

TEXTOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF FRAGMENTARY MANUSCRIPTS OF BIBLIOLOGICAL
CONTENT AND STRUCTURAL RESEARCH OF THE MATERIAL

(On the basis of Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts)

ეტრატზე შესრულებული ბიბლიოლოგიური შინაარსის ფრაგმენტული ხელნაწერების
ტექსტოლოგიური ანალიზი და მასალის სტრუქტურული კვლევა
(კორნელი კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნულ ცენტრის ბაზაზე)

NINO MEGENEISHVILI

Doctor of Philology, Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts
Tbilisi, Merab Aleksidze str, N1/3, 3093, Georgia
+995 577 955011 ninomegeneishvili@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5985-9117>

SHORENA TAVADZE

PhD, Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts
Tbilisi, Merab Aleksidze str, N1/3, 3093, Georgia
+995 595 635544 tavadze@hotmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6216-9093>

Abstract: The research project "Codicological Analysis of Fragmented Manuscripts and Structural Research of Material" is implemented with the financial support of Shota Rustaveli national scientific foundation of Georgia (FR-19-7472, 2020-2023).

The chronological framework of the fragmentary manuscripts transcribed in the Georgian language is very broad. Their oldest samples are related to the beginnings of the Georgian writing tradition. The Georgian literary culture has been proven to start from the 5th century with "The Martyrdom of the Holy Queen Shushanik". It is the work that provides information that in the 5th century in Georgia there were already manuscripts containing the most important books of Christian teachings - the Bible, Psalms, Gospels, Paul's epistles and hagiographic works, which have not reached us in their complete form. The fact that the early manuscripts containing the complete texts of the Gospels and Psalms date by the 9th-10th centuries (Gospels of Adischi 897 y. Svan.- 478 (K 82 does not give us a reason to consider the above mentioned "The Martyrdom of the Holy Queen Shushanik" as a later interpolation¹.

The article discusses the fragmentary manuscripts of the Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Center of Manuscripts, their systemic-structural, textological-research was conducted, archeographic description was performed. The degree of damage to the fragments was determined and recommendations for preventive conservation were issued.

Keywords: Manuscript Fragments; Textology; Parchment; structure; Preventive Conservation;

¹ As it is known, the oldest text of these poems of the original Georgian hagiography is preserved in Parkhali Polyecephalon manuscript A-95 dated by the 10th century.

ნინო მეგენიშვილი

ფილოლოგიის დოქტორი, კ.კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრის უფროსი მეცნიერი თანამშრომელი, თბილისი, ალექსიძის 1/3, 0193 საქართველო, +995 577 955011
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5985-9117>

შორენა თავაძე

დოქტორანტი, კ.კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრის მეცნიერი თანამშრომელი, თბილისი, ალექსიძის 1/3, 0193 საქართველო, +995 595 635544
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6216-9093>

აბსტრაქტი: კვლევითი პროექტი „ფრაგმენტული ხელნაწერების კოდიკოლოგიური ანალიზი და მასალის სტრუქტურული კვლევა“ ხორციელდება შოთა რუსთაველის ეროვნული ფონდის ფინანსური მხარდაჭერით (FR-19-7472, 2020–2023 წწ.).

ქართულ ენაზე გადაწერილ ფრაგმენტულ ხელნაწერთა ქრონოლოგიური ჩარჩო მეტად ფართოა. მათი უძველესი ნიმუშები ქართული სამწერლობო ტრადიციის სათავეებს უკავშირდება. ქართული სამწიგნობრო კულტურა კი დადასტურებულად V საუკუნიდან „შუმანიკის წამებით“ იწყება. სწორედ ეს თხზულება იძლევა ინფორმაციას, რომ საქართველოში V ს-ში უკვე არსებობდა ქრისტიანული მოძღვრების უმნიშვნელოვანესი წიგნების - ბიბლიური, ფსალმუნის, სახარების, პავლეს ეპისტოლეებისა და ჰაგიოგრაფიულ თხზულებათა შემცველი ხელნაწერები, რომელთაც ჩვენამდე სრული სახით არ მოუღწევიათ. ის ფაქტი, რომ სახარებისა და ფსალმუნის სრული ტექსტების შემცველი ადრეული ხელნაწერები IX-X სს-ით (897 წ-ის ადიშის სახარება Svan.- 478 (კ 82), 936-940 წწ-ის ჯრუჭის პირველი სახარება H-1660, X ს-ის მცხეთის ფსალმუნი A-38) თარიღდება, არ გვაძლევს იმის საფუძველს, რომ „შუმანიკის წამების“ ზემოთ მოხმობილი ცნობა გვიანდელ ინტერპოლაციად აღვიქვათ². ფრაგმენტულ ხელნაწერებს დიდი მნიშვნელობა ენიჭებათ ქართული სამწიგნობრო კულტურის წარმოშობისა და განვითარების სურათის აღდგენის საქმეში.

სტატიაში განხილულია კორნელი კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრის ფრაგმენტული ხელნაწერები. ამ ეტაპზე შესწავლილ იქნა ეტრატზე შესრულებული მხოლოდ რამდენიმე (6 ფურცლამდე) ფრაგმენტული ხელნაწერი, ჩატარდა მათი სისტემური - სტრუქტურული, ტექსტოლოგიური - კვლევა, შესრულდა დეტალური არქეოგრაფიული აღწერა, განისაზღვრა ფრაგმენტების დაზიანების ხარისხი და გაიცა რეკომენდაციები პრევენციული კონსერვაციისთვის.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: ფრაგმენტული ხელნაწერი; ტექსტოლოგია; ეტრატი; სტრუქტურა; პრევენციული კონსერვაცია;

² როგორც ცნობილია, ქართული ორიგინალური აგიოგრაფიის ამ თხზულების უძველესი ტექტი შემორჩენილია X ს. ხელნაწერ კრებულ პარხლის მრავალთავში A-95.

Introduction. New and complex field of manuscript studies, fragmentology, which studies origin, composition, migration, material and issues connected to it (paper, parchment, ink, preservation, determining conditions of conservation, etc.) direct relation with the manuscript and, generally, with the generating culture in combination, is one of the important fields of modern codicology.

Manuscript heritage has preserved a great number of fragmentary manuscripts, which involves quite an extensive chronological period, interesting from the viewpoint of topics and materials. The oldest Georgian manuscripts that date from the 5th–8th centuries have not come down to us in a complete form, they have survived in fragments. As for the 9th–18th century collection, it preserves both complete and fragmentary manuscripts.

The origin of fragmentary manuscripts had various reasons. The migration of manuscripts is one of the reasons for the large number of fragments. The main part of the manuscript was often found in another fund, and its fragmentary part - in private or stock collections of another country. In addition, parchment was an expensive material, so it was not thrown away and was used either to create a new manuscript (the writing was torn apart and another text was written on the parchment (this is how palimpsest was created), or as a storage sheet or for the covers of another manuscript.

The history of Georgia is rich in handwritten heritage. It is preserved not only in Georgian museums and archives, but also in antiquities of many countries of the world. The history of the Georgian handwritten book begins in the V century and continues to this day. It is distinguished by thematic variety, there are works of both religious content and secular content. The first work preserved in the manuscripts until today is "The Martyrdom of the Holy Queen Shushanik" by Jacob the Priest.³ Several manuscripts are mentioned in the essay „He took with him the Gospel and a book about the saints“⁴, here it is also mentioned „With great eagerness he took the psalms in his hands and learned one hundred and fifty psalms in a few days“⁵ The mentioned small sections prove that in the 5th century in Georgia there were already handwritten books of various genres, including hagiographic and bibliological (Psalms, books of old and new perception) content, the remaining fragmentary heritage of which we are talking about below.

Method

An interdisciplinary method is used in the research of fragmentary manuscripts.

Results

Georgia is a pre-Christian country, where its followers lived from the first century and, accordingly, Christian culture was created. Work on fragmentary manuscripts, showed us that such manuscripts, despite their small volume, contain rich and interesting textological material, that research, publication and inclusion in scientific circulation may reveal still unknown texts and editorial differences of different works.

Also, the fundamental, multidisciplinary research of fragmentary manuscripts ensures the preventive conservation of fragments and the determination of appropriate conditions, which is the most important task of cultural heritage protection.

³ Shushanik lived in the second half of the 5th century, she died as a result of torture in 576. The author of the work, Jacob the Priest, was his contemporary and Shushanik's priest.

⁴ This is the episode when Shushanik, who left the palace after Varksen, her husband, changed the religion, returned to the palace at the request of her brother-in-law Jojik and Bishop Apots.

⁵ დიდიტა გულსმოდგინებითა ჳელთა აღიხუნა დავითნი და მცირედთა დღეთა შემდგომად ასერგასისნი იგი ფსალმუნნი დაისწავლნა

Discussions

New and complex field of manuscript studies, fragmentology, which studies origin, composition, migration, material and issues connected to it (paper, parchment, ink, preservation, determining conditions of conservation, etc.) direct relation with the manuscript and, generally, with the generating culture in combination, is one of the important fields of modern codicology.

Manuscript heritage has preserved a great number of fragmentary manuscripts, which involves quite an extensive chronological period, interesting from the viewpoint of topics and materials. The oldest Georgian manuscripts that date from the 5th–8th centuries have not come down to us in a complete form, they have survived in fragments. As for the 9th–18th century collection, it preserves both complete and fragmentary manuscripts.

The origin of fragmentary manuscripts had various reasons. The migration of manuscripts is one of the reasons for the large number of fragments. The main part of the manuscript was often found in another fund, and its fragmentary part - in private or stock collections of another country. In addition, parchment was an expensive material, so it was not thrown away and was used either to create a new manuscript (the writing was torn apart and another text was written on the parchment (this is how palimpsest was created), or as a storage sheet or for the covers of another manuscript.

The history of Georgia is rich in handwritten heritage. It is preserved not only in Georgian museums and archives, but also in antiquities of many countries of the world. The history of the Georgian handwritten book begins in the V century and continues to this day. It is distinguished by thematic variety, there are works of both religious content and secular content. The first work preserved in the manuscripts until today is "The Martyrdom of the Holy Queen Shushanik" by Jacob the Priest.⁶ Several manuscripts are mentioned in the essay „He took with him the Gospel and a book about the saints“⁷, here it is also mentioned „With great eagerness he took the psalms in his hands and learned one hundred and fifty psalms in a few days“⁸ The mentioned small sections prove that in the 5th century in Georgia there were already handwritten books of various genres, including hagiographic and bibliological (Psalms, books of old and new perception) content, the remaining fragmentary heritage of which we are talking about below.

Main point of the problem - Bible, biblical books for any Christian nation and ethnic group represented not only a holy book, but also the main manual of divine liturgy. It had a specific practical meaning in the early Christian era, before the Christian liturgy, dogmatics and the canon of law were formed at the church meetings. It is difficult to say whether the books mentioned in the above-mentioned work have survived in the form of fragments or not, but it should be noted that the first Georgian manuscripts preserved in fragmentary form, including biblical books, dating from the V-VII centuries, represent the lower layer of palimpsest fragments. We selected the Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John)

⁶ Shushanik lived in the second half of the 5th century, she died as a result of torture in 576. The author of the work, Jacob the Priest, was his contemporary and Shushanik's priest.

⁷ This is the episode when Shushanik, who left the palace after Varksen, her husband, changed the religion, returned to the palace at the request of her brother-in-law Jojik and Bishop Apots.

⁸ დიდითა გულსმოდგინებითა ჳელთა აღიხუნა დავითნი და მცირედთა დღეთა შემდგომად ასერგასისნი იგი ფსალმუნნი დაისწავლნა

to discuss the research methodology of fragmentary manuscripts. It should be noted that the ways of its formation are reflected in the Georgian manuscript foundations and different editions of the Gospels are preserved.

The study of manuscripts, including fragments, requires complex, multidisciplinary research: archeographic description, textological research, which involves the study and identification of the text of a manuscript fragment, determining the probable redaction; study of wills (if any); Codicological analysis of fragments - determination of material, writing tools, format (codex, scroll), determination of approximate chronological framework; study of artistic and paleographic features; Accurate description of the degree of damage of the fragment.

The Gospels went through three main stages of development - pre-Athonian (V-X centuries), Athonian (X-XI centuries) and Hellinophilic (XI-XII centuries). The oldest edition preserved in Georgian written monuments must be from the long period of the VI-VII centuries. the existing so-called Khanmet⁹ (H-1240, XI century) and Sabatsminda editions (H-999, XIII-XIV centuries).

As we mentioned, Georgian manuscripts have preserved three main editions of four chapters. The most accepted and established edition by the Georgian Church was created by Giorgi Mtatsmindeli (1009-1065) in the 50s of the 11th century and is known in Georgian manuscript studies as Giorgi Mtsmindeli's edition, among them the so-called Gelati Gospel Q-908, XII century.

N	Gospel of Matthew
1.	A-492b Gospel, XII-XIII century; 2s; Matthew 21,39-22,11(1r-v) Matthew 24,45-25,14(2r-v);
2.	A-1287b Gospel; XII-XIII century; 3s.; Matthew 18 34, 35-19, 20,24
3.	A-1287e Gospel; XII-XIII century; 1s.; Matthew 7, 24-29; v 8,1-11
4.	H-1326, Gospel, X century; 2 s.; Matthew 16 13-25 1r-v; 18, 12-22 2r-v
5	H-2704, Gospel, XI century; 1 s.; Matthew 21,45; 22,13
6	H-2093v scroll, 2, palimpsest, XIV-XV century. Sulta Matiane, 1v;
7	H-1885b Gospel, XVI century; 2 s.; Matthew 7, 15-16 1r-v, 10, 2-3 2r-v
8	H-2129, Gospel, XIII century.; 2 s.; Matthew 5,35 1r-v, მბოჯ 8, 5-19 2r-v
9	H-2704 Gospel XI century 1s., Matthew 21, 45-46; 22, 1-13
10	S-3280a, Gospel, XII-XIII century; 4s.; Matthew 7,8-23 1r-v; 15,5-16,4 2r-3v; 22,40-23,16 4r-v
11	Q-211, Gospel, X century; 1 s.; Matthew 23, 37-46
12	Q-637b, Gospel, XIII century; 5 s.; Matthew 26-29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
13	Fr-217 Gospel 1s. Matthew 27,57-62; 28,4-14

⁹ The written monuments of the ancient Georgian language are divided into several groups: Khanmet, Haemeti, Sannarevi and Khmovanmet (A, I, O, U). Predominance of consonants is based on the principle of which prefixes express the second subjective and third objective persons. "Khanmet" is called such written monuments, in which the prefix "kh" is dominant as a sign of the second subjective and third objective persons. We also have the kh-prefix in the plural forms of adjectives and adverbs and in the passive voice with the "T"-prefix. Such texts, where h- is used in the above-mentioned forms, are called Haemeti, and Sannarevi are called written monuments, in which the s-prefix is confirmed before the consonants ც თ ტ ძ ცხ ჯ ზ ზ as the producer of subjective second and objective third persons, and vowels are such written monuments where Vowels are included unsystematically, in violation of linguistic norms.

The oldest texts are Khanmeti texts (5th century - 1st half of the 8th century). The oldest example of Haemeti texts is the Tskisi inscription (616-619 BC). Sannarevi texts can be found from the 9th century. Voicing is found in the dialects of eastern and southern Georgia.

14	Fr-221 Gospel, 1s. Matthew 15, 20-32
----	--------------------------------------

N	Gospel of Mark
1.	A-1287a Gospel; X-XVII century; 1s.; Mark 4, 26-39
2.	H-1885g, Gospel, XI century; 1 s.;
3.	S-2855, Gospel, XIII century; 2 s.; 23,5X22,5; Mark 14, 43-62
4.	Q-213, Gospel, X century.; 2s.; Mark 14,72,15,1-15.
5.	Q-218 Gospel XIII-XIV century; Mark 15.
6.	Q-1054. Gospel XIII-XIV century; 1 s.; Mark 9,45-46,47,48,49,50 (Mark. 10-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9) (Mark. 10-9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15).
7	Fr-231 Gospel Mark

N	Gospel of Luke
1	A-492d Gospel XIV century; 2 s; Luke 13,34,35; Luke 14,1-35; Luke 15,1-8
2	H-1892, Gospel, XI century; 2 s.; 21,5X15; Luke 9, 43-44 1 r-v; 11,42
3	H-2702 Gospel, XII century; 1 s.; Luke 8,38-50
4	H-362 Gospel XIII century; 1 s; Luke, 24, 20-40
5	H-2084b, Gospel, XV century; 2 s.; Luke 8,30.
6	H-2093d Sulta Matiane, XVI century; palimpsest, Luke 23, 48-52.
7	Q-783, Gospel, XIII century.; 3 s.; Luke 14-35, 15-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; Luke 15-6, 7, 8, 9, 10 Luke 15- 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 Luke, 15-17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 ლუკა, 15- 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 Luke, 15- 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29; 16-1 Luke 16-2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 Luke 16-8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 Luke 16-13, 14, 15, 16, 17 Luke 16-18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 Luke 16-24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31
8	Fr-194, Gospel, Luke 16, 10

N	Gospel of John
1	A-1090b Gospel X century; 1s. XIII century John, 20, 8-25
2	A-1090b Gospel, XIII century; 1s; John 20, 8-25
3	H-3181, Gospel XI century; 1s.; John 6,52
4	H-1409, Gospel XI-XII century; 2 s.; John 4,10-5,12
5	Q-486b, Gospel, X century; 1 s.; John 20, 17-27.
6	Fr-224 Gospel John

N	mixed ¹⁰
1	H-1396, Gospel, XIII-XIV century; 4 s.; Luke 12, 36-52, 14,28-151-9; Matthew 6,2-17, 7,12-25
2	2084d Gospel XV century; 4 s.; John 11,4-55-(1r-2v); Matthew 10,34-11,12 3r-v; Matthew 12,26-43 4 r-v
3	2084e Gospel XV century; 2 s.; Matthew 26, 61-27,9 1r-v; Mark 1,24-2,2 2r-v,
4	2084v, Gospel, XV century; 4 s.; John 12,23-46 1r-v; John 19,16-19,32 2r-v; 3r-v; 4 r-v Matthew 5,18
5	2084z, Gospel XV century; 2 s.; Luke, John

40 (up to 6 sheets) fragmentary manuscripts of the Gospels, which include different chronological frameworks and editions, are preserved in the archives of Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts (A,S,H,Q,FR). From the point of view of quantity, the most numerous of the remaining fragments, 14 units, are the Gospel of Matthew, Luke - 8, Mark - 7, John - 6, fragmentary manuscripts - 5, where 2 or more fragmentary parts of the Gospel have survived.

¹⁰ It is meant when two or more fragments of the gospel have survived in the manuscript.

Research methodology of fragmentary manuscripts - A specific method was defined for the fundamental research of Georgian fragmentary manuscripts, which includes codicological-textological research of the fragment, its complete archeographic description, as well as the structural analysis of the material and the development of preventive conservation recommendations.

For illustration, we selected one sample of each of the four Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John). The fragments are interesting from the point of view of the structure and damage of the writing material.

Fr-221

The said fragment has been preserved in the archive of Academician N. Berdzenishvili, which has been transferred to the Institute of Manuscripts along with his memorial items, at the request of N. Berdzenishvili's family. The fragment is comprised of one folio, dating from the 11th century (according to the handwriting). Given the manuscript structure and paleographic data, we may assume that it should have been commissioned by some nobleman.

The fragment structure is as follows: length – 17.5 cm, width – 12.9 cm. width of the text in the column – 3.8 cm. space between the lines – 0.5 mm. space between words – 0.4 mm. right margin – 2.5 cm. left margin – 1.5 cm. upper margin – 1.4 cm. lower margin – 2.5; 2.8 cm. Number of lines in the column – 21. The folio is damaged, deformed, torn and defective. The torn part is folded in the lower section of the Spine. Due to its severe deformation, the ink and the text have been damaged, therefore, the latter has become illegible. The verso is written on the hair side with the rulling performed so carefully that it is almost invisible. A distance of 1 cm is available (with initials inserted) between the vertical lines drawn in the center of the folio. There are almost four-line initials (size: 1.3-1.7 cm).

The parchment is a well-treated thin writing material. The recto and the verso represent hair and flesh sides, respectively. During microscopic examination, the trace as well as direction of hair could be observed in the form of small stains even on a well-treated parchment. It allows to determine the precise animal origin of a skin as a writing material. With the naked eye, such signs are not easily discernible on a well-treated parchment, as is the case with the parchment under discussion.

The fragment is written in brown ink, in two columns of calligraphic Nuskhuri characters. Initials are found at the beginning of chapters and verses are written in cinnabar ink. Letters are written in close sequence. The letter „ჰ“ (hoe), inserted within the letter don, is executed also in cinnabar ink. In addition, under the initials, the same small-sized letters are found, both written in cinnabar ink.

The fragment under consideration represents The Gospel of Matthew 15: 20-32[2]. The textological and verse order of the fragment coincides with the redaction by Giorgi the Athonite, with the exception of one detail, namely: the verse 31 in the manuscripts of Giorgi the Athonite's redaction reads: [so that the crowd was amazed when they saw the mute speaking, the maimed whole, the lame walking, and the blind seeing. And they praised the God of Israel] (Mat 15:31), however, the same verse of the fragment opens with არამედ [but] („არამედ უკვრდაცა...“ [but... was amazed]). In other manuscripts, namely,

in the Adishi Four Gospels, the cited verse opens with „ვიდრე უკვრდაცა...“ [Than ... was amazed], while the verse in H-1660 (Jruchi I Four Gospels, 52v), A-1453 (Parkhali Four Gospels, 36r), A-98 (Tskarostavi Four Gospels, 24r), the beginning of the verse reads: „ვითარმედ უკვრდაცა...“ [for ... was amazed]; the conjunctions „არამედ“ [but] and „ვიდრე“ [than] are used to suggest a contrast and comparison. The Greek text reads as follows: „31 ὥστε τὸν ὄχλον θαυμάσαι...“ which could be rendered as „for this reason, therefore, (and) so; so that; for the purpose of, with a view to, in order that“. Given this nuance, it is difficult to determine the exact recensional attribution of the text.

Gospel of Matthew¹¹ 15, 20-32 თავი¹²

Georgian	Greek ¹³
1r 1-ლი სვეტი 20. [შეაგი]ნებენ კაცსა, ხოლო უზანელითა კელითა ჭამად არა შეაგინებს კაცსა.	Ματθ. 15,20 ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον· τὸ δὲ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶ φαγεῖν οὐ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.
21. და წარვიდა მიერ იესუ და მივიდა ადგილთა ტვროსისა და სიდონისათა.	Ματθ. 15,21 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος.
22. და აჰა ესერა დედაკაცი ქანანელი გამოვი და, საზღვართაგან მათგან ლაღადებდა და იტყოდა: შემიწყალე მე, უფალო, ძეო დავითისო, რამეთუ ასული ჩემი ბოროტად ეშმაკეულ არს.	Ματθ. 15,22 καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ Χαναanaία ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων ἐκεῖνων ἐξελθοῦσα ἐκράυγασεν αὐτῷ λέγουσα· ἐλέησόν με, Κύριε, σὺ ἐ Δαυὶδ· ἡ θυγάτηρ μου κακῶς δαιμονίζεται.
23. ხოლო იესუ არად მიუგო მას სიტყუად. და მოუჯდეს მოწაფენი იესუს და ჰრქუეს მას: განუტევე ესე, რომელი	Ματθ. 15,23 ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον. καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἡρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν, ὅτι κράζει ὀπισθεν ἡμῶν.

¹¹ <https://www.biblica.com/bible/niv> 20These are what defile a person; but eating with unwashed hands does not defile them.” 21Leaving that place, Jesus withdrew to the region of Tyre and Sidon. 22A Canaanite woman from that vicinity came to him, crying out, “Lord, Son of David, have mercy on me! My daughter is demon-possessed and suffering terribly.” 23Jesus did not answer a word. So his disciples came to him and urged him, “Send her away, for she keeps crying out after us.” 24He answered, “I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel.” 25The woman came and knelt before him. “Lord, help me!” she said. 26He replied, “It is not right to take the children’s bread and toss it to the dogs.” 27“Yes it is, Lord,” she said. “Even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their master’s table.” 28Then Jesus said to her, “Woman, you have great faith! Your request is granted.” And her daughter was healed at that moment. 29Jesus left there and went along the Sea of Galilee. Then he went up on a mountainside and sat down. 30Great crowds came to him, bringing the lame, the blind, the crippled, the mute and many others, and laid them at his feet; and he healed them. 31The people were amazed when they saw the mute speaking, the crippled made well, the lame walking and the blind seeing. And they praised the God of Israel. 32Jesus called his disciples to him and said, “I have compassion for these people; they have already been with me three days and have nothing to eat. I do not want to send them away hungry, or they may collapse on the way.”

¹² The missing parts are restored in square brackets

¹³ www.imgap.gr It should be noted that at the end of the 10th century and the 11th century. At the beginning, the Georgian church liturgy was influenced by Constantinople, which was also reflected in theological writings.

<p>მე-2 სვეტი დადადებს და შეგვდგეს ჩუენ. 24. ჰრქუა მათ იესუ: არა ვიდრე მოვლინებულ ვარ, გარნა ცხოვართა მათ წარწყმედულთა სახლისა ისრაჴლისათა. 25. ხოლო იგი მოუჴდა და თაყუანის-სცემდა მას და ეტყოდა: უფალო, შემიწყალე მე!</p> <p>26. ხოლო თავადმან მიუგო და ჰრქუა მას: არა კეთილ არს მოღებად ჰური შვილთაგან და დაგებად ძაღლთა. 27. ხოლო მან ჰრქუა: ჰე, უფალო, რამეთუ ძაღლნიცა ჴამედ ნაბიჴევისაგან, რომელ გარდამოცვიენ ტაბლისაგან უფალთა მათათადას.</p> <p>1v 1-ლი სვეტი 28. მაშინ მიუგო იესუ და ჰრქუა მას: ჴ დედაკაცო! დიდ არს სარწმუნოებად ეგე შენი; გეყავნ შენ, ვითარცა გნებავს. და განიკურნა ასული იგი მისი მიერ ჴამითგან. 29. და წარვიდა მიერ იესუ და მოვიდა ჴღვს-კიდესა მას გალილეასასა და აღვიდა მთასა და დაჯდა მუნ. 30. და მოუჴდა მას ერი მრავალი, რომელთა ჴყვა მათ თანა მკელობლები, ბრმები, ყრუნი, ჴუეწარმძრომელნი და სხუანი მრავალნი თითო-სახეთაგან სენთა შეჴყრობილნი. და დასხნეს იგინი ფერჯ</p> <p>მე-2 სვეტი თა თანა მისთა, და განკურნნა იგინი, 31. ვიდრე უჴკრდაცა ერსა მას, ხედვიდეს რად, ვითარ-იგი ყრუნი იტყოდეს, და მკელობელნი ვიდოდეს, და ღრეკილნი განიკურნებოდეს, და ბრმანი ხედვიდეს; და ადიდებდეს ღმერთსა ისრაჴლისასა. 32. ხოლო იესუ მოუწოდა მოწაფეთა თჴსთა და ჰრქუა მათ: მეწყალის ერი ესე, რამეთუ აჴა ესერა სამი დღე არს, და მელიან მე და არა რად აქუს, რადმცა ჴამეს; და განტევებად მათი უზმთად არა მნებავს, ნუჴკუე დაცვეენ გზასა ჴედა.</p>	<p>Ματθ. 15,24 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.</p> <p>Ματθ. 15,25 ἡ δὲ ἔλθοῦσα προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ λέγουσα· Κύριε, βοήθει μοι.</p> <p>Ματθ. 15,26 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· οὐκ ἔστι καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις.</p> <p>Ματθ. 15,27 ἡ δὲ εἶπε· ναί, Κύριε· καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἔσθιει ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν.</p> <p>Ματθ. 15,28 τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ· ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις! γεννηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις. καὶ ἰάθη ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκεῖνης.</p> <p>Ματθ. 15,29 Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦλθε παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ.</p> <p>Ματθ. 15,30 καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν χαλοῦς, τυφλοῦς, κωφοῦς, κυλλοῦς καὶ ἑτέρους πολλοῦς, καὶ ἔρριψαν αὐτοὺς παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔθεράπευσεν αὐτούς,</p> <p>Ματθ. 15,31 ὥστε τοὺς ὄχλους θαυμάσαι βλέποντας κωφοῦς ἰκοῦντας, ἀλάλους λαλοῦντας, κυλλοῦς ὑγιαῖς, χαλοῦς περιπατοῦντας καὶ τυφλοῦς βλέποντας· καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν Θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ.</p>
---	--

	<p>Ματθ. 15,32 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπε· σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσί μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι· καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς νήστευς οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.</p>
--	--

Q 213

The fragment Q 213 dated to the X century is one of the most interesting units in terms of its textological, paleographical, linguistic peculiarities and the structure of the written material.

This unit was found together with many other fragments (Q-209, Q-210, Q-212, etc.) in the papers of Mkhitarist Kalatozishvili, they were purchased from his heirs.

The structure of the fragment is as follows: the text and upper letters are written in Asomtavruli, in brown ink; ruled lines - slightly noticeable horizontal lines; number of sheets - 2, written in one column, four rhombic cuts remain on both sheets; The format of the sheets is incomplete and unpreserved; The size of both sheets and the number of lines are different due to damage: Sheet I: line 12; Size 14.2x11.5, distance from the text to the top: 0.7 cm., bottom - 0 cm (cut), from the spine--0 cm (cut), right field--3.0 cm., column height - 13 cm;

Sheet II: line - 11; Size 13.5x11.7, distance from the pages to the text: top - 1.4 cm., bottom - 0 cm (cut), from the back--1.5 cm., right field--1.7 cm. The height of the column is 11.3 cm., dark color; thickness -0.4;

Q-213 preserves the Gospel of Mark 14,72; Article 15, 1-15. From chapter 14, verse 72, only the last phrases remain: "And he began to weep" („და იწყო ტირილად“). The text preserved in the fragment was compared with all redactions preserved in Georgian writing. The text stored in the named unit is different from all of them. Therefore, in contrast to the found research units, the table contains the text preserved in the fragment, Giorgi Mtatsmindeli's edition and the Greek version, which reveals the textological difference of the manuscript. Here are some examples: Chapter 15 begins with words: -, „The priests decided for **tomorrow**“ „და მუნ თქუეს-ვე ხვალისაგან ძრახვა-ყვეს მდღელთ-მოდღუართა...“ This episode is showed as follows in all named manuscripts-, „Very early in the **morning**“ „და მეყსეულად განთიად ზრახვა-ყვეს (Q-908, 72v, XII century, Gelati Gospel, A-98, 58r, X century), The mentioned section in the Greek list is as follows "Καὶ εὐθέως ἐπὶ τὸ πρωῖν ἡσυχασάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς...". τὸ πρωῖν - it means "early in the morning, dawn" and not tomorrow or the next day, as given in the above passage. The rest of the verses of the Gospel of Mark preserved in the fragment are interesting, which differ from all the lists preserved in Georgian written sources, not only in terms of terminology and individual words, but also in the whole sentence: „4. So again Pilate asked him, „Aren't you going to answer? See how many things they are accusing you of“ (Q-213), „4. და იგი არა სმოდა სახე მერმე ეტყოდა მას: არა სმოდენსა ესე იტყოიან (Q-213) „He seemed to understand nothing and asked him again: Do you not understand what they are saying?“ 4.ხოლო პილატე კუალად ჰკითხა მას და ჰრქუა: არარას მიუგება? აჰა რაოდენსა შეგწამებენ შენ! (Q-908, A-98) 15,4 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνη σὺδέν; ἴδε πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν. This is the complete textual picture of the fragment.

The linguistic features of the Gospel preserved in the fragment are interesting. "O" is sometimes used instead of "U" in the text. „14. ...რაჲ ეგოდენ ძუირი ოქმნიეს და ეგენი ოქმობდეს, ჯუარს აცუ ეგე“. უნდა იყო - უქმნიეს, უამობდეს. A similar form, the alternation of vowels O - U, is found in a fragmentary Georgian manuscript dated to the 10th century preserved at the University of Graz, in Polycephalion. (B I 2058): „საყუარელნო, ოფლისა მიერ, რამეთუ ვითარცა გონიერთა მივსწერ თქოენდა, რამეთუ შემძლებელ...“. უნდა იყო - უფლისა, თქუენდა.

The distribution of the text on the pages is interesting. As noted, the surviving fragment begins with the last phrase of Mark 14, verse 72, and continues with Mark 15, verse 1. The mentioned text is preserved on the 2v of the fragment, on the r of this page the 13th and 15th verses of the 15th chapter of the same Gospel are placed, and on the r of the preserved 2nd leaf (1r-v) the 15th chapter of the Mark's Gospel, verses 4-6, Articles 7-8 are missing, and on v, articles 9-11, article 12 is missing. The surviving fragment is written by one hand, with Asomtavruli on pages folded in the middle. It is interesting how they divided the text on r and v in such a way that it is quite difficult to determine the order of the gospel, because the beginning of the preserved fragment, verse 72 of chapter 14 and verse 1 of chapter 15, is on page 2v, and on the previous page, on page 2r - chapter 13 of chapter 15 - There are 15 articles. The binding notches left on the fragment and the traces of the direction of the fur found during microscopic examination allow us to define the right and the reverse sides of the sheet without fail.

It should be emphasized that the text of 1r-v is written without a frame and misses the binding-related cuts. With the uneven distribution of the text on the pages and the haphazard writing, it can be assumed that this was a calligrapher's exercise sheet and not part of any manuscript.

Gospel of Mark 14,72; 15, 1-15 ¹⁴

Georgian	Giorgi Mtatsmindeli's edition	Greek
2v მუხლი 1 14.72 და იწყო ტირილად	14.72 და იწყო ტირილად	Μαρκ.14,72 και ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε.
15.1 და მუნ თქუეს-ვე ხვალისაგან ძრახვა ყვეს	15.1 და მესეულად განთიად ზრახვა-ყვეს მღდელო- მოდღუართა მათ	Μαρκ. 15,1 Καὶ εὐθέως ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτῳ συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων

¹⁴<https://www.biblica.com/bible/niv> And he broke down and wept.

1Very early in the morning, the chief priests, with the elders, the teachers of the law and the whole Sanhedrin, made their plans. So they bound Jesus, led him away and handed him over to Pilate. 2“Are you the king of the Jews?” asked Pilate. “You have said so,” Jesus replied. 3The chief priests accused him of many things. 4So again Pilate asked him, “Aren’t you going to answer? See how many things they are accusing you of.” 5But Jesus still made no reply, and Pilate was amazed. 6Now it was the custom at the festival to release a prisoner whom the people requested. 7A man called Barabbas was in prison with the insurrectionists who had committed murder in the uprising. 8The crowd came up and asked Pilate to do for them what he usually did. 9“Do you want me to release to you the king of the Jews?” asked Pilate, 10knowing it was out of self-interest that the chief priests had handed Jesus over to him. 11But the chief priests stirred up the crowd to have Pilate release Barabbas instead. 12“What shall I do, then, with the one you call the king of the Jews?” Pilate asked them. 13“Crucify him!” they shouted. 14“Why? What crime has he committed?” asked Pilate. But they shouted all the louder, “Crucify him!” 15Wanting to satisfy the crowd, Pilate released Barabbas to them. He had Jesus flogged, and handed him over to be crucified.

<p>მლდელოთ-მოდღუართა მათ მოხუცებულთა თანა და მწიგნობართა და ყოვლისა კრებულსა. და შეკრეს იესუ, წარიყვანეს და მისცეს</p> <p>1r 4.და იგი არა სმიოდა სახე მერმე ეტყოდა მას: არა სმიოდენსა ესე იტყოიან:</p> <p>5. შენ [] არაჲ მიუგო და საკურველებამდე []ტესა.</p> <p>6. ხოლო დღესასწაულად მიოტევეს ერთი პერობილიცა [მი]თხოიან</p> <p>1v 9.ვითარცა ყვეს მამამ[] მიმართ პილატე მიუგო და ჰრქუა მას: გნებავს, მიგიტეო [] Ⴀნ მეოფედ ჰორიათად.</p> <p>10.ოწყოდა, რამეთუ შურით მიეცა მლდელოთ-მთავართა.</p> <p>11.ხოლო მლდელოთ-მთავართა, რომელთა მათ აღძრეს ერი იგი, რადთა ბარაბა მიუტეოს მათ. 2r</p> <p>13. ხ[ოლო] იყვნეს მღვდელთ-მოდღუართაგან და იტყოდეს: ჯუარს აცუ ეგე და</p> <p>14. პილატე ეტყოდა მათ: რად ეგოდენ ძუირი Ⴀქმნიეს და ეგენი Ⴀქმობდეს, ჯუარს აცუ ეგე.</p> <p>15. ხოლო პილატე იზრახა</p>	<p>მოხუცებულთა თანა და მწიგნობართა და ყოველმან კრებულმან. და შეკრეს იესუ და წარიყვანეს და მისცეს იგი პილატეს.</p> <p>4.ხოლო პილატე კუალად ჰკითხა მას და ჰრქუა: არარას მიუგება? აჰა რაოდენსა შეგწამებენ შენ!</p> <p>5.ხოლო იესუ არარად მიუგო, ვიდრემდის უკვრდაცა პილატეს.</p> <p>6.და რად დღესასწაულსა მიუტევის მათ ერთი პერობილი, რომელიცა გამოითხოიან.</p> <p>9 ხოლო პილატე მიუგო და ჰრქუა მათ: გნებავსა, რადთა მიგიტეო თქუენ მეუფე ჰურიათად?</p> <p>10.რამეთუ იცოდა, ვითარმედ შურითა მისცეს იგი მლდელოთ-მოდღუართა მათ.</p> <p>11ხოლო მლდელოთ-მოდღუართა მათ აღძრეს ერი იგი, რადთა ბარაბა მიუტეოს მათ.</p> <p>13.ხოლო მათ კუალად დადატყვეს და ჰრქუეს: ჯუარს-აცუ ეგე.</p> <p>14 ხოლო პილატე ეტყოდა მათ: რად ბოროტი უქმნიეს? და იგინი უმეტესად დადადებდეს და იტყოდეს: ჯუარს-აცუ ეგე.</p> <p>15 ხოლო პილატეს უნდა ერისა მის მომადლებად,</p>	<p>καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὄλον τὸ συνδριον, δήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν τῷ Πιλάτῳ.</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,4 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν λέγων· οὐκ ἀποκρίνη οὐδέν; ἴδε πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν.</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,5 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη, ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν Πιλάτον.</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,6 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυεν αὐτοῖς ἓνα δέσμιον, ὃνπερ ἤτοῦντο.</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,9 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων· θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,10 ἐγίνωσκε γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς...</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,11 οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς...</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,13 οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραξαν· σταύρωσον αὐτόν...</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,14 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· τί γὰρ ἐποίησε κακόν; οἱ δὲ περισσοτέρως ἔκραξαν· σταύρωσον αὐτόν...</p> <p>Μαρκ. 15,15 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι ...</p>
--	--	--

H-2093e (Palimpsest)

According to the description, the manuscript is a fragment consisting of 4 sheets dated to the 16th century. However, during research, it was found that all four pages are 4 fragments of different manuscripts. The manuscript was divided into 4 units (H-2093 D, E, F, Z). The article discusses H-2093E, the manuscript is a palimpsest page, the upper layer is a 16th century work of secular content, the Annals of the Souls.

The lower layer of the manuscript is the Gospel of Luke 23, 48-52 written in two columns, the lower layer on r is washed well, the outline of several letters can hardly be distinguished in empty places. The upper layer is applied only to r; The remaining text of the gospel on v is not washed away, but the 2nd column of the gospel is cut off, only the beginning of the letters can be seen. The lower layer of the gospel is written in calligraphic script in dark brown ink and dates from the 12th-13th century according to the handwriting. The reason for the fragmentation of the manuscript is unknown. The distribution of texts on the fragment, both upper and lower layers, are different. The manuscript sheet is cut lengthwise, vertically in the middle, and the top layer is written in width; And in the lower part, the Gospel text is written in length. Thus, it can be assumed that the fragment represents a fragment of an old manuscript out of use; They probably did not need the second page and therefore did not scratch it; As a result of interdisciplinary, textological-codicological research, a fragmentary manuscript was separated and assigned "H-2093E". The structure of the fragment is as follows: sheet size 22.5X12.5; The distance between the pages and the text: 5 cm from the bottom, cut from the edge; The upper part is 2 cm, the lower part is 4.5 cm; Column-5x16; The distance between the columns is 1.5 cm; number of lines - 24; Rubrication in text ink; ink - brown; ruled lines can be seen; parchment sheet is of dark color; Thickness 003 mm. Format - incomplete, not conserved.

The textual and article structure of the fragment corresponds to Giorgi Mtatsmindeli's edition. Articles 51 and 52 prove this. In the manuscripts of the Giorgi Mtatsmindeli editorial office and in this fragment, these articles are read as follows: „51. who had not consented to their decision and action“. „51. ესე არა თანაშერთულ იყო ზრახვასა მათსა...“, (Q-908, XII, 122v, Q-213, 1v) The same article is given in Tskarostavi Gospel in the following way: „This was not the intention“, „ესე არა იყო ზრახვასა...“ (A-98, Xc. 164v), The same passage in Greek version is the following: „οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλή...“ **συγκατατεθειμένος** means permission, agreement; „52. Going to Pilate, he asked for Jesus' body.“ **52. ესე მივიდა პილატესა და მოითხოვა გუამი იგი იესუდსი**“, which literally follows the same verse of the fragment, but the verse named in other manuscripts, namely the Gospel of Adishi, is different „He stood in front of“ „[ესე წარდგა წინაშე პილატესა...“, **ხოლო H-1660 (Jrutchi Gospel 223v), A-1453 (Parkhali Gospel, 182v), A-98 (Tskarostavi Gospel, 164v)** the article starts „ესე მოუადა...“ The ancient Greek text begins with words „οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ...“ In Greek the word **προσελθὼν**- Προσερχομαι means “to come” It is in this form that Article 52 is protected in the fragment. Considering these nuances, it can be said with certainty that the fragment is edited by Giorgi Mtatsmindeli, this is confirmed by the article division and the differences with the listed lists. In particular, in A-98, 48 articles are followed by 49 articles, they are not separated into separate articles. A morphological difference is observed, e.g. ჰხედვიდეს A-98 164v, A-1453 182v (49 article), H-2093E ხედვიდეს

(ხედვიდეს მას). There is also a stylistic difference - „51. და იყო კაცი (Man) იგი (H-2093E), the “man” is missed H-1660, 223v, A-98 164v, A-1453 182v.

Gospel of Luke 23, 48-52¹⁵

Georgian	Greek
1v 48. იხილეს ხილვად ესე და საქმენი ესე, იცემდეს მკერდსა მათსა და წარვიდოდეს.	Λουκ. 23,48a καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγερόμενοι ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωροῦντες τὰ γενόμενα, τύπτοντες ἑαυτῶν τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον.
49. და დგეს ყოველნი მეცნიერნი მისნი შორით და დედანი, რომელნი შეუდგეს მას გალილეადთ, ხედვიდეს მას	Λουκ. 23,49 εἰστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθήσασαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὀρῶσαι ταῦτα.
50. და აჰა ესერა კაცი, სახელით იოსებ, მზრახვალი, იყო კაცის სახიერი და მართალი.	Λουკ. 23,50 Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ, βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων καὶ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος - Λουκ.
51. ესე არა თანაშერთულ იყო ზრახვასა მათსა და საქმესა. იყო კაცი იგი არიმათიადთ, ქალაქისაგან ჰურთიადსა, რომელი იგიცა მოელოდა სასუფეველსა ღმრთისასა.	Λουკ. 23,51 οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν- ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃς προσεδέχετο καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
52. ესე მივიდა პილატესა და მოითხოვა გუამი იგი იესუმსი ...	Λουკ. 23,52 οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἠτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ...

Q 486 -B

The mentioned fragment represents the verses 17-27 of the 20th chapter of the Gospel of John. The fragment consists of one sheet, dated to the 10th century, written in Asomtavrili with brown ink and singuri, in two columns. Rubrication is performed in brown ink.

The structure of the fragment is as follows: size - 25.3x21.5; The distance between the columns and the text: top - 2.5 cm. Bottom - 4.4 cm. From the spine - 2.8 cm. From the right edge - 3.2 cm. The height of the column is 18.5 cm. number of lines - 20, thickness - 0.2-0.3; ruled lines - horizontal and vertical lines; Due to damage of spine, the notch used for binding is not visible. The format is complete, unconserved; The upper right side of the spine is damaged. At the upper right corner of the page, the parchment is sewn with a thread in place of the text. It is contemporaneous with the creation of the manuscript. The textological and article structure of the fragment is consistent with Giorgi Mtatsmindeli's edition, except for one detail, namely, in article 19, in the manuscripts of Giorgi's edition,

¹⁵ <https://www.biblica.com/bible/niv> 48When all the people who had gathered to witness this sight saw what took place, they beat their breasts and went away. 49But all those who knew him, including the women who had followed him from Galilee, stood at a distance, watching these things. 50Now there was a man named Joseph, a member of the Council, a good and upright man, 51who had not consented to their decision and action. He came from the Judean town of Arimathea, and he himself was waiting for the kingdom of God. 52Going to Pilate, he asked for Jesus' body.

this article is read like this: „19. On the evening of that first day of the week, when the disciples were hidden“, „19. და ვითარცა შემწუხრდა დღედ იგი ერთშაბათთაჲ მათ და კარნი იგი დაჯშულ იყვნეს, სადა-იგი მოწაფენი შეკრებულ იყვნეს შიშისა...“, also – „when the disciples were together“, „მოწაფენი მისნი შეკრებულ იყვნეს მოწაფენი...“ – in Gelati (Q-809,), Vani (A-1453) and Adishi Gospels. In the mentioned fragment, this article is as following: „19. და ვითარცა შემწუხრდა დღედ იგი ერთშაბათთაჲ მათ და კარნი იგი დაჯშულ იყვნეს, სადა-იგი მოწაფენი დამალულ იყვნეს შიშისა...“, the ancient Greek text is as following: 19. Οὐσυχ σὺν ὀψίας τῆ ἡμέρα ἐκεῖνη τῆ μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων, καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ συνηγμένοι διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων...“**სυνηγμένοι – συναγα** that is translated like “gathering”. In Greek “hidden” is - „κεκρυμμένος... Compared to other lists, stylistic differences can also be observed, for example S-4927 Magdalene, and in the fragment it is rendered - **Magdalene (Article 18)**.

Gospel of John 20, 17-27¹⁶

Georgian	Greek
<p>1r 17.... აღსრულ ვარ მამისა ჩემისა; წარვედ ძმათა ჩემთა და არქუ მათ: „აღვალ მამისა ჩემისა და მამისა თქუენისა, ღმრთისა ჩემისა და ღმრთისა თქუენისა“.</p> <p>18.მოვიდა მარიამ მაგდანელი თხროზად მოწაფეთა მისთა, რამეთუ იხილა უფალი და ესრეთ ჰრქუა მას.</p> <p>19. და ვითარცა შემწუხრდა დღედ იგი ერთშაბათთაჲ მათ და კარნი იგი დაჯშულ იყვნეს, სადა-იგი მოწაფენი დამალულ იყვნეს შიშისა (მეორე სვეტი)თჳს ჰურიათაჲსა. მოვიდა იესუ და დადგა მათ შორის და ჰრქუა: „მშჯღობჲა თქუენ თანა“</p>	<p>17. 20,17 λέγει αὐτῆ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ μου ἄπτου· οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς· ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν, καὶ Θεὸν μου καὶ Θεὸν ὑμῶν.</p> <p>18. 20,18 ἔρχεται Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἀπαγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὅτι ἑώρακε τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῆ.</p> <p>19. 20,19 Οὐσυχ σὺν ὀψίας τῆ ἡμέρα ἐκεῖνη τῆ μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων, καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ συνηγμένοι διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.</p>

¹⁶<https://www.biblica.com/bible/niv> 17Jesus said, “Do not hold on to me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father. Go instead to my brothers and tell them, ‘I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.’” 18Mary Magdalene went to the disciples with the news: “I have seen the Lord!” And she told them that he had said these things to her. 19On the evening of that first day of the week, when the disciples were together, with the doors locked for fear of the Jewish leaders, Jesus came and stood among them and said, “Peace be with you!” 20After he said this, he showed them his hands and side. The disciples were overjoyed when they saw the Lord. 21Again Jesus said, “Peace be with you! As the Father has sent me, I am sending you.” 22And with that he breathed on them and said, “Receive the Holy Spirit. 23If you forgive anyone’s sins, their sins are forgiven; if you do not forgive them, they are not forgiven.” 24Now Thomas (also known as Didymus), one of the Twelve, was not with the disciples when Jesus came. 25So the other disciples told him, “We have seen the Lord!” But he said to them, “Unless I see the nail marks in his hands and put my finger where the nails were, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe.” 26A week later his disciples were in the house again, and Thomas was with them. Though the doors were locked, Jesus came and stood among them and said, “Peace be with you!” 27Then he said to Thomas, “Put your finger here; see my hands. Reach out your hand and put it into my side. Stop doubting and believe.”

<p>20.და ესე ვითარცა თქუა იესუ, უჩუენნა მათ ჳელნი თჳსნი და გუერდნი.და განიხარეს მოწაფეთა, იხილეს რაჲ უფალი.</p>	<p>Ιω. 20,20 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ. ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν Κύριον.</p>
<p>21.მერმე ჳრქუა მათ: „მშჯდობადთქუენ თანა, ვითარცა მომავლინა მე მამამან, მეცა წარგავლინებ თქუენ“</p>	<p>Ιω. 20,21 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν. καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ πέμπω ὑμᾶς.</p>
<p>22.და ესე ვითარცა თქუა, შეჳბერა მათ და ჳრქუა: „მიიღეთ სული წმიდაჲ“.</p>	<p>Ιω. 20,22 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησε καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· λάβετε Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον·</p>
<p>23.უკუეთუ ვიეთნი მე¹⁷ მიუტევენთ (1v) ცოდვანი, მიეტევენ მათ; და უკუეთუ ვიეთნიმე შეიპყრნეთ, შეპყრობილ იყვენ“.</p>	<p>Ιω. 20,23 ἂν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφίενται αὐτοῖς, ἂν τινων κρατῆτε, κεκράτηνται.</p>
<p>24.ხოლო თომა, ერთი იგი ათორმეტთაგანნი, რომელსა ერქუა: „მარზბივ“, არა მათ თანა იყო, ოდეს-იგი მოვიდა იესუ.</p>	<p>Ιω. 20,24 Θωμᾶς δὲ εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος, οὐκ ἦν μετ’ αὐτῶν ὅτε ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.</p>
<p>25.უთხოზდეს სხუანი იგი მოწაფენი, ვითარმედ: „ვიხილეთ ჩვენ უფალი“. ხოლო მან ჳრქუა მათ: „უკუეთუ არა ვიხილო ჳელთა მისთა სახჯ იგი სამშჳულთაჲ და დავასხნე (მეორე სვეტი) თითნი ჩემნი ადგილსა მას სამშჳულთასა და დავსდვა ჳელი ჩემი გუერდსა მისსა, არასადა მრწმენეს.“</p>	<p>Ιω. 20,25 ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῶ οἱ ἄλλοι μαθηταί· ἑωράκαμεν τὸν Κύριον. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἂν μὴ ἴδω ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ τὸν τύπον τῶν ἥλων, καὶ βάλω τὸν δάκτυλόν μου εἰς τὸν τύπον τῶν ἥλων, καὶ βάλω τὴν χεῖρά μου εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω.</p>
<p>26.და შემდგომად რვისა დღისა კუალად იყვენს მოწაფენი შინაგან და თომაცა მათ თანა. და შევიდა იესუ კართა დაჳშულთა და დადგა შორის და თქუა: „მშჯდობაჲ თქუენ თანა“.</p>	<p>Ιω. 20,26 Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ πάλιν ἦσαν ἔσω οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θωμᾶς μετ’ αὐτῶν. ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἶπεν· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.</p>
<p>27.მერმე ჳრქუა თომას: „მოყვენ თითნი შენნი და იხილენ ჳელნი ჩემნი და დამ...“</p>	<p>Ιω. 20,27 εἶτα λέγει τῷ Θωμᾶ· φέρε τὸν δάκτυλόν σου ἰδε καὶ ἴδε τὰς χεῖράς μου, καὶ φέρε τὴν χεῖρά σου καὶ βάλε εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν μου, καὶ μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστός.</p>

Conclusion

Work on medieval manuscripts includes an interdisciplinary approach and requires the involvement of specialists from various fields (paleographers, codicologists, textologists, art historians, conservators-restorers, etc.). We were guided by these principles in the scientific research of the fragmentary manuscripts made on parchment. As a result of the study, the injuries on each fragmentary manuscript were described in detail.

The mentioned fragments are damaged for different reasons and to different degrees, on some pages the text is difficult or not readable at all. Damp, candle pigment spots are also observed.

On a small number of fragments, there are traces of early restoration - a place sewn with a thread (Q-486b), which was one of the methods of repairing and strengthening the sheet at that time. We found pages of fragments cut with a sharp object, probably prepared as a storage sheet for another manuscript (H-2093); On the studied fragments, there are both mechanical, rodent and insect damage (H-231). There are palimpsest sheets, one side of which is washed H(-2093E); Used as a storage sheet for another manuscript (Q-213).

Recommendations to be taken into account during preventive conservation include, if necessary, strengthening of mechanical injuries, their correct placement and creation of appropriate conditions.

Complex work on fragmentary manuscripts has shown us that there are fragmentary manuscripts, the main text of which cannot be found (the Gospel of Mark, stands out in terms of redaction), it is either a part of a palimpsest manuscript, or it has been specially divided into a storage sheet of another manuscript and for practical purposes, its complete corpus is lost (the Gospel of Luke). According to the degree of damage of some fragmentary manuscripts, it is clear that it must have been removed from the main text (Gospel of Matthew). Therefore, its complete archeographical description, codicological study, textological analysis and redaction determination will help us to find its complete corpus and restore the complete text. In this regard, the complex study of fragments has a high cultural value, which is one of the goals of researchers working on fragments. Regardless of the degree of damage and the volume of the texts, it is worthwhile to conduct fundamental research and ensure the preventive conservation of the fragments and their preservation under appropriate conditions.

დამოწმებული ლიტერატურა

- ახობაძე, ლ. (2017). ძველი მეტაფრასული კრებული, თბილისი.
- დოლაქიძე, მ. ჩიტუნაშვილი დ. (2017). დიდი სვინაქსარი, თბილისი.
- დობორჯგინიძე, ნ. (2012). მეტატექსტები ბიბლიის ძველ ქართულ თარგმანთა ენობრივი და სტილური თავისებურებების შესახებ. თბილისი.
- თავაძე, შ. (2020). ფრაგმენტულ ხელნაწერთა სტრუქტურული ანალიზი (კ.კეკელიძის სახელობის ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრის ფრაგმენტულ ხელნაწერთა ფონდში დაცული ექვსი ფრაგმენტის მაგალითზე). „სპეკალი“ N14, თსუ <http://www.spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/ge/article/magazinHeadlines/14>
- კეკელიძე, კ. (1982). ქართული ლიტერატურის ისტორია, თბილისი.
- კ.კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი, ელ.რესურსები <https://manuscript.ge/manuscript/>
- ოთხმეზური, თ. (1995). ეფრემ მცირის თარგმანების შემცველ ნუსხათა ერთი თავისებურების შესახებ. ფილოლოგიური ძიებანი N2. გვ. 144-149. თბილისი.
- საქართველოს რეგიონებში დაცული ქართული ხელნაწერები (კატალოგი), (2015). თბილისი.
- სარჯველაძე, ზ. (1975). ქართული სალიტერატურო ენის ისტორიის საკითხები. საქ. სსრ მეცნ. აკად. თბილისი.
- ქართული პალიმფსესტები ხელნაწერთა ეროვნულ ცენტრში (2017). თბილისი

- ქურცილიძე, ც. (2010). ქართული ბიბლია. თბილისი.
- ქაჯაია, ლ. (2018). პუნქტუაცია ქართულ ხელნაწერებში (V-XII სს.). თბილისი.
- ქართული ხელნაწერი წიგნი საზღვარგარეთ, თბ., 2018 <https://manuscript.ge/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/The-Georgian-Manuscript-web.pdf>
- შანიძე, ა. (1962). ქართული ენის გრამატიკა. თსუ. თბილისი.
- ჯავახიშვილი, ი. (1949). ქართული დამწერლობათმცოდნეობა ანუ პალეოგრაფია. თბილისი
- Giovanini, A. (2010). De Tutela Librorum, La conservation des livres et des documents d'archives. Baden.
- Duba, W. Flüeler Ch. (2018). Fragments and Fakes: The Arbor consanguinitatis of the Fondation Martin Bodmer and a Contemporary Forgery, *Fragmentology*, 1. pp.121–153. <https://www.fragmentology.ms/article/view/duba-and-flueeler-fragments-and-fakes>
- Fuchs, R. (2001). Kölner Beiträge zur Restaurierung und Konservierung von Kunst- und Kulturgut: Pergament, Geschichte Material Konservierung Restaurierung. Bd. 12. München.
- Renhart, E. (2013). Manuscript Fragments the Hidden Library, Summer School in the Study of Historical Manuscripts, University of Zadar, Croatia, pp.133-1442.
- Reuben J. S. (1996). New Testament Greek Manuscripts. John. pp. 119-120.
- Reuben J. S. (1996). New Testament Greek Manuscripts. Matthew. p.149 <https://www.biblica.com/bible/niv>
- Тавадзе III.*, Реставрация и консервация фрагмента рукописи XV века, выполненной на пергаменте (г.Кольн). «Сохранение культурного наследия. Исследования и реставрация». Материалы II Международной конференции в рамках V Международного культурного форума. Санкт-Петербург, 2016 г. с. 216-223.

References

- ak'hobaze, l. (2020). zveli metafrasuli krebulebi [Old Metaphorical Collections]. Tbilisi.
- dolaqize, m. c'itunashvili d. (2017). didi svinaqsari [Great Synaxarion, George the Hagiorite], Tbilisi.
- doborjginize, n. (2012). metateqstebi bibliis zveli qart'ul t'argmant'a enobrivi da stiluri tavisburebebis s'esaxeb [Linguistic and Hermeneutic Metatexts, Practical Grammar and Hermeneutics in Georgian Sources of the 10th-13th centuries]. Tbilisi.
- saqartvelos regionebs'i daculi qartuli xelnawerebi (2015). [Georgian Manuscripts in the Regions of Georgia (Catalogue)] Tbilisi.
- kekelize, k. (1982). qart'uli literaturis istoria [History of Georgian Literature, vol. I]. Tbilisi.
- otkhmezuri, t. (2011). efrem mciris t'argmanis s'emcvel nusxat'a ert'i t'aviseburebis s'esaxeb [The Commentarial Genre, in the Medieval Georgian Translation Tradition, Ephrem Mtsire and Commentaries on the Sermons of Gregory the Theologian], Tbilisi.
- qartuli palimfsestebi xelnawrta erovnul cntrs'i (2017). [Georgian palimpsests at the National Centre of Manuscripts] Tbilisi.
- qurtsikize, c. (2010). Qartuli biblia [Georgian Bible], Tbilisi.
- qajaia, l. (2018). punqtuacia qartul xelnawerebs'i [Punctuation in the Georgian Manuscripts (5th-12th cc.)]. Tbilisi.
- s'anidze, a. (1976). qart'uli enis gramatika [Grammar of the Georgian Language]. Tbilisi.

- sarjvelaze, z. (1975). qartuli saliteraturo enis istoriis sakit'xebi [Issues in the history of ancient literary language]. Tbilisi.
- Giovanini, A. (2010). De Tutela Librorum, La conservation des livres et des documents d'archives. Baden.
- Duba, W. Flüeler Ch. (2018). Fragments and Fakes: The Arbor consanguinitatis of the Fondation Martin Bodmer and a Contemporary Forgery, *Fragmentology*, 1. pp.121–153.
https://www.fragmentology.ms/article/view/duba-and-flueler_fragments-and-fakes
- Fuchs, R. (2001). Kölner Beiträge zur Restaurierung und Konservierung von Kunst- und Kulturgut: Pergament, Geschichte Material Konservierung Restaurierung. Bd. 12. München.
- Renhart, E. (2013). Manuscript Fragments the Hidden Library, Summer School in the Study of Historical Manuscripts, University of Zadar, Croatia, pp.133-1442.
- tavadze, sh. (2020). fragmentul xelnawerta struqturuli analizi (k.kkelizis saqartvelos xelnawerta erovnuli centris fragmentul xelnawerta fonds'I daculi eqvsi fragmentis magalit'ze). [Structural Analysis of Fragmentary Manuscripts (The Case of Six Fragments Preserved in Fragmentary MSS Fund of Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts) „Spekali“ N14]. Tbilisi.
<http://www.spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/14/231/>
- tavadze, Sh. (2016). restavracia i konservacia fragmnta wipolnennogo na pergamnte XV weka (koln). [Restoration and Conservation of the Fragment, Made on the parchment of the XVth Century (Cologne), Preservation of Cultural Heritage. Research and Restoration, II International Conference. Post Prints V International Cultural Forum, pp. 216-223. St.Petersbung.
- korneli kekeliz'is saqartvelos xelnawert'a erovnuli centri [Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts]. E-resources
<https://manuscript.ge/manuscript/>
- qartuli xelnaw'eri wigni sazr'vargaret [The Georgian Manuscript Book Abroad] (2018) Tbilisi.
<https://manuscript.ge/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/The-Georgian-Manuscript-web.pdf>
- Reuben J. S. (1996). New Testament Greek Manuscripts. John. pp. 119-120.
- Reuben J. S. (1996). New Testament Greek Manuscripts. Matthew. p.149
<https://www.biblica.com/bible/niv>
- javax'ishvili, i. (1949). qart'uli damw'erlobat'mcodneoba anu paleografia [Study of Georgian Handwriting or Palaeography]. Tbilisi.