

Achtung!

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Kapitels
„Catalogues of Georgian Manuscripts“
von Jost Gippert und Bernard Outtier (2014).
Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe in
Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies. An Introduction
Hamburg: COMSt 2015, 487–489
zu entnehmen.

Attention!

This is a special internet edition of the chapter
“Catalogues of Georgian Manuscripts”
by Jost Gippert and Bernard Outtier (2014).
It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the original edition in
Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies. An Introduction
Hamburg: COMSt 2015, 487–489.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:

Jost Gippert, Frankfurt 2015

2.5. Catalogues of Georgian manuscripts (JG–BO)

Academic research into Georgian manuscripts—about 75,000 manuscript leaves (see General introduction § 3.8)—began rather late, in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first investigations were not quite what we could characterize as catalogues, but simply notices about manuscripts sent from St Petersburg to the French *Société asiatique* by the Georgian prince Teimouraz; they contain nothing but an enumeration of the general content of the four manuscripts in question (Brosset 1833). Remarkably enough, in the course of the nineteenth century, all descriptions of collections of Georgian manuscripts are about manuscripts kept abroad.

In May, 1845, N. Čubinov (Čubinašvili) undertook the first examination of Georgian manuscripts preserved in the Monastery of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem. His account, which addresses but a minor number of manuscripts, is confined to transcripts of colophons and a few superficial observations; it was only published 50 years after Čubinov's sojourn in Jerusalem (Čubinašvili 1894).

In his *Anecdota sacra et profana* of 1855 (slightly revised in 1861), Constantin Tischendorf provided the first descriptions of Georgian manuscripts, including palimpsests, that were taken by him 'itinerare orientali' to Leipzig. It is noteworthy that for five Greek palimpsests (his nos. VIII, IX, XII, XIII, XV, 8–13), the overwriting is still declared to be Armenian in his descriptions, a mistake corrected by Tischendorf himself in the table of content of his work ('Index Libri', xi–xii: 'rescripta sunt Georgice, non ut in textu dictum est Armeniace'). His description of Georgian manuscripts proper (Codd. Tisch. XXXIX–XLIII of the Leipzig collection; 74–75) is confined to an indication of the size and format of the manuscripts, with a short indication of their contents and their age (for example, 'satis vestustus').

In 1886 and 1888, Aleksandre Cagareli (Tsagareli) provided the first detailed descriptions of Georgian manuscripts kept on Mount Athos (Ivion), in Jerusalem and on Mount Sinai. He indicates the content, the measures, the number of leaves, the material, the date and the type of script, sometimes adding indications on a particular text (*incipits*) or scribe (part of colophons). Cagareli's work meant great progress in Georgian manuscript studies indeed, but his descriptions were still rather imprecise so that Gérard Garitte was not able to identify with Cagareli's account eighteen of the ninety-six manuscripts he saw during his re-investigation of the Georgian manuscripts of St Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai in 1950 (Cagareli 1886, 1888a, 1888b; Garitte 1956, see below).

The Georgian manuscripts of Jerusalem and Mount Sinai were re-investigated by Nikolaj Marr and Ivane Žavaxišvili (Javakhishvili) in 1902. The catalogues provided by them were published considerably later (Marr 1940, 1955; Žavaxišvili 1947); they give much more detailed descriptions of both the format and the contents of the manuscripts dealt with, including transcripts of larger text passages (sometimes complete texts) and colophons. It is clear from Marr's survey of the Jerusalem manuscripts that some of the items described by Cagareli were no longer present in the collection of the Monastery of the Holy Cross after this had been removed to the Greek patriarchate by the end of the nineteenth century; some of these items later re-appeared in other collections (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek; Washington, Dumbarton Oaks; Peradze 1940, Gippert et al. 2007a). The same is true for some of the Sinai manuscripts, which are now kept in Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, or, for parts, at other places (Šaniže 1929; Outtier 1972; Imnaišvili 2004).

The investigation of Georgian manuscripts preserved within Georgia was initiated by the beginning of the twentieth century when Tevdore Žordania, Mose Žanašvili (Džanašvili, Janashvili), Ekvtime Taqaišvili (Takajšvili) and David Ķaričašvili published the first catalogues of the collections of the former 'Ecclesiastical Museum' (now the 'A' collection of the National Centre for Manuscripts, Tbilisi; Žordania – Žanašvili 1902–1908) and the 'Society for the Promotion of Literacy among the Georgian Population' (now the 'S' collection of the National Centre for Manuscripts, Tbilisi; Taqaišvili 1902–1912 and Ķaričašvili 1905). These descriptions remained rather superficial and unbalanced even though they added valuable types of information such as, for example, the identification of water-marks of paper manuscripts, and sometimes even full collations of the texts contained; for example, Taqaišvili provides a full account of the 'History of Kartli' in his description of manuscript no. 74, including ninety pages concerning textual variants (Taqaišvili 1902, 1908 and 1912).

In his catalogues of the Georgian manuscripts of Jerusalem and Mount Athos, Robert Pierpont Blake was the first to pay real attention to a codicological description of the manuscripts, including information as to their binding, quires, dimensions of the written area, ink, and punctuation. He very briefly indicates the content of the colophons but does not give their text in full. For each text, he provides an *incipit*, indicates the presumptive model if the text is a translation, and bibliographical information if the text has been published (Blake 1922–1923, 1924, 1925–1926, 1932a, 1932b, 1933).

Full codicological descriptions can be found in the catalogue of the 'literary' Georgian manuscripts of Mount Sinai worked out by Garitte in 1950. Garitte adds indications about ruling and ornamentation and provides the full text of the copyists' notes and colophons as well as a bibliography of each manuscript; for the texts, he gives titles, *incipits* and *desinitis*. He also adds a very detailed index. In order not to duplicate the work undertaken by Marr and Žavaxišvili, he confined himself with the description of non-strictly liturgical manuscripts as these were dealt with in detail by his predecessors (Garitte 1956).

Even in the twentieth century, we still find catalogues with more simple descriptions, especially for minor collections in Europe. This is true, for example, for Frédéric Macler's and Ekvtime Taqaišvili's descriptions of the Georgian manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Macler 1908; Taqaišvili

1933), Paul Peeters' and David Barrett's accounts of the Georgian manuscripts in Oxford (Peeters 1912; Barrett 1973, 305–354), Jan Braun's account of the Georgian manuscripts in Poland (Braun 1958), or Gregor Peradze's catalogue of the Georgian manuscripts in Austria (1940). More detailed investigations have been provided for the Leningrad / St Petersburg collection (Orbeli 1956; Ceraze – Xoperia 2009; Ceraze forthcoming), the Georgian manuscripts in Germany (Assfalg 1963a), or the Georgian manuscripts in the Mingana collection at Birmingham (Garitte 1960).

In 1946, the Georgian Academy of Sciences initiated the project of a comprehensive cataloguing (in Georgian) of the Georgian manuscripts kept in Georgia and abroad. So far, a total of twenty two volumes describing the four major collections of the former K. Kekelidze Institute of Manuscripts (now styled the National Centre of Manuscripts) at Tbilisi have been published ('H' collection: six volumes, Kutatelaze – Ƙasraze 1946; Kutatelaze 1951; Šarašize 1948; Meparišvili 1949; Metreveli 1950; Ƙasraze et al. 1953; 'Q' collection: two volumes, Metreveli et al. 1957–1958; Bregaze et al. 1958; 'S' collection: seven volumes, Bregaze et al. 1959; Bakraze et al. 1961; Erukize et al. 1963; Bregaze et al. 1965, 1967, 1969, 1973a; 'A' collection: six volumes, Bregaze et al. 1973b, 1976, 1980, 1985, 1986, 2004). These catalogues provide precise codicological descriptions throughout, including detailed indexes, but no reproductions. The same is true for the catalogues of the Historical Archive at Tbilisi (two volumes, ƘaƘabaže – Gagošize 1949–1950), the Marx Library at Tbilisi (Čikvašvili 1964), the Historico-Ethnographical Museum at Kutaisi (two volumes, NiƘolaze 1953–1964), the Axalcixe Museum (Abulaze et al. 1987), and the Museum of Gori (Bregaze – Ƙaxabrišvili 2002), but also for the catalogues of foreign collections that were published in Georgia (Mount Sinai: three volumes, Metreveli et al. 1978; ČanƘievi – Žğamaia 1979; Gvaramia et al. 1987; Mount Athos: Axobaže et al. 1986). The catalogue of the Georgian manuscripts discovered among the 'New Finds' of St Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai (Aleksize et al. 2005; published in three languages: English, Greek, and Georgian) has been the first to add sample images of each manuscript described.

Some collections still want detailed descriptions. This is true, for example, for the collections of the museum of Mestia in Svanetia (but cf. Silogava 1986, 41–60). Among foreign collections, we are still missing a thorough account of the Georgian manuscripts kept in the Matenadaran in Yerevan, Armenia, or in the Armenian patriarchate in Jerusalem (but cf. Outtier 1986).

References

- Abulaze et al. 1987; Aleksize et al. 2005; Assfalg 1963a; Assfalg – Molitor 1962; Axobaže et al. 1986; Bakraze et al. 1961; Barrett 1973; Blake 1922–1923, 1924, 1925–1926, 1932ab, 1933; Braun 1958; Bregaze – Ƙaxabrišvili 2002; Bregaze et al. 1958, 1959, 1965, 1967, 1969, 1973a, 1973b, 1976, 1980, 1985, 1986, 2004; Brosset 1833; Cagareli 1886, 1888a, 1888b, 1889; ČanƘievi – Žğamaia 1979; Ceraze – Xoperia 2009; Ceraze forthcoming; Čikvašvili 1964; Čubinašvili 1894; Erukize et al. 1963; Garitte 1956, 1960; Gippert et al. 2007a; Gvaramia et al. 1987; Imnaišvili 2004; ƘaƘabaže – Gagošize 1949–1950; Ƙaričašvili 1905; Ƙasraze et al. 1953; Kavtaria 2002; Kutatelaze 1951; Kutatelaze – Ƙasraze 1946; Macler 1908; Marr 1940, 1955; Meparišvili 1949; Metreveli 1950; Metreveli et al. 1957–1958, 1978; Metreveli et al. 1978; NiƘolaze 1953–1964; Orbeli 1956; Outtier 1972, 1986; Peeters 1912; Peradze 1940; Šanize 1929; Šarašize 1948; Silogava 1986; Taƣaišvili 1902–1912, 1933; Tischendorf 1855, 1861; Žavaxišvili 1947; Žordania – Žanašvili 1902–1908.