

Some Issues on Old Georgian Versions and Manuscripts of the Gospel of John

Sophio Sarjveladze

Institute of The Georgian Language, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

(Presented by Academy Member Mzekala Shanidze)

The study of all the existing complete and fragmentary manuscripts of the Old Georgian versions of the John's Gospel revealed manuscripts containing the Adishi, proto-vulgate and Giorgi Athonite's (Georgian Vulgate) recensions. Manuscripts containing Adishi recension (geo¹): C, fr-13, proto-vulgate recension (geo²): A^dODERPsBTbLAFmGMihScvl(fr-17)wt, mixed recension: Mm. There are subgroups among the manuscripts containing the texts of the proto-vulgate and Giorgi Athonite's recensions. The subgroups consist of those manuscripts, the variant readings of which largely coincide with each other, or are found only within this subgroup. The subgroups are a reflection of the text spread after the editing of the original translation. In the paper the problem of establishing the structure of the manuscripts of Giorgi the Athonite's recension and their relationship to the early Gospels manuscripts are discussed. © 2021 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.

Manuscript studies, new Testament textual criticism

In the Preface to the edition of Old Georgian Four Gospels based on three ancient manuscripts (1944), Akaki Shanidze wrote that full understanding of the history of Old Georgian Gospel texts would be possible only after detailed exhaustive study of all available manuscript material [1].

A group formed by the late corresponding member of the Georgian National Academy of Science, Zurab Sarjveladze, who aimed to establish the critical text of the Old Georgian versions of the Gospels based on all the existing complete and fragmentary manuscripts. The critical text of the old Georgian versions of the Gospel of John was prepared for publication. Scientific Supervisor of

the project was Prof. Darejan Tvaltvadze, project staff included Elguja Giunashvili, Darejan Tvaltvadze, Sophio Sarjveladze and Tinatin Jikurashvili. The text, at this stage, is only available on the web-page: <http://ogg.tsu.ge/>. Within the framework of the project, all existing mss. containing the old Georgian versions of the Gospel of John were studied. Based on them, recensions were identified, mss. were arranged according to the recensions and the critical text was established. Also, the mss. of the lectionaries containing readings of the Gospel of John as well were arranged accordingly to the same principle.

Gospel of John, verse 19:40:

C: სმ ა 40. გარდამოიხუნეს კორცნი იგი იესუმსნი და შეგრაგნეს იგი მწუართა საკუმეველითურთ, ვითარცა ჩუეულებამ აქუნდა ჰურიათა და ღუწოლამ სამკუდრომთა.
Pr: სმ ა 40. და მოიღეს გუამი იესუმსი და შეგრაგნეს იგი არდაგებითა სულნელთა მათ თანა, ვითარცა არს ჩუეულებამ ჰურიათამ დაფლვასა. A^dODERPBTlFGiScw
 და შეგრაგნეს იგი არდაგებითა სულნელთა მათ თანა, A^dORPi
 და შეგრაგნეს იგი ტილოებითა სულნელთა მათ თანა, BTLFGScw
 და შეგრაგნეს იგი ტილოებითა, არდაგებითა სულნელთა მათ თანა, DE
 ვითარცა არს ჩუეულებამ ჰურიათამ დაფლვასა. ODERPB
 ვითარცა ჩუეულებამ არს ჰურიათამ დაფლვასა. A^dTLFGScw
 ვითარცა არს ჩუეულება ჰურიათა დაფლვისამ. i
M: სმ ა 40. გარდამოიხუნეს კორცნი იგი იესუმსნი და შეგრაგნეს იგი მწუართა საკუმეველითურთ, ვითარცა ჩუეულებამ იყო ჰურიათამ და ღუწუნამ სამკუდრომთა. m

40. გუამი + იგი T*. იქსი A^dDFSw. შეგრაგნეს A^dDEB. ტილოებითა – RP. არდაგებითა|ტილოებითა FG. სურნელთა DSFW. – ჩუეულებამ არს TLFGScw. ჩუეულებამ ჰურიათა დაფლვისამ i. ჰურიათამ w. დაფლვამ T#, დაფლვისამ T*, დაფლვისა S.
 სმ აქსმ w. სმ ა – A^d.

G: სმ ა 40. და მოიღეს გუამი იესუმსი და შეგრაგნეს იგი ტილოებითა სულნელთა მათ თანა, ვითარცა ჩუეულებამ არს ჰურიათა დაფლვისამ. aaVnoNQHIKf

40. სურნელთა aao. ჩუეულებამ HIf. ჰურიათამ aaVnoQK.

Lect: 40. და გარდამოიღეს გუამი იგი იესუმსი ჯუარისა მისგან და შეგრაგნეს იგი არდაგებითა სულნელთა მათ თანა, ვითარცა არს ჩუეულებამ ჰურიათა დაფლვისამ. Lk

Each verse in the critical text of the Old Georgian version of the Gospel of John is presented in the following way: the text of each recension is placed separately and horizontally. Each of them has a reference to the mss. in which this verse is found. The principal variant readings in each recension are written below the verse horizontally, each indicating the ms. in which the reading is preserved. The verse is followed by a footnote where you can read the orthographic readings of the ms.; additions and abbreviations and minor variant differences can be found. All this is followed by the relevant text of the verse from the lectionaries also arranged according to the same principle. The Reuben Swanson's edition [2] of Greek Gospels is taken as a model for the publication of the critical text. In our case, the text of each verse is divided according to the recensions and within these recensions the main variant readings are arranged horizontally. Representing the critical text in this

way clearly shows the reader the variant reading presented in any ms. of each subgroup. The variant readings within one recension can easily be compared to each other and to the texts preserved in the lectionaries. The differences or similarities between them are visible. To illustrate this, a verse is shown as an example:

The siglas assigned in the critical text to the old Georgian mss. of the Gospel of John are the same as were used in the editions and articles written by the members of the working group [3-5]. M. Machkhaneli introduced the scheme of redaction affiliation of major mss. of the Gospels [4]. However, more mss. have been studied now, and this requires updating of this scheme and cataloguing the mss.

Manuscripts containing the old Georgian versions of the Gospel of John. The oldest of the mss. containing the old Georgian translation of the

Gospel of John are the Khanmeti palimpsest fragments, dating back to the 5th-8th centuries [6-10].

The list of complete and fragmentary mss. of the Old Georgian text of John's Gospel, according to which the critical text of John's Gospel was established, can be presented chronologically as follows: Pre-athonian recension: X - A-89/A-844, Khanmeti Gospels, National Centre of Manuscripts (NCM); C - Adishi codex, 897; A^d - Anbandidi codex, 10th-11th cent.; O - Opiza codex, Iver. georg. 83, 913; D - Jruchi I codex, H-1660, 936 (NCM); E - Parkhali codex, A-1453, 973 (NCM); R - Sin.Geo.O. 15, 978; P - Sin.Geo.O. 30-38, 979; s - S-405, 10th cent. (NCM); fr-13, H-3181, 1 leaf, 10th cent. (NCM); B - Berta I codex, 998, MS Georgian 1 (Houghton Library, Harvard University, USA); T - Tskarostavi codex, A-98, 10th cent. (NCM); b - Kurashi I codex, A-1699, H-1886, H-1887 10th cent. (NCM); L - Tbeti codex, 995, National Library of Russia, Petersburg; A - Ksani codex, A-509 (NCM); Geo H. C. 8-9, National Library of Russia, Petersburg, 10th cent.; F - Urbnisi Gospels, A-28, 11th cent. (NCM); m - Mestia Gospels, s.i.e.m. 1, 1033; G - Palestinian Gospels, H-1741, 1048 (NCM); M - Martvili gospels, S-391 (1r-140v 10th cent.; 141r-193v 1050) (NCM); i - Kut-176 10th-11th cent.; h - H-1240, 11th cent. (NCM); S - Sin.Geo.O.16, 11th cent.; c - S-962 (NCM), Kut-668 (1 leaf.) 1054; v - KuT-363, 11th cent.; l - Likhuri Gospels, Q-645, 11th cent. (NCM); fr-17 - H-1792, 11th cent. (NCM); w - Vienna Georg.1, 11th cent.; t - A-18, 12th cent. (NCM).

Giorgi the Athonite's recension: a - Alaverdi Gospels, A-484, 1054 (NCM); α - Kaliposi Gospels, Kut.-76, 1060; V - Vatican Gospels 11th cent.; n - Black Mount Gospels, A-845, 11th cent. (NCM); o - Ivir.georg. 62, 11th cent.; N - Sin.Geo.O.19, 1074; Q - Jer.-49, 11th cent.; H - Vani Gospels, A-1335, 12th-13th cent. (NCM); I - Echmiadzin Gospels, 12th-13th cent.; K - Gelati Gospels, Q-908, 12th-13th cent. (NCM); f - Ienashi Gospels, s.i.e.m. mestia #73, 13th cent.; d - Kurashi II Gospels, 12th-13th cent.

Mss. containing Adishi recension (geo¹): C, fr-13. We do not focus here on the Adishi version of the Khanmeti palimpsest fragments and on the mixed recension insert of H-1240, as the text of both manuscripts within the Gospel of John is only the proto-vulgate recension. Mss. of the Proto-vulgate recension (geo²) are as follows: A^dODERPsBTbLAFmGMihSevl(fr-17)wt. Mss. containing the mixed recension are: M and m. The main text of these two mss (M and m). is of the proto-vulgate recension, however, they contain the texts of the verses of certain chapters which are copied from the mss. containing the text of the mixed recension. The mss. of Giorgi the Athonite's recension are as follows: ααVonNQHIKfd.

There are subgroups among the mss. containing the texts of the proto-vulgate and Giorgi Athonite's recensions. The subgroups consist of those mss. the variant readings of which largely coincide with each other, or are found only in subgroup. The subgroups are a reflection of the text spread after the editing of the original translation. The copyists of the Proto-vulgate recension mss. may also be considered as text editors. They mostly copied the text of the ms. in their possession. However, not infrequently, they changed the text of a verse according to another (Georgian or Greek) ms. or corrected the text at their discretion. The variants of the mss. united in the subgroups are divided into the ones a) in which the relevant Greek recensions are considered better; and b) in which lexical, grammatical, phraseological variants are of Georgian origin [11]. Some of proto-vulgate mss. contain variant readings preserved only in one of them and therefore are not found in any other extant mss. The similar variants of mss. in subgroups reflect different stages of text editing. Within one recension, there are identical verses, moreover, Adishi and proto-vulgate recensions reveal identical verses, but the subgroup is formed by mss., which contain systematically repeating (fully or partially) variant readings of certain verses. This indicates the existence of various editing variant

readings of the first Georgian versions of the Gospels in different monastic centers. The text of the mss. of a certain subgroup reached a monastery and was copied and then re-edited. Thus, variant readings of certain verses appear only in the text of a ms. belonging to this subgroup. The development of the same variant readings either forms a new subgroup or the variant reading remains as an individual variant in one ms. The process of this gradual editing may be observed using the method of textual criticism and chronologically. These subgroups are distributed differently according to different Gospels. Within the text of the proto-vulgate edition of the Gospel of John, one can outline the following subgroups: XODEsBv; XA^dRPTbih; FGScLw(fr-17). The X ms. belongs to two subgroups. This means that the original text of the proto-vulgate recension ended up in two different monastic centers, where it was edited and developed according to Greek mss. preferred by translators and editors or they gave preference to the Georgian material (concerning the selection of synonyms, phrase stylistics or grammatical forms). The texts of these two subgroups were either locked up in some monasteries, or, as a result of re-editing, a new group of manuscripts emerged. In the subgroups, the number of mss. with identical variant readings can be further narrowed down, this results in the emergence of another sub-subgroup, as the variants of these mss. are not found in any other group, e.g., ODE, A^dih and RP sub-subgroups. Individual variant readings of the mss. copied on Mount Sinai (RP) are nowhere to be found; this means that the text of the Gospels from Mount Sinai did not spread elsewhere but was "locked" there. Such text is preserved only in the Sinai lectionary.

The text of the chronologically latest subgroup - FGScLw(fr-17) - is also interesting and significant. Ivane Imnaishvili first noticed the text of two of these mss. (FG) and singled them out as a separate recension by Euthymius the Athonite; he published them together with Giorgi the Athonite's Vulgate

as a separate column [12]. Zurab Sarjveladze does not agree with the separation of the recension by Euthymius the Athonite in his work "Tskarostavi Gospels and the Issues of Euthymius the Athonite's Recension" [13]. The arguments of the author are clear. Some of the variant readings attributed, by Ivane Imnaishvili, to the editorial contribution of Euthymius the Athonite had existed in the manuscripts copied before the latter's time, namely the Tskarostavi (T) and the RP mss. Further examination of the mss. containing the text of the Old Georgian versions of the Gospels revealed that the verses attributed to Euthymius the Athonite by Ivane Imnaishvili are found not only in TRP but also in A^dsb 10th century mss. This study enlarged the subgroup of mss. attributed to Euthymius the Athonite recension by Ivane Imnaishvili and rejected by Zurab Sarjveladze. Today this subgroup contains seven mss: FGScLw(fr-17). If we enlarge the subgroup further, as the main variants of this subgroup are found in two more mss., the result is a subgroup of nine mss.: Mestia (m) and Martvili (M) codices and FGScLw(fr-17). Mestia and Martvili codices are not included in the main subgroup because: 1. The variant readings of these mss. precede the variant readings of the FGScLw(fr-17) subgroup; 2. The texts in the Mestia and Martvili codices are heterogeneous: in John's Gospel, there are inserts of mixed recension in both mss.; 3. Individual variants are found in these mss., which are no longer found in the mss. of the FGScLw(fr-17); 4. The variant readings of the Mestia and Martvili codices, in some cases agree with the variant readings of the mss. of the other subgroups and differ from the variant readings of this subgroup.

The study of the mss. also revealed that the copyists of the mss. of each sub-group did not have only one ms. from which they copied. From the mss. at their disposal, they chose one "reliable" ms., from which they copied the main text, whereas from the other texts they (1) either filled in the gaps of the "reliable" ms. or (2) or chose variant readings

of some verse and replaced them. There is no other possible explanation for the existence of the variant readings characteristic of the mss. of other subgroups found in one or more of the mss. of certain subgroups, as other mss. of the subgroup offer a different variant. This also explains the heterogeneous variants of the subgroup FGSclw(fr-17).

In the recension of Giorgi the Athonite two subgroups are found: $\alpha VnNQHIK$ and $ao\#fd$. The mss. of the first subgroup contains the text revised in the last period of Giorgi the Athonite's recension (work known as the Georgian Vulgate), while the second group reflects its first period [14].

In addition to the textual differences, old Georgian mss. of the Gospels differ in composition and visual characteristics. Following the Greek traditions certain additional elements and sometimes composition is changed, etc. Here, due to the limitation of space, the author is unable to dwell on each remarkable Georgian ms. describing their textual or compositional varieties nor provide bibliographic data about them; she can only focus on one point of their composition.

The Structure of the Manuscripts of Giorgi the Athonite's Recension and their Relationship to the Early Gospels Manuscripts

The mss. of the Georgian Vulgate edited by Giorgi the Athonite are based on the structure of the Greek Byzantine text-type mss., namely: the mss. beginning with a letter from Eusebius to Carpianus, followed by the Eusebian canon tables; each Gospel is preceded by a list of the chapters of the Gospel; miniature of the respective Evangelist in a seated posture and the list of the liturgical Gospel readings. This structure (except for a miniature) is repeated in almost all of the 200 extant mss. In addition, most of the mss. of Giorgi the Athonite's recension are accompanied, at the end of the Gospel of John, by either A or B recension of the colophon of Giorgi the Athonite [15-17]. Furthermore, texts

of each of the Gospels, written either in one or two columns, are accompanied by the Ammonian section, written under the column.

How original is this structure of the manuscript and was Giorgi the Athonite the first to translate and establish the following "auxiliary" and "additional" elements of the Gospels: the letter of Eusebius to Carpianus, Eusebian Canon tables, chapters of Gospels, the list of liturgical Gospel readings?

Before Giorgi the Athonite's recension or, in other words, in the earlier mss. of the Pre-Athonian recension had a different structures. The greater part of these mss. has not reached us in a complete form, and one has to "restore" them according to the surviving leaves. This means that unless a ms. lacks the pages before the Gospel of Matthew, it includes Eusebian canon tables (either in a complete or a fragmentary form depending on the number of preserved leaves). At the end of the text of the Gospels (again depending on the completeness of the manuscript), the colophons of the editors, scribes or commissioners and the list of liturgical Gospel readings are added. The first sample of the Eusebian Canon tables is found in the Adishi codex, whereas the first list of liturgical Gospel readings can be seen in the Anbandidi codex.

The letter of Eusebius to Carpianus is first found in the Jruchi I codex (D). This manuscript lacks the first leaves. It starts with the last 15 lines of the letter of Eusebius to Carpianus (lr) copied in 940 by the painter Theodore, who also copied canons tables and painted the cross and miniatures [1, 023-024]. In addition to the Jruchi I codex, amongst the proto-vulgate recensions mss, the Letter of Eusebius to Carpianus can also be found in the mss. m (1v-2r) and c (4r-v). Except for minor variant readings, the *Epistula ad Carpianum* is identical in the mss. containing both the pre-Giorgi Athonite's recension and Giorgi Athonite's recension. The Ammonian sections were known to the Georgian translators of the Gospels from the

very beginning because they are found even in the Khanmeti fragments of the Gospels. The number of the ancient mss. containing the Letter of Eusebius to Carpianus is well-nigh impossible, since most of them lack initial leaves.

The P codex (Sin.Geo.O.30-38) copied by Ezra Kobuleanisdze (Gospels of Matthew and Mark) and Ioane Zosime (the rest of the manuscript) in 979, on Mount Sinai, are not accompanied by the Canon Tables, but the ms. begins with a brief account of the letter of Eusebius to Carpianus or, in other words, by the description of the Canon tables. This description is copied by Ioane Zosime, this is indicated by the note at the end of the text: “da mčxreḡali amisi i(ovan)e p(ria)d c(o)dvili” (2r) (and the copyist of this (is) Ioane the sinful). Then all ten canons are listed, followed by the following text: “da amit saxita gulisxma-q’avt q’ovelta tavta šina amat atta ḡanonta gangeba da ḡmidata maxarebelta šcertebulad ertq*mobaj*” (2r) (and thus consider the operation of these ten canons in

each Gospel and agreed coordinated unison of the narration of the Holy Evangelists). Such a description of the canons is not found in any other Georgian ms. I was not able to find its Greek original either. Therefore, it is not impossible to suppose that Ioane Zosime himself wrote this brief “description” of the Canon Tables, following solely the text of the latter, without taking the Eusebius’s letter into consideration.

Only few issues have been covered in this paper. These issues and many other issues of textual criticism, codicological, original Greek text-related problems will be further discussed in extensive researches and separate papers concerning the critical text of the Old Georgian versions of the Gospel of John.

The research was carried out with the financial support of the Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia [SRNSFG. Grant number FR17_170].

ფილოლოგია

იოანეს სახარების ძველი ქართული თარგმანის რედაქციები და ხელნაწერები

ს. სარჯველაძე

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახ. თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი, ქართული ენის ინსტიტუტი,
თბილისი, საქართველო

(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიის წევრის მ. შანიძის მიერ)

იოანეს სახარების ძველი ქართული თარგმანის კრიტიკულად დადგენილი ტექსტის გამოსაცემად მოსამზადებლად შესწავლილ იქნა ყველა არსებული სრული თუ ფრაგმენტული ნუსხა. კრიტიკული ტექსტი გამოსაცემად მომზადდა V- XIII საუკუნეების უძველესი სრული და ფრაგმენტული ხელნაწერების შესწავლის შედეგად. ჩატარებული ტექსტოლოგიური კვლევის შედეგად გამოიკვეთა იოანეს სახარების ძველი ქართული თარგმანის შემცველი ხელნაწერების რედაქციული ჯგუფები და ხელნაწერები, რომელებიც ამ რედაქციათა შიგნით ქვეჯგუფებს ქმნიან. კერძოდ, წინათონურ პერიოდში: 1) ადიშური რედაქცია (C, fr-13), 2) პროტოვულგატური რედაქცია (A⁴ODERPsBTbLAFmGMihScvl(fr-17)wt) და 3) ნარევი რედაქცია (Mm). პროტოვულგატურ რედაქციაში გამოიყო 3 ქვეჯგუფი: ა) XODEsBv; ბ) XA⁴RPTbih; გ) FGScIw(fr-17). ათონურ პერიოდში გიორგი ათონელის მიერ რედაქტირებული ტექსტის (aαVomNQHIKfd) შემცველი ხელნაწერები წარმოდგენილია ორ ქვეჯგუფად: ა) a^o#fd და ბ) αVnNQHIK, რომელთაგან პირველი, სახარების ტექსტზე გიორგის მუშაობის პირველ, შუალედურ ეტაპს ასახავს, ხოლო მეორეში, გიორგის მიერ ბოლო ეტაპზე შექმნილი რედაქციის ტექსტია წარმოდგენილი, რომელსაც ქართული ვულგატა ეწოდა. იოანეს სახარების თითოეული მუხლის ტექსტი ჩაწერილია რედაქციების, ჯგუფებისა და ქვეჯგუფების მიხედვით ცალ-ცალკე, ჰორიზონტალურად ისე, რომ მკითხველს ნათელი წარმოდგენა ექმნება, იოანეს სახარების რომელ ხელნაწერში რა ტექსტი იკითხება. მუხლების გასწვრივ მითითებულია ლიტერები, რომელიც გვიჩვენებს, თუ რომელი ხელნაწერის მიხედვითაა წარმოდგენილი ეს ტექსტი და რომელ მანუსკრიპტშია ამ ადგილას ლაკუნა. მუხლს ქვემოთ განთავსებულია ხელნაწერთა ვარიანტული წაკითხვები, სადაც აისახა მცირე სხვაობები, ორთოგრაფიული და კალმისეული შეცდომები. ამგვარადვეა მომზადებული და სახარების ძირითად ტექსტს ერთვის იოანეს სახარების საკითხავები ძველი ქართული ლექციონარებიდან. სტატიაში განხილულია გიორგი მთაწმიდლის რედაქციის ტექსტის შემცველი ხელნაწერების სტრუქტურა და ორიგინალურობა ადიშურ და პროტოვულგატურ რედაქციათა შემცველ ხელნაწერთან მიმართებაში.

REFERENCES

1. Shanidze A. (1945) Two old recensions of the Georgian Gospels according to three Shatberd manuscripts (A. D. 897, 936 and 973), *Monuments of the Old Georgian Language*, 2: 07, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
2. Swanson R. J. (1995) *New Testament Greek manuscripts, Variant readings arranged in horizontal lines against codex Vaticanus*, John, Sheffield Academic Press, England, W. Carey International University Press, USA.
3. Giunashvili E. et al. (Eds) *Adishi Codex A.D. 897*. (2003) Tbilisi (in Georgian).
4. Machkhaneli M. (Ed.) (2010) *Anbandidi IX century manuscript of the Gospels*, p. 4, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
5. Giunashvili E. (Ed.) (2010) *The Sinai Gospels*, A. D. 978-979, I edition, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
6. Zhordania F. D. (1902) *Opisanie rukopisei Tiflisskogo tserkovnogo muzeia*, № 9: 30, Tiflis (in Russian).
7. Dzhanashvili M. G. (1908) *Opisanie rukopisei tserkovnogo muzeia dukhovenstva gruzinskoi eparkhii*. kn.3, N 13: V, Tiflis (in Russian).
8. Javakhishvili Iv. (1949) *Georgian palaeography*, p. 312, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
9. Kajaia L. (1980) *Khanmeti texts*, I: 3-7 Tbilisi (in Georgian).
10. Sarjveladze Z. (1995) Once again on the relationship between khanmetoba and haemetoba: *Philological Researches*, pp. 125-132, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
11. Sarjveladze S. (2012) The problem of establishing the recensions of the Georgian version of the Gospels: Textual research on the Psalms and Gospels, *Papers from the Tbilisi colloquium on the editing and history of Biblical manuscripts 19-20 September 2007*, edited by Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott with Bernard Outtier, *Supplements to Novum Testamentum*, 142: 168-170, Brill, Leiden. Boston.
12. Imnaishvili Iv. (1979) The last two recensions of the Georgian Gospels, *Proceedings of the Department of Old Georgian Language*, 22, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
13. Sarjveladze Z. (2001) Tskarostavi Gospels codex and the issue of Euthymius's recension of Georgian Gospels: *Tbilisi State University Proceedings of the Department of Ancient Georgian Language*, 29: 109-133, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
14. Tvaltvdze D. (2012) The manuscripts of Georgian translations of the Four Gospels from the Black Mountain: textual research on the Psalms and Gospels: *Papers from the Tbilisi colloquium on the editing and history of Biblical manuscripts*, Edited by Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott with Bernard Outtier, *Supplements to Novum Testamentum*, 142: 213-229, Brill, Leiden. Boston.
15. Shanidze A. (1981) Literary reference to the newly discovered ancient texts in eleventh century writings, *Essays*, II: 282-283, Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
16. Tvaltvdze D. (2015) Colophons attached to the ancient manuscripts of the athonite recension of the Gospels and the issue of the formation of the athonite recension: *Tbilisi State University Faculty of Humanities Electronic Bilingual Scientific Journal "Spekali"*, N9.
17. Kvirkvelia E. (2019) *Codico-textological analysis of Georgian Gospel Mss. of the 11th century and the history of the establishment of the Giorgi the Athonite's Gospels recension*, Dissertation for the academic degree of Doctor of Philology, Tbilisi.

Received March, 2021