning. In this respect, we may adapt the wider definition given by Z. Čumburiże according to whom

\textsuperscript{55} In the Udabno Mravaltavi, texts no. 9 (fols. 7r–11v, followed by an ‘Eclogue of the holy martyr Habo’, Kebay čmidisa moçamisa Haboysi, as no. 10, 11v–14r), and 11–13 (fols. 14r–36v); in the Ťheti Mravaltavi (A–19, see the descriptions by Gorgaże 1927, 1–35, and Bregaze et al. 1973, 58–71), texts no. 62 (402b–432b / 202v–203r, including the ‘Eclogue’) and 63 (433a–451b / 218r–224r).

\textsuperscript{56} Texts no. 42 (fols. 225rb–232rb), 43 (232va–234ra), and 10 (59vb–67ra) in the Sinai Mravaltavi.

\textsuperscript{57} T Kumuli ioane bolnel eṗisḳoṗosisay lazarestws da daǯdomisatws upliṣa ƙicusa zeda da ʂeslvisatws iĕrusalemad da ʂesxmisatws ʔrmataysa; see Bregaze et al. 1973, 380, no. 97. The text of the homily is printed with a French translation in Verhelst 2015, 430–453.

\textsuperscript{58} No. 107 (fols. 353r–359v), see Bregaze et al. 1973, 382.

\textsuperscript{59} See Esbroeck 1975, 57 who stated clearly that ‘il ne s’agit pas en réalité d’un seul manuscrit, mais de deux codices qui ont été reliés ensemble’. It may also be noted that there is a lacuna at the beginning of the ‘martyrology’ part, which suggests that some peculiar title may have been lost there; see Bregaze et al. 1973, 380 and Esbroeck 1975, 55.

\textsuperscript{60} E.g., legends of St. Stephen and the finding of his relics (nos. 20–24: fols. 52v–71v), St. Peter and Paul (nos. 25–26: 71v–77r), St. Habo of Tpinisi (incl. the ‘Eclogue’, no. 53: 145v–159v), the 40 martyrs (no. 82: 212v–217v), the Finding of the Cross and the nails (nos. 75–76: 197v–201v), or the Vita of St. Anthony (nos. 54–55: 159v–169r); see Bregaze et al. 1973, 361–380.
mravaltavis were ‘collective volumes which comprise works used as lections on certain feast days in church’, as this encompasses homilies as well as hagiographical accounts and the like.

4 Another question that remains open is whether the term ‘mravaltavi book’ might have been coined before the Sinai codex was written. As a matter of fact, the very existence of mravaltavi-like codices that antedate Sin.georg. 32–57–33 by some time has been claimed for long, especially for the lower layer of the palimpsest manuscripts A–737 of Tbilisi and M–13 of St. Petersburg, which are believed to go back to the early 9th century.
4.1 An even more archaic *mravaltavi* has been preserved in the lower layer of the palimpsest manuscript S-3902, which must go back to the so-called Khanmeti period, i.e. the first period of Georgian literacy extending from the 5th to ca. the 7th cc. A first attempt at editing its fragments was undertaken by Akaki Šaniże as early as 1927. Depending on the readability of the lower script, the amount of text Šaniže was able to restore varies considerably from page to page; in some cases, it is but a few characters per line that could be made out in his days. This is especially true for the homily on the ‘Envy of the Pharisees’, which is usually ascribed to John Chrysostom. Besides the Khanmeti version represented by the palimpsest, the homily is preserved in Old Georgian in the Jerusalem manuscript Jer. 4, as well as in two Greek recensions, an Old Church Slavonic version available in two codices, and one Coptic version. Of the Greek recensions, it is the one represented by the codex Ottobonianus graecus 14 of the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana which comes closest to the Khanmeti text; together with the Old Church Slavonic version as represented in the famous Codex Suprasliensis of the 10th century and, with minor deviations, in the so-called Uspenskij Sbornik (12th–13th cc.), it provides a good basis for reconstructing the Khanmeti text even where it has been thoroughly erased in the palimpsest. In Appendix 2 below, a

---

64 A. Šaniže 1927, 98–159; re-edited (together with a Latin translation) in Molitor 1956, 65–90.
65 *Parisevelta mat šurisatws*, relating to the passage *xolo parisevelni igi gamovides da zraxva-ğves mistws, rayta çarçiqmidon igi* (Mt. 12,14). See Gippert (forthc.) for a thorough study of the homily in question.
66 In the palimpsest, the author is simply named *iohane eṗiskopoşi*, ‘John the Bishop’: fol. 3vb, l. 5 =A. Šaniże 1959, 135: 11b, l. 5. See Gippert (forthc.), 1. for a survey of other proposals as to the authorship.
67 Text no. 12 (fols. 65r–66v); see the catalogues by Blake 1922–23, 367, and Mari [Marr] 1955, 48 (ms. ‘18, 12.’). The text was used by M. Šaniże 2009 in her article “Homilia ‘Parisevelta šurisatws’ xanmeṭ mravaltavši” (“The Homily ‘On Jealousy’ in Khanmeti Homiliary”) to establish a ‘complemented and reconstructed’ version of the homily; see Gippert (forthc.) 2. with n. 28 for further details.
68 See Geerard 1974, 582, no. 4640, where the Georgian Khanmeti version is not referred to explicitly. As to the Coptic text, which was published by Rossi 1889, 49–152bis, and in 1888 [1892], 3–104, see Gippert (forthc.), 1.3.
69 Fols. 123–126v; the text as edited by M. Capaldo (= Kapaldo) is available via the facsimile edition of the Old Church Slavonic Codex Suprasliensis by Zaimov and Kapaldo 1983, 395–404. See Voicu 2012 as to other witnesses pertaining to the same recensions, and Gippert (forthc.), 1.1 and passim as to important shibboleths.
70 The Greek text as printed in Migne 1862b, 705–710 represents the other recension and is a bit less close.
diplomatic rendering of the reading is contrasted with a photo collage (11 multispectral images) of the recto of the bifoliate consisting of fols. 2 and 7\textsuperscript{73} of S-3902, and with four Tables that display the lower text of the recto and verso of the same bifoliate as re-established now,\textsuperscript{76} contrasted with A. Šaniže’s reading and collated with the Greek and Slavonic versions.\textsuperscript{75} Whether or not this palimpsest may have been styled a mravaltavi when it was written down, is not decidable, however, as no colophon has been preserved.\textsuperscript{76}

4.2 As another candidate for a Khanmeti mravaltavi, we might regard one of the six Khanmeti manuscripts that were re-used in the Georgian palimpsest codex of the Vienna National Library (Codex Vind. georg. 2).\textsuperscript{77} The original manuscript in question, of which 38 bifoliates have been preserved, contains parts of the legends of Ss. Cyprianus and Justina and St. Christina;\textsuperscript{78} four additional bifoliates of the same original have been detected in the Tbilisi palimpsest A–737.\textsuperscript{79} It is not very probable, though, that the two hagiographical texts might be the remnants of a former mravaltavi, albeit

\textsuperscript{73} Several different pagination systems have been applied in the descriptions of S–3902: according to pages of the upper layer, folios of the upper layer, and folios of the original manuscripts. The folios here addressed as 7r and 7v represent pages 13 and 14 according to the first pagination applied, and fols. 2r and 2v, pages 3 and 4. For a rough survey of the codicological structure of S–3902 see Esbroeck 1975, 60.

\textsuperscript{74} On the basis of a multispectral analysis undertaken by the author together with L. Kajaia, D. Tvaltvadze, and S. Sardjveladze in Tbilisi, 2005.

\textsuperscript{75} The present reading was first proposed publicly in a paper read on the 1st International Symposium ‘Georgian Manuscripts’ in Tbilisi, Oct. 21, 2009 (‘New Prospects in the Study of Old Georgian Palimpsests’; see the abstract in \textlangle}http://www.manuscript.ge/uploads/sympoziumi/tezisebi.pdf\textrangle, p. 182). The conference volume has not yet appeared in print. – See Gippert 2009 for a similar account of the bifoliate page consisting of fols. 3r and 6v (instead of 3ra–6va read 3rb–6vb on p. 182). See Gippert (forthc.), 4, for a more comprehensive treatment of the four folios.

\textsuperscript{76} Apart from the remnants of the Khanmeti mravaltavi, S–3902 comprises fragments of another manuscript written in Asomtavruli script in its lower layer. This – hitherto unpublished – manuscript, which can hardly be dated earlier than the 10\textsuperscript{th} century, represents a lectionary with lectures from New Testament books. Different from the mravaltavi, the lines of the original manuscript were overwritten horizontally in this case, which makes the reading more difficult here and there although the letters have been preserved more clearly throughout than those of the Khanmeti original. The edition of two of its pages (fols. 56r and 49v) was part of the paper read in Tbilisi, Oct. 21, 2009 and has been prepared for being published in the conference volume (see n. 75 above).

\textsuperscript{77} See Gippert et al. 2007.

\textsuperscript{78} See the edition, 6–1 – 6–90 (ms. no. VI).

\textsuperscript{79} Fols. 134–141, see the edition, p. 6-1. The assumption that the fragments from the Tbilisi and the Vienna palimpsests pertain to one original manuscript was first published hesitatingly by Kaǯaia 1974, 419; it has been approved beyond any doubt by the edition project.
they are also present in the Parxali codex,\textsuperscript{80} for here, they pertain to the ‘martyrological’ extension, not to the mravaltavi proper. In a similar way, the legend of St. Christina occurs in a Sinai manuscript that may be styled ‘hagiographical’ as it contains mostly legends of saints (Sin. georg. 6); as a matter of fact, none of the texts it comprises is met with in any one of the ‘classical’ mravaltavis.\textsuperscript{81} It seems therefore preferable to regard the Khanmeti original of the Vienna codex as a prototype of a martyrology.\textsuperscript{82}

5 Conclusions

To sum up, it seems well founded to assume that manuscripts of the mravaltavi type existed in Old Georgian from Khanmeti times on, as collective volumes comprising homilies, sermons, and a few ‘basic’ hagiographical texts used as lections in the liturgy of certain feast days, thus constituting a special genre of MTM of unarbitrary content. It is especially those mravaltavis whose remnants have been preserved in palimpsest form that deserve to be studied more intensively. Not only in the Khanmeti palimpsests but in general, the Georgian mravaltavis contain texts or text versions that are either unique or archaic in comparison with other versions, which renders them important for textological studies far beyond Georgia.

\textsuperscript{80} Texts no. 110 (part III of the legend of Ss. Cyprianus and Justina; fols. 380v–385v) and 106 (legend of St. Christina; fols. 343v–353r); see Bregaże et al. 1973, 382–3.

\textsuperscript{81} Apart from the vitae of St. Symeon the Stylite, Julian-Saba the Syrian, Epiphanius, and Zosime, and the legends of St. Febronia, Christina, and Catherina, it contains the Protevangelium Jacobi, the Teachings of St. Stephen the Sabaithe, and, by the hand of Ioane Zosime again, the ‘Praise of the Georgian Language’; see Garitte 1956, 15–26.

\textsuperscript{82} It may be important in this context to note that both the Vienna palimpsest and the ms. Sin.georg. 6 contain the Protevangelium Jacobi alongside the legend of St. Christina; it is not likely, however, that the former text was written by the same hand in the palimpsest (see the edition, p. xxvi) and it was therefore treated as representing another original manuscript (no. V; 5–1 – 5–26).
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Fig. 2: Sin. georg. 32–57–33, outer appearance.

Fig. 3: id., fol. 1r (upper half).
Fig. 4: Transition from Sin.georg. 32(–57–33), fol. 84v to Sin.georg. N 89, fol. 1r (within Cyril of Jerusalem).

Fig. 5: Transition from Sin.georg. N 89, fol. 2v to Sin.georg. (32–)57(–33), fol. 85r (within Hesychius of Jerusalem).
Fig. 6: Title of Hesychius’ Sermon (Sin.georg. N 89, 1vb-2ra).

Fig. 7: Transition from Sin.georg. N 89, fol. 2v to Sin.georg. (32–)57(–33), fol. 85r (with quire numbers highlighted).
Fig. 8: The scribe's colophons of Sin.georg. 32–57–33 (fols. 273v–274r).

Fig. 9: The binder's colophon and the ‘Praise of the Georgian Language’ (Sin.georg. 32–57–33, fols. 274v–275r).
Fig. 10: Front and back fly-leaves of Sin. 32–57–33.

Fig. 11: Scribe’s colophon and additional note of the Adishi Gospels (fol. 387).\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{83} Reproduction from the facsimile edition by Taqaišvili 1916.
## App. 1: The ‘Praise and Exaltation of the Georgian Language’ (Sin. 32–57–33, fol. 275r)\(^8^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kebay da d(ide)b(a)y kart(u)lis a enisay:</th>
<th>Praise and Exaltation of the Georgian Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damarxul ars enay kartuli</td>
<td>The Georgian tongue is buried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d(\text{g})edmdme meored moslvisa misa sa(\text{c})ame-belad:</td>
<td>until the day of his second coming, to witness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r(\text{a}(\text{y}))a q(\text{u}(\text{v}))esa gn(\text{e}(\text{r}))tm(\text{a}(\text{n})) amxilos amit enita:</td>
<td>so that God may convict every tongue through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da ese enay m(\text{z})inare ars d(\text{g})esamomde</td>
<td>this tongue.(^8^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da saxarebasa (\text{S})(\text{i})(\text{n})a (\text{a})(\text{m})(\text{a})(\text{s}) enasa laza(\text{r})e h(\text{r})(\text{k})(\text{w})an.</td>
<td>And this tongue is sleeping until today,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da axalman nino moakcia da h(\text{e})(\text{l})(\text{e})(\text{n})e dedopal-man:</td>
<td>and in the Gospels this tongue is called Lazarus.(^8^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ese a(\text{r})(\text{i})(\text{a})(\text{n}) orni dani, v((\text{i})(\text{t})ar(\text{c}))a m(\text{a})(\text{r})(\text{i})(\text{a})(\text{m})a da m(\text{a})(\text{r})(\text{t})(\text{a})(\text{y}:</td>
<td>And it was converted by the new Nino and by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da megobrobay amistws tk(u)a v((\text{i})(\text{t})ar(\text{c}))d q(\text{u}(\text{v}))li sa(\text{i})(\text{d})umloy (\text{a})(\text{m})(\text{s}) enasa (\text{S})(\text{i})(\text{n})a damarxul ars</td>
<td>Queen Helena,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>these are two sisters, like Mary and Martha.(^8^8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{8^4}\) For the text version of Sin.georg. 6 (fol. 223v) see Garitte 1956, 21; for that of Sin.georg. 38 (fol. 144r), Cagareli 1888, 203 (no. 12). The version in Sin.georg. 6 is the only one in Asomtavruli script. The text of Sin. 32–57–33 was first published by Marr 1940, 26.

\(^{8^5}\) See Jo. 16.8: *da igi movides da amxilos sopelsa codvatatws da simartlisatws da sas\(\text{z}\)elisatws* ‘and he will come and will convict the world because of sins and justice and judgment’.

\(^{8^6}\) See Jo. 11.11: *lazare, megobarman \(\text{c}\)\(\text{u}\)\(\text{e}\)nman, da\(\text{i}\)\(\text{z}\)\(\text{i}\)\(\text{n}\)a, aramed me mivide da ganva\(\text{gw}\)\(\text{z}\)o igi* ‘Lazarus, our friend, is sleeping, but I will go and wake him up’.

\(^{8^7}\) For Sin.georg. 38, Cagareli notes *elin\(\text{t}\)i dedupalman elene*, obviously by interference of *elin-i* ‘Hellen, Greek person’; however, the manuscript has plain *helene dedupalman*.

\(^{8^8}\) See Jo. 11.1–3: *da ig\(\text{i}\)\(\text{g}\)o v\(\text{n}\)me sneul lazare betaniayt, dabit mariamisit da martaysit, disa misa.* ... *miavlines misa data mista da h\(\text{r}\)\(\text{k}\)ues... And there was one sick (person named) Lazarus, from Bethania, from the village of Mariam and Martha, her sister. ... His sisters sent (a message) to him and said ...’. – St. Nino, according to the legend coeval with St. Helena, the mother of King Constantine I, is regarded as the converter of Georgia.
Da otxisa dğiṣa mḳ(u)dari amistws tk(u)a davit č(ina)č(armet)q̇(ue)lm(a)n, r(amezu) čeli atasi v(itarc)a erti dği̧e. and ‘dead for four days’ (he) said

Da sasar(e)basā šina kartulsa tavs(ola) matēssa (because) David the Prophet (said) that ‘1000 years (is) like one day’.90

c̣ili(2) zis, r(ome)l asoy ars And in the Georgian Gospels, only in the Gospel (lit. chapter) of Matthew, da itq̇ws q̇(ov)lad otxatassa maragsa: sits a c̣ili, which is the letter (Ῥ = c),92 and it means all in all the number 4000.93
daq̄ esa erši otxi dği̧e: da otxisa dğiṣa mḳ(u)dari And this is the four days and he who is dead for four days, therefore it is buried with him through the death of his baptism.94

amistws mis tanave dapluli sḳ(u)dili̧ta natlis-gebisa misisayta: And this tongue, adorned and blessed by the name of the Lord,
da ese enay, Ŧemḳuli da kurt(eu)li saxelita (yet) humiliated and reviled, o(wpl)isayta is waiting for the day of the second coming of the Lord.
mdabali da daçunebuli And this it has as a miracle:
moelis dği̧sa mas meored moslvasa And all this, which is written, o(wpl)isasa I have told you as a witness,
a(ṣ)e ars otxi dği̧e: da otxisa dğiṣa mḳ(u)dari I, the letter c̣il of the alphabet.
dasaṣ(au)lad ese akus And this tongue, adorned and blessed by the name of the Lord,
oktimoc da atotxmeṭi čeli utetēs sxuata enata (yet) humiliated and reviled, k(risṭ)ēs mislvit(a)n v(idr)e dğiṣamomde is waiting for the day of the second coming of the Lord.
Da ese q̇(ove)li r(ome)lim(95) čeril ars And this tongue, adorned and blessed by the name of the Lord,
omčamed čarmogitxar (yet) humiliated and reviled,
asoy ese c̣ili(96) anbanisay. is waiting for the day of the second coming of the Lord.

89 See Jo. 11.17: movida iesu da ṗova otxdġisay samaresa šina ‘and Jesus came and found (him having been) in the grave for four days.’
90 See Ps. 89 [90].4: rametu atasi čeli tualtča činaše uplisata vitarca gušindeli dği̧e, romel çarqda da vitarca saqumilaivi erti ǧamisay ‘for 1000 year(s) before the eyes of the Lord (are) like yesterday’s day that has passed, and like one night watch.
91 All three manuscripts have cerili ‘writing, script’ instead of c̣ili ‘part; (name of the) letter c’.
92 In Georgian, the Gospel of Matthew begins with the word cigni ‘book’ ~ Greek Βίβλος ‘id.’.
93 The letter c = c̣ili has the numerical value of 4000 in the Georgian alphabet.
94 See Rom. 6,4: da tana-daveplenit mas natlis-ġebita mit sikudilsa missa ‘and we were buried together with him in his death by being baptised’.
95 According to Cagareli’s transcript (1888), Sin.georg. 38 omits romeli ‘which’; this information is wrong, however.
96 The Sinai Mravaltavi and Sin.georg. 38 have asi ese čeli, which would mean something like ‘these 100 years’ instead; Sin.georg. 6 has moçamed čamogitxras ese cili anbanisay, which means something like ‘it will tell you as a witness, this (letter) c̣ili (or part) of the alphabet’. Together with the restitution of asoy ‘letter’ for asi ‘hundred’, this yields the most coherent text version.
App. 2: The ‘mravaltavi’ palimpsest S-3902

Ms. S–3902, fol. 7r–2v\(^7\)

---

97 The marking system used here is that developed for the edition of the Vienna palimpsest (see Gippert et al. 2007, p. xxxv), except for curly braces denoting reconstructed text passages, and angle brackets, restored abbreviations here.
(John Chrysostom, On the Envy of the Pharisees)

7ra

1 7rανλβομεν
2 7ρανλβομενον
3 7ηλορεωμενον
4 7ημηρομενον
5 7απαντησομεν
6 7ομηρομενον
7 7ομηρομενον
8 7ομηρομενον
9 7ομηρομενον
10 7ομηρομενον
11 7ομηρομενον
12 7ομηρομενον
13 7ομηρομενον
14 7ομηρομενον
15 7ομηρομενον
16 7ομηρομενον
17 7ομηρομενον
18 7ομηρομενον
19 7ομηρομενον
20 7ομηρομενον
21 7ομηρομενον
22 7ομηρομενον

7rb

1 7υμηρομενον
2 7υμηρομενον
3 7υμηρομενον
4 7υμηρομενον
5 7υμηρομενον
6 7υμηρομενον
7 7υμηρομενον
8 7υμηρομενον
9 7υμηρομενον
10 7υμηρομενον
11 7υμηρομενον
12 7υμηρομενον
13 7υμηρομενον
14 7υμηρομενον
15 7υμηρομενον
16 7υμηρομενον
17 7υμηρομενον
18 7υμηρομενον
19 7υμηρομενον
20 7υμηρομενον
21 7υμηρομενον
22 7υμηρομενον
κομήζει. 
Καί ἐδεδύσοντος οἱ Φαρισαῖοι 
συμβούλιον ἔλαβον, 
ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν. 
{"Ὡ συμβούλια κακίστη διὰ 
φθόνου στειρομένη, καὶ διὰ 
φθόνου ἐλεγχομένη! ὥς ματαί 
βουλή! Ἀγνοοῦσι γὰρ, ὅτι 
Θεὸς οὐκ ἀπόλλυται. Τὸν 
γὰρ ὁστράκινον λύχνον τοῦ 
σώματος αὐτοῦ διαλύσουσι, 
τὴν λαμπήδα τῆς θεότητος 
σβέσαι οὐ δύνανται.}

 Positioned correctly:  
'Ἡλθεν  
ὁ Ἰσσαοῦ ἀναζητήσαι  
καὶ σώσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,  
καὶ οὕτωι τὸν  
τῶν ἀπολωλότων εὑρέγετην  
ἀπολέσαι ζητοῦσι.  
Διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν,  
ἐπίτετε ἡμῖν, ὦ Ἰουδαῖοι,  
ἐβουλεύσασθε κατ’ αὐτοῦ;  
'ΑΛΛ’ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν

 Table 1
καὶ εἴεξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
συμβούλιον ἔλαβον,
ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

{‘Ω συμβουλία κακίστη διὰ φθόνου
σπειρομένη, καὶ διὰ φθόνον ἐλεγχομένη! ὃ
ματαία βουλή! Ἀγνοοῦσι γὰρ, ὅτι Θεὸς σὺν
ἀνατελά.

καὶ μυστηρίου
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

οὗτοι τὸν

τῶν ἀπολωλῶν εὑρέτην

ἀπολέσαι ζητοῦσι.
Διὰ ποιὰν αἰτίαν,

ἐπιτατ ἡμῖν, Ἰουδαῖοι,
κατ’ αὐτοῦ τοιαῦτα

ἄλλ’ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν

να ἐνέκατοι ἐν ὑμῖν ἑαυτῶν

καὶ μοι σύ 

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

τῶν ἀπολωλῶν εὑρέτην

ἀπολέσαι ζητοῦσι.
Διὰ ποιὰν αἰτίαν,

εἰπάτε ἡμῖν, Ἰουδαῖοι,
κατ’ αὐτοῦ τοιαῦτα

βουλεύεσθε;

᾽Αλλ’ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν

να ἐνέκατοι ἐν ὑμῖν ἑαυτῶν

1 ხორცხოჳენიან, და ხორცხუენიან და აიშონენიან 
2 (3<მოგ>ბ) ოთარმებ (:) b<ოთარ> 
3 აუცილებელი d<გულ> (b<ჯღ>) [d<მრჸ>][<ოთ>][<მო>] [და] 
4 ოთარმებიანი ოთარ 
5 ([ოთ]) გულია, [: —] 
6 [3<მოგ>ხ] ხორცხლია, () გის <ჯღ> ოთარმებ (b<ჯღ>) 
7 (3<მოგ>) პალანული ოთარმები ჟ სოლი 
8 (3<ჯღ>) ოთარმები სულოვი (:) აუცილებლი და ჰევლი 
9 გამხიბდება ჟ (:) ჟუდე 
10 ახანგ თაობმებრ, ჰევლი 
11 ბუქში და ბუქუალმაჟბი (:) ჟ სოლი 
12 გულწმეტა ჯაფრი (3<ჯღ>) შუქია 
13 ტაბლის ოთარმები (:) ჟ ტაუბ 
14 ჯგუდ<შუქ>ჯილამი ჯგუდი ჯგუდი 
15 (3<ჯღ>) დაქვრა(3[ჯღ])[ჯღ] და 3<ჯღ> 
16 (3<ჯღ>) ჯილამი (:) (იო ბაჟ) 
17 (3<ჯღ>) ჯილამი <შუქ> <3<ჯღ> ჯილამი მორამზო ჟ 6<არ> 6<არ> [3<ჯღ> (3<ჯღ>) 
18 პანთა ტა ჰეკლიმათა ბულშემები აუთო ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდეს, აჟობა (, :) ბაიაჲ ობდეს, აჟობა 
19 პანთა ტა ჰეკლიმათა ბულშემები აუთო ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდეს, აჟოบა (, :) ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდეს, აჟობა 
20 ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდ ავარს (, :) ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდეს, აჟობა (, :) ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდეს, აჟობა 
21 ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდ ავარს (, :) ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდეს, აჟობა (, :) ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდეს, აჟობა 
22 ბაიაჲ ობდეს ობდეს ობდ
αἰσχύνονται
λέγειν
ἡμεῖς τήν
αὐτῶν
αἰσχύνην πανταχὺ στηλιτεύσωμεν.

Διὰ τί γὰρ, φησὶ,

νεκροὺς ἐγέρει;
καὶ διὰ τί ἁθενοῦντας
ίταται;
διὰ τί καλὰ λαλεῖ; διὰ τί καλὰ

πράττει; διὰ τί καλὰ διδάσκει;

Διὰ ταῦτα

πάντα τὰ ἐγκλήματα

βουλεύονται αὐτὸν

ἀπολέσαι.

"Όταν ἐξέρχονται νήπιοι παιδεῖς

καὶ τῶν βαἰῶν

καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐφημίᾳ αὐτοῦ

PG 61

Cod.Supr. (402,23)

Usp.Sb.

PG 61

Cod.Supr. (403,1)

Usp.Sb.

καὶ τὰ ἐγκλήματα
βουλεύονται αὐτὸν

χουγέλαμα

ξοιμέλα

πογκάκ

πογκάς

πογγατι ἐγγογατ"ιν ιγο

εγδα μαλαντ ακτιν

βηνε καθισω εις βηνελε εμου

πογκάκ

πογκάς
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7va</th>
<th>S-3902</th>
<th>Šanize BUT 7</th>
<th>BAV Ottob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7va</td>
<td>S-3902</td>
<td>Šanize BUT 7</td>
<td>BAV Ottob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7va</td>
<td>S-3902</td>
<td>Šanize BUT 7</td>
<td>BAV Ottob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7va</td>
<td>S-3902</td>
<td>Šanize BUT 7</td>
<td>BAV Ottob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7va</td>
<td>S-3902</td>
<td>Šanize BUT 7</td>
<td>BAV Ottob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7va</td>
<td>S-3902</td>
<td>Šanize BUT 7</td>
<td>BAV Ottob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7va</td>
<td>S-3902</td>
<td>Šanize BUT 7</td>
<td>BAV Ottob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7va</td>
<td>S-3902</td>
<td>Šanize BUT 7</td>
<td>BAV Ottob.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PG 61</th>
<th>Cod.Supr. (403,1)</th>
<th>Usp.Sb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λέγοντες, Ὄσαννὰ</td>
<td>γλασαλιτε ὅσαννα</td>
<td>γλασαλιτε ὅσαννα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τοῖς υφίστοις,</td>
<td>ἐν βυθώμασιν</td>
<td>ἐν βυθώμασιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πάνεται</td>
<td>πάνεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>γράδαν</td>
<td>γράδαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκ νηλά ποσοῦ</td>
<td>ἐκ νηλά κ{'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἠς ἵδρυσεν</td>
<td>ἠς ἵδρυσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκεῖνοι ἀπὸ τῶν ζβήνων σφατόμενοι</td>
<td>τυγδα οἰνί ἄκτα</td>
<td>τυγδα οἰνί ἄκτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐστίνας</td>
<td>ἐστίνας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπὸ τοῦ φθόνου κεντοῦνται</td>
<td>βοδομι</td>
<td>βοδομι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ξηθῆ</td>
<td>ξογος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σκρύκτααχοχ χαλας</td>
<td>σκρύκτααχοχ χαλας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
<td>ἔπαινοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων</td>
<td>ἔπαινοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
<td>σουτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων</td>
<td>σουτи</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ προσέρχονται</td>
<td>ἵ προσφάτῃ</td>
<td>ἵ προσφάτῃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
<td>καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
<td>καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων,</td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων.</td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ προσέρχονται</td>
<td>ἵ προσφάτῃ</td>
<td>ἵ προσφάτῃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
<td>καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
<td>καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων</td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων.</td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Καὶ προσέρχονται</td>
<td>Καὶ προσέρχονται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
<td>τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων</td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων.</td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Καὶ προσέρχονται</td>
<td>Καὶ προσέρχονται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
<td>τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
<td>οἱ γὰρ ἐπαινοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων</td>
<td>τῶν φθονουμένων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
<td>βέλη εἰσι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων.</td>
<td>τῶν φθονούντων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7vb</td>
<td>S-3902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3&lt;ονοβεπγ&gt;  )</td>
<td>(3) oνοος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(θελεμαν δηι) θελεμαν</td>
<td>θελεμαν δηιοσθενα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(καθισμοσγοι) [θ]</td>
<td>καθισμοσγοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[κηδοι]</td>
<td>κηδοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[οχωλ-ο] (δο οχο) [μαι] (μα)</td>
<td>οχωλ-ο (δο οχο) [μαι] (μα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>θεοι [θ] (θεοι) [θ] (θεοι)</td>
<td>θεοι [θ] (θεοι) [θ] (θεοι)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[ζο] [ζο]</td>
<td>[ζο] [ζο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>οχο οιονιονκαν</td>
<td>οχο οιονιονκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(μο) [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
<td>(μο) [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>θεοι [θ] (θεοι) [θ] (θεοι)</td>
<td>θεοι [θ] (θεοι) [θ] (θεοι)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>θεοι [θ] (θεοι) [θ] (θεοι)</td>
<td>θεοι [θ] (θεοι) [θ] (θεοι)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[ζο] [ζο]</td>
<td>[ζο] [ζο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>[ζο] [ζο]</td>
<td>[ζο] [ζο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>[ζο] [ζο]</td>
<td>[ζο] [ζο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(μο) [μο] (μο) [μο]</td>
<td>(μο) [μο] (μο) [μο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>[μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
<td>[μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
<td>δο [μο] [μο] [μο] [μο]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
τὸ, Ἐκ στόματος νηπίων
καὶ δηλαζόντων
κατηρτίσω
ʹΟτε Ἰεζάβελ
κατὰ τοῦ Ναβοῦδε τὰ πλαστὰ
ἐποίει γράμματα,
γράφει καὶ ἰδέως
ἀνέχεσθε∙
ὁτε Πιλᾶτος γράφει
ἐπὶ τοῦ τίτλου
τὰ χρηστὰ
γράμματα,
ἀγανακτεῖτε,
καὶ κωλύετε γράφεσθαι.
Τί γὰρ λέγουσι;
Μὴ γράφε, ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς
tῶν ᾿Ιουδαίων.
Μὴ γράφε, ἀντὶ τοῦ,
Τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τοῦ Μηδείς

PG 61

Cod.Supr. (403,9)

Usp.Sb.

ἄνεξαρτητά ὕποπτον
ἐκ τοῦ στόμου νηπίων
καὶ ἐκλείποντος
κατηρτίσω
ʹΟτε Ἰεζάβελ
κατὰ τοῦ Ναβοῦδε τὰ πλαστὰ
ἐποίει γράμματα,
γράφει καὶ ἰδέως
ἀνέχεσθε∙
ὁτε Πιλᾶτος γράφει
ἐπὶ τοῦ τίτλου
τὰ χρηστὰ
gράμματα,
ἀγανακτεῖτε,
καὶ κωλύετε γράφεσθαι.
Τί γὰρ λέγουσι;
Μὴ γράφε, ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς
tῶν ᾿Ιουδαίων.
Μὴ γράφε, ἀντὶ τοῦ,
Τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τοῦ Μηδείς

PG 61

Cod.Supr. (403,16)

Usp.Sb.