

Achtung!

Dies ist eine Preprint-Version des Aufsatzes
„A Homily Attributed to John Chrysostom (CPG 4640)
in a Georgian Palimpsest“

von Jost Gippert (2016).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Druckausgabe in
Francesca P. Barone, Caroline Macé, Pablo A. Ubierna (Hrsgg.),
Philologie, herméneutique et histoire des textes entre Orient et Occident.
Mélanges en hommage à Sever J. Voicu
(Instrumenta Patristica et Medievalia, 73),
Turnhout: Brepols 2017, 895–927
zu entnehmen.

Attention!

This is a preprint version of the article
“A Homily Attributed to John Chrysostom (CPG 4640)
in a Georgian Palimpsest”
by Jost Gippert (2016).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the printed
edition in

Francesca P. Barone, Caroline Macé, Pablo A. Ubierna (eds),
Philologie, herméneutique et histoire des textes entre Orient et Occident.
Mélanges en hommage à Sever J. Voicu
(Instrumenta Patristica et Medievalia, 73),
Turnhout: Brepols 2017, 895–927.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:

Jost Gippert, Frankfurt 2020

A Homily Attributed to John Chrysostom (CPG 4640) in a Georgian Palimpsest

Jost GIPPERT
(Frankfurt / Main)

0.1 In the study of the written traditions of the Caucasus, palimpsest manuscripts play an outstanding role as they have, in their lower layers, in many cases preserved the most ancient specimens of important texts or text versions that have come down to us. This is especially true for the Old Georgian tradition as most of the texts of the so-called *Khanmeti* and *Haemeti* periods (covering roughly the fifth to seventh and seventh to eighth centuries) are only available as underwritings in parchment palimpsests. A very important example of these has been published *in extenso* a few years ago,¹ viz. the famous Codex Wien, ÖNB, georg. 2, which contains fragments of six different *Khanmeti* manuscripts comprising Biblical texts from the Old and New Testaments as well as hagiographical texts. The edition project, which was kindly supported by the Volkswagen Foundation, Germany, has greatly profited from the adaptation of modern technology to enhance the readability of the erased or washed out lower script. The same technology, which consists in multispectral digitised imaging,² has also been successfully applied in the preparation of the *editio*

¹ Cf. *The Old Georgian Palimpsest Codex Vindob. georg. 2*, edited by J. GIPPERT in co-operation with L. KAJAIA and Z. SARJVELADZE, Turnhout, 2007 (*Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi, Series ibero-caucasica*, 1).

² For a description of the imaging technique cf. J. GIPPERT, “The Application of Multispectral Imaging in the Study of Caucasian Palimpsests”, *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences / Sakartvelos mecnierrebata erovnuli akademiis moambe* 175 / 1, 2007, p. 168-179.

princeps of the “Albanian” palimpsests uncovered in St Catherine’s Monastery on Mt. Sinai.³

0.2 The Korneli Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts in Tbilisi hosts a large collection of Old Georgian manuscripts that are palimpsests (all in all more than 4500 manuscript folios), among them the *Khanmeti* and *Haemeti* palimpsests S-3902, H-999, A-89, A-844, and H-1329. Only in very few cases, the lower layers of these invaluable codices have been accessible for reading so far, and only a handful of partial editions have been published. In the course of the project on the Vienna palimpsest, the multispectral imaging technology was also applied to parts of these palimpsests in order to judge the prospects of a thorough decipherment of their lower layers, with a view to achieving improved readings and more reliable interpretations of the texts they conceal. The present paper summarises the results of the preliminary application of a multispectral analysis with ms. S-3092 achieved during the test runs undertaken in 2005.⁴

0.3 The fourteenth- to fifteenth-century lectionary manuscript S-3902⁵ comprises in its lower layer the fragments of a homiliary written in majuscule (*Asomtavruli*) letters which can be dated to the *Khanmeti* period, probably the seventh century.⁶ A

³ Cf. *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mt. Sinai*, edited by J. GIPPERT, W. SCHULZE, Z. ALEKSIDZE and J.-P. MAHÉ, Turnhout, 2008-2009 (*Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi, Series ibero-caucasica*, 2).

⁴ The test runs were undertaken by L. Kajaia, D. Tvaltvaдзе, S. Sardjveladze, G. Aleksidze and the present author; their results were first reported 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”; the conference volume has not yet appeared in print).

⁵ The lectionary in the upper layer of the manuscript is of the later (Byzantine) type, covering the Easter Cycle. For a brief account of the manuscript cf. M. VAN ESBROECK, *Les plus anciens homéliaires géorgiens: étude descriptive et historique*, Louvain, 1975, p. 60-61. The catalogue by T. BREGAŽE et al., *Kartul xelnaçerta aqçeriloba, qopili Kartvelta šoris çera-kiłxvis gamavrcelebeli sazogadoebis* (S) *kolleckia*, t. V, Tbilisi, 1967, p. 285 styles it a “collected Gospel” manuscript (“*gamokrebeli saxareba*”).

⁶ Cf. J. GIPPERT, “Siaxleni xanmeṭobidan”, *Enatmecnierebis saqilxebi / Issues of Linguistics*, 1-2 (2009), p. 164-184 (German version on <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/personal/jg/pdf/jg2009cd.pdf>) as to the linguistic characteristics of *Khanmeti* texts and *Codex Vindob. georg.* 2, p. xxvi-xxxi as to the possibility of establishing a relative chronology of *Khanmeti* fragments on paleographical grounds (including the use of abbreviations). – For a second (later)

first attempt at editing the remnants of this so-called *Khanmeti Mravallavi*⁷ was undertaken by the Georgian scholar Aḳaḳi Šaniḷe as early as 1927.⁸ Depending on the readability of the lower script, the amount of text Šaniḷe 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” (CPG 4640), of which about one half is comprised in the palimpsest.⁹ Many details concerning this Pseudo-Chrysostomian homily have been elucidated by Sever Voicu; the present study is meant to be a modest *antidoron* to him.

1. The Greek text and the Slavonic and Coptic versions

The homily on the “Envy of the Pharisees” (in the Georgian palimpsest: ფარისეველთა მათ შოჯროსათჳს) relates to the pas-

original manuscript contained in the lower layer of S-3902 cf. J. GIPPERT, “*Mravallavi* – A Special Type of Old Georgian Multiple-Text Manuscripts”, in *One-Volume Libraries: Composite and Multiple-Text Manuscripts*, ed. by M. Friedrich, C. Schwarke, Berlin / Boston, 2016 (*Studies in Manuscript Cultures*, 9), p. 47-91 (here: p. 70, n. 76).

⁷ For the term *mravallavi*, lit. “multi-headed”, cf. J. GIPPERT, “*Mravallavi*”, p. 47-55.

⁸ A. ŠANIḶE, “Xanmeti mravallavi”, *Tpilis universitetis moambe / Bulletin de l'Université de Tiflis*, 7 (1927), p. 98-159; the texts were re-edited (without indication of the line structure) and translated into Latin by J. MOLITOR, *Monumenta Iberica Antiquiora; textus chanmeti et haemeti ex inscriptionibus*, S. Biblii et patribus, Louvain, 1956 (CSCO, 166; *Subsidia*, 10), p. 65-90.

⁹ The other homilies fragments of which are contained in S-3902 are: (Pseudo-) John Chrysostom, *In diem natalem* (CPG 4334; no. 1 in A. ŠANIḶE's edition); *De baptismo domini nostri* (~ CPG 4571; no. 2); *In ramos palmarum* (CPG 4602; no. 4); *In illud: Collegerunt Iudaei* (CPG 4579; no. 7); *Lectio sanctae feriae quintae* (~ Severian of Gabala, *De lotione pedum*, CPG 4216; no. 8); *De integritate* (~ Severian of Gabala, *De laudatione puerorum et de sessione domini super pullum*, CPG 4287; nos 9 and 11); *De annuntiatione* (~ Antipater of Bostra, *In s. Iohannem Baptistam*, CPG 6680; no. 10); Julian of Tabia, *De baptismo domini nostri* (CPG 6155; no. 3); Hesychius of Jerusalem, *De mortuorum resurrectione* (CPG 6581; no. 5); (anonymous), *In meretricem et pharisaeum* (no. 12; this is not CPG 4641 – possibly it pertains to nos 9 and 11, cf. M. TARCHINIŠVILI, “Les récentes découvertes épigraphiques et littéraires en géorgien”, *Le Muséon*, 63 [1950], p. 249-260; here: p. 258). The homily *De invidia Pharisaeorum* is fragment no. 6. For a rough survey cf. M. TARCHINIŠVILI, “Découvertes”, p. 254-259; as to the distribution of the fragments cf. M. VAN ESBROECK, *Homéliaires*, p. 60-61.

sage “But the Pharisees went out and took counsel about him, how to exterminate him” (ხოლო ფარისეველნი იგი გამოვიდეს და ზრახვა-ყვეს მისთვის, რადთა წარწყმიდონ იგი) in Mt. 12,14. It is ascribed to John Chrysostom in Georgian (in the palimpsest, the author is simply named იოჰანე ეპისკოპოსი, “John the Bishop”: f. 3vb, l. 5) as well as other traditions; J. A. de Aldama in his *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum*¹⁰ discusses proposals as to regarding Proclus (Diadochus) or Amphilochius (of Iconium) as the real author, the *ambiente* of the latter having been accepted by Sever Voicu.¹¹

1.1 The Greek text of the homily was published as early as 1612, in vol. 7 of H. Savile’s *editio princeps* of the *corpus Chrysostomianum*,¹² which was the basis for the text published in J.-P. Migne’s *Patrologia Graeca*.¹³ It was Sever Voicu again who first pointed out that the Greek text has survived in more than one form: by collating the beginning of the homily in the four manuscripts containing it in the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana (ms. *Ott.gr.* 14 = “O4”, *Ott.gr.* 85 = “O5”, *Ott.gr.* 179 = “O9”, and *Vat.*

¹⁰ ALDAMA, p. 122, no. 333.

¹¹ S. J. VOICU, “‘Giovanni di Gierusalemme’ e Pseudo-Crisostomo. Saggio di critica di stile”, *Euntes docete*, 24 (1971), p. 98 n. (73): “... proviene presumibilmente da un autore della sua scuola”; p. 111: “Allo stesso ambiente si ricollega ALDAMA 333”. Voicu (*ibid.*; p. 97-98) also supports a closer relation between the present homily and that listed by ALDAMA as no. 113 (*CPG* 4579) which refers to Joh. 11,47, both thematising “la iniqua decisione dei farisei ... contrapposta ai miracoli di Cristo”. In later articles, S. J. Voicu assumes an author with “forti affinità con il mondo cappadoce” or “di matrice cappadoce” (“Tracce origeniane in uno Pseudocrisostomo Cappadoce”, in *Origene e l’alessandrinismo cappadoce* (III-IV secolo). *Atti del V convegno del Gruppo Italiano di ricerca su “Origene e la tradizione alessandrina”* (Bari, 20-22 settembre 2000), ed. by M. GIRARDI, M. MARIN, Bari, 2002, p. 333-346 (here: p. 340); S. J. VOICU, “Per una lista delle opere trasmesse in copto sotto il nome di Giovanni Crisostomo”, in *Christianity in Egypt: Literary Production and Intellectual Trends. Studies in Honor of Tito Orlandi*, ed. by P. BUZI and A. CAMPLANI, Rome, 2011 (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, 125), p. 575-610 (here: p. 586).

¹² *Tou en agiois patros emōn Iōannou archiepiskopou Kōnstantinoupoleōs lou Xrysostomou tōn euriskomenōn tomos ebdomos*, Etonae, 1612, p. 325-329; the title of the homily is “ΕΙΣ ΤΟ, ΕΞΕΛΑΘΟΝΤΕΣ ΟΙ ΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΟΙ ΣΥΜΒΟΤΛΙΟΝ ἔλαβον”.

¹³ Vol. 61, Parisiis, 1862, cols. 705-710; the title here is “Εἰς τὸ, Ἐξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβόλιον ἔλαβον.”

gr. 564 = "V4"), he was able to show that many of the peculiarities of the palimpsest undertext of the codex *Val.gr.* 772, which contains 29 lines of the same homily,¹⁴ are shared by the majority of the later witnesses, opposing themselves to the *textus receptus* of the *PG*.¹⁵ As a matter of fact, we may safely state that there are at least two different recensions of the Greek homily discernible, sharply differentiated by non-trivial characteristics, with the *textus receptus* being represented only by O5 within the Vaticana; in contrast to this, the second recension, which has been made available by M. Capaldo on the basis of O4 in the facsimile edition of the Old Church Slavonic *Codex Suprasliensis*,¹⁶ is much more widespread, comprising, besides O9 and V4, the mss. Barocchi 212 and 241 of the Bodleian Library, Oxford (hereafter: B1 and B2), or the ms. A.f.gr. 1186 of the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris (hereafter: P1).¹⁷ It may suffice here to list some remarkable shibboleths.

a. *PG* 61, col. 707, 2-3 reads ὃν παρθένος ἄρουρα ἄνευ ἄρότρου καὶ σπέρματος ἦνθησε; of the mss. mentioned above, ἄρουρα is only met with in O5.¹⁸

¹⁴ Published by P. ORSINI, "Un foglio palinsesto nel codice *Val.Gr.* 772", in *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae*, 19, Rome, 2012 (*Studi e testi*, 474), p. 457-473.

¹⁵ S. J. VOICU, "Varianti per l'omelia *In illud: Exeuntes Pharisei* (CPG 4640)", in *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae*, 19, Rome, 2012 (*Studi e testi*, 474), p. 639-648.

¹⁶ J. ZAIMOV / M. KAPALDO, *Supraslski ili Relkov sbornik*, t. 2, Sofija, 1983, p. 395-404.

¹⁷ All in all, there are 19 mss. containing the homily listed in the *Pinakes* database (<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/id/8008>), five of which (O5 and O9, B1 and B2, and P1) are accessible online today (P1 as a digitised microfilm: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10722182g>). — S. J. Voicu's assumption ("Varianti", p. 639-640) that Savile's edition was based upon P1 (the source manuscript is simply marked "Ex Ms. Regio Lut." on p. 326 in the margin of the edition) cannot be upheld after inspection, given that it shares all shibboleths (see below) with O4 and the other representants of the second recension. According to *Pinakes*, the ms. Auct. E. 3. 16 (Misc. 051.16) of the Bodleian is "codex R Saulii" (<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/id/47033>); unfortunately, this codex has not been accessible to me. — Note that the text in B2 is not found on f. 40-43v as indicated in *Pinakes* but on f. 33r-36v (http://viewer.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/icv/page.php?book=MS_Barocchi_241&page=85).

¹⁸ F. 178vb, 7-8 (see http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Ott.gr.85/0359/image?page_query=178v&action=pagesearch), with missing accent (cf. S. J.

b. *PG* 61, col. 707, 4-5 reads (ὅν) καὶ δώδεκα κόφινοι τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐτρύγησαν; all mss. mentioned above except for O5 have δέκαδυο instead of δώδεκα.

c. *PG* 61, col. 707, 9-12 reads ἡ τῶν θεομάχων Ἰουδαίων κατὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ῥαπτομένη ἐπίβουλος ἐνέδρα; of the mss. mentioned above, only O5 has ῥαπτομένη, ἐξαπτομένη prevailing in the others.¹⁹

d. *PG* 61, col. 709, 18-19 reads καὶ τὴν ζωὴν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀνατεῖλαι; all mss. mentioned above except for O5 (f. 181va, 9) have κομίζει as the verbal predicate.

e. *PG* 61, col. 709, 26-27 has Ὡ θυμαστοῦ πράγματος, καὶ μυστηρίου καινοῦ! This is found in O5 (f. 181va, 25-27) but not in the other mss. mentioned above; here we read: Ὡ ξένων καὶ παραδόξων πραγμάτων!

f. Immediately before this exclamation, *PG* 61 repeats the reference to Mt. 12.14 (Ἐξεληθόντες δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν), again in agreement with O5 (f. 181va, 22-25) but not with any other one of the mss. mentioned above.

g. Sometimes Savile's text is not even matched by O5. This is true, e.g., for the sentence οὔτοι τὸν τῶν ἀπολωλότων εὐρέτην ἀπολέσαι ζητοῦσι (*PG* 61, col. 709, 28-29); here, O5 agrees with the other mss. mentioned in substituting εὐρέτην by εὐεργέτην (f. 181va, 30-31).

1.2 All the shibboleths listed above (and, of course, many more of the same type found throughout the homily) can also be used to determine the relationship between the Greek recensions and the existing non-Greek versions. This has already been undertaken, implicitly, for the Slavonic version, which has proven to be so close to the text of O4 (i.e., the "second recension") that its editors deemed it worthwhile to establish the text of the latter witness for being printed in parallel with that of the *Codex*

Voicu, "Varianti", p. 643 with n. 14: "Sic in O5, come se l'accento della parola fosse problematico").

¹⁹ The participial phrase (κατὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐξαπτομένη) is missing in O9, f. 125r, 22. S. J. Voicu, "Varianti", p. 647 points out that the "sister" homily on Joh. 11,47 (ALDAMA, nr. 113; *CPG* 4579) has παραπτομένην ἐπίβουλον ἐνέδραν (*PG* 59, col. 525, 19); however, both ῥάπτω and ἐξάπτω go well with ἐπιβουλῇ, in the sense of "forging out" and "igniting" intrigues, the latter verb being supported by раждизати in the Slavonic version.

Suprasliensis. Within the Slavonic tradition, the homily exists a second time, in the so-called *Uspenskij sbornik* of the thirteenth-fourteenth century; except for usual differences in the orthography, this is identical so that it can be taken to derive from the same translation. A remarkable feature of the Slavonic text is met with on f. 199r (l. 2) of the *Codex Suprasliensis* where the equivalent of ὁμῶν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ἐθυσίαζε τοῖς δαιμονίοις, καὶ τοὺς οἴκους τοῦ Θεοῦ τεμένη τῶν εἰδώλων καθίδρυσε; διὰ τί τοιαύτην is missing between ѿгда сынъ ми (read: сынъми) ~ ὅτε τοὺς υἱοὺς and вѣта ~ (βο)υλὴν (οὐκ ἡγάγετε κατὰ τοῦ Ἡρώδου; PG 61, col. 707, 29-32), thus leaving an unintelligible context; the *Uspenskij sbornik* (f. 198a, 20-21) has the same *lacuna* but with съ “with” added before сынъми, and with съвѣта ~ βουλὴν restored to provide a correct syntax.²⁰ This strange *textsprung* is not a feature of the Greek “second recension” as the wording is complete in O9 (f. 125v, 21-24), P1 (f. 41vb, 33-42ra, 5), B1 (f. 241r, 3-5), and B2 (f. 33v, 21-26).

1.3 The Coptic version of the homily is contained on 17 folios of a papyrus preserved (as no. VI) in the Egyptian Museum of Turin. It was edited together with an Italian translation in 1888 by F. Rossi,²¹ who obviously failed to identify the text although he correctly established its title as “(Discorso del beato Apa Giovanni), Arcivescovo di Costantinopoli ... sulla invidia dei sacerdoti e dei farisei verso il nostro Signore Gesù Cristo.”²² By consequence, Rossi did not notice that the folios of the papyrus are arranged in an extremely distorted order; the correct sequence would be 1v – 14vr – 9vr – 13vr – 12vr – 11rv – 10rv – 15rv

²⁰ O. A. KNJAZEVSKAJA / V. G. DEM'JANOV / M. V. LJAPON (under the redaction of S. I. KOTKOV), *Uspenskij sbornik XII-XIII vv.*, Moskva, 1971, p. 331; J. ZAIMOV / M. KAPALDO, *Supraslski*, p. 397, n. 2.

²¹ “Trascrizione con traduzione italiana di due sermoni attribuiti il primo a S. Atanasio Arcivescovo di Alessandria, il secondo a S. Giovanni Crisostomo Arcivescovo di Costantinopoli dai testi copti, appartenenti alla Collezione Egizia del Museo d'Antichità di Torino”, published in *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, serie seconda*, 39, 1889, p. 49-152^{bis} and in *I papiri copti del Museo Egizio di Torino, trascritti e tradotti da F. Rossi*, vol. II fasc. 1, Torino, 1888 [1892], p. 3-104.

²² F. Rossi, “Trascrizione”, p. 50 / 4.

– 2rv – 3rv – 5rv – 4rv – 8rv – 7rv – 6rv – 16rv – 17rv.²³ The Coptic (Sahidic)²⁴ version of the papyrus is reasonably close to the Greek text although it contains some peculiar elements; e.g., before comparing the green colour of the envious with that of the lizard (Ⲅⲁⲩⲣⲁ = Greek σαύρα),²⁵ it refers (on f. 15rb) to Jer. 13,23 (“Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?”) where the Greek text alludes to I Sam. 17,40 (the five stones used by David to attack Goliath; *PG* 61, col. 708, 23-24). Establishing the exact relationship between the Coptic version and the Greek recensions remains an exciting task indeed.

2. The Georgian version

Besides the *Khanmeti* version represented by the Tbilisi palimpsest S-3902, the homily “On the Envy” is present in Old Georgian in two later codices, viz. the so-called *Udabno Mravaltavi* (ms. A-1109 of the Korneli Kekelidze Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi) of the ninth-tenth century²⁶ and manuscript no. 4 of the Greek patriarchate of Jerusalem²⁷ (Jer-4; ca. thirteenth-fourteenth century).

²³ With Rossi's f. 1 representing the actual f. 51 of the papyrus, etc. – The very fact of the order being “en partie fautif” was noted by T. ORLANDI, “Les papyrus coptes du Musée égyptien de Turin”, *Le Muséon*, 87 (1974), p. 115-127 (here: p. 123) but without any attempt to restore the original order.

²⁴ Thus according to T. ORLANDI, *Elementi di lingua e letteratura copta*, Milano, 1970, p. 120 (where reference is made erroneously to Mt. 12,4).

²⁵ The sentence in question (Λέγεται εἶναι σαῦρα χλωρά· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι τῶν φθονερῶν χλωρότερα.) reappears in near-to identical shape in Johannes Damascenus, *Sacra parallela* (recensiones secundum alphabeti litteras dispositae, quae tres libros conflant; fragmenta e cod. *Val.gr.* 1236), *PG* 95, col. 1345, 50, where the object of comparison is the fool (φλύαρος: Λέγεται καὶ σαῦρα χλωρά, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι χλωροτέρα τοῦ φλύαρου), and a similar comparison is also found in the *Corpus Hippocraticum* (*De morbiis* 3, 11, 4) thematising the skin of the jaundiced (ἤκτερος τοιόσδε ἔστιν ὁ ὀξύς καὶ διὰ τὰ χεῖρος ἀποκτείνων· ἡ χροὶ ἔλη σιδιοειδῆς σφόδρα ἔστιν ἢ χλωροτέρη οἷη οἱ σαῦροι οἱ χλωροί).

²⁶ The text has been edited in A. ŠANIȚE / Z. ČUMBURIȚE, *Udabnos mravaltavi*, Tbilisi, 1994, p. 182-183. As to the dating of the *mravaltavi* cf. Z. ČUMBURIȚE in the preface to the edition, p. 9, and J. GIPPERT, “Mravaltavi”, p. 64-65.

²⁷ Cf. the catalogues by R. P. BLAKE, *ROC*, 23 (1922-1923), p. 367, and N. MARI (MARR), *Ierusalimis berznuli sapatriarko cignsacavis kartuli xelnaçer-*

Of all three witnesses, only the last one provides the text in full;²⁸

ebis mokle ajçeriloba, Tbilisi, 1955, p. 48 (ms. 18 no. 12.). The text of the homily was edited on the basis of Jer-4 by M. ŠANIŽE in her article “Homilia ‘Parisevelta šurisatws’ xanmeṭ mravaltavši / The Homily ‘On Jealousy’ in *Khanmeti* Homiliary”, *Enatmecnierebis Saḡilxebi* / *Issues of Linguistics*, I-II, 2009, p. 233-248, attempting to provide a “complemented and reconstructed” version of the *Khanmeti* wording but without taking into account the new readings (of f. 3r and 6v published in the same volume in J. GIPPERT, “Siaxleni”, p. 164-184 – instead of 3ra-6va read 3rb-6vb on p. 182). It is regrettable that the editors of the journal did not inform the two authors about the common subject of their articles before publishing them.

²⁸ For the present purpose, the text of the Jerusalem codex was recollated on the basis of a microfilm stored at the Université Catholique de Louvain; my sincere thanks are due to Caroline Macé and Perrine Pilette for providing scans of the pages in question. Leaving the restored *Khanmeti* forms (here indicated by curly braces) aside, only a few amendments as to M. ŠANIŽE’s text can be noted: f. 65va, l. 9: instead of სსწაულთა თვსთა “their own miracles” read სსწაულთა ი(ესო)ვ(ა)სთა “the miracles of Jesus” ~ τῶν δὲ θαυματουργῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (PG; Σατῆρις 04); f. 65vb, 20-21: instead of წყალსა ღვინოდ გარდა[ხ]იქცევდა “he changed water into wine” read წყ(ა)ლი ღვინოდ გ(ა)რდა[ხ]იქცეოდა “water was changed into wine” ~ Τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς οἶνον μετεβάλλετο; on f. 65vb, 33-34 the ms. has the strange form დაბრმმებოდეს (instead of დაბრმებოდეს “they became blind”, ~ ἐσχοιτίζοντο); on f. 67ra, 18-20, Jer-4 has the nonce formation შურისა ლესველმ(ა)ნ, as if for შურისა მლესველმან “the (person) whetting envy”, correctly restored by M. ŠANIŽE with a sentence boundary inside (ხოლო ბევრეულთა წყაროთა ვერ დაშრიტონ შური. სალესველმან ერთმან გესლი რკინასა გარდაჰკადის “But myriads of wells cannot extinguish envy. One whetstone removes the rust from the iron” ~ τὸν δὲ φθόνον, μαρῖαι πηγὰς διδασκάλων οὐ παύσουσι· μία ἀκόνη τὸν ἰὸν τοῦ σιδηροῦ ἀποσμήχξει); f. 67ra, 27: instead of მოძღუართა “of the teachers” read მოძლ(უ)რებათა “of the teachings” ~ ῥήσεις διδασκάλων; on f. 67rb, 5, the ms. has the unmotivated genitive ი(ესო)ვ(ა)ს “of Jesus”, correctly replaced by the nominative-ergative იესუ by M. ŠANIŽE (იესუ ... დააცხრვო ~ Ἰησοῦς ... κατεπέντισεν); f. 67rb, 21: instead of მოქამდე “until now” read მოქამდენ “id.”; f. 67rb, 32: instead of იგინიმა “may they” read იგინივამცა “may they, too”; in f. 67va, 2, the ms. has a nominative ს(ა)რწმ(უ)ნო “faith” by anticipation of the following relative pronoun, რ(ომელ)ო, replaced by the correct dative სარწმუნოსა by M. ŠANIŽE; f. 67va, 10: instead of რადმე “something” read სამე “somewhere” (აწ ვინ(ა)მ გ(ა)მოვიდეს . სჯ(უ)ლის(ა)გ(ა)ნ სამე და არა შურის(ა)გ(ა)ნ . “Now, from where did they go out? From the law somewhere, and not from envy” ~ Πόθεν ἐξελθόντες [PG]; Οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ φθόνου, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου); f. 67va, 16: instead of გან[ხ]ნათლებს read გან[ხ]ნან(ა)თლებს “enlightens”; f. 67va, 31-32: the instrumental word form დაკრებოთა is combined with the interrogative particle -ა, yielding ქვისამე დაკრებოთა “really by stoning, *lit.* gathering a stone?” ~ ἄρα πέτρα (PG; λῆσις 04). On f. 67va, l. 29 there

it extends, as the twelfth text in the collective codex, from f. 65ra (l. 26) to f. 66va (l. 22) across f. 67, which has been displaced from its original position between f. 65 and 66.²⁹ In the *Udabno Mravaltavi* (ms. A-1109), it is the beginning of the homily that is missing: the extant text here extends from f. 91r (l. 1) to 91v (l. 13),³⁰ thus covering about one third of the homily (corresponding to PG 61, col. 709, l. 43 up to the end), which means that two folios must have been lost at the beginning.³¹ In contrast to this, the *Khanmeli* palimpsest has preserved the beginning and the end of the homily, lacking its middle part corresponding to PG 61, col. 707, l. 15-709, l. 19, a span covering three folios.³² Thus, all three witnesses together can only be collated for the last third of the text as indicated in Table I. Nevertheless, it is clear from the collation that the text version they contain is basically the same, a few remarkable divergences notwithstanding, and the wording of the extant palimpsest pages can be established with great confidence, with but a few cases deserving further comments.³³

is no larger lacuna after ეშმაკო “the devil” as indicated by M. ŠANIŽE (“...”) but simply a colon. As to f. 67ra, 16-17; 21-22; f. 67va, 26-27 see § 2.2 below.

²⁹ The distortion was first noted by M. ŠANIŽE, “Homilia”, p. 235.

³⁰ Line numbers concerning the *Udabno Mravaltavi* refer to the printed edition by A. Šaniže and Z. Čumburize, not the actual codex.

³¹ Cf. M. VAN ESBROECK, *Homélistes*, p. 145 as to text no. U24a.

³² The undertext of S-3902 is arranged in two columns each per page, with one bifoliate of the original yielding two folios of the present codex. Several different page numbering systems have been applied in the descriptions of the palimpsest: according to pages of the upper layer, folios of the upper layer, and folios of the original manuscripts. The present study addresses folios of the present codex, 2r and 2v equalling pages 3 and 4, etc. (cf. M. VAN ESBROECK, *Homélistes*, p. 60 for the distribution of the palimpsest folios among the pages of the present codex). The numbering system used in M. ŠANIŽE, “Homilia” (extending from “A135a” to “A141b”) is unclear to me.

³³ If we disregard the *Khanmeli* characteristics and other normal morphological and orthographical changes, minor divergences between the palimpsest and Jer-4 consist in the use of different verbal forms (e.g., imperative დაადგეოთ “sit down” in Jer-4, f. 65rb, ll. 1-2 instead of optative დახადგოთ “you should sit down” in the palimpsest, f. 6rb, l. 21); the addition or omission of demonstratives (e.g., ესე “this” between ჩუენიცა “also our” and სიტყვად “word” in Jer-4, f. 65rb, 2 vs. f. 6rb, 22, or the relative pronoun რ(მე)ლი in Jer-4, f. 65rb, 22 vs. extended რ(მელ)ო-ოგო f. 6vb, 16); the use of different conjunctions (e.g., და “and” Jer-4, f. 67vb, 22 instead of რ(ამეთუ) “for, because” f. 7rb, 6; or ვ(ითარმე)დ “that” Jer-4, f. 66ra,

PG 61	705, 60			707,15					709, 19-41	709, 41-50	710, 1-50				
S-3902 (pal.)	3vb	3ra	3rb						7ra	7rb	7va	7vb	13vab	12rab	12vab
	6rb	6va	6vb						2va	2vb	2ra	2vb			
Jer-4	65ra	65rb		65va	65vb	67ra	67rb	67va	67vb	66ra		66rb		66va	
A-1109												91r		91v	
Table I: Alignment of the three Georgian witnesses with the Greek text															

Table I: Alignment of the three Georgian witnesses with the Greek text

2.1 In the *editio princeps* of the palimpsest, A. ŠANIṢE proposed the title of the homily (appearing on f. 3vb, l. 4-14) to be introduced by სიტყუა თქოვმოვლი იოჰანწსი ეპისკოპოსისაჲ, i.e. “Sermon (*lit.* word) authored (*lit.* spoken) by John the Bishop”. Different from this, Jer-4 introduces the title by referring to the date when the homily was read: დიდსა ოთხშ(ა)ბ(ა)თსა თქ(უ)მ(უ)ლი წ(მიდ)ისა ი(ოან)ე მთ(ა)ვ(ა)რ ებისკ(ო)პოსის(ა)ჲ კოსტ(ან)ტინეპოვლელის(ა)ჲ,³⁴ i.e. “On Holy (*lit.* Great) Wednesday: sermon (*lit.* spoken) by St John the Archbishop of Constantinople”. The multispectral images give no clear picture of the first word, probably because the title was written in rubrics and therefore erased more thoroughly in the preparation of the palimpsest. However, a large initial დ = *d* seems conceivable so that სიტყუა can be ruled out. On the other hand, the space in line 4 is not sufficient to restore დიდსა ოთხშაბათსა თქოვ- (only ოვ being well discernible at the end of the line), given that the line length hardly ever exceeds 16 characters in the palimpsest, the average being 13-14 characters. We may therefore propose to read დშაბათსა here, with დ̣ = “4” representing the value of the numeral ოთხი in ოთხ-შაბათი “Wednesday” ~ τετάρτη σαβ-βάρου / *quarta feria*. Note that at the end of the title, Jer-4 adds the formula გ(უ)აგ(ურთ)ხ(ე)ნ მ(ა)მ(ა)ო “Bless us, father”, which has no equivalent in the palimpsest.

2.2 On f. 6rb, 19-20, the palimpsest shows the word form გლახავისაჲ “of the poor”, which has no equivalent in Jer-4. In

14 vs. ვ(თა)რ “how” f. 7vb, 10 and A-1109, f. 91r, 7); and changes in the word order (e.g., ჩ(უჭ)ნ მას ვჭამთ “we eat it” in Jer-4, f. 65rb, 14-15 vs. მას ჩ(ოვე)ნ ვჭამთ, lit. “it we eat”, f. 6va, 22 – f. 3rb, 1.

³⁴ Here and in the following paragraphs, (round) parentheses mark the restorations of abbreviations (suspensions) in the Georgian text. In transcribing from the palimpsest, the sequence of ოვ denoting the vowel *u* is rendered as such. Translations of the Georgian text are as close as possible.

the given genitive form, the adjective clearly pertains as an apposition to the word ქოვრივისა (Jer-4 ქურივისა) “of the widow” mentioned a few lines above; the (relative) clause in question reads რ(ომელმა)ნ-იგი ქოვრივისა მის ტაბლად არა შეურაცხ-ყო გლახაკისა (Elia) who did not disdain the table of that widow, the poor one”. It is also clear that გლახაკი corresponds to Greek *πενιχρός* “poor” even though this refers to the table, not the widow in the given context: τοῦ τῆς πενιχρᾶς τραπέζης τῆς χήρας μὴ ἐξουθενήσαντος. The genitive reading, already proposed by A. ŠANIŽE, is nevertheless certain. The same is true for the compound ჩემ-გლახაკისა³⁵ “of mine, the poor one” appearing on f. 3rb, 4-5, where Jer-4 has ჩემ-ც(ო)დვილისა “of mine, the sinful one”; the sentence in question reads ამას პოვრსა ჩემ-გლახაკისა (-ცოდვილისა Jer-4) ტაბლასა ზ(ედა) დაგიგებ “This bread I will put for you on my, the poor (sinful) one’s, table”. Here again, the text diverges from the Greek where the corresponding adjective, *μέτριος*, refers not to the author but to the table: Τοῦτον ἄμῃν τὸν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῆς μετρίας μου τραπέζης ἐπιθείς. Note also that the Georgian text indicates a paragraph break after დაგიგებ in both the palimpsest and Jer-4, marked in the former by a long *paragraphos* after the verbal form plus a large initial მ in მინდა “I wanted” ~ *ἡβουλόμην* in the following line, thus standing in sharp contrast to the participial construction of the Greek text.

2.3 On f. 3ra, l. 6-7, the text of the palimpsest can be restored as reading არცა ველთა შექმნეს: და “(the bread which) hands did not make either, and”, clearly matching the Greek οὐχ (ὅν) ... καὶ χεῖρες ἐμάλαξαν as the second of three properties of the bread identified with Christ: პოვრი ... რ(ომე)ლი-იგი არა ფქვილთაგან დახიფქვა: არცა ველთა შექმნეს: და არცა ცეცხლითაგან გამოცხვა “the bread ... which was not ground by a mill, (which) hands did not make either, and (which) was also not baked by fire”~ ἄρτον ... οὐχ ὅν ὁ μῦλος ἐλέπτυσε, καὶ χεῖρες ἐμάλαξαν καὶ πῦρ ἐτελείωσεν. In Jer-4, the second property is missing by *saut du même au même* from the first არცა “neither, nor” to the second one. Note that Jer-4 has the secondary passive გამოიცხვა instead of the primary passive გამოცხვა “was baked” of the palimpsest.

³⁵ From here on, characters that were already read by A. Šaniže are marked by underlining.

2.4 A few lines below, the next property of Christ identified with the bread is clearly restorable as ჰ(რამე)დ რ(ომე)ლი-დგი თვნიერ თესლისა ქალწოვლისაგან ხიშვა ‘და აღორძნდა’ “but which was born by the virgin without semen and raised”, matching the intention of Greek ἀλλ’ ὅν παρ’ ἑνός (+ ἄρσεν PG) ἄνδρα ἄρσενος καὶ σπέρματος ἦν γίγνηται but without confirming the image of the ploughing and blooming and thus giving no hint as to the authenticity (or anciennity) of the insertion of ἄρσεν in the *textus receptus* (cf. 1.1.a. above).³⁶ Curiously enough, Jer-4 has თვნიერ ცეცხლისა “without fire” instead of თვნიერ თესლისა “without semen”, probably by influence of the “fire” mentioned before.³⁷

2.5 Even worse is the text of Jer-4 concerning the following three properties. It reads და ჯ(უარ)ითა გვკვნნა და მ(ა)ნ სრ(უ)ლ-ყვნა . და მ(ო)ც(ი)ქ(უ)ლმ(ა)ნ გ(ა)ნათორმეტნა გოდორთა მოისთლო, which is quite incomprehensible at least at the end: “and (which) redeemed us with the cross, and he (it?) accomplished them (!). And the apostle made them twelve, in the baskets he (it?) was harvested”. Different from this, the text of the palimpsest can with certainty be restored as და ჯ(ოჯა)რითა ჩ(ოჯე)ნ გვკვნნა და მამამან სროვლ-ყო ‘და მოციქულთაგან ათორმეტთა გოდორთა მოხისთოვლო’ “and (which) redeemed us with the cross, and (which) the father accomplished, and (which) was harvested by the apostles in the twelve baskets” (cf. Mt. 16,9). This agrees well with the Greek text again, except for the first statement where the latter maintains the image of growing plants (“whom the cross ripened”): καὶ σταυρὸς ὥριμασε, καὶ Πατὴρ ἐτελειώσε, καὶ δῶδεκα (δεκαδύο PG) κρίνοι τοῦ ἀποστόλων ἐτρίγησαν. Of course, the Georgian text cannot contribute anything as to the distinction of δῶδεκα and δεκαδύο in the Greek recensions (cf. § 1.1.b above).

2.6 Another remarkable divergence between Jer-4 and the palimpsest is found in the passage corresponding to PG 61, col. 707, 9-12. The Greek text runs ἀλλ’ ἡ τοῦ θειομάχου Ἰουδαίου κατὰ τοῦ Σατῆρος ἡμῶν (<PG) ῥαπτομένη (ἐξαρπτομένη PG)

³⁶ The Coptic text is closer to the Greek: “ma uno stesso terreno vergine lo germogliò senza travaglio e senza seme” (f. 14va: F. Rossi. “Papiri”, p. 112 / 149).

³⁷ Already marked as a scribal error by M. ŠANIՇԷ, “Homily”, p. 239 n. 10. – Instead of აღორძნდა “was raised” Jer-4 has the younger form აღორძინდა.

ἐπιβουλος ἐνέδρα καὶ τοὺς λίθους λαλεῖν ἀναγκάζει, which is rendered by ა(რამე)დ მათ ღ(მრ)თის-მოშორნეთათჳს ჰოვრიათა ‘რ(ომელ)ი ხიკადრეს მაცხოვრისათჳს ქვათაცა ხეიძოვლების სიტყოვად in the palimpsest (f. 3rb/6vb, 10-15), missing just the equivalent of the (ῥα)πτομένη or ἐξαρπτομένη) ἐπιβουλος ἐνέδρα that was thematised above as to the distinction of the two Greek recensions (cf. § 1.1.c above). A literal translation would be “but because of those enviers of God, the Jews, who ventured against the Saviour,³⁸ even stones are forced to speak”. This text is by and large confirmed by Jer-4 where, however, the postposition -თჳს “for, because of” is missing after ღ(მრ)თის-მოშორნეთა “enviers of God”, the genitive plural ჰურიათა is extended with the nominative ending -ო, yielding “that of the Jews”, and the finite passive form ხეიძოვლების is replaced by the instrumental of the verbal noun, იძულებით “with force”, thus leaving an incomplete sentence: ა(რამე)დ მ(ა)თ ღ(მრ)თის-მოშორნეთა ჰ(უ)რიათაო

³⁸ The verb in question, კადრება-, usually combines with a verbal noun in the sense of “dare, venture to do sth.” as the equivalent of Greek *τολμάω*, as in the Georgian version of the homily “De paenitentia” by John Chrysostom (CPG 4614) which is contained in the *Udabno Mravaltavi* as well as other homiliaries under the title “Sur la décollation de Jean-Baptiste” (cf. M. VAN ESBROECK, *Homéliaires*, p. 96: A 53; p. 129: S 37; p. 157: U 46d); here we read in agreement with PG 59, col. 763, 12-13 *Τολμάς ὁρχησθήν φίλον ἔχειν; τολμάς σεαυτὸν τάττειν ἐραστὴν ὁρχηστοῖς: ὁκადრებს მროკვალისა მისთჳს სიყუარულსა. ὁკადრებ თავით თჳსით ზრძანებად. ეტრფიალე მროკვალსა მას ...* “He (!) ventures to love that dancer. Venture yourself to command: love that dancer! ...” In II Cor. 11.21, the Georgian text adds სიქადულსა “boasting” to ὁკადრებს in rendering plain Greek *τολμά*: რომლითა-ოგი ვინმე ὁკადრებს სიქადულსა, უგუნურებით ვიტყვ, ვიკადრო მეცა “with what(ever) someone (else) ventures to boast – I am talking in senselessness – I will dare myself, too” ~ *ἐν ᾧ δ’ ἔν τις τολμά, ἐν ἀφορισίνῃ λέγω, τολμῶ καίγω*. In Rom. 10.20, simple ὁკადრებს renders Greek *ἀποτολμά*: ესაია ὁკადრებს და იტყვს “Isaiah is (so) bold and says” ~ *Ἡσαίας δὲ ἀποτολμά καὶ λέγει*. In the homily *De invidia Pharisaeorum* itself, the equivalence of კადრება with *τῆλμα* is met with in a passage covered by all three witnesses (“VIIIar” = f. 13va, 3-4 / A-1109, f. 91r, 11; Jer-4, f. 66ra, 21 has the quasi-synonym კადნიერება- “boastfulness” instead), with the genitive ღ(მრ)თის / ღ(მრ)თისა “of God” as its attribute; this is likely to mean “boldness against God” as the object of *ნოვ გოვამხილებ* “do not accuse us publicly” here, as the equivalent of *μηδὲ τὴν θεομάχον ἐκπομπευσθῆς τῶλμαν* of the second Greek recension. Forms of კადრება with -თჳს in the sense of “venturing against sb. or sth.” seem not to be attested elsewhere though.

რ(ომელ)ი ივადრეს მ(ა)ცხ(ო)ვრისათჳს ქვათაცა იძულებით სიტყ(უ)ად “but that of those enviers of God, the Jews, who ventured against the Saviour, even stones with force to speak”. The proposal by M. Šaniže to fill the gap by inserting აღძრავს “arouses” may work for Jer-4 (if we take “that of the Jews” as the subject of arousing, with “counsel” or the like missing), but not for the palimpsest.

2.7 On f. 67vb, 12-13, Jer-4 misses the equivalent of წარწყმედოვლი “destroyed” in the sentence მოვიდა ი(ესო)ჳ ’ რ(ადო)ამცა მოიძია და აცხოვნა წარწყმედოვლი ნათესავი³⁹ კაცთად “Jesus came in order to seek and revive the damned human race” of the palimpsest, thus omitting the equivalent of ἀπολωλός as the focussed element of the Greek text. Here, it is the “human race” that is not mentioned in the given context: Ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός. In contrast to this, the palimpsest and Jer-4 agree in the lines following further on in styling Jesus a მეძიებელი, i.e. a “searcher” ~ ἐρεტης, and a “saviour”, not a “benefactor” = εὐεργέτης of the “ruined”: ხ(ოლო) ესენი მეძიებელსა მას და მაცხოვარსა წარწყმედოვლასა ხეძიებდეს წარწყმედად “but they searched for the searcher and saviour of the ruined to ruin (him)” (~ καὶ οὗτοι τὸν τῶν ἀπολωλότων ἐρετὴν ἀπολέσαι ζητοῦσι). Here, the Georgian text clearly supports the wording of the Greek *textus receptus* (cf. § 1.1.g above) with its internal logic of “searching” and “finding”.

2.8 Another few lines further down, the palimpsest is likely to repeat რ(ომ)ლისა ბრალისათჳს “for which guilt” a second time in the sentence რ(ომ)ლისა ბრალისათჳს გვთხართ ჩ(ოვე)ნ ჰოვრდანო რ(ომ)ლისა ბრალისათჳს შეხიზრახენით მის ზ(ედა) “For which guilt, tell me, Jews, for which guilt did you take counsel on him?”; instead, Jer-4 prefers a *variatio sermonis* using რადსათჳს “why”. The Greek text does not repeat the question word at all: Διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν, εἴπατε ἡμῖν, ὃ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐβουλεύσασθε (PG) κατ’ αὐτοῦ (+ τοιαῦτα βουλεύσασθε PG). It is true that the reading of the palimpsest remains quite uncertain at the given position; however, the space between (ჰოვ-)რდანო in l. 20 and -თჳს clearly appearing at the beginning of the next line is much too large for the five letters of რადსა-. Similarly, the palimpsest

³⁹ The palimpsest has dittographical ნათესა|ავი at the line break.

seems to add და “and” before აწ “now” at the beginning of the next sentence, judging by the space given in l. 22.

2.9 A more remarkable divergence between the palimpsest and Jer-4 is met with half a column later where the accusation of Jesus put in the mouth of the Pharisees is quoted in the third person in the former and in the second person in the latter. The text of the palimpsest runs: რ(ამეთოვ) ხიტყოდეს ‘ ვ(ითარმე)დ რადსათვს შაბათსა მკოვდართა აღხადგინებსღ: და წყლოვლთა განხკოვრნებსო: ანოვ რადსათვს ‘ სსწაოვლთა ხიქმს ‘ და ხსწავეებსო “For they said (*lit.* that), why on a Shabbath does he raise the dead, and why does he cure the wounded, or why does he work miracles and teach?” (f. 7rb, 6-14). This is in good agreement with the Greek text which, however, omits the Shabbath: Διὰ τί γάρ, φησί, νεκροὺς ἐγείρει, καὶ (+ διὰ τί PG) ἄσθενοῦντας ἰᾷται; διὰ τί καλὰ λαλεῖ, καὶ (διὰ + τί PG) θαυμαστοῖς γινεται (καλὰ πράττει PG); διὰ τί δὲ (<PG) καὶ διδάσκει;. In Jer-4, all four verbal forms address Jesus directly: აღადგინებო “you raise”, გ(ან)ჰკურნებო “you cure”, იქმ “you work”, სწავებო “you teach”; less important differences are the replacement of რ(ამეთოვ) “for, because” by და “and” and of the plural “of the dead” by the singular მკუდარსა.⁴⁰ Note that the quotation particle -ო “saying”, attached to three of the verbal forms in the palimpsest, is extremely rare in *Khanmeli* texts.⁴¹

2.10 Not less remarkable is the use of ისრითა “with an arrow” in Jer-4 instead of სამჭოვლითა “with a nail” in the palimpsest in the description of the Pharisees’ reaction to hearing the *Hosianna* of the children: ხ(ოლო) იგინი მათსა მას გალობასა ვ(ითარც)ა სამჭოვლითა ხიწერტებოდეს ‘ და კბილთა იღრჴენდეს “but they, on that chant of theirs, were quasi pierced by a nail and

⁴⁰ The text of Jer-4 is sometimes doubtful also in the passages that are not matched by the palimpsest. This is true, e.g., for the wording on f. 67ra, 16-17 where M. ŠANIŽE reads ვითარცა შურისაგან და სრული იგი სიყუარული განაქარვობ, which would mean something like “as by envy, even the complete affection dissolves”; instead of და სრული “and the complete”, the manuscript rather has the participle დავრული which, however, with a meaning of “bound” remains enigmatic in comparison with the Greek text (ὥς ὁ φθόνος τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς καλλίνισσος ἕθους, τῆς ἀγάπης, μαραινέει).

⁴¹ So far it has only been attested in აღვდგეო “I will resurrect” in Mt. 27,63 in the *Khanmeli* palimpsest A-89.

ground their teeth" (f. 7va, 7-11). The text of Jer-4 may be explained by anticipation of the explanation following immediately afterwards, according to which, in both witnesses, "the chants of the envyless became arrows for the envious": რ(ამეთოვ) გალობანი იგი ღვშოვრელისანი ისარ ხიქმნებოდეს მოშოვრნეთა (მოშურნეთანი Jer-4) მათ.⁴² The palimpsest obviously reflects the difference between ჴიჭყან (ჴიჭყან) "pikes, spears" and ბელჴ "arrows" in the Greek text and can thus be proven to be more authentic. Even more important is the fact that both Georgian versions clearly agree with the second recension here, the *textus receptus* missing the notion of grinding the teeth as well as that of quasiness (καθάρπε): Ἐκεῖνοι καθάρπε (<PG) ἵπῳ (ἄπῳ + τῶν PG) ἴχθυον (+ σφαττόμενοι ἵπῳ τοῦ φθόνου PG) κυντοῦμενοι (κυντοῦνται PG) τοὺς ὀδόντας ἔβραχον (<<PG) οἱ γὰρ ἔπαινοι τῶν φθονοῦμένων, βέλῃ (+εἰσι PG) τῶν φθονοῦντων εἰσι (<PG).

2.11 Referring to Pilate in an allusion to Joh. 19,19, the Georgian text says that he "writes down the truth on the cross"; only the palimpsest adds ფიცარსა მას "on the board": ხ(ოლო) ოდეს ჰილატე ჯოჯარსა მას ზ(ედა) დასწერს 'ჴემმარიტსა ფიცარსა მას' "but when Pilate writes on the cross the truth, on the board" (f. 7vb, 12-15). The addition is in agreement with the Greek text, which has ἐπὶ τοῦ τέτλου in both recensions, but without mentioning the cross. A-1109 takes an intermediate position here as it has the demonstrative მას as if combined with the adjective ჴემმარიტსა "the true" (*scil.* "thing"),⁴³ the equivalent of which, ἀλήθειαν, appears only in the second Greek recension (while γράφει "he writes" occurs only in the first): ὅτε καὶ (<PG) Πιλάτος (+ γράφει PG) ἐπὶ τοῦ τέτλου τῆν (τῇ PG) ἀλήθειαν (χρηστῇ + γράμματα PG) ἔδειξε (<PG). Note that in დასწერს "he writes (down)" as well as in მიწწერა "he wrote" (l. 10) and დასწერ "write!" (l. 19), the palimpsest shows post-*Khanmeli* forms (instead of დახწერს, მიხწერა, დახწერ), possibly by later correction.⁴⁴

⁴² Possibly we have to read მოშოვრნეთა მათთა მათ "of those enviers of theirs".

⁴³ As an adjective meaning "true", ჴესმარიტსა might also be taken to pertain to ფიცარსა ("on the true board") in the palimpsest but this would leave the position of the object of writing empty.

⁴⁴ Cf. § 3.3 below as to divergent forms in Jer-4 and A-1109.

3. The relationship with the Greek *Vorlage*

It has already become clear from the examples discussed above that the Old Georgian version stands fairly close to the Greek text of the homily; in contrast to the Slavonic version, however, it does not adhere sharply to one of the two recensions. As we have seen, the shibboleths distinguishing the two recensions have no equivalent whatsoever in it in many cases, and sometimes the evidence is even contradictory. In general we may state that the Georgian version is less verbose than, or even abridged in comparison with, the Greek text, which may hint at its reflecting an older stage in the development of the homily.

3.1 One such abridgement is found on f. 7ra, 5-6 of the palimpsest (equalling f. 67vb, 10 of Jer-4) where the Georgian version omits the lengthy lamentation about the Pharisees' counsel beginning with Ὡς συμβούλις κακίστη in the Greek text. In the given case, this might be explained by a *saut du même au même*, given that the Georgian text recommences with მ ოცნობ და ზაკოვველი დიდებოვლი სჟემჳ "Oh (what a) strange and treacherous majestic deed!", obviously reflecting Ὡς ζήνων καὶ παραδεδέξων πραγμάτων! of the second recension rather than Ὡς θασμαστοῦ πράγματος, καὶ μυστηρίου καινοῦ! of the *textus receptus* (cf. § 1.1.e above).⁴⁵ On the other hand, the *textsprung* from Ὡς to Ὡς might even better be justified on the basis of the latter recension as this (as well as the Coptic version) has the thematic quotation ('Εξελθόντες δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν) before both Ὡς συμβούλις κακίστη and Ὡς θασμαστοῦ (cf. § 1.1.f above).

3.2 Another abridgement is visible where the *Hosianna* of the children (Mt. 21,9; Mc. 11,9; Joh. 12,13) is thematised in the Georgian version (in both the palimpsest and Jer-4) by stating (f. 2vb, 20-7va, 1-3 / f. 67vb, 30-33): ოდეს-იგი ყრმანი ზაიადთა მიხეგებოდეს ' ხოვგალობდეს ' და ხიტყოდეს ოსანა რ(ომელ)ი ხარ მალალთა შინა "When the children approached him with the palm twigs, they chanted and said: 'Hosianna (to you) who are in

⁴⁵ Jer-4 has რ(ამეთუ) "for, because" instead of მ, საკვრველი "miraculous" instead of ზაკოვველი "treacherous", and დ(იდ)ებ(უ)ლ(ე)ბისა + იგი "of majesty + that" instead of დიდებოვლი; the reading of the palimpsest is with no doubt more authentic again.

the high(nesses)!” The Greek text is more verbose here, speaking about an “announcement of the victory” in both recensions and further “praise” in the *textus receptus*: “Οτε (”Οταν + ἐξέρχωνται PG) νήπιοι παῖδες βαία λαμβάνοντες, καὶ ((PG) διὰ τῶν βαίων τὴν νίκην προαναφώνουντες (+ἐν τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες PG), Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.⁴⁶ The Georgian version continues with completing the text of Jo. 12.13, კოვრობეოვლ არს მომავალი სახელითა ო(კფლისა)ითა მეოვფს ო(სრა)ჭლისად “blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord, the ruler of Israel”,⁴⁷ which is not matched by the Greek *textus receptus* but only by the second recension: εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, βασιλέως τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

3.3 A closer affinity to the second Greek recension can also be seen in the allusion to I Reg. 21,1-16 where the Georgian version explicitly mentions the desire of Jezebel, the wife of Ahab, to conquer the vineyard of Naboth: ოდეს-იგი იეზაბელს ხეგოვლებოდა დაპყრობად ვენაჲი იგი ნაბოვთჳსი და წ(იგნ)ი (+ იგი Jer-4, A-1109) სივროვეისად მისწერა (მიწერა Jer-4, მიგოწერა A-1109) “when Jezebel intended to conquer the vineyard of Naboth and wrote (+ to you A-1109) a (Jer-4, A-1109: the) letter of fallacy” (f. 7vb, 5-10 / 66ra, 11-14 / f. 91r, 6-7) ~ “Οτε Ἰεζάβελ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα τοῦ Ναβουθ ἐρπᾶσαι ἐβούλετο πλαστὰ γράμματα γράφει. The vineyard is not mentioned in the *textus*

⁴⁶ Of the three Gospel passages in question (Joh. 12,13, Mc. 11,9, and Mt. 21,9), the addition “in the high(nesses)” (მაღალთა is a plural form of the normal grade of the adjective მაღალი “high”, not a superlative as in the Greek) is primarily found in the latter but occasionally spread from there to the others in Georgian Gospel manuscripts and lectionaries. The relative clause რომელი ხარ “(you) who are” is found in Mt. 21,9 only in the Athonite vulgate (from the eleventh century on); the so-called Protovulgate (of the ninth-eleventh century) has რომელი არს “who is”. In the *Khanmeti* Gospels of the Tbilisi palimpsest ms. A-89 / A-844 (edited by L. KAJAIA, *Xanmeti lekṣebi*, I, Tbilisi, 1984), Mt. 21,9 and Joh. 12,13 are missing; Mc. 11,9 simply reads ოხსანა მაღალსა (with the singular form of the adjective and without the postposition მინა “in”).

⁴⁷ In the given form, the sentence is only found in Joh. 12,13; in Mt. 21,9, the “king of Israel” is missing but the Protovulgate has კურობეულ არს მეოვფს “blessed is the king”, as does the Paris Lectionary in Mc. 11,10. In the *Khanmeti* Gospels of A-89 / A-844, the latter verse runs კოვრობეოვლ არს მოსლვაი მეოვფისად “blessed is the coming of the king”.

receptus at all: "Οτε 'Ιεζάβελ κατὰ τοῦ Ναβουφῆ τὰ πλαστὰ ἐποίησε γράμματα, γράφει.

3.4 A remarkable deviation from the Greek text is found where the Georgian version (in both the palimpsest and Jer-4) speaks about the "poison" of the Pharisees that is to be revealed by speaking: ხ(ოლო) ჩ(ოვე)ნ ვთქ(ოვ)ათ და გამოვაცხადოთ მათი ოგი გესლი "but we shall speak and reveal the poison of theirs!" (f. 7rb, 2-5 / f. 67vb, 19-21). Of the two Greek recensions, the first one is a bit closer here even though გესლი "poison" is not quite the same as αἰσχύνη "shame" (ἡμεῖς τὴν αὐτῶν αἰσχύνην πανταχῇ στήλιτευσάμεν); with ἧττα "defeat", the second recension stands clearly farther away (ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν αἰσχύνην, τὴν αὐτῶν ἧτταν ἐκπομπέυσάμεν).

3.5 Noteworthy abridgements are also found in Jer-4 in passages that have no counterpart in the palimpsest. This is true, e.g., for the context alluding to I Sam. 17-18 (the story of David and Saul) where the Greek, Coptic, and Slavonic texts thematise the green colour of the lizard, with the Coptic text additionally referring to Jer. 13,23 (cf. § 1.3 above). None of these elements is present in the Georgian version, which also differs from the Greek before in not speaking about David's "five stones" provoking Saul's envy (οἱ δὲ πέντε λίθοι τοῦ Δαυὶδ τὸν φθόνον τὸν ἐν τῷ Σαουλ πλεῖστον ἐξήγειραν; I Sam. 18,9) but of his "loyal services" to Saul (f. 67ra, 21-24): ხ(ოლო) ყ(ოველ)თა მ(ა)თ ერთგულობით⁴⁸ მს(ა)ხ(უ)- რეშ(ა)თა დ(ავი)თისთა საულისგ(ა)ნ შური იგი ვერ განიშორეს "but all those services of David (undertaken) with loyalty did not remove the envy from Saul".

3.6 Another remarkable deviation from the Greek text within the passages only preserved in Jer-4 is met with on f. 67va, 26-27, where the second Greek recension introduces the question "from whom" the Pharisees "took" the counsel: Καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν ἡ γράφη παρὰ τίνος (+ τὸ συμβούλιον 09) ἔλαβον τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν ἀνακινῶν πρὸς τὴν ζήτησιν. Instead of this, Jer-4 (f. 67va, 25-27) thematises the question whether the Pharisees took counsel by themselves or received a counsel (from someone else): და არა თქ(უ)ა წერილმ(ა)ნ თუ შეიზრახნესო, ა(რამე)დ ზრახვა (*sic!*) მოიღესო "And the scripture did not say that (*lit.* if) they

⁴⁸ Sic, not ერთგულებით as in M. Šanize's edition.

took counsel but (that) they received a counsel". This contradicts the Georgian Gospel text which has **ზრახვა-ყვებ**, *lit.* "they made counsel", throughout,⁴⁹ as well as the homily itself which uses **მე{ბ}ზრახნებ** "they conspired" (*lit.* "they were counselled"), even immediately before the passage in question (67vb, 24-25). It may be important that the Greek *textus receptus* runs quite differently here, omitting the counsel and the question "from whom" and thus leaving an odd sentence indeed (but providing, with **ὁ γράψας** instead of **ἡ γραφή**, a correct masculine head noun for **ἀνακινῶν**): **Καὶ οὕκ εἴπεν ὁ γράψας τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν ἀνακινῶν πρὸς τὴν ζήτησιν.**

4. The restored text

In the following pages, the text of two folios of the palimpsested manuscript is restored as neatly as possible on the basis of the multispectral images taken in 2005 and the collation with the other witnesses. The folios in question are numbered III and II, resp., in A. Šaniže's edition; they correspond to f. 3+6 and 2+7, resp., of the present codex (with the page distribution indicated in Table II). The text of the third leaf of the original, *ibid.* styled VIIa and b,⁵⁰ was established *in extenso* by A. Šaniže in collating the text of the *Udabno Mravaltavi* (see above); it has not yet been analysed with multispectral methods so far so that no amendments are available. For the sake of easy reference, the text of Jer-4 = J (with variant readings from A-1109 = U where available) as well as that of the two Greek recensions ("PG" and "RS")⁵¹ and the Italian translation of the Coptic version are aligned line by

⁴⁹ I.e., in all existing redactions. In the *Khanmeli* Gospels of A-89 / A-844, the first part of Mt. 12.14 is missing, A-89, f. 42ra beginning with **⟨წარწყმოდონ** "they would exterminate him" (L. KAJAIA, *Xanmeli*, p. 28).

⁵⁰ Different from f. III and II, this is a bifoliate of the original, turned by 180°, not 90° in being prepared for being re-used and yielding a bifoliate of the palimpsested codex; cf. A. ŠANIŽE, "Xanmeṭi", p. 102.

⁵¹ The text of the *recensio secunda* is given after the edition of O4 printed in J. ZAIMOV / M. KAPALDO, *Suprasǎlski*. In cases where elements of the Greek text are omitted (indicated by ...) in that edition, the text has been supplied by collation of the codices mentioned in § 1.1 above.

line.⁵² A full treatment of the Georgian version of the homily will hopefully be providable elsewhere soon.

Fol. no.	III		II		VIIIa		VIIIb	
	3r = 5	3v = 6	7v = 14	7r = 13	13v = 26	12r = 23	12v = 24	(13r = 25)
	6v = 12	6r = 11	2r = 3	2v = 4				

Table II: The distribution of the text among the folios of the palimpsest

ABSTRACT – RÉSUMÉ

The article illustrates the state of decipherment of the earliest Old Georgian version of the homily on the “Envy of the Pharisees” attributed to John Chrysostom, which is contained in the lower text of the Old Georgian palimpsest codex S-3902 of the Korneli Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi. Based on a multispectral analysis undertaken in 2005 and on a collation with later witnesses, the text of four folios of the codex, which pertains to the oldest layer of Georgian literacy (the so-called *Khanmeli* period, c. fifth to seventh centuries), has been established with great confidence. Its main characteristics are outlined in comparison with the other Georgian witnesses and the non-Georgian parallels.

Cet article illustre l’état de déchiffrement de la plus ancienne version géorgienne de l’homélie sur «l’envie des Pharisiens» attribuée à Jean Chrysostome, contenue dans le manuscrit palimpseste géorgien S-3902 du Centre national des manuscrits ‘Korneli Kekelidze’ à Tbilisi. Basée sur une analyse multispectrale entreprise en 2005 et sur la collation avec d’autres témoins, la lecture de quatre folios de ce codex, qui appartient à l’état le plus ancien du géorgien écrit (la période dite *Khanmeli*, qui va du v^e au vii^e siècle environ) a pu être établie avec une grande assurance. Les caractéristiques principales de ce texte sont mises en parallèle avec les autres témoins géorgiens et non-géorgiens.

⁵² In the transcription of the palimpsest, rectangular brackets denote hardly readable characters; curly braces, unreadable characters; and angle brackets, characters restored beyond the margins of the preserved parchment. As before, round parentheses denote restorations of abbreviations.

III: 3vb	S-3902	J, 65ra, 26	RS 198r,22 / PG 61, 705,60 Rossi 1va, 1
1	რ(მ)ლისა არს დიდება		
2	ოკოვნითი ოკოვნითი-		
3	სამდე ' სამე]		
4	[დ]'შაბათს თქ[ის]-	დიდსა ოთხშაბათსა	Discorso pronunziato
5	მოვლი ოიჰნა[ფ]'სი ე[პ]'ის]-	თქ[უ]მ(უ)ლი წ(მიდ)ისა	dal beato Apa Giovanni
6	კოპოსისა] ფარისე]-	პოსისა	arcivescovo di Costantinopoli
7	ველთა მათ [მოვ[რისათვს]	ს(ა)მ :	sulla grande invidia dei Sacer-
8	[ი(ესო)ვსისა {} ვ(ითარცა)	ფარისე ველთა ზურის	doli e dei Farisei
9	სახარე-	თ(ვ)ს .	verso il nostro Signore Gesù
10	[ქ]ად [ხოტვს] {} [ვ(ითარ-	ი(ესო)ვს თ(ვ)ს ვ(თარცა)	Cristo.
11	მე)დ გა]-	ს(ა)ხ(არ)ე(ბ)ად იტვს .	
12	მოვიდეს გარე {} და	ვ(ითარმე)დ	
13	ზრახვა-ყვეს [მის][თვს]	გ(ა)მოვიდეს გ(არე) და	
14	რ(ა)თადმცა წარწყმოდეს	ზრ(ა)ხვა-ყვეს	
15	ოგი {} და შემდგომი	რ(ა)თადმცა წარწყმოდეს	
16	ამისი	ოგი და შემდგ(ომი	
17	რ(ა)თადმცა ხართ	ამისი . გ(უ)ა(ვ(უ)რთ)ხ(ე)ნ მ(ა)-	
18	[ელ]იას მოწაფენი	მ(ა)თ:-	
19	რ(ომელმა)]წ-იგი	რ(ა)თადმცა ხ(არ)თ	
20	ქოვრისა	ელ(ი)ას მ(ო)წ(ა)ფ(ე)ნი .	
21	მის ტაბლად [] არა	რ(ომელმა)წ-იგი ქოვრი-ს(ა)	
22	[შე]ოვრად-ყო [] გლა-	მის ტაბლად ა რა	
23	ხაკისა ' ჩ(ოვე)ნ თან[ა]	შეოვრად-ყო .	
24	[და]ხადვრეთ {} რ(ამეთოვ)	ჩ(ოვე)ნ თან(ა)	
25	ჩ(ოვე)ნ[ი]ცა [ს]იტ[ყოვ]ად	დაადგ(ერით) . რ(ამეთო)	
26		ჩ(ოვე)ნიცა ესე სიტ(უ)ად	
III: 6rb	S-3902	J, 65rb, 2	RS 198r, 28 / PG 61, 706,61
1	რ(მ)ლისა არს დიდება		
2	ოკოვნითი ოკოვნითი-		
3	სამდე ' სამე]		
4	[დ]'შაბათს თქ[ის]-	დიდსა ოთხშაბათსა	Discorso pronunziato
5	მოვლი ოიჰნა[ფ]'სი ე[პ]'ის]-	თქ[უ]მ(უ)ლი წ(მიდ)ისა	dal beato Apa Giovanni
6	კოპოსისა] ფარისე]-	პოსისა	arcivescovo di Costantinopoli
7	ველთა მათ [მოვ[რისათვს]	ს(ა)მ :	sulla grande invidia dei Sacer-
8	[ი(ესო)ვსისა {} ვ(ითარცა)	ფარისე ველთა ზურის	doli e dei Farisei
9	სახარე-	თ(ვ)ს .	verso il nostro Signore Gesù
10	[ქ]ად [ხოტვს] {} [ვ(ითარ-	ი(ესო)ვს თ(ვ)ს ვ(თარცა)	Cristo.
11	მე)დ გა]-	ს(ა)ხ(არ)ე(ბ)ად იტვს .	
12	მოვიდეს გარე {} და	ვ(ითარმე)დ	
13	ზრახვა-ყვეს [მის][თვს]	გ(ა)მოვიდეს გ(არე) და	
14	რ(ა)თადმცა წარწყმოდეს	ზრ(ა)ხვა-ყვეს	
15	ოგი {} და შემდგომი	რ(ა)თადმცა წარწყმოდეს	
16	ამისი	ოგი და შემდგ(ომი	
17	რ(ა)თადმცა ხართ	ამისი . გ(უ)ა(ვ(უ)რთ)ხ(ე)ნ მ(ა)-	
18	[ელ]იას მოწაფენი	მ(ა)თ:-	
19	რ(ომელმა)]წ-იგი	რ(ა)თადმცა ხ(არ)თ	
20	ქოვრისა	ელ(ი)ას მ(ო)წ(ა)ფ(ე)ნი .	
21	მის ტაბლად [] არა	რ(ომელმა)წ-იგი ქოვრი-ს(ა)	
22	[შე]ოვრად-ყო [] გლა-	მის ტაბლად ა რა	
23	ხაკისა ' ჩ(ოვე)ნ თან[ა]	შეოვრად-ყო .	
24	[და]ხადვრეთ {} რ(ამეთოვ)	ჩ(ოვე)ნ თან(ა)	
25	ჩ(ოვე)ნ[ი]ცა [ს]იტ[ყოვ]ად	დაადგ(ერით) . რ(ამეთო)	
26		ჩ(ოვე)ნიცა ესე სიტ(უ)ად	

III: 3ra	S-3902	J 65rb, 2	RS 198r,28 / PG 61, 706.61 Rossi 1vb, 13
1	სიმდბლოსა [ეგრე]-	სიმდაბლოს(ა) . ეგრე-	μειρά ητίμαστα
2	თი[ი]სა[ვე] ტა[ბ]ლი-	თისავე ტაბლის(ა)	τράπεζα,
3	სმა[ნ]ე[ი], [რ(მე)ლსა]	სმინეთ . რ(მე)ლსა ერთი	ένα
4	[ე]რითი		
5	პოვრი ზ(ედა)ს მესი [პური ზ(ედა) მეს . რ(მე)-	პური ზ(ედა) მეს . რ(მე)-
6	რ(მე)ლი-	ლი-	
7	-ი[ი]გი [არ]ა ფეკილოთა[ნ]	-იგი არა ფეკილოთ(ა)გ(ა)ნ	იუგ ὅς ἡ μῆκος
8	[დ]სიოთ[ქვა] არა	დაიქცა . არა	ἐλέπτουσε, καὶ
9	[კელ]თა [შე]ქმნე[ს] [] [და]		χέρους ἐμάχασαν
10	არა ცეცხლით[გან გა]-	ც(ე)ცხლით(ა)ნ გა-	καὶ πῦρ
11	მო[ცხ]ვა [] ა(რამე)დ	მოიცხვა . ა(რამე)დ რ(მე)-	ἐτελεώσεν, ἀλλ'
12	[რ(მე)ლი]-	ლი-	
13	-იგი თუნიერ თი[ესლ]ისა	-იგი თუნიერ ცეცხლ[ისა]	ὅν παρβένος [+ ἄρουρα PG]
14	ქალწოლი[სა]გან ხიმ-	ქალწ(ე)ლის(ა)გ(ა)ნ იმ-	ἄνευ βρότρου καὶ σπέρματος
15	ვა . და აღორძნა	ვა . და აღორძინდა .	ἦν ἡγε,
16	და [X(ოვ)]რითა ჩ(ოვე)ნ	და X(უფარი)თა გვჰსნა	καὶ σταυρὸς ὀρίμασε,
17	[გჰსნა]		
18	და მამანს [ს]რო-	და მ(ა)ნ სრ(ე)ლ-	καὶ Πατήρ ἐτελεώσεν,
19	ვლ-ყო [] და მოცი-	-ყვნა . და მ(ო)ც(ი)-	καὶ θεοῦ ἰσ(ო)ბ(ო)ნი
20	ქოვლთაგან ათო[('რ)-	ქ(ე)ლმ(ა)ნ გ(ა)ნათ ორ-	τὸν ἀποστόλου
21	მეტათა [გ]ო[დ]ო[რ]ითა	მეტანა გოდორთა	ἐτάρχησαν.
22	მოცხის[ქ]ლო[]	მოცხის[ქ]ლო[]	Τοῦτον τὸν βροτὸν Μαρία μὲν
23	ეგ პოვრი ქალწოლ-	ესე პური ქ(ა)ლწ(ე)ლის(ა)-	ἐγέννησεν, καὶ ἡ 'Εκκλησία
24	მან შვა, და [კელ]-	გ(ა)ნ იშვა, და ეკლე-	
25	სამან შეიწყნარა	სამან შეიწყნარა	δὲ ἰαμ(ე)δ(ე)ζ(ე)το,
26	და დლითი-დღედ მას	და დლითი-დღედ მ(ე)წ(ე)ნ	καὶ καὶ 'ἐχάσθη ἡμέραν
III: 6va	S-3902	J 65rb, 14	RS 198v,4 / PG 61, 707.6 Rossi 14vb, 16

è preparata anche a noi;

un solo

pane è posto su essa.

Questo pane non ... ||

*... né sono
mani umane, che l'hanno for-
mado,
né fu compilo dal fuoco,
ma uno stesso*

*terreno vergine lo germogliò
senza travaglio e senza seme,*

e la croce, che lo manifestò,

ed il padre che lo compì ...

*questo siffatto pane ... Maria,
colei che l'ha generato, la
Chiesa*

*santa l'ha accolto in sé,
e noi lo mangiamo ogni giorno,*

III: 3rb	S-3902	J 65rb, 14	RS 198v,4 / PG 61, 707,6	Rossi 14vb
1	ჩოფენ ვკამთ და იგი დ[ა]-	ვკამთ და იგი და-	ბჭ' ἡμῶν ἐσθίεται, καὶ	<i>e non si consuma, ma</i>
2	ოვსროვლეულ არს	უს(რე)ლეულ(ე)ლ არს	μένει.	<i>rimane come esso</i>
3	მა[რა]დი[ს] [::] ამას	მ(არ)ადის . ამ(ა)ს	Τοῦτον ἑμὺν	<i>perenne. Questo</i>
4	პოვრსა ჩემ-გლახა-	პურსა ჩ(ე)მ-ც(ო)დვო-	τὸν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῆς μετρίας	<i>pane adunque... sopra la mia</i>
5	კისა ტაბლასა ზ(ე)და დ[ა]-	ლისა ტაბლასა ზ(ე)და და-	μὸς	<i>povera mensa.</i>
6	გოგებ —	გიგებ .	τραπέζης,	<i>Io valli</i>
7	მინდა რ(აით)ამცა ვდო<ვ>-	მინდა რ(აით)ამცა ვ დუ-	ἡβυσσῶν	<i>togliere l'organo</i>
8	მე ნ და დოვმილით-	მენ და დუმილით-	τῇ σιωπῇ	<i>della mia lingua dal silenzio.</i>
9	მც სა დავადიკერ	ცა დავა დგრე .	τὸ τῆς ἰγνώσεως μου ἥρως	<i>Ma la frode piena di invidia e di</i>
10	ცა (რამე)დ მ[ა]ს[თ] [დ](მრ)-	ა(რამე)დ მ(ა)თ ლ(მრ)თის-	περιστάτης	<i>ogni sorta d'insidie,</i>
11	თის-მო-	-მო-	ἀλλ' ἡ τὸν θεομαχῶν	<i>che i giudei, lottatori con Dio,</i>
12	შ[ო]ფრნქეთათჳს ჰოვ-	შურნქეთაჳს ჰ(უ)-	κατὰ τὸν Σωτῆρος	<i>pensarono contro Cristo,</i>
	რიათაჳს [::] რ(ომელ)[ი]	რიათაჳს რ(ომელ)ი იკად-	ἐξαστομένη ἡμῶν +	
	ხიკად-	ხიკად-	ῥαπτομένη PG]	
13	რეს მავ[ხო]ვრისათჳს<ს>	რეს მ(ა)ცხ(ო)ვრის თჳს	ἐπιβουλῆς ἐνέδρα	<i>potrà eccitare le pietre</i>
14	ქვა თაცა [ხ]ქიძოჳ-	ქვათაცა იძუ-	καὶ τὰς λίθους	<i>a parlare.</i>
15	ლ(ებ)ის სოცოჳდ: —	ლ(ებ)ით სიჭ(უ)ად .	λαλεῖν ἀναγκάζει.	<i>Imperoché qual cosa ...</i>
16	სა[წ] რ(ომელ)ი-იგი გოვსმა	აწ რ(ომელ)ილი გუშ[ს]მის	Τί γὰρ ἡκιστοῖεν	
17	სახარებისაგან [::]	სახარების(ა)გან .	ἀργύρας ἀναγινωσκόμενος	
18	ვ(ითარმე)დ განვიდიქს	ვ(ითარმე)დ განვიდიქს	[ἀναγινωσκόμενος PG]	<i>i Farisei uscirono, e</i>
19	ფარი-	ფარი-	Καὶ ἐξελθόντες, φησὺν, οἱ	<i>presero da lui [demonio]</i>
	სეველინი და [შუიზ]-	სევე(ე)ლნი იგი და შუიზ-	φαραiseῖν,	<i>consiglio,</i>
20	რახნეს იც(სო)ვისათჳს რ(ა- თ)ა	რა ხნეს იც(სო)ვის თ(ც)ს . რ(ა)თ)ა-	κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως	<i>per farlo morire.</i>
21	მცა წარწმიდეს იგ[ი]	მცა წარწმ[ი]დეს იგი .	αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνωσι.	<i>Quale dunque è la colpa? o qual</i>
22	რაჲ არს იგი მიზეზი	რ(ა)ჲ არს მიზეზი იგი	Καὶ τίς ἡ αἰτία,	<i>è la cosa ...</i>
III: 6vb	S-3902	J 65rb, 26	RS 198v,12 / PG 61, 707,15	Rossi 14rb
			δὲ ἦν βουλησίνται αὐτὸν	
			ἀποκτεῖναι;	

II: 7ra	S-3902	J 67vb, 8	RS 201v,10 / PG 61, 709,19	Rossi 4rb
	ხანიჭოს. —: —: —	და ს(ო)ფ(ე)ლს ცხ(ო)რ(ე)- მ(ა)მ მო- ანიჭოს .	xai t'hi žəh'p tois əv'pəpɔis xou'zi. ɪnaɤe'liɔi PG .	della vita agli uomini.
1	{გ}ამოვიდეს ფარსე-	გ(ა)მოვიდეს ფარს(ე)-	Kai ē'zēl'm'ntes oi fərisə'i	Ma i Farisei uscirono
2	ველნი } რ(აი)ამგა გა-	ველნი რ(აი)ამგა გ(ა)-	saɤm'liɔi ɛ'laβɔi,	e presero consiglio
3	ნიზრახეს და წარ[წ]-	ნიზრახეს და წ(ა)რწ-	ɛ'pəs əb'tən əp'ɔl'səɔi.	per farlo a morte.
4	ყმოდეს ი(ეს)ოჴ —	ყმოდეს ი(ეს)ოჴ .		
5			<p>“Ω σαμβολία κακίστη δὲ ὁμόνοια σπειρομένη, καὶ δὲ ὁμόνοια ἐλεγχόμενη! ὦ ματρία βουλῇ! Ἀγνοῶσι γὰρ, ὅτι Θεὸς οὐκ ἀπόλλυται. Τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἑσθράκιον λύγρον τοῦ σώματος διαλύσους, τῆν + ἄσβεστον ἀποῖ PG λαμπήδονα [λαμπάδα PG τῷς μέρητος σβέσαι οὐ δύνανται.</p>	<p>Oh! ... dal diavolo, e fu da lui compilo. Ma piuttosto oh! sconsideratezza ed insipienza dei Farisei! non hanno conosciuto che Dio è immortale; l'armatura poi di terra, che è il suo corpo, si sciolse ... ma non poterono estin- guere la lampada inestinguibile della divinità.</p>
6	{მ} ოვცხომა და ზაკ[ოვ]-	რ(ამეთუ) უცხ ომა და საკვრ-	[+ 'E'zēl'm'ntes δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι> σαμβόλιον ἔλαβον, ὅπως ἀποῖ ἀπολίσσων. PG	I Farisei presero poscia consiglio per farlo morire.
7	ველი დიდებოვლი	ვ(ე)ლი დ(ი)ებ(უ)ლ(ე)- ბისა	“Ω ξένοια μαμαστοῦ + παράλυτος, PG	Oh! grande
8	საქმ[ფ] } მო[ვ]ი[და]	ოგი ს(ა)ქმე . მოვიდა	καὶ παραδίδων [μαμαστρίου PG παραλύατοω [καυοῦ PG ἡλθεν	ed inenarrabile temerità! E questa cosa incre- ditabile,

9	ი(ესო)ჯ ' რ(ათა)მცა მო[ი]- ძის	ი(ესო)ჯ რ(ათა)მცა მ ოძიძა	ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναζητῶσαι	<i>il Signore venne a cercare</i>
10	და ავხოვ[ი]ს წარ-	და ავხ(ო)ვნს .	καὶ σῶσαι	<i>e vivificare</i>
11	წმედლოლი ნათესა-	ნ(ათე)ს-	τὸ ἀποκλᾶσζ,	<i>quello ... </i>
12	ავი კაცთაჲ [; } ხ(ოლო)	ავი კ(აც)თ(ა)ჲ . ხ(ოლო)	καὶ	<i>Questi</i>
13	[ესენ][ი] მეძებელსა	ესენი მეძებელსა	οὐτοι τὸν	<i>poi hanno cercato</i>
14	მას და მაცხოვარ-	მ(ა)ს და მ(ა)ცხ(ო)ვ(ა)რ-	τὸν ἀποκλᾶσζ τὸν εὐεργέτην	<i>di uccidere</i>
15	სა წარწყ[მ]ედლოვლ-	სა წ(ა)რწყმედლოვლ-	[εὐεργέτην PG]	<i>il datore di vita;</i>
16	თა[სა ხეძიებდეს]	თასა ეძიებდეს	ἀποκλᾶσαι ζήτῶσαι.	<i>imperoché hanno crocifisso il</i>
17	წარწყ[მ]ედ[ა][დ:]	წ(ა)რწყმედად .	Διὰ τοῖαν ἀπειραν,	<i>Signore della gloria veramente.</i>
18	[რ](ომ)ლისა ზრ(ა)ლისა	რ(ომ)ლისა ზრ(ა)ლისა	εἵπατε ἡμῖν, ὃ <PG>	<i>Ditemi, o giudei ingrati</i>
19	[გვთხ]ს [რთ ჩ(ოვ)ნ ჰოვ]-	გვთხ(ა)რთ ჩ(ოვ)ნ ჰ(ო)-	ἴσαδαι.	<i>ed ingiusti;</i>
20	[რ]იან[ო რ(ომ)ლისა	რიანო რ(ა)მსა-	ἐβλαπένσαθ[ε] <PG> <ατ'	<i>qual è la colpa per cui</i>
21	ბრალისა]-	ბრალისა-	ἀπ[ο] τ[ῆ]ς + τ[ο] αὐτ[ῶ]ν	<i>noleste la morte del Signore?</i>
22	თ[ეს] მ[ცხიზრახენით]	თ(ეს)ს მცხიზრახენით	βλαπένσαθ[ε] PG];	<i>Ma essi</i>
	მი[ს ზ(ედ)]სა [; და აწ მათ]	მის ზ(ედ)]სა . აწ მ(ა)თ	Ἄλλ' ἐξείναι μὲν	
II:	S-3902	J 67vb, 19	RS 201v,23 / PG 61, 709,31	Rossi 8ra
2va				

II: 7rb S-3902	J 67vb, 19	RS 201v, 23 / PG 61, 709,31	Rossi 8ra
1 ხრცოვნანი . და	პრცოვნანი და	αἰσχύνονται	arrossirano
2 ვერ გვთხოვენ [:] ხ(ოლო)	ვერ გვთხოვენ . ხ(ოლო)	λέγειν	a dirla.
3 [ხ(ოვე)ნ ვთქ]:(ოვ) ათ [და] [გ]ამო-	ჩ(ოვე)ნ ვთქ(უ)ს თ და გ(ა)მო-	ῥμεις τῶν δὲ δὴ [(<PG]	Noi però ... della
4 ვაცხადით მათი	ვაცხადით მ(ა)თი	αὐτῶν αἰσχύνη, τῶν αὐτῶν	loro
5 [ოგი] გესლი ['] [:- —]	იგი გესლი .	[(<PG]	impudenza.
6 [რ(ამეთოვ)] ხიტყოდეს [']	და იტყოდეს რ(ა)მ-	ῥῆται [πανταχῇ PG]	Perché?
7 ვითარმე)დ რამ-	და იტყოდეს რ(ა)მ-	ἀπαμπεσάμεν	perchè egli ha
8 სათვს [შ]აბათსა	ს ა თ(ვ)ს შ(ა)ბ(ა)თსა	νεκρὸς ἐγείρει,	risuscitato i morti.
9 მქოვდართა აღზად-	მვ(უ)დარსა აღად-	καὶ [+ δὴ τῇ PG]	Perché? perchè ha
10 გინებსო ['] და წყლ-	გინებო . და წყლ-	ἀσθενήσας	sanato gl'infermi.
11 ოვლთა განხვოვრ-	უღლებ(ა)თა გ(ა)ნხ კურ-	ἔσται;	Perché?
ნებსო [:-] ანოვ რამ-	ნებო . ანუ რ(ა)მ-	δὴ τῇ καλὰ λαλεῖ, καὶ [δὴ + τῇ PG]	perchè ha aperto gli occhi ai ciechi, ed ha ridato l'udito ai sordi. Perché? perchè ha guarito i lebbrosi, e quelli che erano travagliati da convulsioni ... chi era posseduto da spirito immondo, ha sanato.

12	სათვს ' საწაოვლ-	ს ა თ(ვ)ს ს(ა)ს აულ-	მამათაჲთჳი xalà + παράτει PG ;	<i>Perché? perchè ha fallo opere</i>
13	თა ხიჲს ' და ხას-	თა იჲმ და ას-	ძაღ ტი ძე [(PG) xal δὴ δάσκαε;	<i>buone e meravigliose,</i>
14	წავებხო { : } ესევ(თა)რ-	წავებხო: ესე-ვ(თა)რ-	Δαδ ταντα	<i>ed ha insegnato alle moltitudini la via della salute.</i>
15	სა მ რალს დახვ-	სა ბრ(ა)ლს დაჰვ-		<i>Ecco sono</i>
16	რ(ებ)დ(ებ) ზ(ედ) ა ი(ე- ხო)ს: —	რებ დეს ზ(ედ)ა ი(ესო)ს .		<i>tutte queste le accuse,</i>
17	ა წ ესევ(თა)რ სა ამის- თვს	აწ ესე-ვ(თა)რისა ამის თ(ვ)ს	პანთა თღ ლჩაჲმთა	<i>per cui</i>
18	გოვწნებავს ჩოვ(ენ რ(ათ)ა-	გუნებ(ა)ვს ჩლ(ფ)ნ რ(ათ)ა-	ბოლესმემა [(ბოლეს)თა PG] ანტონ	<i>deliberarono</i>
19	მ ც ა წარ ვწმითეთო :	მცა წ(ა) რვწმითეთო .	ბპილესთა.	<i>la morte del Signore.</i>
20	ო დ(ებ) (-იგი ყრ)მანი	ოდეს-იგი ყრმ(ა)ნი	"O-თე "O-თა + ჰქვ(ა)თა PG] ყრპიოი პაღეს	<i>Imperocché quando i fanciulli</i>
21	ზაია(თა მი) ხეგზო-	ზაიათა მიეგზო-	ბაღა ლამბანონთეს, xal [(PG) ძაღ ტან ბაღაო თჳი სჩეჲ	<i>con le palme andarono incontro</i>
22	დეს ' ხოვბ ა ოზდეს ' .	დეს უგ(ა)ლ ოზდეს	პროანაგოთნთეს xal ((PG, O9) ლე ტჳი ლბჲმღ ანტონ (((O9)	<i>a lui, che entrava in Gersa- lemme, furono eccitati dallo Spirito Santo a cantare</i>
II:	S-3902	J 67vb, 32	RS 202r, 1 / PG 61, 709,39	Rossi 8vb
2vb				

II: 7va	S-3902	J 67vb, 32	RS 202r, 1 / PG 61, 709,39	Rossi 8vb
1	და ბიჭოდეს ოსან-	და იტყოდეს . ოსან-	[+ λέγοντες, PG] 'Ἰσχυρὸν	<i>l'inno della vittoria, dicendo: Oh!</i>
2	ნა რ(ომელი ხარ მ[ა]ლ-)	ნა რ(ომელი) ხ(არ მ(ა)- ლ(ა)ლ-	ἐν τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς,	<i>Osanna nell'alto de' cieli,</i>
3	თა შ(ინა: კ[ოვრთ]-	თა შ(ინა) . კ(ურთ)-	ἐνδοξασίας [<i><PG</i>]	<i>benedello</i>
4	ხოვლ[არს] მომ[ა]ცა-	ხ(ეულ (არს მომ(ა)ცა-	ὁ ἐργασίας [<i><PG</i>]	<i>Colui che viene</i>
5	ლი სხ[ელ]ითა	ლი სხ(ეულითა ო(ვლი- სა)ითა	ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, [<i><PG</i>]	<i>nel nome del Signore.</i>
6	მოვლ(ა)თა	მ(ეულ)ფ ო(სრა)ლ(ა)თა	βασιλείας τοῦ 'Ισραήλ. [<i><PG</i>]	
7	{ხ(ოლო) ო(გ)ინი მ(ა)ლ[ა] მ(ა)ლ[ა]}	ხ(ოლო) იგინი მ(ა)ლ(ა)ს	'Εχθροὶ καρδίᾳς [<i><PG</i>]	<i>Avendo ciò udito i Farisei fecero come se ...</i>
8	გალო[ბა]სა ც(ითარც) სა}-	გ(ა)ლომ(ა)სა . ვ(ითარც)	ἔπερ + ἑω <i>PG</i> ζήλῳ [+ σφαιρῶν ἐπὶ τῷ φθόνῳ <i>PG</i>]	<i>... il loro cuore con saetle</i>
9	მ[ო]ვ[ლი]თა ხიშ[ე]რ[ა]-	ისრითა იწერ[ა]-	χεντοῦνται [<i>χεντοῦνται PG</i>]	
10	მოვლ[არს] და კ[ო]ლითა	ზოდეს და კ[ო]ლითა	τοὺς ἐδόντας [<i><PG</i>]	
11	მოვლ[არს] [რ(ამეთოვ) გალო]-	ილგუნდეს . რ(ამეთოვ) ქ(ე)-	ἐπαύχον [<i><PG</i>]	
12	მან[ი] ო(ვ)ოვ[ა]-	ზანი იგი უმუერელი-	οἱ γὰρ ἔπαυον	<i>per gli onori. Imperocché gli onori</i>
13	რ[ა]ლი-	ზანი ისარ ო(ვ)ოვ[ა]-	τῶν ἐμυῖνων,	<i>degli invidiosi</i>
14	მოვლ[არს] მოვლ[არს]-	ზოდეს მოვლ[არს]-	βέλῳ [<i>+ἐπὶ PG</i>]	<i>sono saetle e piaghe</i>
15	თა მ[ა]ლ[ა]	თან .	τῶν ἐμυῖνων ἐπὶ [<i><PG</i>].	<i>dell'invidia.</i>

16	და მო ხ ოვ კ და ეს ო [[ესოვ	და მოუვდეს ი(ესოვს	Καὶ προσέρχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ,	<i>Si fecero incontro a Gesù,</i>
17	და {ხ(ო)ქოვ ეს არა გ ეს -	დაჰ(ო)ქ(უ)ეს . არა გეს-	καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Οὐκ	<i>dicendo:</i>
18	მისა რ(ასა-) ეს ეს ქ -	მისა რასა inc. U - ეს იტ-	ἀκούεις, τί οὖτοι λέγουσι;	<i>Ascolta; che cosa dicono questi?</i> <i>Oh! invidia, piena di mali! testa</i> <i>di serpe! potenza del diavolo!</i>
19	ყვან { : რ(ამეთოვ) იგო ნ ნ ო	ყვან რ(ამეთოვ) იგინი სოტ-	[+ Καὶ PG] οὐκ εἰδότες	<i>energia ... di tutti i diavoli, il</i>
20	სოტ -		[ἐ- γ ωσχοι PG], ἔτι	<i>lottatore con Dio veramente. Ma</i>
21	ყო ვ ს სა წ (ინა) წა რ-	ყ(უ)ასა მას წ (ინა) წ(არ-	πρόφητιᾶς	<i>rispose loro: ciò che disse il Sal-</i>
22	მე ტყოვ ელი ს ს ს ს	მეტ(ყოვ)ლიასა (-ისასა U)	ἐπληροῦτο	<i>valore non intendeste? Egli disse:</i>
	ად ხ ს(სრ) ო ვ ლ ეს მ-	ადასრ(უ)ლეზდეს .	τὸ γεραίμμένον.	<i>fu compila</i> <i>la profezia</i> <i>che fu detta di me;</i>
	დ ეს			
II:	S-3902	J 66ra, 8 / U 91r, 2	RS 202r,9 / PG 61, 709,45	Rossi 7rb
2ra				

II: 7vb	S-3902	J 66ra, 8 / U 91r, 2	RS 202r,9 / PG 61, 709,45	Rossi 7rb
1	ვ(ითარმე)დ [მ]ო[რ]ითა ყ[რ- მ]ათ[ან]	ვ(ითარმე)დ პირითა ყრმ(ა)- თა	[+ τὸ, PG] 'Εκ στόματος νηπίων	<i>per la bocca dei fanciulli</i>
2	[ჩჩ]ვლთა მწ[ოვ]ართა[მ]-	ჩჩვლთა მწოვართა-	ჩაქ მრ[ა]ჯ[ონ]თა	<i>e dei lattanti</i>
3	[თა დახმტკ]ო[მ]ო[ს]	თა დახმტკიცის	ხართქითა	<i>hai preparato</i>
4	[ქქ]ბა }	ქქ(ბ)ა .	აწონ,	<i>una lode; o... Farisei.</i>
5	[ოდეს-ი]გი იუფ[ამ]ე[ლს]	ოდეს-იგი იუფადელს	"()თე 'ლჯაქელ	<i>Quando poi lezabele</i>
6	[ხე]გ[ი]ო[ვლ]ე[მ]ო[დ]ა	ვგულეზოდა და-		<i>presentò scritti menzogneri</i>
7	[მ]ე[რობა]დ [ვ]ე[ნა]ჭი	პერობ(ა)დ ვენაჭი	ტონ პერელაჯა [(+ ხატა PG] თონ	<i>per fare uccidere</i>
8	[იგი ნაბოვთმსი]	იგი ნაბოთესი (ნაბოთმსი U).	ნაბოთამე პერაქთა მბოლქო [(PG]	<i>Naboth,</i>
9	[და] [წ]ოგნ[ი]ო სიგ[ი]ოვ- ვ[ისა]	და წიგნი იგი სიგრევის(ა)მ	[+ τὰ PG] პლასტა [+მბოლქ PG] ერამატა	
10	[მის]წ[ერა:] ვ(ითა)რ ე[რ]თ-	მოწერა (მიგრერა U). ვ(ითარმე)დ (ვითარ U)	ერამაქი ჩაქ ჯდეს	<i>noi avete accolta la cosa</i>
11	[გ]ოვლ[ო]მ[ი]ო[მ]ო მ[ე]ხო- წმ[ი]ს-	გ(უ)ლ(ო)მით (-ეზით U) მეწმნა-	პანელქემე [ქანელქემე PG] მეწმნა	<i>con gioia.</i>
12	[რ]ე[ი]ო ხოლო [ოდეს პი- ლ]ს-	რეთ . ხ(ოლო) ოდეს პილ(ა)- მეწმნა-	მე დაქ [(PG] მლქთო [+ერამაქ PG]	<i>Anche quando Pilato</i>
13	[უ]ოვარსა მას	უე ჯ(უ)არსა მას	მეწმნა	<i>volle scrivere il titolo</i>
14	[ზ]ედაქ დასწერს [ქქ]მ- მას-	ზედაქ დასწერს ქქმმა- მას-	ტეჩ მლქთა მბოლქ ქქერაქ ერამატა, PG,	<i>di Cristo,</i>
15	[რ]ე[ი]ო [ფ]ო[ვარსა] მას	როტსა (+ მას U).	პანელქემე,	<i>ni siete lamentati,</i>
16	[მა]მონ [ო]ვ[ლ]ო [ო]ვ[ლ]- რ[ე]-	მამონ გ(უ)ლო გიგრე- მამონ	პანელქემე,	

17	ბის და {ხაყე} 5 [ც] მთ	ბის . აყენებთ	xal xwalsate yrafeyn [yrafeyn ba PG].	<i>e lo impediste di scribere.</i>
18	და {ხე} ტყვ თ}	და ეტყვთ .	Ti yafar elayon [láyoyon PG];	<i>Imperoché elio cosa dieró?</i>
19	{6}ოვ და ს წ ერ მე ოვფე დ}	ნუ დასწერთ (დასწერ U) მეთ)ფმდ (მეუფედ U)	Mh yrafeyn, [+ ʔti PG] ó βασισεις	<i>Non scribere, perchè questi ...</i>
20	ჰო ვრ იათად :] და	ჰ(უ)რიათად . და (U)	τὼν Ἰουδαίων,	<i>che questo è;</i>
21	წ ო ქ {გა}მ ო ხა წინე ბ	ნუ გ(ა)მოაჩინებ	[+ Mh yrafeyn, PG] ávτl τoῦ μῆ	<i>non scribere</i>
22	ჰეშ მარი ტ სა:] ნოვ	ჰ(ეშმარი)ტსა . ნუ	δελζης [(PG) τῆν ἀληθειαν μῆδῃ τoῦ +Mhδεις PG]	<i>la verità; non</i>
II:	გოვამბილვ მ(ოვე)ნსა მას ოვჭოვლოვბასა, ნოვცა ლ(მრ)თის კადრებასა .	გუამბილვ მ(ოვ)ნსა უჭ(უ)ლ(ოვ)მ(ა)სა ნუცა ლ(მრ)თის კადრებასა.—	τῆν μεσιάζον ἐκποιπεσσης τῆν αὐτὴν ἀφελον PG)	<i>fare che sia alcuna salute, non fare che sia alcun bene.</i>
2rb	S-3902	J 66ra, 19 / U 91r, 10	RS 202r, 16 / PG 61, 710,1	Rossi 7vb