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

Since 1971, the ქ. ოექელიჯე 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’.\(^1\) 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’,\(^2\) 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’.\(^3\) 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’.\(^4\) 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-i ‘many’ and tav-i ‘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;\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) 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. Conçus pour donner les lectures de la tradition aux fêtes du Seigneur et de la Vierge, ce type de collection a pour armature l’année mobile...’.
\(^4\) Mgaloblishvili 2001, 229–236. Long before, P. Peeters had proposed that mravaltavi was modelled upon Greek πολυκεφαλίων (1913, 324), obviously under the influence of ქ. ოექელიჯე (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-‘many’ and tual-‘eye’, and its Greek equivalent in the legend, πολυόμματος.  

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:

The text contains 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 κεφαλὰς 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

---

8 See მარყალაშვილი 1999, 265, 5–12 and მ. Şanige 2014, 320, 10–17; Migne 1862a, 659.
‘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 *mrvaltavi* 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 Baḳurianisζ, a Georgian nobleman from the province of Ṭao-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, summarizes 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):\(^12\)

| 21) saxarebay erti berʒuli okroyta da šemeptonita šekazmuli romelsa zeda sxenan tualni did-pasisani: | 21) one Gospel (codex), in Greek, adorned with gold and coloured glass, with precious stones embedded; |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 22) sxuay saxarebay erti kartulad çerili *otxtavi* veçxlita šeç̣edil okro-curvebuli.: | 22) another Gospel (codex), a *Tetraevangelion* written in Georgian, forged with silver, gold-plated; |
| 23) sxuay saxarebay erti mcire *otxtavi* veçxlita mocuaruli: | 23) another Gospel (codex), a small *Tetraevangelion*, forged with silver; |

\(^9\) 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. Qauxlsxvili 1955–1959, vol. II, 68: *ortavi igi vešapī*).

\(^11\) – 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’).

\(^12\) In Georgian: *sevasṭosman da didman demestikosman ḡovilisa dasavaletisaman*; see the edition by A. Šaniże 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. Šaniże 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. Qauxlsxvili 1955–1959, vol. I, 318, l. 8).

\(^12\) Chap. 34 in the edition A. Šaniže 1970 / 1986, 113–114 / chap. 33, 102 in the edition Tarchnişvili 1954, 74.
27) ცოცი ერთ თარგმანი სახარების იოვანეს თავისი:
28) ცოცი ერთ ორმეთ-მეთქული:
29) ცოცი ერთ ცმისა ბაჟილის იტიხაი:
30) სხუაი ცოცი ერთ ძიმალა.
31) სხუაი ცოცი ერთ ცმისა სვმეორისი:
32) სხუაი ირი ცოცი ცმისა მაქსიმისი:
33) სხუაი ირი ცოცი კლემაქსი.

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 ἰβηρικόν.
(23) 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 οἱ 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.
14 Chap. 33: p. 121, l. 1700 sqq. in the edition provided by Gautier 1984 and p. 53, l. 6 sqq. in the edition by Petit 1904; chap. 34: p. 240, l. 27 sqq. in the edition by Q̣auxčišvili 1963.
15 There is no doubt that ῥωμαϊκός means ‘Greek’ here, given that the Georgian text has berʒuli ‘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:

| Βιβλίον ἐκλογάδιον | sxuay cigni erti didi mravaltavi: | ‘one more book, a big mravaltavi;’ |
|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ἔχον τὰ θαύματα τοῦ ἁγίου | sxuay cigni erti cxoreba ɛmidisa | 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’.\(^{18}\)

\[\text{ΕΚΛΟΓΑΔΙΟΝ, καὶ ΕΚΛΟΓΑΡΙΟΝ, οὔδετ. Δ. (ex-}
\text{trait) ὄνομαζαν οἱ Γραικοὶ. (ἀπὸ τὸ Ἐκλογῆ, Ἐλλ.) τὴν}
\text{ἀπὸ τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια συναγωγὴν τῶν ἀναγινωσκομένων}
\text{εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καθ’ οἶλον τῶν ἐναντόν περικοπῶν. Πιθανὸν}
\text{ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον Εὐαγγελιστάριον, Δ.}
\text{Ἡ λέξες δύναται να μᾶς χρησιμεύῃ ὡς συνών. τοῦ συνήθως}
\text{μεταφέρ. λεγόμενου Ἀπάνθισμα (recueil).}

Fig. 1: ἐκλογάδιον in the ‘Atakta’ dictionary 1835.

\(^{16}\) 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.

\(^{17}\) Άτακτα 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 Bakurianisze’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 τά 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; |
| ἐτερων εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ιω(άννην) ἐκλογάδην- | another one, the Gospel of John, eklogadēn; |
| τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια διὰ τοῦ Βουλγαρί(ας) ἔρμηνευμένα- | the four Gospels, explained by (Theophylact of) Bulgaria; |
| ἐξαήμερος τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου- | the Hexaemeron of (John) the Chrysostom; |
| ἐτέρα 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, καί | An apostolos book for all days of the year, and |
| ἔτερον βιβλίον ἀπόστολος ἐκλογάδην. | another apostolos book eklogadēn. |
| Προφητικὰ βιβλία δύο τῆς ἀκολουθίας. | Two books of the prophets for the acolouthia. |
| Πραξαπόστολος βιβλίων ἐν 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 Baḳurianisže’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).

\(^{21}\) Ed. Gautier 1984, 123 l. 1721–23; ed. Petit 1900, 53, l. 18–21; ed. Qauxčišvili 1963, 242, l. 24–27.
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):22

| Greek | Georgian |
|-------|----------|
| Βιβλίον τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσαάκ. | Βιβλίον τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσαάκ. |
| Ἐπιλώρικα βασιλικὰ ἄκαμπτα τέσσαρα, ἕν τὸ ἔν χρυσοῦν. | *mēnaion eklogadin* |
| A book of St. Isaac; another (book), one *mēnaion eklogadin*. | Four royal gowns, from violet silk, one of them with gold... |

As Greek μηναῖον can be equated with Georgian *iadgari*,23 we are left with the correspondence of ἐκλογάδιν and *gamokrebul-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 ἐκλογάδιν 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.24 However, we must underline here that the usage of ἐκλογάδιν was wider in that it could be used both with μηναῖα and with εὐαγγέλια 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*.

---

22 Ed. A. Šaniże 1970 / 1986, 114; ed. Tarchnişvili 1954, 74 l. 28–30.
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 ‘ἀνθολόγιον’ (1888, 206).
1.3.3 That Greek ἐκλογάδιον 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, we may quote the following title:

| Title no. 17 from the ‘ἐκλογάδιον book’ | Title no. 17 from the ‘ἐκλογάδιον book’ |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 1. Μηδεὶς τὸν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφεύγοντα βίᾳ ἀφαιρείσθω, ἀλλὰ τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ πρόσφυγος κατάδηλον ποιείτω τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ παρ’ αὐτοῦ λαμβανέτω τὸν προσφυγόντα... | 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...

1.3.4 All in all, Greek ἐκλογάδιον 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 ἐκλογάδιον 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 scholarship 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). Besides this, the

---

25 See Simon and Troianos 1977, 58–74 (l. 307t).
26 The edition contains seven further titles of this type.
27 At least since the investigation by I. Abulaže published under the title of ‘Mravaltavi’ (Abulaže 1944, 241–316 / 1982, 32–106).
28 The texts of the codex were edited by A. Šaniże 1959. As to (undated) older mss. see below.
set usually comprises the *mravaltavis* of Mt. Athos (ms. Ath. 11, 11th c.), Udabno (ms. A–1109, 9th–10th cc.), Klaržeti (ms. A–144, 10th c.), Ṭbeti (ms. A–19, 10th c.), and Ḳarǯeti (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* = 26.12., or *ttuesa ianvarsa a çmidisa 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-ğebisatws uplisa çuenisa 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 Ḳarǯali *mravalta*), 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-caesarea, on the Annunciation of the holy Mother of God’ (*tkumuli çmidisa grigoli neokesariel eṗisḳoṗosisa xarebisa çmidisa ġmrtis-mšobelisa*), to be read as the first

---

29 See the edition of the Sinai Mravalta by A. Šaniże 1959, 55, l. 1 and p. 70, l. 1 (fols. 54r and 67r of the codex).
30 See the edition of the Sinai Mravaltavi by A. Šaniže 1959, 74, l. 2–4 (fol. 70v of the codex).
31 The codex was first described by Cagareli 1888, 193–240 (also printed in Cagareli 1889), in two parts: Cagareli’s no. 83 (pp. 234–5) comprises the present nos. 32 and 33, and no. 86 (pp. 236–7), the present no. 57. The same distribution is still found in Marr’s catalogue (1940), which describes no. ‘32–33’ on pp. 1–26 and no. ‘57’, on pp. 93–97. Garitte in his *Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens littéraires du Mont Sinaï* was the first to join the three parts (1956, 72–97).
32 My thanks are due to the librarian of St. Catherine’s Monastery, Father Justin, who made the codex accessible to me in May, 2009, during a sojourn on Mt. Sinai in connection with the international project ‘Critical Edition of the Old Georgian Versions of Matthew’s and Mark’s Gospels – Catalogue of the Manuscripts Containing the Old Georgian Translation of the Gospels’ (project kindly supported by INTAS, Brussels, under ref.no. 05-1000008-8026).
of three lections on this topic (sakitxavni xarebisani, ‘Lections of the Annunciation’) on March 25th (tt(u)sa martsa ñe: 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 cmidata da netarta mamatay romeltna moisrnes mtasa sinasa da raits barbarostagan, açcera cmidaman amonios: fol. 255v), 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. 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. 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, 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 eṭ- at the end of fol. 84v of no. 32 with no doubt pertain to the verbal form eṭq̇odes ‘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:

| 32, romelni-igi mouqdes petres | samatasn | da eṭq̇oda mat,romelita | -igi ʒuars-ecua k(r)ıstı.é |
| r(omel)n-igi mouqdes petres | samatasn | da eṭq̇oda mat,romelita | -igi ʒuars-ecua k(r)ıstı.é |
| those 3000 who came to Peter | and he talked to them, who had crucified Christ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

33 Apart from A. Šanițe’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 Šanițe assumes a lacuna of ‘ca. 75 leaves’ (daaxloebit 75 purcıs ţekstit) for the breakage between fols. 57 and 33 (see the edition 1959, 151).

35 See Ιερά Μονή και Αρχιεπισκοπή Σινά. Τα νέα ευρήματα του Σινά, Αθήνα 1998, 8–24 and 25–49, and Gippert et al. 2009, p. 1–2 as to the circumstances of the finding.

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).

37 Chaps. 15–16, corresponding to the Greek version as edited by Reischl / Rupp 1848 / 1967, 82–86, and in Migne 1857, 445–48.
They asked him and said to him: What shall we do, men, <brethren,> for a big wound you have added, Peter, upon our sins ...

πυνϑανομένοις καὶ λέ-

γουαί: τί ποίησομεν ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί; μέγα γὰρ τὸ τραῦ-

μα ἐπέστησας ἡμᾶς, ὦ Πέτρε,

τῷ ἡμετέρῳ πτώματι...

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:

| N89, 2v, 19-25 | If someone were an uneducated (U: ignorant) landman, 42 |
| --- | --- |
| Owkowetow vinme korikozi iqos owscavleli, | Ukuetu vinme kurekozi iqos umecari, |

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. Šaniże and Z. Čumburiże 1994, 117, l. 5–8.
42 The term korikozi / kurekozi-i seems not to be attested elsewhere in Old Georgian. The proposal by Z. Čumburiże (in the lexicon attached to his edition of the Udabno Mravaltavi 1994, 329) to take this as a corrupted form of korepiskoṣkozi ‘local bishop’ is now rendered improbable by the attestation in the Sinal Mravaltavi. As korepiskoṣkozi clearly reflects Greek χωρεπίσκοπος ‘id., korikozi-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 Cabalimum’ 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 χωρικός, 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, romelman ver ikadros meped saxelis-deba, aramed gamotoargmanebis mçeemsad; 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): uketu vinne (< E) korikozi iqos (iqo D) umecari, mived (movides E) betlemad da iscav[jos] (<< D). The definition ‘(king’s) regent (in Kakhetia)” provided...
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.

---

**S(a)k(l)tx(a)vni migebebisani**

In the month (of) February, 3rd

| S(a)k(l)tx(a)vni migebebisani | Lections of the Hypapante |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| *On the day when Symeon took the Lord upon his arms* | *dģesa, romelsa miikua mśmeon* |
| *Sermon of the holy and blessed* | *tkumuli cmidisa* |
| *Father of ours, Hesychius, Presbyter* | *evsuki xucisay* |
| *of Jerusalem, on/of the twentieth* | *ierusalēmelisay meormeocisa mis* |
| *day from the virgin birth* | *dģisa šobitgan kalçuļisa* |

---

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 Vaxuṣṭi Bagraṭioni (Qauxčišvili 1973, 524, l. 5-6 and 557, 18–21: grigoli... içoda ḵaxta mtavrəd 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. Šaniże’s edition (1959.90), the title was supplied from the Udabno Mravaltavi.
of our Lord Jesus Christ, when they brought him to the temple.

V(ita)r-igi, aḳowrtxevda mas How he was blessed by St. Symeon.
* ç(mida)y swmeon . *
c̣miday swmeon .
T(towes)a : p(e)b(e)rv(a)lsa : b: In the month (of) February, 2nd

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. ิง้า = 11 and ሞብ =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:

| Daic̣era ese çigni i(eros¬sa)lëms, | This book was written in Jerusalem, |
| lavrasa didsa ç(midis)a | in the big Laura of our Holy |
| da neṭarisa mamisa ç(owe)nisa | and Blessed Father |
| sabay(s)sa dĝeta | Saba, in the days |
| ġ(mr)tis m(o)q(owa)risa tevdosi | of the God-loving Theodosius, |
| ṭatrektisada da saba- | the patriarch, and |
| ç(mid(i)𝑑(ω)𝑡iosnisa da sanatrelisa solomon | the venerable and |
| mamasaxlisisata. | blissful Solomon, |

Da daic̣era çmiday ese çigni | And this holy book was written |

dasabamitgan c̣elta: | in the year(s) after |

xwyē | Creation |

Kroniḳoni iq̇o: 6468, |

The chronicon was |

pd: 84.

---

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 et Monte Sina’).

46 The ms. has çerta instead of çelta, probably by perseveration 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 čelta kartulad: xppe-sa da kronikonsa: šā-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 atotxmeti čeli umețēsxuata enata krisțēs 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 čeli ‘year’ with preceding zā, 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 čeli 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) q̇(av)t ‘pray!’ over the closing dots of its last line.

47 It would be less promising if the number were to be read as sē 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 Makări 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):

---

*Çq̇alobita mamisayta da ʒisayta da sulisa çmidsa yat ...*
*Da madlita çmidisa adgomisa saplavisapulisa çuienisa ijesu krisṭēsisayta ...*
*Da meoxebita q̇ovelta çinaçarmetq̇uelta, mocikulta, maxarebelta ...*
*Me, makari leteteli, ʒē giorgi grʒelisay, codvili priad, ǧirs mão ǧmertman şesakmed çmidsa amis çignisa mravaltavisa ...*
*tana-Šeçevnita ʒmisa çuienisa sulierad piler WRAPPERER ašmisa amona kaxisayta ...*
*da qelt-cerita dedis ʒmisçulisa çemisa amona vaxtang moząrçulisa ʒisayta ...*

---

By the charity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit ... and the mercy of the Holy Resurrection from the grave of Our Lord Jesus Christ ... and with the support of all prophets, apostles, evangelists ... I, Makari 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, P̄imen Șaxa, 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.

49 See Z. Čumburiże in the preface to the edition by A. Šaniże and Z. Čumburiże 1994, 9.
following transcripts are quoted from Zurab Čumburiże’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.\(^{50}\)

| 75v | k(risṭe) mravaltavi mrguloani da sepipirī ġmertman uçqis da natlis mcemelman | Christ! The *mravaltavi* in round (letters) and noble (lit. noble person) God and the Baptist knows. |
| 126r | k(risṭe) mravaltavi mrguloani da sepipirī ġmertman icis da natlis mcemelman, romel razom karga 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 Nikolaos, of the Tetraevangelion together with some other codices from Šaṭberdi, one of the centres of Georgian eruditeness in Tao-Ḳlarǯeti in East Anatolia, to Guria (Fig. 11). The list comprises, besides the *ottxtavi* itself, a lectionary (*qelt-kanoni*) 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 Tao-Ḳlarǯeti and was detected in the early 20\(^{th}\) century in the Gurian monastery of Udabno.\(^{51}\) The following transcript comprises lines 6–14 of the note.\(^{52}\)

---

\(^{50}\) Interestingly enough, a comparable wording is found in the introduction to the Visramiani, i.e. the Georgian prose translation of the Persian epic Vīs u Rāmin, which was compiled by the 12\(^{th}\) c.; here we read (p. 34, II. 19–21 in the edition by A. Gvaxaria and M. Todua 1962): *me q̇uela vici da masmia siğete da sepispiroba mati, romel karga hamo ambavia brzenta da mecnieragan tkumuli da šecqobili 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 pirī* (e.g., in the chronicle of Queen Tamar’s age by Basili Ezosmoğhari in Qauçišvili 1955–1959, vol. II, 149, l. 27; the chronicle of the Mongol invasions by an anonymous ‘Ţamtaqmc̣ereli’ = ‘Chronicler’, ib. p. 196, l. 4; or the Georgian prose translation of the Persian Šāhnāme, *Šah-Names anu mepeta çignis kartuli versiebi*, vol. III, ed. Ḳobiʒe 1974, p. 510, l. 21), this seems to suggest the note in the Mravaltavi to have been added after the 12\(^{th}\) century.

\(^{51}\) See Taqaišvili 1916, 12 in the preface to the facsimile edition of the Adishi Gospels, and A. Šaniže and Z. Čumburiże 1994, 5 and 9–10.

\(^{52}\) See Taqaišvili 1916, 12, and A. Šaniže and Z. Čumburiże 1994, 9.
I, Nikolaos, formerly the abbot of (the monastery of) Žumati, unworthy and pitiful with (my) soul, with much endeavour I have visited the monasteries of Klarjeti – may God build them up – and collected these books: first, this holy Tetraevangelion, and a Mravaltavi and a lectionary, 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. Šaniže 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. The Udabno and Tbeti 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 Sabanisze) of St. Habo of Ṭbilisi, as well as accounts of the life of St. Anthony.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.56

3.2 The mravaltavi of  Пархали, 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),57 among them the autochthonous legend of the 5th century Georgian martyr, St. Šušaniḳ.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,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  Пархали codex but in its first part.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. Čumburisi according to whom

55 In the Udabno Mravaltavi, texts no. 9 (fols. 7r–11v, followed by an ‘Eclogue of the holy martyr Habo’, Kebay შმიდისა მოჭამისა ობაიოს, as no. 10, 11v–14r), and 11–13 (fols. 14r–36v); in the Ṭbeti Mravaltavi (A–19, see the descriptions by Gorgaże 1927, 1–35, and Bregae et al. 1973, 58–71), texts no. 62 (402b–432b / 202v–203r, including the ‘Eclogue’) and 63 (433a–451b / 218r–224r).
56 Texts no. 42 (fols. 225rb–232rb), 43 (232va–234ra), and 10 (59vb–67ra) in the Sinai Mravaltavi.
57 Tkumuli ioane bolnel epişkopisisay lazarestws da daǯdomisatsws upliṣa ƙicusa zeda da šeslvisatsws ierusalemad da šesxmisatsws ƙrmataysa; see Bregae et al. 1973, 380, no. 97. The text of the homily is printed with a French translation in Verhelst 2015, 430–453.
58 No. 107 (fols. 353r–359v), see Bregae et al. 1973, 382.
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 Bregae et al. 1973, 380 and Esbroeck 1975, 55.
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 Ṭbilisi (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 Bregae 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.

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.

61 Udabnos Mravaltavi, 7: mravaltavis saxelit cnobili krebulebi, romlebic ama tu im dgesascaulis dros eklesiaši sašitxvad gankutvnil txzulebebs seicaven...

62 In contrast to this, the definition given by E. Taq̄aišvili in the preface to the facsimile edition of the Adishi Gospels (1916, 12), is disbalanced as it foregrounds hagiography (‘многоглавъ’ (мравалъ-тави). Подъ этим названиемъ въ дрѣвнегрузунской письменности исвѣстны жизнеописанія святыхъ и слова и рѣчи отцовъ церкви.’); it may well have been influenced by the occurrence of the term in the compiler’s colophon of a 13th c. menology (of April) which contrasts the ‘metaphrastic’ versions of Saints’ lives (cxorebata da mokalakobata, da cāmebata da ǧuač̣ta = ’lives and ministries, martyrdoms and toils’) with ‘the old Keimena, which are also called mravaltavi by some’ (ʒuelisa kimenisagan, romelsa vietnime mravaltavadca uc̣oden; see Ҝečēli 1912, 340–1; note that the adverbial case in -ad attested here was erroneously taken to constitute a stem mravaltavad-i by P. Peeters 1913, 324). The first attempt to define the term mravaltavi is probably Al. Cagareli’s who in his account of the Sinai Mravaltavi (1888, 235: no. 83 ~ Sin. georg. 32–33) styled it a ‘святооческій сборникъ’, i.e. a ‘collective volume of Holy Fathers’. – Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani in his 17th century dictionary (1965, 522 /1966, 516) records only the abstract noun mravaltaobay that might be derived from mravaltavi (in the sense of ‘mravaltavi-ness’ or ‘being a mravaltavi’), glossed by him as mraval-gannac̣ilebulivit, i.e. ‘like (something) much divided’. The addition of ‘katiġ.’ in ms. ZAa of the lexicon obviously refers to the ‘Categories’ of Aristotle, as mravaltaobay occurs in the Georgian version of the commentaries of Aristotle by the Neoplatonian Ammonios Hermeiou, produced by the so-called Gelati school in the 12th c., where it translates Greek τὸ κατὰ πλειόνων (within the text ‘In Porphyrii isagogen sive quinque voces’, see the edition by A. Busse 1891, 61, ll. 20–23 and the edition of the Georgian text by Ҝečēli 1983, 49, ll. 27–33): φησὶ γάρ· γένος ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ πλειόνων καὶ διαφερόντων τῷ εἶδεν ἐν τῷ τί ἐστι κατηγορούμενον· τὸ γάρ κατὰ πλειόνων διακρίνει αὐτὸ τῶν ἁτόμων (ἐκείνων καθ’ ἑνὸς λεγομένων), τὸ δὲ διαφερόντων τῷ εἶδεν διακρίνει αὐτὸ ἐδοὺς καὶ ἰδιοῦ...

63 For the former see Esbroeck 1980, 18–21; for the latter, Orbeli 1967, 125–134 (see Esbroeck 1975, 35).
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 Šaniže 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-ques mistws, rayta čarčimidon 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 episkoposi, ‘John the Bishop’: fol. 3vb, l. 5 =A. Šaniže 1959, 135: 11b, l. 5. See Gippert (forthc.), 1. for a survey of other proposals as to the authorship.
67 Text no. 12 (fol. 65r–66v); see the catalogues by Blake 1922–23, 367, and Mari [Marr] 1955, 48 (ms. ‘18, 12.’). The text was used by M. Šaniže 2009 in her article “Homilia ‘Parisevelta šurisatws’ xanmet 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, 49–152, 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.
71 Text no. 35, 395–405 in the facsimile edition; see also the edition by Severjanov 1904 / 1956, 395–405.
72 See the edition by Knjazevskaja et al. 1971, 330–336.
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 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,74 contrasted with A. Šaniże’s reading and collated with the Greek and Slavonic versions.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.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).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;78 four additional bifoliates of the same original have been detected in the Tbilisi palimpsest A–737.79 It is not very probable, though, that the two hagiographical texts might be the remnants of a former mravaltavi, albeit

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.
74 On the basis of a multispectral analysis undertaken by the author together with L. Kajaia, D. Tvaltavadze, and S. Sardjveladze in Tbilisi, 2005.
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 <http://www.manuscript.ge/uploads/sympoziumi/tezisebi.pdf>, 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.
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 10th 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).
77 See Gippert et al. 2007.
78 See the edition, 6–1 – 6–90 (ms. no. VI).
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; 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*. It seems therefore preferable to regard the Khanmeti original of the Vienna codex as a prototype of a martyrology.

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.

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 Bregaje et al. 1973, 382–3.
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 Sabaite, and, by the hand of Ioane Zosime again, the ‘Praise of the Georgian Language’; see Garitte 1956, 15–26.
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)\textsuperscript{84}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{ll}
| Kebay da d(ide)b(a)y kart(u)lisə enisay: | Praise and Exaltation of the Georgian Language |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Damarxul ars enay kartuli                | The Georgian tongue is buried               |
| dgesture meored moslvisa misisa saçame-belad: | until the day of his second coming, to witness, |
| r(ayt)a q̇(ove)lsa enasa ġ(mer)tm(a)n amxilos amit enita: | so that God may convict every tongue through |
| da ese enay mʒinare ars dgestureamode | this tongue.\textsuperscript{85} |
| da saxebaraša ŝina amas enasa lazare hrk-wan. | And this tongue is sleeping until today, |
| Da axalman nino moakcia da hèlene dedopalman: | and in the Gospels this tongue is called Lazarus.\textsuperscript{86} |
| ese arian orni dani, v(itarc)a mariam da mar-tay: | And it was converted by the new Nino and by |
| da megobrobay amistws tk(u)a v(itarc)d q̇(ove)li saidumloy amas enasa ŝina damarxul ars | Queen Helena, |
| And 'friendship' he said\textsuperscript{86} because |
| every mystery is preserved in this language, |
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{84} For the text version of Sin.georg. 6 (fol. 223v) see Garițte 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.

\textsuperscript{85} See Jo. 16.8: \textit{da igi movides da amxilos sopelsa codvatatws da simartlisatws da sas'elisatws ‘and he will come and will convict the world because of sins and justice and judgment’.}

\textsuperscript{86} See Jo. 11.11: \textit{lazare, megobarman čuennan, dačćina, aramed me mivide da ganvağıwzo igi ‘Lazarus, our friend, is sleeping, but I will go and wake him up’.

\textsuperscript{87} For Sin.georg. 38, Cagareli notes \textit{elinni dedupalman elene}, obviously by interference of \textit{elin-i ‘Hellen, Greek person’}; however, the manuscript has plain \textit{helene dedupalman}.

\textsuperscript{88} See Jo. 11.1–3: \textit{da ijo vinme sneul lazare betaniayt, dabit mariamisit da martaysit, disa misisa. ... miavlines misa data mista da hrkues... ‘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 dġisa ṁ(u)dari amistws tk(u)a davit č(ina)č(armet)q̇(ue)lm(a)n, r(ametu) celi atasi v(itarc)a erti dġē.
dasaxar(e)basā šina kartulsā tavsa x(olo) matēssa ą91
andal sand q̇(ov)lad otxatassa maragșa:
da esē ese otxi dġē: da otxisa dģisa ṁ(u)dari
amistws mis tanave dapluli siƙ(u)dīlata natlis-ğebisa misisayta:
Da ese enay, șemƙuli da ƙurtx(eu)li saxelīta o(wp)līsya ta
mdabali da daçunebuli
moelīs dģesā mas meored moslvasa o(wp)līsasa
da sasč(u)lad ese akus
oktxmeoc da oktxmeṭi celi umetēs sxuata enata k(r)istēs moslvitg(a)n v(idr)e dģesamomde
Da ese q(ove)li r(ome)li95 čeril ars
moçameđ ćarmogitxar
asoș ese ći96 anbanisay.
and ‘dead for four days’ (he) said99 (because) David the Prophet (said) that
‘1000 years (is) like one day’.90
And in the Georgian Gospels, only in the Gospel (lit. chapter) of Matthew,
sits a cili, which is the letter (ŋ = c),92 and it means all in all the number 4000.93
And this is the four days and he who is dead
for four days,
therefore it is buried through the
death of his baptism.94
And this tongue, adorned and blessed by the
name of the Lord,
(yet) humiliated and reviled,
is waiting for the day of the second coming of
the Lord.
And this it has as a miracle:
94 years more than the other tongues
since the coming of Christ up to the present
day.
And all this, which is written,
I have told you as a witness,
l, the letter ći (or part) of the alphabet.

89 See Jo. 11.17: movida iesu da pova otxdģisay samaresa šina ‘and Jesus came and found (him having been)
in the grave for four days.’
90 See Ps. 89 [90].4: ranetu atasi celi tualtā činašē uplisata vitarca guşinđelī dğē, romel čarqda da vitarca saqumilavi erti ǧanisay ‘for 1000 years before the eyes of the Lord (are) like yesterday’s day that has passed, and like one night watch.
91 All three manuscripts have çerili ‘writing, script’ instead of cili ‘part; (name of the) letter ç’.
92 In Georgian, the Gospel of Matthew begins with the word čigni ‘book’ – Greek Βίβλος ‘id.’.
93 The letter ç = cili has the numerical value of 4000 in the Georgian alphabet.
94 See Rom. 6,4: da tana-daveplenit mas natlis-ģebita mit siƙudilsa 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 celi, which would mean something like ‘these 100 years’ instead; Sin.georg. 6 has moçameđ ćamogitxras ese cili anbanisay, which means something like ‘it will tell you as a witness, this (letter) cili (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–2v²⁷

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.

²⁷
| 7ra | S-3902 | Šanize BUT 7 | BAV Ottob. |
|------|---------|--------------|-------------|
| 1    | ობჰჺჰჺჰ | ობჰჺჰჺჰ | [ομ] | ჯოსტ გიპერტ |
| 2    | [ძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძჰძهجჰძჰძჰძჰძهجჰძჰძهجჰძهجჰძهجჰძهجჰძჰძهجჰძჰძهجჰძჰძჰძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجومჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძჳძჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძჳძჳძهجჳძهجჳძهى
καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

καὶ ἐξελθόντες δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

καὶ σώσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,

καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός,
| 7rb | S-3902 | Šaniže BUT 7 | BAV Ottob. |
|------|--------|---------------|------------|
| 1    | ἐπιστημονεῖαι, καὶ | ἐπιστημονεῖαι καὶ | αἰσχυνονται |
| 2    | ὑποθέτοντες (:) b<ἵνα> | ὑποθέτοντες b- | λέγειν' |
| 3    | (b<ظلم>ς οὐκ)]<<ίναι>ς> (καὶ) [καὶ] | οὖν | ήμεῖς δὲ διὰ τὴν |
| 4    | μὲνο | μὲνο | αὐτῶν |
| 5    | (ὁγ) ἀνεῖσο, [: —] | (ὁγ) ἀνεῖσο | αἰσχύνῃ, τὴν αὐτῶν ἦτταν ἐκπομπεύσωμεν. |
| 6    | [ὅ<ἀθάνατον>] ὁδυγεῖται (,) | [ὅ<ἀθάνατον>] ὁδυγεῖται | Διὰ τί γὰρ, ϕῆσιν, |
| 7    | (ἐ)πιστημ. | (ἐ)πιστημ. | νεκροίς ἐγέιει, |
| 8    | μὴ ἂν ἔπειτα ἐφικμαζόμεθα [:] | μὴ ἂν ἔπειτα | καὶ ἀσθενοῦντας |
| 9    | καὶ τὸς ἐρρυσόμεθα | καὶ τὸς ἐρρυσόμεθα | ιἀται; |
| 10   | [ἄνοι] ὁμολογεῖσθαι, | [ἄνοι] ὁμολογεῖσθαι, | διὰ τί καλὰ λαλεῖ, καὶ |
| 11   | [ἄνοι] ὁμολογεῖσθαι, | [ἄνοι] ὁμολογεῖσθαι, | δια τί δὲ και διδάσκει; |
| 12   | [ἀνο] μὲν [ἀνο] ἐχθρὸς [:] | [ἀνο] μὲν [ἀνο] ἐχθρὸς | Διὰ ταῦτα |
| 13   | [ἀνο] μὲν [ἀνο] ἐχθρὸς [:] | [ἀνο] μὲν [ἀνο] ἐχθρὸς | μαθεοῦμεβα αὐτῶν |
| 14   | [ἀνο] μὲν [ἀνο] ἐχθρὸς [:] | [ἀνο] μὲν [ἀνο] ἐχθρὸς | ἀπολέσαι. |
| 15   | (ἢ) ὁμολογεῖσθαι (ἐχθρος) | (ἢ) ὁμολογεῖσθαι (ἐχθρος) | "Ὀτε νήπιοι παῖδες |
| 16   | (ἢ) ὁμολογεῖσθαι (ἐχθρος) | (ἢ) ὁμολογεῖσθαι (ἐχθρος) | βαία λαμβάνοντες, καὶ διὰ |
| 17   | (ἢ) ὁμολογεῖσθαι (ἐχθρος) | (ἢ) ὁμολογεῖσθαι (ἐχθρος) | τῶν βαιων τὴν νίκην |
| 18   | (ἢ) ὁμολογεῖσθαι (ἐχθρος) | (ἢ) ὁμολογεῖσθαι (ἐχθρος) | προαναφορώντες ... |

Table 2
### Mravaltavi – A Special Type of Old Georgian Multiple-Text Manuscripts

| PG 61          | Cod.Supr. (402,23) | Usp.Sb. |
|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| αἰσχύνονται     | σραλλὰίκτης σα      | σραλλάις του     |
| λέγειν̩         | γλαγολατί ἵνα      | γλατί ἵνα       |
| ἡμείς τὴν     | λῦς σραλλὰδυ      | λῦς σραλλὰδυ     |
| αὐτῶν̩         | τῆςκαλλίκτης ἵνα   | τῆςκαλλίκτης ἵνα |
| αἰσχύνην πανταχῇ στηλιτεύσωμεν. | πρόδοτικην ὀλυμπίαν | πρόδοτικην ὀλυμπίαν |
| Διὰ τὶ γὰρ, φησὶ, | ποιόθεν ποιεῖσθαι | ποιόθεν ποιεῖσθαι |
| νεκροὺς ἐγείρει; | λαράτωνα θεσπιαίεστι | λαράτωνα θεσπιαίεστι |
| καὶ διὰ τὶ ἀσθενοῦντας | ἰναπεκτικῆς    | ἰναπεκτικῆς    |
| ἱταῖ;         | ζηκαί      | ζηκαί       |
| διὰ τὶ καλὰ λαλεῖ; διὰ τὶ καλὰ | ποιόθεν ὠ γλαγολεῖται | ποιόθεν ὠ γλαγολεῖται |
| πράττωτε; διὰ τὶ καλὰ διδάσκει; | τεκνίται ποιόθεν χε ὀσχίτες | τεκνίται ποιόθεν χε ὀσχίτες |
| Διὰ ταῦτα | σιχὺ δάλλαμα | σιχὺ δάλλαμα |
| πάντα τὰ ἐγκλήματα | βαῖχχ ὀνεῖ    | βαῖχχ ὀνεῖ     |
| βουλεύονται αὐτὸν | χοιρίσει | χοιρίσει |
| ἀπολέσαι. | πογογατίμην   | πογογατίμην |
| Ὁταν ἔξερχωνται νήπιοι παιδεσ  | ἐγὼ παλάδα δέκτη | ἐγὼ παλάδα δέκτη |
| βαῖα λαμβάνοντες, διὰ τῶν βαίων | βαῖε βαῖλαμε ἐν βαῖλεμε ἐμοῦ | βαῖε βαῖλαμε ἐν βαῖλεμε ἐμοῦ |
| τὴν νίκην αὐτοῦ προσαναφωνοῦντες, καὶ | | |
| ἐν τῇ εὐφημίᾳ αὐτοῦ | ποημᾶ ||

| PG 61          | Cod.Supr. (403,1) | Usp.Sb. |
|----------------|--------------------|---------|
| | | |

---
Table 3

| 7va | S-3902 | Šanize BUT 7 | BAV Ottob. |
|------|--------|--------------|------------|
| 1    | δα δοθήκηκας ')  ολης; ην   | δα δοθήκηκας ολης | Όσαννά |
| 2    | δα σοι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι  | δα σοι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι  | έν τοις υψίστοις, |
| 3    | (άδης ολης) | (άδης ολης) | εύλογημένος |
| 4    | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | ο ερχόμενος |
| 5    | δα σοι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι | δα σοι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι | έν ονόματι Κυρίου, |
| 6    | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | βασιλέως του 'Ισραήλ. |
| 7    | δα σοι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι | δα σοι οι οι οι οι οι οι οι | 'Εκείνοι καθάπερ ύπο ζιβήνων |
| 8    | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | κεντοῦμενοι |
| 9    | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | τοις οδόντας |
| 10   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | ἐβρυχον· |
| 11   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | οι γὰρ ἐπανοι |
| 12   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | τῶν φθονομένων, |
| 13   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | βέλη |
| 14   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | τῶν φθονούντων εἰσι. |
| 15   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | Καὶ προσέρχονται |
| 16   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ; |
| 17   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | Οὐκ ἀκούεις, |
| 18   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | τί αὐτοὶ λέγουσι; |
| 19   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | οὐκ εἰδότες, ὅτι |
| 20   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | προφητικῶς |
| 21   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | ἐπιηροῦτο |
| 22   | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | δα σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι σοι | τὸ γεγραμμένον. |

2ra | S-3902 | Šanize BUT 7 | BAV Ottob. |
|                  | PG 61                          | Cod.Supr. (403,1)                          | Usp.Sb. |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------|
| **λέγοντες,** *Ωσαννά* | **γλασλιθεῖ· ὑσαιν*          | **γλασλιθεῖ· ὤσαινά**                  |         |
| ἐν τοῖς ὑψιτοῖς,         | **ἐπί· ὑσαινίνχ**                 | **ἐπί· ὤσαινίνχ**                  |         |
|                       | **βλασολοβεῖν**                  | **βλασολοβεῖν**                  |         |
|                       | **γραδὶν**                       | **γραδὶν**                          |         |
|                       | **ἐπὶ· ἡμῖν ἰσποδίσει**        | **ἐπὶ· ἡμῖν ἰσποδίσει**          |         |
|                       | **ὑπὸ· ἑδραίσει**                | **ὑπὸ· ἑδραίσει**                 |         |
| **ἐκεῖνοι ἀπὸ τῶν ζβήνων* | **τῷ· ὤν· ἀκτύ**                | **τῷ· ὤν· ἀκτύ**                  |         |
| σφατόμενοι               | **ὁστῆν**                      | **ὁστῆν**                        |         |
| **ὑπὸ τοῦ φθόνου κεντοῦνται·** | **βοδομι**                     | **βοδομι**                        |         |
|                       | **χβγ**                         | **χβγ**                         |         |
|                       | **σκρφξτααχµ· χβλαβ βο**      | **σκρφξτααχµ· χβλαβ βο**      |         |
| **οἱ γὰρ ἔπαινοι**      | **ξαβιστη· ὧμβοςξτινιη**      | **ξαβιστη· ὧμβοςξτινιη**      |         |
| τῶν φθονουμένων,         | **ὁρφκει**                     | **ὁρφκει**                      |         |
| βέλη εἰσι              | **ξαβιδλστιην**                 | **ξαβιδλστιην**                 |         |
| τῶν φθονούντων.          | **ἐξητ**·                       | **ἐξητ**·                       |         |
| Καὶ προσέρχονται        | **ὑπὸ· πριπσδλςε**              | **ὑπὸ· πριπσδλςε**              |         |
| τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· | **κῇ· ἱσουσαγ γραλολασ ἐμον·** | **κῇ· ἱσουσαγ γραλολασ ἐμον·** |         |
| Οὐκ ἀκοίεις,             | **εἰσθανίι**                   | **εἰσθανίι**                   |         |
| τί οὗτοι λέγουσι;        | **κρν· ἱγλαρδετ**               | **κρν· ἱγλαρδετ**               |         |
| Καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον, ὃτι | **καὶ· βκστε· αι· ἰακο**    | **καὶ· βκστε· αι· ἰακο**    |         |
| προφητικάς              | **προροχκεσκο**                | **προροχκεσκο**                |         |
| ἐπληροῦστο               | **κοινάπασασε· εα**           | **κοινάπασασε· εα**           |         |
| τὸ γεγραμμένον,          | **πισαθεί·**                   | **πισαθεί·**                   |         |
1. ჰეგულებოდა დახემტკიცოს
2. თაფრობაჲ კატερτίσω
3. ἐβούλετο πλαστὰ
4. ἀντი თო დებაჲ ბირთვისა Ჰს გრამμათი ჲა
5. ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡδέως გართობით შეხიწყნა ἢνείχε 
6. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡδέως ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔδειξε, ἡ ἀλήθειαν ἔδειξε, ἢ ὁ βασιλε无视
τὸ, Ἐκ στομάτος νηπίων
καὶ δηλαδόντων
κατηρτίσω
αίνων.
Ὅτε Ἰεζαβέλ
κατὰ τοῦ Ναβοὺθε τὰ πλαστά
ἐποίει γράμματα,
γράφει καὶ ἤδεως
ἀνέχεσθε·
ὅτε Πιλᾶτος γράφει
ἐπί τοῦ τίτλου
τὰ χρηστὰ
γράμματα,
ἄγανακτείτε,
καὶ κωλύετε γράφεσθαι.
Τί γὰρ λέγουσι;
Μὴ γράφε, ὁτι ὁ βασιλεὺς
tῶν Ἰουδαίων.
Μὴ γράφε, ὁτι τοῦ,
Τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τοῦ Μηδείς