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Abstract

This article deals with two aspects of the secondary ‘life’ of Old Georgian manuscripts, namely a) their ‘wandering’ between the (autochthonous and allochthonous) centres of manuscript production and storage, and b) their reutilisation for personal blessings, rogations and prayers, and also for less ‘immanent’ purposes such as prescriptions, contracts and writing exercises added by later readers, users or owners. The various types of reuse are exemplified with reference to codices from Georgia and elsewhere.

1. Introduction

Amongst the manuscript traditions of the Christian Near East, that of the Georgians is one of the richest, extending from about the fifth to the nineteenth century CE and comprising approximately 75,000 surviving leaves. The role played by the production of manuscripts in the spiritual and intellectual life of the Georgian people can easily be inferred from the various forms of secondary use to which many of the codices were subjected. This is true for a large number of them that can be shown to have been the object of relocation, being moved from the place where they were originally conceived to one or several other places where they were worked upon, sometimes long before they were stored in modern depositories such as the Korneli Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts in Tbilisi. Another type of secondary use can be seen in the various functions to which many codices were subjected, aside from being merely read and copied. On the following pages, these two main types of secondary use will be illustrated by a series of examples, which should by no means be regarded as exhaustive.

2. Georgian manuscripts in motion

In comparison with the small region south of the Caucasus main ridge that is inhabited by speakers of the Georgian language today, Georgian manuscripts originated in a much broader area in the Christian East from the early beginnings of Georgian literacy on. By the end of the first millennium of the Christian era, Georgian monks had long been established in Jerusalem and on Mt Sinai, and with the foundation of the Georgian monasteries on Mt Athos and in the Rhodopes, further centres of erudition evolved in what may be termed the Georgian diaspora of the Middle Ages. However, none of the ‘allochthonous’ centres remained isolated. Instead, we can be sure there were close ties not only between neighbouring centres, but also across longer distances (cf. map on next page, which details the most important centres of Georgian manuscript production and the most obvious ties between them).

This is clearly demonstrated by both explicit and implicit evidence to be found in ‘wandering’ manuscripts, that is, colophons and marginal notes on the one hand and textual and layout features on the other.

2.1 A famous example of a manuscript taken from one centre to another is the Sinai mravaltavi, a homiliary codex from the second half of the ninth century, which is preserved in St Catherine’s Monastery. Having become disintegrated over the course of time, the separate parts

---

1 This article is based on my lectures given at the workshops Manuscripts in Motion and The Secondary Life of Manuscripts held at the Sonderforschungsbereich 950 ‘Manuscript Cultures in Asia, Africa and Europe’, University of Hamburg, financed by the German Research Foundation, and within the scope of the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (CSMC), on 17 November 2012 and 11 July 2013.

2 In contrast to other (secondary) notes (usually) applied to the margins, I treat scribes’, owners’, donors’, binders’ and restorers’ notes that refer (explicitly or implicitly) to the manuscript itself or the text(s) contained within it as colophons.

3 See Gippert (forthcoming) with reference to the term mravaltavi, lit. ‘multi-headed’.
and the scribe. The transfer of the codex to St Catherine’s Monastery, then, must have occurred before the year 982. This is clear from another colophon added ‘in the year 6585 ... after Creation and in the chronicon 201’, i.e. between September 980 and August 981 CE, by the most prominent Georgian conventual of St Catherine’s, Iovane Zosime, who undertook the third (!) binding of the codex on site. For convenience’s sake, the relevant passages of the three colophons are provided in table 1 together with an English translation (cf. also figs. 1 and 2).

In the transcripts, abbreviations and punctuation marks are employed according to modern usage. Capital letters are used to represent enlarged initials within both majuscule and minuscule contexts. See Gippert (forthcoming) for information on the lines added below the end of the first colophon, which read: ‘Pray for Amona the scribe, the very sinful one, Saints!’, and the dating following them in the form of an extra line (‘?Pray for Amona the scribe, the very sinful one, Saints!’) and the dating following them in the form of an extra line (‘?Pray for Amona the scribe, the very sinful one, Saints!’). — Unless otherwise indicated, the photographs reproduced in this article were all taken by the author.

Map: Centres of Old Georgian manuscript production and their ties.
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, Maḳari Leteteli, son of Giorgi Gryeli, a very sinful (man), was considered worthy by God to create this holy mravaltavi book with the help of my brother in spirit, Pimen Ḳaxa, and by the handwriting of my mother’s brother’s son, Amona, the son of Vaxtang Moʒarģuli, as a memento of our souls and the souls of our parents and of (the souls of) all our deceased...

This book was written in Jerusalem, in the big Laura of our Holy and Blessed Father Sabbas, in the days of the God-loving patriarch, Theodosius, and the venerable and blissful abbot of St Sabbas’ (Laura), Solomon. And this holy book was written in the year 6468 after Creation. The chronicon was 84.

And I, poor Maḳari, have devoted 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. Grant, Lord, to find your compassion ...

Kyrie eleison! In the name of God!

This holy mravaltavi book was bound for the third time in cowskin on Holy (Mt) Sinai by the hand of Iovane Zosime, a 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 after Creation, Georgian style, and in the chronicon 201 ...
2.2

Whilst the transfer of the mravaltavi from Jerusalem to Mt Sinai was intentional and planned from the start, many other manuscripts of the same age were subjected to unforeseen relocation from their place of origin to other sites. A well-known example of this is the famous Gospel codex of Adiši in Svanetia, which, according to the scribe’s colophon appended to the right-hand column of fol. 378v, was written by him, a certain Mikael, in the chronicon 117, i.e. between September 896 and August 897 CE. Cf. the reproduction of the column in question together with its transliteration in fig. 3 and the restored text in table 2.

As is visible in fig. 2, Iovane Zosime added two words (over two lines) to the left margin, viz. zroxia and qacisa. Taking them together as a coherent gloss, they might mean something like ‘the cow of man’, which would remain incomprehensible even if it referred to the ‘cowskin’ mentioned in the text. I therefore consider the phrase qacisa (‘of [a] man’) to relate to the following words, priaod codvilisa (‘very sinful’), and zroxia (‘cow’ – mod. Georgian ‘ʒroxa’) to have been added before the ending sayta for zroxi of the line above, which was probably barely legible even in Iovane Zosime’s time. It is true that we would also expect to read zroxi in this case, but Iovane Zosime was anything but an accurate scribe.

There is no indication that the second colophon (in minuscules) was added much later than the first (in majuscules). Why should the scribe have left a column for it as neatly as he did (fol. 274v) if it was not meant to be inserted immediately after the first colophon had been finished?

Fig. 1: Cod. Sin. georg. 32-57-33, fol. 273v and 274 (quoted parts of colophons 1 and 2 highlighted).

Fig. 2: Cod. Sin. georg. 32-57-33, fol. 274v (upper half; quoted parts of colophon 3 highlighted).

---

6 As is visible in fig. 2, Iovane Zosime added two words (over two lines) to the left margin, viz. zroxia and qacisa. Taking them together as a coherent gloss, they might mean something like ‘the cow of man’, which would remain incomprehensible even if it referred to the ‘cowskin’ mentioned in the text. I therefore consider the phrase qacisa (‘of [a] man’) to relate to the following words, priaod codvilisa (‘very sinful’), and zroxia (‘cow’ – mod. Georgian ‘ʒroxa’) to have been added before the ending sayta for zroxi of the line above, which was probably barely legible even in Iovane Zosime’s time. It is true that we would also expect to read zroxi in this case, but Iovane Zosime was anything but an accurate scribe.

7 There is no indication that the second colophon (in minuscules) was added much later than the first (in majuscules). Why should the scribe have left a column for it as neatly as he did (fol. 274v) if it was not meant to be inserted immediately after the first colophon had been finished?

8 See Gippert (forthcoming) for an earlier account of this codex and its history.

9 Image taken from the facsimile edition by Taq̇ aišvili 1916, pl. 198. Another reproduction can be found in Sarǯvelaζe et al. 2003, opp. 433.

10 In the narrow transliterations, any abbreviations and characters used numerically are marked by overbars. Uncertain readings are enclosed in square brackets and restorations of lost elements in angle brackets.

11 Unlike Ekvtime Taq̇ aišvili, who provided a first transcript of the colophons in his facsimile edition of the Adiši Gospels (Taq̇ aišvili 1916, 11–14), but in
Daicêra ç'y ese çigni
<daçabamit'g'n çe>
lta : x[p]<a : kr k>
nsa : riz : shob[i]<tg'n>
o'isa ê'nisa ìw k'si[t]
cëla : : ěa : k'e [m]<e>
owpeo ñegwçuqalen [č]<'n>
etobit a'n :
Mcéra amisi mikael[l]
locvasa momiq[s]<en>
et da şemindvet s[i]
owbe čemi :
Da mmoselica mik[a]<l>
diaqoni momiqse[n]<et>
c'e locvasa tk'n<s><a>
o'i mparvel gwe<kmn>
[en] q'lt<r[t]<obit a'n>

Fig. 3: Scribe's colophon of the Adïşi Gospels, fol. 387v, with transliteration.

Table 2: Restored and translated text of the scribe's colophon of the Adïşi Gospels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Restored</th>
<th>Translated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daicêra ç'INDEX] ese çigni</td>
<td>dashabamit'g'n çe</td>
<td>This holy book was written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daçabamit'g'n çe</td>
<td>lta : x[p]&lt;a : kr k</td>
<td>in the year 6501 after Creation, in the chronicon 117,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nsa : riz : shob[i]&lt;tg'n</td>
<td>nsa : riz : shob[i]&lt;tg'n</td>
<td>(and) in the year 1001 after the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o'isa ê'nisa ìw k'si[t]</td>
<td>o'isa ê'nisa ìw k'si[t]</td>
<td>Christ, Lord, have mercy upon us all. Amen!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cëla : : ěa : k'e [m]&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>cëla : : ěa : k'e [m]&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>Remember the writer of this, Michael, in (your) prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owpeo ñegwçuqalen [č]&lt;'n&gt;</td>
<td>owpeo ñegwçuqalen [č]&lt;'n&gt;</td>
<td>and forgive me my inattentiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etobit a'n :</td>
<td>etobit a'n :</td>
<td>And the binder, too, Michael the deacon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locvasa momiq[s]&lt;en&gt;</td>
<td>locvasa momiq[s]&lt;en&gt;</td>
<td>May the Lord protect us all. Amen!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et da şemindvet s[i]</td>
<td>et da şemindvet s[i]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owbe čemi :</td>
<td>owbe čemi :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da mmoselica mik[a]&lt;l&gt;</td>
<td>Da mmoselica mik[a]&lt;l&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diaqoni momiqse[n]&lt;et&gt;</td>
<td>diaqoni momiqse[n]&lt;et&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'e locvasa tk'n&lt;s&gt;&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>c'e locvasa tk'n&lt;s&gt;&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o'i mparvel gwe&lt;kmn&gt;</td>
<td>o'i mparvel gwe&lt;kmn&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[en] q'lt&lt;r[t]&lt;obit a'n&gt;</td>
<td>[en] q'lt&lt;r[t]&lt;obit a'n&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1

One problematical aspect of this colophon is the date: the year 1001 post Christum natum is given here, which does not accord with the ‘chronicon’ calculation that would suggest 896–7 CE. The dating ‘after Creation’ does not help, since only the first element of the number in question (*x̅p̅a = 6501), x̅ = 6000 is readable with any certainty. Ekvtime Taqaśvili, who was the first person to consider this inconsistency, strongly argued in favour of accepting the earlier date. His main thrust of argumentation was that calculating dates based on the birth of Christ was extremely unusual in ancient Georgia and that it may therefore have been a miscalculation on the part of the scribe – a point that does seem to be well founded. Taqaśvili further hinted at a second colophon written by the same hand and in the same layout, which covers the two subsequent pages of the codex (387–388; cf. fig. 4). Similarly to the donor’s colophon of the Sinai mravaltavi, this colophon, also written in the first person, concerns the person who ‘executed’ the codex, that is, a certain Sopron. In addition, it mentions several contemporary dignitaries such as King Adarnase curopalates and his son, Davit eristavi, as well as two deceased fathers, named Grigol and Gabriel, all of them being easily identifiable in Georgian history during the period between 850 and 950 CE. For the sake of convenience, the essential parts of the second colophon have been transcribed and translated and are presented in table 3.

In the transcripts, square brackets indicate the reinsertion of elements in lacunae. A more comprehensive – although not complete – reconstruction has been provided by Silogava 1986, 47–48.

suggested, (1001–897 =) 104 years, should be seen within the context of the discrepancy in dating between the Georgian and the Byzantine eras, which consisted of 96 years; see Gippert (forthcoming) on the subject of this discrepancy, erroneously reduced to 94 years in Iovane Zosime’s Praise of the Georgian Language. The difference in dating remains unexplained thus far, as does the question as to whether it was arrived at by calculating on the basis of years ante or post Christum natum.

The form mceru, as it occurs in the manuscript, is ungrammatical and must be a lapsus calami for mcerali (‘scribe’).

The form mcera, as it occurs in the manuscript, is ungrammatical and must be a lapsus calami for mcerali (‘scribe’).
2.2.2

The other problem with the information contained in the two colophons is that they do not indicate the place where the codex was created. In this connection, it is especially the names of royalty mentioned in the colophons that are revealing. According to Taqašvili, the contemporary king is identical to Adarnase, son of Davit curopalates, who mounted the Georgian throne in 888 CE, was acknowledged as curopalates by the Byzantine government in 891 CE and ruled until 923 CE, before being succeeded by his son, Davit. The deceased kings mentioned in the colophons then are Davit, Adarnase’s father, who ruled from 876 to 881 CE, and his younger brother Ašoṭ, who died in 885 CE; only the bearer of the third name, Arseni, has thus far remained unidentified (but may possibly represent the second son of Bagraṭ I, the father of Davit curopalates and Ašoṭ, who is also named Adarnase in historical sources). All of these identifications lead us to the Georgian province of Ţao-KlarǮeti, situated in present-day Eastern Turkey, which was the hereditary land of the dynasty of Bagraṭ I (the so-called ‘Ţao-Klarǯetian Bagratids’). This view is further supported by the fact that the compiler of the codex, Sopron, and the two other clerics who figure in the colophon can be placed in the same province, that is, as priors of the monastery of Šaṭberdi, beginning with Grigol of Xanǯta, who founded the monastery under Bagraṭ I, and ending with Sopron himself, who is mentioned as its renewer in Grigol’s vita (by Giorgi Merčule).}

15 Except for the latter proposal, see Taqašvili 1916, 17.
16 Abulaǯe 1964, 294, 1, 5–6; ‘didi sopron, sanatreli mamay, šaṭberdisa eklessis ganastebit ağaːmaːnebela da ukunisamde gwrqwmi miːti’ (‘the great Sopron, the blissful father, the builder [and] renewer of the church of Šaṭberdi and its crown in eternity’). See Taqašvili 1916, 16–17 for further details.
added later. It details the collection, by a certain Nikolao, of the Tetraevangelion (book containing the text of the four Gospels) together with some other codices at Šaṭberdi. The list of items assembled comprises, besides the otxtavi (‘Tetraevangelion’) itself, a qeltkanoni and other ‘books’ as well as a mravaltavi that is not further specified. There is good reason to believe that the latter codex is the so-called Udabno mravaltavi (nowadays ms. A-1109 at the National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi), which was detected in (and named after) the monastery of Udabno in Guria in South-west Georgia.

This and the fact that Nikolao was a

17The Gospel verse above is Mark 14:37, part of the passage from Mark 14:33–37, duplicated in a slightly different wording, following the Gospel of John on fol. 386r. The introductory line (‘sotovasa mas aqsamaglebelisasa : evanqeli markozis tavisi’ (‘In the portico of the Ascension: from the Gospel of Mark’) indicates that this text version was taken from a Jerusalem-type lectionary; cf. the so-called ‘Paris lectionary’ (Tarchnischvili 1959, 116–7), which has the lection of Mark 14:33–40 on Maundy Thursday (no. 630), prescribing to proceed to the locum ascensionis (aqsamaglebelad) before (no. 645).

18See Taq̇aišvili 1916, 12–13, and Šaniže / Č̣umburiže 1994, 5 and 9–10. See Gippert (forthcoming, 2.3) for more information on the Udabno mravaltavi.
former abbot of Ǯumati, another monastery of Guria, leads one to the assumption that the illegible parts of the colophon deal with the transfer of the codices to the latter region.19

2.2.4

What remains unresolved, then, is the question as to when the removal from Šaṭberdi to Guria took place and when, how and by whom the Gospel codex was transported to the mountain area of Svanetia. If Taq̇ aišvili was right in assuming that Nikolaos undertook his expedition to Klarǯeti in the second half of the sixteenth century, there was not much time remaining for the Tetraevangelion to have reached Adiši, where it was found by the Svanetian scholar Besarion Nižaraʒe sometime before the end of the nineteenth century.20 There are, indeed, two later notes in the codex that mention the name of Adiši (on fol. 312r, between Jn. 3.32 and 4.2, and on fols. 345r–346v, under Jn. 10.41); these, however, are undated (cf. the transcripts provided in figures 6a and b), so that the question must remain unresolved.21

2.3

Another Georgian manuscript from Mt Sinai likely to have originated in Jerusalem, namely Cod. Sin. georg. 16, a Gospel codex written in nusxuri minuscule, is testament to a particular type of ‘wandering’.22 The main colophon of the codex has now been lost, but it was transcribed by A. Cagareli in his catalogue of the Georgian manuscripts of St Catherine’s monastery in 1888.23 According to this transcript, the codex was executed in 992 CE (chronicon 212) by Gabriel ‘the amiable’ (saq̇ uareli) in the Monastery of the Holy Cross.24 As a matter of fact, Gabriel does figure in other notes in the codex, too, specifically on fol. 94v at the end of St Matthew’s Gospel and on fol. 243v at the end of St Luke’s Gospel. However, he was obviously not the scribe who penned most of the text, given the sharp difference in the handwriting discernible in the former note. Instead, it is obvious that the main text of the Gospels as well as the additional indices contained in the manuscript were written by a ‘decanus of the Cross’ (juaｒisa ...)

19 The first five lines pertain to the Gospel text of Mark 14:37. For parts that are illegible today, the transcript provided here is based upon Taq̇ aišvili 1916, 11.


21 Silogava 1986, 49 proposes (obviously on palaeographic grounds) a dating sometime during the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries for the first note and the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries for the second note; furthermore, he determines the script of Nikolaos’s colophon to be a ‘straight nusxuri of the eleventh century’ (’XI ბ–ქ ოხილი ფოხი გეხიხშაფი’).

22 These and other manuscripts from Mt Sinai were inspected by the author and several colleagues (M. Shaniidze, S. Sarjveladze, D. Tvaltvadze, B. Outtier) during a research trip to the monastery undertaken in May 2009 in connection with the international project entitled ‘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’ (a project kindly supported by INTAS, Brussels, ref. no. 05-100008-8026). The members of the group are extremely grateful to the monastery librarian, Father Justin, for the kind support he provided during their stay.

23 The last folio (fol. 332) containing the colophon must have disappeared before 1902, since I. Ǯavaxišvili was unable to consult it during his visit to Mt Sinai; see his catalogue (Ǯavaxišvili 1947, 38).

24 Cagareli 1888b, 198–9, no. 7; reproduced in Garitte 1956, 53.
ars r(omel)i­igi išva meupe ho(w)riatay,

with the relative clause romeli­igi išva replacing the participial clause axladšobili igi (‘the newly born one’ – cf. fig. 7; the erased text has remained visible in part). Comparing other witnesses to the Old Georgian Gospels, it becomes clear at once that this difference stems from a controversy about different recensions, the erased wording representing the text of the ‘Protovulgate’, which prevailed in the ninth and tenth centuries, whilst the ‘new’ text is that of the later ‘Vulgate’ redaction, worked out by George the Hagiorite on Mt Athos in the early eleventh century (Athonite Vulgate); cf. table 5, where the versions in question are contrasted with the Greek text, which has the participle τεχθείς in the position in question.

27 Here, and in the following transcripts, restorations of abbreviations are marked by parentheses.

dekanozi) named Daniel, whose name appears alongside Gabriel’s in the main colophon and the two notes mentioned above, and also in several other short notes, each written in the same hand as the text to which they pertain.25

2.3.1

Be that as it may, the present codex is unusual in that its first quires – containing the text of St Matthew’s Gospel – were obviously corrected in a second hand, the original text having been erased earlier, at least in parts. A clear example can be seen on fol. 8v where the wording of Matt. 2:2, ‘Where is he who was born king of the Jews?’, was changed to read sada

25 See Ǯavaxišvili 1947, 38, and Garitte 1956, 51–2 for the full list; cf. 2.6 below for further details.

26 Because of its idiosyncratic spelling, the text of this note is provided with both a transliteration and a (tentative) transcription.
2.3.2

However, things are not that simple. In some cases, the overwritten text does not agree with the Athonite Vulgate, but instead with the Protovulgate itself. This is true for Matt. 4:12 on fol. 13v, for example. Here, the corrector’s text runs: $x(olo)\ esma\ r(a)y\ i(eso)w\ v(itarme)d\ iovane\ mieca\ sapqrobile\(d)\ gane\(s)ora\ da\ car\(v)da\ gal\(i)e\(d)$ (‘But when Jesus heard that John had been thrown into prison, he withdrew and went away to Galilee’), with $x(olo)$ (‘but’) replacing erased $v(itarc)a$ (‘as’) (in red ink), $v(itarme)d$ (‘that’) replacing erased $r(ametu)$ (‘id.’), $r(a)y$ (‘as’) added above the line, and sapqrobile\(d)\ (‘into prison’) covering an erasure of the same length, with no traces of the erased wording remaining (cf. fig. 8). The resulting text is clearly that of the Athonite Vulgate again, with the exception of sapqrobile\(d)\ (‘into prison’), which does not appear in this redaction. Instead, sapqrobile\(d)\ is part of the Protovulgate wording, as are the erased words $v(itarc)a$ and $r(ametu)$; the closest witness of this redaction, the Palestine Gospels (G), reads: $vitarca\ esma\ i(eso)w\ s(rametu)\ iovane\ mieca\ sapqrobile\(d)\ gane\(s)ora\ da\ car\(v)da\ gal\(i)e\(d)$ (‘When Jesus heard that John had been thrown into prison, he withdrew and went away to Galilee’). What, then, did the corrector replace by sapqrobile\(d)\ at the position specified, if not the same word? Compare table 6, which contrasts the relevant versions with the Greek text again. It proves that there is, indeed, no other candidate available for restoring the erasure, even though sapqrobile\(d)\ has no explicit equivalent in the Greek version. Note that two other Sinai Gospel manuscripts, $R = $ Sin. georg. 15 (from 975 CE) and $P = $ Sin. georg. 30 (tenth century), show an intermediate text with the conjunctions of the Protovulgate, but without sapqrobile\(d)\, while the latter word does occur in the oldest redaction, represented in the Adi\(s)\i\ and Opiza Gospels (C, from 897, cf. above, and A, from 913).

Table 6: Recensions of Matt. 4:12 represented in Sin. georg. 16, fol. 13v.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sin.georg. 16, original text</th>
<th>Protovulgate (D,F,G)</th>
<th>Sin.georg. 16, corrected text</th>
<th>Sin.georg. 16, original text</th>
<th>Protovulgate (D,F,G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athenite Vulgate (H,I,K; B,R,P)</td>
<td>sada ars aklad(sh)(b)(i)(l)(i)(g)(i) me(u) pe huri(t)(a)(t)(a)(y)</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7: Sin.georg. 16, fol. 8’, excerpt, with Matt. 2:2 highlighted.

Fig. 8: Sin.georg. 16, fol. 13’, excerpt, with Matt. 4:12 highlighted.
2.3.3
A similar case is encountered in the next verse (Matt. 4:13). Here, the corrected text comprises the phrase ʼzgwṣ ḳidit ḳerṣo (‘by the seashore’) and the article-like pronominal form m(a)t (‘those’), both again inserted into erasures of the same length, thus resulting in the text movida daemḳwdra kaparnaums ʼzgwṣ ḳidit ḳerṣo sazġvarta m(a)t zabulonista (‘He came [and] settled in Capernaum by the seashore in the confines of Zabulon’) (cf. fig. 9). In this form, however, the text is not compliant with the Athonite redaction, which has neither ʼzgwṣ ḳidit ḳerṣo nor m(a)t, but with that of the Protovulgate, which does contain these words. So again we must assume that the ‘corrections’ reinstate words that had been previously erased. Table 7 contrasts the relevant versions again; note that the absence of da (‘and’) between the two verbal forms cannot be taken as a decisive feature, since it may have been omitted haplographically prior to daemḳwdra (‘he settled’). In this verse, the Adiši and Opiza versions are closer to the Protovulgate in that they do have ʼzgwṣ ıkid- (‘seashore’) (parallelling Greek τὴν παραϑαλασσίαν), but in the dative-locative case.

2.3.4
Why, then, did the corrector replace saṭq ̣ robiled, ʼzgwṣ ḳidit ḳerṣo and m(a)t with the same words? In my view, the perplexing picture we have can only be accounted for if we assume that the corrector first attempted to adapt the text to the ‘new’ Vulgate, but was then forced – for whatever reason – to re-establish the ‘older’ reading. There is no indication that this was performed by another person, the hand of both types of corrections being the same. However, the erasures might have been applied independently beforehand. This is suggested by Matt. 4:10 (fol. 13′), where the corrector provided a contaminated text, with both the ‘new’ and the ‘old’ readings covering the same erasure, side by side (cf. fig. 10). The words in question are the vocative forms saṭ(a)na and ešmaḳo, both denoting the ‘devil’ (‘Go away from me, devil, for it is written...’), the former appearing in the Athonite text and the latter in the Protovulgate (as well as the Adiši Gospels); and it is clear that it must have been ešmaḳo that was erased first (see table 8, which displays the relevant versions as a synopsis).

If the corrector had intended to simply replace the older text with the newer one here, he would certainly have written

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sin. georg. 16, original text</th>
<th>movida daemḳwdra kaparnaums ʼzgwṣ ḳidit ḳerṣo sazġvarta m(a)t zabulonista...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protovulgate</td>
<td>F,G,R,P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>movida daemḳwdra kaparnaums ʼzgwṣ ḳidit ḳerṣo sazġvarta m(a)t zabulonista...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiza</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adiši</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin.georg. 16, corrected text</td>
<td>movida daemḳwdra kaparnaums ʼzgwṣ ḳidit ḳerṣo sazġvarta m(a)t zabulonista...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ath. Vulgate</td>
<td>H,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>movida daemḳwdra kaparnaums sazġvarta zabulonista...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐλϑὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς Καϕαρναοὺμ τὴν παραϑαλασσίαν ἐν ὁρίοις Ζαβουλὼν ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 9: Sin.georg. 16, fol. 13′, excerpt, with Matt. 4:13 highlighted.

Fig. 10: Sin.georg. 16, fol. 13′, excerpt, with Matt. 4:10 highlighted.
the scribe exclaimed: century ‘Queen Mary’ codex of the Georgian chronicle, Kartlis Cxovreba, where exclamation is found in a colophon in the Tbilisi manuscript S-30, the fifteenth- ('goodness me!', 'my God!'). A similar ('so much') with the interjection hai haisten esten esten.

pretation preferred here presupposes instead that haisten is a contamination of haysten (i.e. esteṭiḳa' (Georgia) 'εστιτικά'), with the initial h- being an ‘addition’ (damaṭebuli) as in hobo, haeri, and hegve. The interpretation preferred here presupposes instead that haisten is a contamination of esten ('so much') with the interjection hai ('goodness me!', 'my God!'). A similar exclamation is found in a colophon in the Thbisi manuscript S-30, the fifteenth-century ‘Queen Mary’ codex of the Georgian chronicle, Kartlis Cxovreba, where the scribe exclaimed: dedasa esten ecer (‘Mother, he has written so much!’)

In any case, the codex clearly presupposes – and bears witness to – contacts between the Georgian communities on Mt Sinai and Mt Athos, where the Vulgate was established by about 1025 CE. These contacts are not precisely datable, of course, since the corrector left no colophon or other information in the manuscript on which he worked. However,

Table 8: Recensions of Matt. 4:10 represented in Sin. georg. 16, fol. 13′.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sin. georg. 16, original text</th>
<th>Sin. georg. 16, corrected text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protovulgate</td>
<td>Athenian Vulgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D,F,G,R,P,B)</td>
<td>(H,I,K)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: The scribe’s colophon of Sin. georg. 19, fol. 262′.

28 The present formula has not yet been identified with any certainty. Garitte (1956, 58) hesitatingly read laystain instead of haystain, which remains incomprehensible and can be ruled out on closer inspection. A more promising interpretation has recently been provided by B. Outtier (2012, 19–22) who saw haystain as a variant of esten (< esodon < esodon) (‘so much’), with e > a configuring an otherwise unknown ‘inverted development’ (ucnobia akame piramidega megresa)[ha] of the adaptation of (Greek) ‘αἴσθησις to (Georgian) ცბაფი ცალი (‘sees’), with the initial h- being an ‘addition’ (damaṭebuli) as in haba, haeri, and hegve. The interpretation preferred here presupposes instead that haystain is a contamination of esten (‘so much’) with the interjection hai (‘goodness me!’, ‘my God!’). A similar exclamation is found in a colophon in the Thbisi manuscript S-30, the fifteenth-century ‘Queen Mary’ codex of the Georgian chronicle, Kartlis Cxovreba, where the scribe exclaimed: dedasa esten ecer (‘Mother, he has written so much!’)

29 The restoration of the name is highly uncertain, only the initial capital M being discernible. We might also read M(o)s(e) if it was the Mose named previously by about 1025 CE. These contacts are not precisely datable, of course, since the corrector left no colophon or other information in the manuscript on which he worked. However,

2.3.5 Lovers of Christ, fathers and brothers! To whomver these holy Gospels will fall after us, pray for him to God! And pardon me for what I have missed!

We have written it down from the new translation and it is very faithful to its mother. Of those old Gospels it does not testify many a word.

Christ, have mercy on our leader Davit and Michael, the inattentive writer, and Mose and Michael and Čiṭay and Symeon and Gerasime and Grigol and their parents and brothers, amen! And it was written on the holy Mount Sinai, in the abode of the holy and God-viewing Moses. The chronicon was number 292. My goodness! Mikael has written so much! The parchment and the writer, both remain. Christ, let it be useful to Moses as you like!

20 The word esten itself is attested as early as the Adiši Gospels (Jn. 14.9), while hai appears in Šota Rustaveli’s epic (Vepx. 309a) and later texts.
there is another witness among the Georgian manuscripts from St Catherine’s monastery that provides evidence of the existence of such contacts during the eleventh century, shortly after the execution of the Vulgate. This is Cod. Sin. georg. 19, another Gospel manuscript written in nusxuri minuscules, which represents the Athonite Vulgate text throughout. The scribe’s colophon has been preserved in this manuscript (on fol. 262v), and it records that it was written in the year 1072 (chronicon 292), possibly by a certain Mikael, whom it mentions as an ‘inattentive writer’.\(^3\) What is more, it explicitly states that it contains the text of the ‘new translation’, whilst some of the ‘old words’ no longer appear. Given its importance for the history of Georgian manuscript culture, I have reproduced the colophon in toto in table 9, in as far as it is legible today (cf. fig. 11).\(^2\)

2.3.6
The very fact that Cod. 19 was written on Mt Sinai presupposes that the Gospel text from Mt Athos must also have been forgiven for his si-uch-e, i.e. ‘inattentiveness’ (cf. 2.2 above): Rayfield 2006, 1188 translates siuche as ‘ignorance’, which seems hard to justify.

\(^3\) In Modern Georgian, uchad, an adverbial form of the adjective ucebi, means ‘suddenly, unexpectedly, quickly’ (Rayfield 2006, 1263), which would suggest Mikael was considered to ‘write fast’. Within the present context, however, we may assume a pejorative meaning (‘negligent, inattentive’) if we consider that the writer of the Adiši Gospels begged the photo taken in situ in 2009 shows that the ends of the last four lines have been largely obliterated. Multispectral analysis would be necessary to enhance the legibility.
In the name of God! This book is named ‘the blissful one’; it was written by the hand of the unapt ‘Black’ Nikolaoz ‘the Nikra’, *in the vicinity of the (monastery of) the holy Father David* in Gareǯa, in Ḳedva, which as a village is named Berta; in the chronicon 380, under the reign of the son of Demetre, Giorgi, in the third year of his reign.

May God consolidate his dominion, to the delight of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose is the glory forever and ever.

— And for the black Nikra eternal benediction for his endeavour! Amen!

Glory to God, the accomplisher of all! Amen!

Ruler, bless us!

---

Table 10: Scribe’s colophon of Cod. Vind. georg. 4, fol. 304v.

| Saxelita ǧmrtisayta, cignsa amas eçodebis sannatreli; daîcera qelita undoysa, šavisa nik(o)loaz niḳrayasayta; sanaxelsa ç(mid)isasmamisa d(avi)tissa | In the name of God! This book is named ‘the blissful one’; it was written by the hand of the unapt ‘Black’ Nikolaoz ‘the Nikra’, *in the vicinity of the (monastery of) the holy Father David* in Gareǯa, in Ḳedva, which as a village is named Berta; in the chronicon 380, under the reign of the son of Demetre, Giorgi, in the third year of his reign.

May God consolidate his dominion, to the delight of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose is the glory forever and ever.

— And for the black Nikra eternal benediction for his endeavour! Amen!

Glory to God, the accomplisher of all! Amen!

Ruler, bless us! |
present there as the ‘mother’, i.e. the template from which it was copied. We do not know whether there was a direct route leading from the Iviron monastery to St Catherine’s or whether the contact indicated went via Jerusalem. The latter proposal is suggested by the fact that the founder of the Georgian monastery on Mt Athos, Eptwme the Hagiorite, is commemorated in the *menaion* of May (i.e., the liturgical book containing the varying parts of the liturgy for that month), which represents the overwriting of the palimpsest codex, Vind. georg. 2, another codex that originated in Jerusalem (cf. 2.5).\(^{34}\)

### 2.4

The Georgians in Jerusalem were not only in contact with their compatriots on Mt Sinai and Mt Athos, but also with the centres of manuscript production in their Caucasian homeland. Cod. Vind. georg. 4, a large, illuminated homiliary codex in *nusuri* minuscule now kept in the Austrian National Library, Vienna, is testament to this.\(^{36}\) According to the scribe’s colophon written in red ink on fol. 304’ (cf. fig. 12), the codex was produced in the year 1160 CE (chronicon 380) by Niḳoloz Nikra at a place called Berta, which was close to the monastery of St David of Gareǯa in South-east Georgia; compare the transcript with its English translation in table 10.\(^{37}\)

#### 2.4.1

Sometime after its completion, the codex must have been moved to Jerusalem. This is implied by another colophon added on the subsequent page (305r) by Vlasi, archbishop of Urbnisi, who visited Palestine between 1570 and 1572 to restore the Georgian manuscripts of the Monastery of the Holy Cross.\(^{38}\) His colophon (fig. 13) clearly states that he undertook the restoration of the present codex in the year 1570 (chronicon 258); cf. the transcript provided in table 11.

#### Table 11: Vlasi’s colophon of Cod. Vind. georg. 4, fol. 305’.

*Didebay იყრთისა სრულ-მიყოპელსა ჯოღისა ქერილისა:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gibbs-vikmen me urbnel mtavarebikoposi, vlasi</th>
<th>შეკაზმა ჭიმიდისა ამის ჭიჭინა სანადგეგილა:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>da ჭენ ახალი ბრანებითა და ორლენი მამისა ჭუნინისა ჯერილი</td>
<td>ჩანთა ზახისი საუკრული გართული, და უამრა-ქმრილი ივიჯო.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da ჭუნა ჭუნა ქალუნა სანადგეგ გასათლილი, და ჯოღილა ჭუნის თვესთა</td>
<td>და ნათასავთა მიკვალებული სანადგეგბალი.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da აჭ გევუდიქი ჯოღილა ორთინული იუმეხვივი ჭმიდისა ამას ჭიჭინა, რათა შემწეობი წიქმები ჭმიდითი შინა ლოკვათა თუხუეთა</td>
<td>რათა თუხუეთა მოთოთ სასჯიდი სუჭვა მინწელისა ამის ჭიჭინათავსაგან, და ერთობი ჭიჭი ქლიმენი სასუპედელი ღალათა ამენ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ჩანთა ჭუნილა სანამაზი ბარნაბასთა და ჭუნა სულიერთა ჭმათათვს</td>
<td>ლოკვა ჯარკუთ მამისა ბარნაბასთა და ჭუნა სულიერთა ჭმათათვს</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>და ჭუნლი ჭმილილი ტახომი რომელი ჭმიდი ესე ჭიჭი შეხვარიქვეს, მრავალი ჩილა ვიქილი, უპალმან უჩჰიჯ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**შეკაზმა**\(^{35}\) ჭმიდი ესე ჭიჭი ქრონიკონსა: შესახებ:

Glory to God, the accomplisher of everything good!
I, the **archbishop of Urbnisi, Vlasi**, have become worthy of restoring this holy ‘blissful’ book. For due to the length of time, it has become rotten and unusable.
And upon the order and regulation of our father, the archbishop of Tbilisi, Barnaba, I have undertaken to restore it to receive prayers for my sinful soul and forgiveness of my sins, and forgiveness for all our deceased kin and relatives.
And now I beg all of you who read this holy book that we may be remembered in your holy prayers, that you, too, may receive ample reward from Him who gives to all, and that we may become worthy of the kingdom of the heavens. Amen!
Pray for Father Barnaba and for us, the brethren in spirit, and myself, sinful Vlase, I who have restored this holy book. I have seen many hardships, as God knows!

**This holy book was restored in the chronicon 258.**

---

\(^{33}\) The colophon has *mepeo* without an abbreviation mark, which would mean ‘King!’; *meupeo* (‘Ruler!’) is preferred here as it is more commonly used to address God.

\(^{34}\) See Gippert 2013b as to further details.

\(^{35}\) The colophon reads *šeḳazmay* with a hyper-archaising addition of the suffix ‘y’, typical of post-Old Georgian writers.

---

\(^{36}\) My thanks are due to the staff of the Austrian National Library, who made the Cod. Vind. georg. 4 and several other manuscripts in its collection available to the members of the aforementioned INTAS project during a stay in Vienna in June 2008.

\(^{37}\) A German translation of the colophon can be found in Peradze 1940, 226.

\(^{38}\) See Peradze 1940, 227 following Cagareli.
William Vlasi’s colophon on fol. 305r, with date highlighted.

Table 12: Besarion’s colophon and note on Cod. Vind. georg. 4, fol. 8r.

Holy fathers, you who have seen this holy and spiritual book (before): it was extensively eaten by worms (?). Many times I have considered restoring it. And I have implored God for its writer and reader. Grant me forgiveness so that you, too, may achieve forgiveness from the Lord. God and Redeemer, Christ’s Cross, Christ’s Sepulchre, have mercy on me, Besarion, (in the year) of Christ 1864.

God, have mercy on Besarion, poor and sinful. Amen!
2.4.2

It is true that the colophon does not indicate the place where the restoration – which is styled šekazna here, lit. ’decoration’ – took place. However, the codex contains the colophon of a second restorer named Besarion Kioṭišvili,\footnote{41} which clearly refers to the Holy Cross and the Sepulchre of Christ. This text, written in a fugitive mxedruli cursive, was added at the bottom of fol. 8\textperthousand, with an additional note in the right-hand margin of the same page (fig. 14), being dated 1864.\footnote{42} The transcript and translation provided in table 12 is tentative, since parts of the colophon are no longer legible.

2.4.3

An explicit reference to Jerusalem, then, is found in a lengthy note, again in mxedruli script on the verso of the front flyleaf of the Vienna codex (fig. 15). This note, by a mute monk named Ioane, reports on the deposition of several printed books in the Monastery of the Holy Cross and is dated 25 March 1772\footnote{43} (cf. the transcript and translation in table 13). It is true that the flyleaf may have been added later, but it seems obvious that this was also done in Jerusalem.

2.4.4

Although it seems clear, then, that the codex was in the possession of the Monastery of the Holy Cross at least from the middle of the sixteenth century until the second half of the nineteenth, it did not find its way into the catalogue of the Monastery library compiled by A. Cagareli during his stay in Jerusalem in 1883. G. Peradze was certainly right in

\footnote{43} The colophon reads mamanno with a hyper-archaising repetition of the plural suffix.

\footnote{40} A similar wording is found in other marginal notes by Besarion, e.g. on fol. 81\textperthousand: ǧmerto samebit dividesalo da cxovels-mjopolo, ǯaro kristeso, ǯe(carjatl)le besarion sacqalii um cerilis mxilvelnini ǯe(eundo)ji ǯermertan da ǯendobis-brzanebeli ǯe(eundo)ji ǯermertan amin, i.e. ’God, exalted with the Trinity and Redeemer, Christ’s Cross, have mercy on pitiful Besarion! May God pardon the reader of this note and may God pardon him who grants forgiveness. Ament!’ See also the notes on fol. 129\textperthousand and 180\textperthousand (right margin, dated 10 Oct. 1863).

\footnote{41} The family name is not contained in the present colophon, nor in most of the other notes written by (or referring to) Besarion (on fols. 4\textperthousand; 39\textperthousand; 41\textperthousand--42\textperthousand; 56\textperthousand; 81\textperthousand; 128\textperthousand--129\textperthousand; 180\textperthousand, right margin; and fol. 292\textperthousand). However, a note in the bottom margin of fol. 180\textperthousand does contain the family name; cf. 3.1 below.

\footnote{42} The dating post Christum natum is usually only encountered in Georgian manuscripts after the fifteenth century. The note referring to Besarion on fol. 4\textperthousand of the present codex bears the date tvesa deḳembersa t k(risṭe)s čq̄yg, i.e. ’in the month of December, 9; (in the year) of Christ, 1863’.

\footnote{44} Peradze 1940, 231, erroneously gives the date as 1770 (’čegor’), omitting the last character; his transcript (ibid., note 3) has ’čegom’, with b (= 2) misinterpreted as m (= 40). A second note on the same page, which refers to that of Ioane, bears the date čegor oktombers ke, i.e. ’1778, October 25’.\footnote{45}
assuming that the codex had previously been transferred to the private library of an archdeacon named Kleopas, who left his own name in the codex in the form of an owner’s mark on fol. 303r (fig. 16). As Peradze further proposed, an heir to the archdeacon,\(^\text{44}\) who later became the Archbishop of Nazareth, may have sold the codex to an antiquarian at Alexandria, from where it was acquired by the Austrian National Library in 1931, thus ending its journey from South-east Georgia via Jerusalem to Central Europe.

\(^\text{44}\) Recte: Grand Archdeacon. The ‘M.’ in the note is likely to stand for Μέγας and may have been added later (with the archdeacon climbing up the greasy pole).

\(^\text{45}\) The word in question is the genitive of stamba (‘press’), while further down in the text it is spelled stabisa. It is unclear whether it refers to all four books mentioned or just to the kontakion.

\(^\text{46}\) The word pirqebuli is unattested elsewhere, and it remains unclear which icon or statue of the Theotokos, i.e., the Mother of God, is meant here, cf. Peradze 1940, 231, n. 4. The translation is tentative.

\(^\text{47}\) In a similar way, several manuscripts from St Catherine’s Monastery on Mt Sinai, including a xanmeti-haemeti lectionary, were removed and taken to Austria, where they ended up in Graz University Library; for details, see Imnaišvili 1977 and 2004.

\(^\text{48}\) Peradze 1940, 222. The third codex is Cod. Vind. georg. 3, a menaion for the month of February.
In the course of the editing work on the palimpsest, it came to light that the front flyleaf (and perhaps the back flyleaf as well) belonged to another codex from the Monastery of the Holy Cross, that is, the one described by Cagareli as no. 36, which contains a *menaion* of the months of December, January and February. This codex had also disappeared from the collection when Marr and Ǯavaxišvili visited the site; it did not go to Vienna, however, but to Dumbarton Oaks Library in Washington, DC, where it bears the access signature BZ.1952.1.

There is no room for doubt that the front flyleaf of the Vienna palimpsest codex is the first leaf of the Dumbarton Oaks *menaion*, which must have become detached from it during the move.

Fig. 17 contrasts the verso of the flyleaf with fol. 2r of the *menaion*.

Other signatures mentioned in the literature are D.O. 53.60.1 and WAS.1.2; see http://www.doaks.org/library-archives/library/mmdb/microfilms/2207 for information on a microfilm of the manuscript.

---

**2.5.1**

Different from Vind.georg. 4, the palimpsest codex was included by A. Cagareli in his catalogue of the library of the Monastery of the Holy Cross, appearing as no. 37 in the collection. Cagareli described it, in accordance with its overtext, as a *menaion* of the month of May. As the manuscript was no longer present in Jerusalem when N. Ja. Marr and Iv. Ǯavaxišvili undertook their inspection of the Georgian manuscripts of the Monastery in 1902, it must have disappeared from the collection before this date, possibly in the course of the removal of the Monastery library to the Greek patriarchate in the 1890s.

---

The edition (Gippert et al. 2007) focuses on the undertexts in *asomtavruli* majuscules; work on undertexts in *nusxuri* minuscules is continuing.

Cagareli 1888a, 164, no. 37. Cf. 2.3.6 above for the commemoration of Eptwme the Hagiorite in the *menaion*.

See the catalogue posthumously published as Marr 1955.

See Gippert et al. 2007, V with n. 13 for further references.

---

See Gippert et al. 2007, xii–xvii for further details. Note that the Graz lectionary (cf. note 46 above) was detached in a similar way, its first leaf being found in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (ms. georgien 30, fol. 1); cf. Outtier 1972.
Another remarkable case of disintegration of the Vienna codex concerned one of the manuscripts that were reused in it in palimpsest form. Of the twelve original manuscripts in asomtavruli majuscules that have been identified in it so far, one contains the legends of St Christina and Sts Cyprianus and Justina in an archaic linguistic form datable to the fifth to seventh centuries (the so-called xanmeṭi period of Old Georgian). As early as 1974, L. Kaǯaia proposed that some leaves from the same original manuscript might be included in another palimpsest codex, viz. ms. A-737 of the Kekelidze Institute of Manuscripts (today the National Centre of Manuscripts) in Tbilisi, a multiple-text manuscript rewritten by around the fourteenth century. As a matter of fact, the eight leaves of the Tbilisi codex in question fit exactly into two lacunae in the Vienna palimpsest within St Christina’s legend, as illustrated in table 14 above (where the pages from A-737 are marked

Table 14: Distribution of leaves from ms. A-737 among the leaves of Cod. Vind. georg. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25'</th>
<th>25'</th>
<th>A134'–A141'</th>
<th>A141'–A134'</th>
<th>21'</th>
<th>21'</th>
<th>71'</th>
<th>71'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31'</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>A135'–A140'</td>
<td>A140'–A135'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>63'</td>
<td>63'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70'</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>22'</td>
<td>22'</td>
<td>A136'–A139'</td>
<td>A139'–A136'</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td>26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64'</td>
<td>64'</td>
<td>19'</td>
<td>19'</td>
<td>A137'–A138'</td>
<td>A138'–A137'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2

Figure 18: Cod. Vind. georg. 2, fols. 25v-31r and ms. A-737, fols. 134r-135v+141r-140r in contrast.

55 See Gippert et al. 2007, 18–25 for details.

56 See Kaǯaia 1974, 419.

57 See Žordania 1902, 198.
with an ‘A’ and a grey background). Note that when reused, the folios belonging to the original manuscript were prepared in different ways, so that they yielded one bifoliate each of the Vienna codex (turned round by 90°), but two bifoliates each in the Tbilisi codex (cut horizontally and folded in the middle). The resulting effect is illustrated in fig. 18. 58

2.5.3
The question now is where and when the disintegration of the leaves of the original xanmeti codex took place and how the two different sets resulting from it came to be reused in the production of two different palimpsests. Several scenarios can be drawn up here. The original codex might have been kept in Georgia before it was divided up there, with parts of it being taken to Jerusalem prior to being palimpsested, or vice versa. On the other hand, both palimpsests may have been produced in the same location, in Jerusalem or in Georgia, with one of them being moved to the other site later. The palimpsests may even have been produced at a third site such as Mt Sinai or Antioch. As no hints have been found as yet in the upper layers of the palimpsests, which would indicate where they were written, the question must be left open until other (possibly scientific) means have been devised to determine the provenance of the individual layers.

3. Secondary use of manuscripts
Regardless of their place of origin and their later whereabouts, Georgian manuscripts were subjected to various types of reuse. Leaving aside the special case of palimpsests, this was especially true for blessings, rogations and prayers added by later readers, users or owners, and also for less ‘immanent’ additions such as prescriptions, contracts or writing exercises. A few examples will again suffice to illustrate this.

3.1
It was, indeed, quite common throughout the history of Georgian manuscript production for blessings, rogations and prayers to be added by readers and users, both for their own and for others’ purposes. A good example of this is the Vienna codex no. 4, discussed above, to which Besarion Kioṭišvili added not only a restorer’s colophon (on fol. 8’; cf. 2.4.2 above), but also, as marginal notes, a whole set of rogations of the type ġmerto şe(icqal)e besarion kioṭišvili. a(mi)n
‘God, have mercy on Besarion Kioṭišvili. Amin!’

58 See the list in note 41 above.

59 The right-hand margin of the same page shows a lengthier note by Besarion, dated 9 September 1683 (the date is also highlighted in fig. 19).

60 For an earlier discussion, see Silogava 1986, 59–60. The codex was inspected by the present author and several colleagues during two trips to Svanetia in 2007 (as part of the above-mentioned INTAS project) and in 2010 (as part of the ‘Old Georgian palimpsests’ project, funded by the Volkswagen Foundation, 2009–14). My thanks are due to the inhabitants of the village for allowing us access to this important codex.

61 Located at 43°3’6” N and 42°26’27” E.
On fol. 79r, below the colophon (in red), which provides details about the execution of the Gospel of Matthew, the much later hand of Nač̣u Niṗarṭiani informs us that the codex was brought (to Svanetia?) from Odiši, i.e. Mingrelia (cf. fig. 21, where the important parts of the note are highlighted).

The correct form would be c̣igni; the insertion of the anaptyctical i can be taken as an influence of spoken Svan.

The usual form would be s(ul)sas ‘for the soul’. Possibly the word was added in the left margin to correct the spelling Sūr (for sor[w]is? or soro[w]is?) at the beginning of the line; but cf. Nač̣u Niṗarṭiani’s note treated above.

Another note written in a clumsy late nusxuri minuscule, added below the scribe’s note on fol. 52r by a certain Zenahar on behalf of one ‘Chrysostom’ (ukruṗil, a Svanicised variant of Georgian okroṗiri ‘golden-mouthed’), addresses the church of St George in Laxamula by its traditional name, mtavarm(o)c̣ame qidisa, i.e. ‘the Archimartyr of the Bridge’ (cf. fig. 22, where the names are highlighted again).

63 The correct forms would be codvani and brali; again we have Svanicized forms here.
Christ, God and Sts Matthew, Mark, Luke and John and all God’s (crowd) in heaven and on earth, have mercy in both worlds on (your) servant and praiser, the acquirer of these Gospels, Apakiže Mosaiti, and their (!) bedfellow, the Circassian king’s daughter Aygeldi, and their son(s) Čubini and Maršüeni and Rome! May they live long and may they be supportful in peace for plenty of times, amen, now and in eternity!

May God pardon the soul of Apakiže Tualia, and whoever you deign to be, may you be pardoned by Christ the God, too! Amen!
3.2.3

The same page features yet another colophon that is legible, but unlike the notes mentioned above, it is written in a mxedruli cursive (cf. fig. 23). Its subject (and author?) is Apakiže Mosaiti, who is styled as an ‘acquirer’ (momgebeli) of the Gospel codex, together with his wife (of Circassian origin) and his family. It may be important within this context to note that the name Apakiže is well known in both Svanetia and Mingrelia, the most prominent family members being known as the ‘princes of Odiši’. However, neither Mosaiti nor his deceased relative, Tualia, can be identified historically. The transcript given in table 15 is again tentative.

3.2.4

Apart from the rogations discussed thus far, the codex contains at least three notes that can be categorised as treaties or oaths, either uttered by the village community (addressing themselves as laxamlelni) or by individual persons. For this kind of text, the Gospel codex obviously served as a guarantee of their validity. The following example (from fol. 35; fig. 24) even addresses the subject of blood feuds, a practice upheld in Svanetia at least until the nineteenth century. Again, the church of Laxamula is mentioned by its traditional name (cf. table 16). Note that in applying the note, the codex was turned 90°.

Table 16: Laxamula Gospels, Gažaniani’s note on fol. 35r.

| K(rist)e ǧ(mor)jiṣa dedisa misisa da q̄ɔve- | At the will of Christ God, his mother and all |
| ltu cmiṇdata mista taul- | his saints! |
| sdeubita : d̄eši ikita | If from now on someone should sin |
| tavarmuçuamesa : q̄īṭiṣa : vinca şesco- | against the Archimartyr of the Bridge, |
| dus ertiṣa : sapaṭioisa : svanisa | he should pay with the blood |
| : sīxli : gardixadus | of one noble Svan. |
| tu ar seeq̄olos : muvarvna<1> : | If he is not able, we will suffocate him, |
| saxsari : no iq̄os : amisi : mucaṭame : arian : | there will be no redemption. Witnesses of this are: |
| adila : gažaniani : balta : ʂkīziani | Adila Gažaniani, Balta Şkīziani, |
| ƙašašeli : me, gažaniansa daniçeria | from Kašaši. I, Gažaniani, have written it, |
| mucaṭame var | (and) I am a witness, too. |

66 Silogava 1986, 59, reads aiageldi. However, there is no second a in the name, and Aygeldi is a perfect Turkic name formation (lit. ‘the moon has come’).

67 Silogava 1986, 59, reads marsuebi; however, the first from last character is clearly the same as the first from last, not the third, of the preceding name, čubini. The name is otherwise unknown.

68 Silogava 1986, 59, reads romi. However, the curved descender of the final e is clearly visible and interferes with the r of aqmaren in the line below.

69 A fourth note (in large mxedruli letters) added under Zenahar’s note at the bottom of the page is too faint to be deciphered.

70 The name probably reflects Arabic musā‘id (‘helper’), cf. Turk. müsait (‘apt’). In the Georgian chronicle of the Mongol period (by the anonymous ‘chronicler’, Žamtaq̄mceri), Musait is the name of the Ilkhanid ruler, Öljaitü, who is otherwise known as Abu Sa‘id Bahadur Khan (Qauçešvili 1959, 324, l. 22 and 325, l. 4).

71 These ‘documentary’ texts were first edited by P. Ingoroq̄va (1941, 19, no. 17, and 72, nos. 73 and 74) and, secondly, by V. Silogava (1986, 121–122, nos. 16–18); the notes in question, dated by Silogava to the fifteenth century, are on fols. 35° and 36°.
The custom of using Gospel codices for blessings, rogations and other personal notes was not restricted to Laxamula, however. The same type of notes occurs, in even greater variety, in another codex kept in a village church in Upper Svanetia, viz. the Tetraevangelion of Kurashi, another Gospel manuscript dating from around the twelfth century and written in nusxuri minuscules. This codex, too, contains a scribe’s colophon (by a certain Giorgi; fol. 138r), as well as one by its donor (Inay Xešṭinisʒe; fol. 85r). Additionally, there is a note by the ‘rulers of Kurashi’ who possessed the ‘cemetery in front of the Archimartyr of Kurashi’, stating that they deposited the book there (fol. 161v). Furthermore, the codex abounds in rogations of priests, deacons and other people. A remarkable example of this is one by Deṭo (Gurčiani), who styles himself the priest of ‘St George of Ṭexiši’ (fol. 113r), thus using the traditional name of the church in question. What is peculiar about this codex is the occurrence of at least three notes in the Lower-Bal dialect of the Svan language, obviously written by the same Deṭo Gurčiani in the same nusxuri hand as the above-mentioned rogation, which dates to around the seventeenth century, and thus represent the oldest extant specimens of written Svan. Moreover, these notes deviate considerably from the ‘usual’ type of rogation-like notes; instead, they represent rather personal reproaches addressed to the priest’s deacon (and, probably, nephew), Guṭu Gurčiani. The latter, on the other hand, is likely to have been responsible for a good many notes consisting of nothing more than characters in their alphabetic sequence, with or without their numerical values.

3.2.5

The habit of adding notes to the Laxamula Gospel codex lasted at least until 1975, when a decanus named Davit Pipia inspected it, leaving his handwritten comments on several pages. On fol. 20r, he provided a clear statement as to further usage of the codex (fig. 25), including the practice of swearing oaths before it (cf. table 17).72

Table 17: Laxamula Gospels, Pipia’s colophon on fol. 20r.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>çavińtxe ese çmida</td>
<td>I have read this holy Tetraevangelion, (me), the unworthy decanus Davit Pipia. Year 1975, 19–20 July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otxtavi saxareba uģirisma</td>
<td>It is not allowed in front of the holy Gospels to swear a false oath and to pronounce idle and obscene word(s), which is a great torment for the holy Gospels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekanozma daviti pipiam</td>
<td>Nor is it allowed that the holy Gospels be touched by a woman, or by any man if he is not clean and baptised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975 ć. 19-20 ivlisi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 25: Laxamula Gospels, Pipia’s note on fol. 20r.

3.3

Pipia’s note is written in blue ink, possibly the same ink used for the page numbering of the codex (which deviates enormously from the original order). Further notes by Pipia are found on the inner sides of the (wooden) front and back covers of the Laxamula Gospels.

72 Pipia’s note is written in blue ink, possibly the same ink used for the page numbering of the codex (which deviates enormously from the original order). Further notes by Pipia are found on the inner sides of the (wooden) front and back covers of the Laxamula Gospels.
spanning the complete alphabet or parts of it, as well as other unintelligible material. Considering Guṭu’s clumsy hand, it seems highly conceivable that most of his ‘notes’ were mere writing exercises. As the Kurashi Gospel codex, which also comprises one palimpsest bifoliate, has been the subject of a comprehensive study recently, it should suffice if only a few examples of notes of this type are cited here.

3.3.1
More than half of fol. 85v (fig. 26), originally a vacat between the Gospels of Mark and Luke, comprises a nearly complete nusxuri alphabet (from a to h; only the last letter, ō, is missing), with the numerical value of every character added in full. The last item, $h = 
\text{exraata(s)i} \text{ (‘9,000’)}$, is followed by two and a half lines which read $\text{go aše akörtxe : guṭu}$
gurčans : amis mcərals : $\overset{\text{ša}}{\text{šeunos : on an an ō.}}$ This can easily be interpreted as a rogation of the writer, Guṭu Gurčiani, for himself, as proposed in table 18. At the bottom of the page, we find one more alphabetic sequence (from a to s, with no numerical values), but obviously written in another hand, thus suggesting that it was not only Guṭu Gurčiani who used the codex for his writing exercises.

3.3.2
A strange note abounding in unusual abbreviations in the right margin of fol. 84r (fig. 27) may also have been intended as a writing exercise. It was written in the hand of Guṭu and ‘signed’ by him again. It reads: $\text{čemde | daser | tıkat | mimome | asšek | miaymic | amiş ceri | guṭo gurčan}$. It is clear that the last four words once more stand for $\text{amis mcəral(i) guṭu guṛčian(i)}$ (‘the writer of this, Guṭu Gurčiani’), with amiş (instead of amis) and the missing nominative endings clearly stemming from the influence of spoken Svan. If we ignore the abbreviation marks

---

**Table 18**: Kurashi Gospels, Guṭu Gurčiani’s rogation on fol. 85v.

| ḡ(mert)o aše(ne) akortxe | God, build up (and) bless (the home) of Guṭu Gurčiani, the writer of this! |
| guṭus gurčans amis mcərals | May the Lord forgive (his) soul, amen, amen, Lord! |
| s(ul)sə șeunos o(wpalma)n a(me)n a(me)n o(wpalo) |

---

$\text{73}$ See Gippert 2013a, which includes reproductions of the main colophons and the Svan notes.
Conversely, we find that the Gospel text of Matthew 28:16–18 in the lower margins of fols. 71r and 70r (again turned 180°; fig. 29) is not a copy of the ‘main’ text of the pages in question, which contain Mark 9:18–10:1. Instead, it is likely that this is a copy from a lectionary manuscript, given that Matt. 27:58–28:20 is missing in the Kurashi Gospels and the ‘quotation’ begins with a typical introductory formulation, mas žamsa šina (‘by that time’).

This note might represent a (Turkic) personal name ending in beg in the dative case, given that it ends in bgs (names like zaurbeg were quite common in Svanetia). It is possible that the k does not belong to the note, since it is written in a different style. It may simply be a sign of the cross.

See Gippert 2013a, 92 with fig. 7.

Table 19: Cod. Sin. georg. 16, anonymous complaint on fol. 5r.

| š(eicqale)n . s(a)šinelo . m(a):q(a)lo(a)vi(a)nis . : ţ(mrt)jis- mšob(e)lo ese . orni źm(a)ni damemţer- nes da ź(e)n ź(e)n jë x(a)rt mebërve .
| tu-rays memartlebian. |

Have mercy, frightful Theotokos of the (Unburnt) Bush, on these two brethren. They have become hostile to me, and you and your son are (my) judges as to what they want from me.

Complete musxuri alphabet spelled out in another hand in the right-hand margin and an unintelligible sequence of characters added in yet another hand in the bottom margin below the first column and turned round 180°; fig. 28).

Another type of writing exercise is encountered for instance on fol. 85r, where somebody (not necessarily Guțu Gurčiani) copied the first four lines of the donor’s colophon, including the outdented initial letter, or on fol. 59r, where the last two lines of the Gospel text on the page (Mark 3:29) were copied into the lower right-hand margin (alongside an almost
the scribe in red ink after the index of miracles taken from the Gospel of Matthew, there is, firstly, a four-line complaint made by an anonymous person, also in red ink, addressed to the Theotokos ‘of the (Unburnt) Bush’ (see the transcript in table 19), and, secondly, another rogation by one Davit, written in extremely large and awkward nusxuri characters with many additional dots (cf. the transliteration and the transcript in table 20).

80 The Unburnt Bush of Mt Sinai is a symbol of the Virgin birth of Jesus in Eastern Orthodoxy. The mention of the bush as part of the present complaint speaks in favour of the text having been written down on Mt Sinai. For a previous discussion of this note, see Ǯavaxišvili 1947, 38.

3.4 Most of the ‘secondary’ types of notes dealt with above are not limited to manuscripts from Svanetia. This is true, first of all, of rogations added by laymen or other uneducated people, discernible by the clumsy and faulty way in which they are written. A series of good examples of this is to be found in the Gospel codex, Sin. georg. 16, mentioned above. On fol. 5v (fig. 30a) after the short rogation k kriste ș(eicqal)e  d(a)n(i - e)l, a(me)n, (‘Christ, have mercy on Daniel, amen!’), added by the scribe in red ink after the index of miracles taken from the Gospel of Matthew, there is, firstly, a four-line complaint made by an anonymous person, also in red ink, addressed to the Theotokos ‘of the (Unburnt) Bush’ (see the transcript in table 19), and, secondly, another rogation by one Davit, written in extremely large and awkward nusxuri characters with many additional dots (cf. the transliteration and the transcript in table 20).

78 The cross-shaped symbol at the end of the line might be taken to be the letter k (an abbreviation for krisi te, ‘Christ’), but this seems unlikely when placed between the name of Davit and his epithet, ‘sinful’.

79 A sixth line at the bottom edge of the page, beginning with o̅, i.e. an abbreviated form of upali (‘Lord’), is no longer decipherable today.
In the same codex, there are at least three further lengthy rogations of this sort, possibly written in the same hand (on fols. 1v, 2r and 6r; figs 30c, 30d and 30b). Of the persons mentioned in them, at least one seems to occur twice: Kirile, who is likely to have been the author of the note on fol. 2v and is introduced as the ‘page’ (qına-) of Mzečabuľ on fol. 6v. The latter person, if his title is correctly restored

81 Garitte 1956, 51, also considered the note on fol. 5v to be in the same hand. This is unlikely, however, given the peculiar extension of the m and n characters and the acute form of the j character in the other three notes.

Cagareli 1888b, 198–9, no. 7, does not mention these notes, nor does Žavaxšvili 1947, 36–8, no. 16.
as atabag-amirspasalari, i.e. ‘atabag (and) commander-in-chief’, can be identified as the son of Quarquare II (the Great), ruler of the south-western Georgian province of Samcxe in the second half of the fifteenth century. Mzečabuḳ, who bore the title of atabag from 1500 to 1515 CE, adopted the name of Iaḳob after retreating from the secular world.82 He is not identical, however, with a Iaḳob who is mentioned in the note on fol. 1v of the present codex, given that this person bore the patronym Tualaʒe (lit. ‘son of Tuala’). There is no information available as to whether Mzečabuḳ ever visited Mt Sinai. However, he is mentioned in a codex from Jerusalem, which was brought to the University Library of Leipzig by C. Tischendorf (Cod. V 1095, fol. 15r; fig. 30e) in an aġaṗi (a requiem-like record of deceased persons).83 This suggests that he may well also have been the object of commemoration at St Catherine’s Monastery.84 Due to the orthographical inconsistencies, the transcripts given in tables 21a–c on the following page are again tentative.

3.4.2

An attempt to copy a previously added note can be seen on fol. 146v of the Gospel manuscript, no. 76 from the Historical-Ethnographical Museum of Kutaisi85 where, after the end of the Gospel of Mark (fig. 31), Ioane Kaselaʒe begs for mercy for his deceased parents using the same words as a relative of his, Manavel Kaselaʒe, had previously done on

82 This is clear from the Tbilisi codex Q-969, which mentions a ‘Iaḳob who was Mzečabuḳ before’ (mzečabuḳ-qopilisa iakobisi) in a series of notes concerning the atabags of Tao, amongst the ‘orthodox kings’ (martimadidebli mepeebi) of Georgia, beginning with the atabag-amirspasalari Quarquare, his wife Dedisimedi and his first son Kaimosro, the elder brother of Mzečabuḳ; cf. Bregaye et al. 1958, 381–2 and Šarašiʒe 1961, 15–6. The name mzečabuḳ, lit. ‘sun-squire’, first occurs within the Georgian tradition in the twelfth-century epic Amirandareĵaniani, where it is borne by one of the protagonists. This Mzečabuḳ is mentioned in the anonymous chronicle of Queen Tamar, Istoriani da azmani šaravandedtani (‘Histories and praises of the garlanded’; thirteenth century) together with the ‘sun of the Khazars’, i.e. the daughter of the Khazar king, whom he married according to the epic (ch. 10; Lološvili 1968, 432: xvasro xazarta mepeebi ... šerto asuli misi colad mzeč ̣abuḳsa [‘Khosrow the king of the Khazars ... gave Mzeč ̣abuḳ his daughter in marriage’]), in a list of amorous couples compared to Tamar and her first husband (Qauxčišvili 1959, 36: vitar mzeč ̣abuḳ mzisatws xazartasa [‘like Mzeč ̣abuḳ for the sun of the Khazars’]). Remarkably enough, the next couple in the list are Jacob and his wife, Rachel (vitar iakob rakeslisws [‘like Jacob for Rachel’]). One wonders if this was the reason for the atabag’s choice of iakob as his second name.

83 For a complete transcript of the aġaṗi, see Metreveli 1962, 77, no. 90. The first edition of the aġaṗis by N. Ja. Marr (1914) does not contain the present text.

84 See Šarašiʒe 1961, 94–7 for more information on Mzečabuḳ’s ‘ecclesiastical politics’. Further details of Mzečabuḳ’s life are provided in Šarašiʒe 1954, 198–203.

85 My thanks are due to the staff of the Kutaisi Museum, who made this manuscript available to the members of the above-mentioned INTAS project in April 2007.
his own behalf (cf. the transcripts in table 22). Note that in addition to the two rogations (both of which are faulty in their grammar), the page contains the drawing of a rectangular object, which may be identified as a scribe’s writing tablet, strongly reminiscent of a similar image added to the grave inscription of Lauritius, which is exhibited in the cloister of S. Lorenzo fuori le mura in Rome (fig. 32).

3.4.3

An attempt at copying some of the original text of a manuscript into the margins can be seen on fol. 36 of the fragmentary Gospel ms. A-1699 held by the National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, where the heading (in red ink), sašabatoj, i.e. ‘Sabbath service’, and the words, qvivilasasa (‘of the ear’), tavsa (‘the head’) and da (‘and’) of Mark 2:23 seem to be repeated (in black ink and in a clumsy hand) in the lower margin of the page (fig. 33). As it stands, the gloss may be taken to serve as a sort of decorative element, perhaps intended to add an aesthetic appeal to the page. The images contained in the plate were first published by Perret (1851, pl. LXXIII/6) as part of a series of wall paintings in the catacombs, which may indicate the origin of the monument; cf. also Martigny 1865, 368 and Reusens 1885, 98 as to the interpretation of the images.

---

86 Both Ioane and Manavel Kaselajje, and other members of the family, are also the subject of a lengthy rogation on fol. 7r of the same codex.

87 See Becker 1881, 27 and Greeven 1897, 53, which reads Lauricio confius g(t) benemenenti | uxor pientissima postui q(t) vi(x)ti an(nos) XXV. The transcription in the margins is in black ink and in a clumsy hand. The words Copying the original text of a manuscript into the margins can be seen on fol. 36 of the fragmentary Gospel ms. A-1699 held by the National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, where the heading (in red ink), sašabatoj, i.e. ‘Sabbath service’, and the words, qvivilasasa (‘of the ear’), tavsa (‘the head’) and da (‘and’) of Mark 2:23 seem to be repeated (in black ink and in a clumsy hand) in the lower margin of the page (fig. 33). As it stands, the gloss may be taken to serve as a sort of decorative element, perhaps intended to add an aesthetic appeal to the page. The images contained in the plate were first published by Perret (1851, pl. LXXIII/6) as part of a series of wall paintings in the catacombs, which may indicate the origin of the monument; cf. also Martigny 1865, 368 and Reusens 1885, 98 as to the interpretation of the images.
Fig. 31: Kutaisi Gospel Cod. no. 76, fol. 146v (‘copied’ note and drawing highlighted).

Fig. 32: Grave inscription of Lauritius, S. Lorenzo fuori le mura (drawing highlighted).
the purpose of clarifying the day on which the Gospel passage was to be read (‘Sabbath of the ear heads’). However, Mark 2:23 sqq. seem not to have been a usual lection in the Georgian tradition, and in its given form, the note is too faulty to be taken seriously as a piece of liturgical advice (cf. the transcript of both the Gospel passage and the note in table 23).

The Gospel passage in question is Mark 2:23 and not one of its synoptical parallels (Matt. 12:1; Luke 6:1) is clear from the last word of the previous passage, staassian (‘they pour in’), which closes Mark 2:22. The Gospel text is that of the Protovulgate. The passage taken from Mark 2:23 sqq. is not contained in the Paris Lectionary (ed. Tarchnischvili 1959–60), whereas the Greek lectionary (in the Byzantine style) has it on the Saturday of the first week of Great Lent. The Paris Lectionary does include Matt. 12:1–8 amongst the lections for Saturdays (Tarchnischvili 1960, 106, no. 1674).

Table 22: Cod. Kut. 76, rogations on fol. 146v.

ama otstavni sammado šeicq(ə)le
s(u)li manavel kase-
lajisa iqšeni q(ə)vljisa
codvis(ə)g(a)n

ama otstavni sammado šeicq(ə)le
s(u)li manavel
s(u)li dedisa mamisa
io(a)ne k(a)s(e)laʒisa

May he have mercy on these Gospels charitably!
May the soul of Manavel Kaselage be freed of all sin!
May he have mercy on these Gospels charitably,
on the soul (of) Manavel,
on the soul of the mother (and) father of Ioane Kaselage!

3.4.4

Unlike this, the lengthy (and very faulty) note in the left-hand margin of fol. 1’ of the fragmentary Tbilisi Gospel ms. H-1887 (fig. 34) is not a copy of the main text of the page, which cites Matt. 17:9–18, but another quotation from a lectionary, in this case comprising the very end of the Gospel, Matt. 28:16–20, which was usually read on the Holy Saturday, according to the Jerusalem rite. Due to the bad state of the folio in question, not all of it can be restored with any certainty, as indicated in table 24; the intended text seems clear enough, though.

3.4.5

In rare cases, the authors of secondary notes deemed it appropriate to use a secret script for their ‘private’ texts. One such case is encountered in Cod. H-372 held by the National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, a fragmentary Gospel codex considered to date from the twelfth century. The note in question is found after the index of lections from the Gospel of Matthew (fig. 35).

---

88 That the Gospel passage in question is Mark 2:23 and not one of its synoptical parallels (Matt. 12:1; Luke 6:1) is clear from the last word of the previous passage, staassian (‘they pour in’), which closes Mark 2:22. The Gospel text is that of the Protovulgate. The passage taken from Mark 2:23 sqq. is not contained in the Paris Lectionary (ed. Tarchnischvili 1959–60), whereas the Greek lectionary (in the Byzantine style) has it on the Saturday of the first week of Great Lent. The Paris Lectionary does include Matt. 12:1–8 amongst the lections for Saturdays (Tarchnischvili 1960, 106, no. 1674).

89 My thanks are due to Teimuraz Jojua of the National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, for drawing my attention to this note and to Bernard Outtier, Paris, who discussed its deciphering with me in July 2013.

90 There is no information on this peculiar note in the catalogue by Kutateladze and Kasraze 1946, 273.

91 Sic; note the dittography of the syllable do.

92 Corrected from slva da (for slvad da?)

93 Between the last text line and the marginal note, the abbreviations MR = Mark, L = Luke, and M = Matthew appear in the codex as headings to the Eusebian apparatus (in red).
Sašabatoy

Da ıjo v(t)a)r ıgi ı(a)na-
carhvidododa (ı)39 ıgi
qanobirsa šabatsa
šina da moçapeta
mista içiçes gzasa
slvay da2 mosrvad
tavs qovilisasa34
sašabatoy quv
ilsasasa tvz da

Sabbath service

And it was, when he
went along
in the corn field on the Sabbath,
and his disciples
began on the way
to walk and to pluck
the head of the ear (of grain).
Sabbath service of
the head of the ear (of grain) and (?)
Table 24: Cod. H-1887, lectionary passage of Matthew 28:16–20 on fol. 1r.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sxrebyma</th>
<th>saxarebay ma-</th>
<th>Gospel of Matthew.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teysa mas</td>
<td>teysay mas</td>
<td>In those days:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žisa ša</td>
<td>žansa šina</td>
<td>But they...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xigi</td>
<td>solo igišni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... brža
nebamat
iso da etqo
des hkra mo
mec me qly qe
lcypa cata
da keqanasa
[ža carva]
dis moimo
çapenlt
mamsata sx
ilta qsa
saq da sa
sa çmsa d
ascave
bdet mt

... brža-
nehda mat
iset da etqo-
da (da) hruk: mo-
mec(a) me qoveli qe-
lemçipebay cata
da keqanasa
zed. çarve-
di, moimo-
çapenlt
mamisata sax-
elita (mamisayta da) qisa-
yta da sul-
sa çmidisayta, da
ascave-
bdet mat.

Fig. 35: Cod. H-372, Elia’s note (highlighted).

Table 25: Cod. H-372, Elia’s note in secret script.

O(wpal)o š(eicqala) : s(a)li : a(braa)m(is)i : amin : 
d(a) priad : c(o)dvi-
li : mecxedre : č(e)mí aswrdas
iqsen : gamouqsnelis c(o)dvi-
sagan

Lord, have mercy on the soul of Abraham, amen!
And the very sinful spouse of mine, Asordas, resolve from the unresolvable sin!
Its author is likely to be a certain Elia, who, however, mentions himself only in a single defective line that can be read as əliās da mšobelta mista (‘for Elia and his parents’). In the more verbose text that follows, he prays for two other persons whose names are, however, not certain. The transliteration printed in table 25 is tentative, given that there is no other example of the secret script that has become available to date.

4.

The examples given above were intended to show how and to what extent Georgian manuscripts from the Middle Ages were reused in later times by people seeking support, health or welfare, or just trying to work in accord with the tradition of writing and reproducing ‘holy’ scriptures. Not all of those who left their personal traces in the manuscripts were as certain of the durability of their notes as the scribe of Sin. georg. 19, who stated with confidence in his colophon that ‘The parchment and the writer, both remain’ (cf. 2.3.5 above). One hundred years before him, the scribe of another Gospel codex of Mt Sinai (Sin. georg. 30), a certain Ezra Kobuleani, added the following words to his colophon in a much less optimistic vein after completing his transcription of the Gospel of Matthew (on fol. 75v, fig. 36 and table 26): nakmari egos, xoło

95 Ǧīmerto (‘God’) would also be possible. The initial letter only occurs here.

96 On fol. 78v of the same manuscript, we find another note by one Elia (in a hand dating from the fifteenth or sixteenth century, in black ink), saying that he had tried to ‘revive’ obscure passages of the manuscript; see Ǯoǯua 2014, 370-372 and 380 with fig. 6. This Elia is likely to be the same person as the author of the ‘secret’ note.
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