

J. NEVILLE BIRDSALL

The Euthalian material and its Georgian versions*

It is symptomatic of the neglect of codicology in current New Testament textual criticism that to study the Euthalian apparatus¹ to the praxapostolos we still need to have recourse to the work of Zacagni published in 1698². It has never even been fully reprinted. It is found in over four hundred manuscripts of the Greek New Testament: it is known in Syriac, Armenian and Georgian: it may have left traces in the Gothic version. It has much to teach us about the application of rhetorical methods to the study of scripture, and may, if some interpretations of its data be correct, reach back to the third century of the era. The last studies to accord it a place are those of Guenther Zuntz³ in the fifth and sixth decades of the present century, work which casts light upon the compiler's intentions.

Yet we have no beginning, so far as one can see, of a critical edition. We have a work which may rank as prolegomena to this, namely the unpublished thesis of Dr L.C. Willard "A Critical Study of the Euthalian

* The work which is reported in this article was begun in 1977 and revised for inclusion in a Festschrift in 1981. Since that time, two factors have combined to enrich the available information. Firstly, a thorough study of the oldest recensions of the Georgian version has been begun and is still ongoing: some intimations of its early stages will be available in an article in *New Testament Studies* vol. 29, July 1983, entitled "Georgian studies and the New Testament". Secondly, the invitation of the Georgian Academy of Sciences to the congress of October 1982 (to celebrate the millenary of the Georgian house on Mount Athos) provided the opportunity for a rapid examination of the three manuscripts ζ η θ which are kept in the Institute of MSS. in Tbilisi. Some additions to text and notes have been made on the basis of these researches where it seemed necessary.

1 A good conspectus is given by C.H. TURNER, *Greek Patristic Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles. V. Patristic Editors of the Pauline Epistles in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*. Extra Volume, Edinburgh, 1909, pp. 525-529. The classical study in English is J. Armitage ROBINSON, *Euthaliana* (= *Texts and Studies*, III, 3), Cambridge 1895. For a brief and more recent summary, the reader may consult the section devoted to the Euthalian material in J. NEVILLE BIRDSALL, *The New Testament Text in The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1, (edited by P.R. ACKROYD and C.F. EVANS), reprinted 1975, esp. pp. 362f and viii (corrections to the text).

2 L.A. ZACAGNI, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum ecclesiae graecae ac latinae*, Rome 1698, pp. 401-708.

3 Especially in his study *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament* (The British Academy. Supplemental Papers no. VII) London. n.d. (1945) ch. III. *The Ancestry of the Philoxenian Text: 'Euthalius' and Pamphilus*.

Apparatus”⁴ to which the CPG s. nn. 3640-3642 draws our attention. Having used it in the preparation of the present article, I can bear witness to its great usefulness. The arguments devoted to the problems of the Euthalian material are fully summarized and often sagely commented upon. A very full bibliography is given. Most valuable, in my view, is the manuscript survey (appendix 3) which enables us to see the occurrence of the material in Greek mss. and even in some cases its significant textual features. It also contains a valuable summary of the arguments of Vardanian whose important edition of the Armenian material (see CPG l.c.) is rendered practically inaccessible to most scholars in that it is written entirely in Armenian.

The versions are of great importance in the study of this apparatus as they are in the study of the text of scripture itself. If we can date their origins even approximately, we can discern by means of their form the form (or at least a form) in which the text in question was extant and current at that date: it is very likely that we have access thereby to a text which was in some sense authoritative in Greek circles and to which the scholars of the church in outlying places would be directed as they sought to bring their churches into line with the learning of the Greek church. It has from time to time been intimated that the Euthalian apparatus is to be found in a Georgian translation⁵. But most of the references to it are merely allusive or even tentative, while the only fuller account which has been published⁶ has received little attention, perhaps because it is not expressed with complete clarity. Even Willard has overlooked this article.

The Georgian version is however now available in a number of publications by Georgian scholars. It comes before us in two quite distinct forms associated with different recensions of the Praxapostolos in the Georgian language. The older recensions contain only the apparatus to the Pauline epistles: the younger recensions contain in the Paulines only the most meagre traces of the apparatus, but provide the prologues to both the Acts and the Catholic epistles and some other material. We shall survey all this but it is to the apparatus to the Paulines that we shall give the major part of our attention since this is certainly the most intriguing.

The whole of the New Testament in Georgian is now available for scholarly purposes: the edition of the Pauline epistles is the latest part to appear.

4 University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1971.

5 E.g. KIRSOPP LAKE, *The Text of the New Testament*, Sixth Edition, revised by SILVA NEW, London, 1928, p. 60.

6 THEODOR KLUGE, *Ueber zwei altgeorgische neutestamentliche Handschriften in Novum Testamentum* 1 (1956) pp. 304-321.

7 პავლეს ეპისტოლეთა ქართული ვერსიები (ძველი ქართული ენის კათედრის შრომები 16) = *The Georgian Versions of the Epistles of Paul* (Works of the Department of Old Georgian Language 16). Tbilisi 1974.

This was edited by K'eteven Dzocenidze and after her death by Korneli Danelia: it was published in 1974. The meagre Euthalian material of the later recensions is to be found in this edition, but unfortunately the publication of the Euthalian material which precedes the Paulines in the older recensions was not pursued at the same time, but reserved to appear as an article in the Festschrift for the 90th birthday of the general editor of the series, the great Georgian philologist and linguist Akaki Šanidze, published in 1977⁸. It is the work of Danelia. It is provided with a long introduction in Georgian and a summary of this in Russian, and with a select lexicon.

The older recensions are edited from six manuscripts, two of which attest the oldest form (recension A) and the others the next in age (recension B). Two of the manuscripts in the latter group do not provide the Euthalian apparatus. Thus the edition by Danelia is based on four manuscripts. These are praxapostoloi giving their material in the order Paulines, Acts, Catholic Epistles, an order known in some Greek, Latin and Syriac manuscripts and quite widely in the tradition of the Armenian New Testament. Three of the manuscripts are to be dated in the tenth century and the fourth in the eleventh.

The manuscripts in question are referred to in the edition of the Pauline epistles and of the Euthalian apparatus to these by the following sigla:

Ⲭ (capital form of *ani*) — ms. A 407 of the Institute of Manuscripts in Tbilisi

Ⲙ (capital form of *bani*) — ms. S 1138, same collection

Ⲯ (capital form of *lasi*) — ms. S 1398, same collection

Ⲛ (capital form of *gani*) — ms. 176 of the Historical-Ethnographical Museum in K'utaisi.

The Euthalian material contained in them can be best presented by means of a table of parallel columns. In this the following sigla will represent the parts of the Euthalian apparatus: their reference in Zacagni and in Migne's partial reprint is given. In one case, the reference is elsewhere than to Zacagni; in another, no other occurrence of the material is known.

Pr = Prologue (to the Paulines): Z. 515-535; M. PG 85.693-713

pun = play on the names Saul and Paul: Z. 519f; M. *ibid.* 697

M = Martyrium Pauli apostoli: Z. 535-537; M. *ibid.* 713-716

Av = ἀνακεφαλαιώσας τῶν ἀναγνώσεων: Z. 537-541; M. *ibid.* 715-720

⁸ ევთალეს სტიქომეტრიის ქართული რედაქციები in (ძველი ქართული ენის კათედრის შრომები 20), pp. 53-150 = *The Georgian Redactions of the Stichometry of Euthalius* in (Works of the Department of Old Georgian Language 20) Tbilisi 1977.

- S = short list of testimonia with programma : Z. 542-548; M. *ibid.* 719-726
- L = long list of testimonia with programma : Z. 548-569; M. *ibid.* 725-745
- πλ = πλοῦς Παύλου, *navigatio Pauli* : Z. 515; M. *ibid.* 691, 692
- Πρ 1 = Προσφώνησις — ἀντίφρασις : not found in the material published by Zacagni; known in the New Testament mss. H, 88 and 773, and in the Armenian version. Transcribed from H in J.A. ROBINSON *Euthaliana* p. 3; from 773 in ERNST VON DOBSCHUETZ, *Harvard Theological Review* 18 (1925) p. 281; translated from the Armenian by F.C. CONYBEARE, *Journal of Philology* 23 (1895) pp. 243f. (Armenian text in the edition of Vardanian pp. 156f.)
- Πρ 2 = a second version of the same.
- K = kephalaia : Z. 573-576; 591-593; 613-615; 625-627; 635-636; 643-644; 650-651; 658-659; 665; 669 (ἡ δὲ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολή)-674; 688-690; 697-698; 704; 708 : M.P.G. 85.749-753; 753-756; 757-760; 761; 764; 765; 767; 769-772; 773; 776-780; 781-784; 785; 788; 789.
- T = a table with explanatory preface allegedly giving correspondences between Paul and the gospels; elsewhere unattested.

ႵႶ

Ⴕ

Ⴕ

Pr (without pun)

Pr (without pun)

Pr (without pun)

M

M

M

—

—

Πρ 2

Av

Av

Av

S

S

S

L

L

L

πλ

πλ

πλ

Πρ 1

Πρ 1

Πρ 1

Πρ 2

—

—

T

—

T

K

K

—

—

T

—

—

Πρ 2

—

A few words in exposition of these data are necessary. The Prologue to the Pauline epistles has not been observed (in the present state of research upon the Greek original) to have many variants. The absence of the play on the names Saul and Paul or its inclusion is noteworthy. The majority

of witnesses appear to be without it. The Georgian joins them. The Martyrium was discussed in some detail by Robinson⁹: whether we accept or not his hypotheses about the stages of recension visible in the Euthalian material, the data he gathered and presented is of permanent value. He draws up a list of variants concerning the date of Paul's martyrdom, which, as he says "may be of service as a guide for the future classification of Euthalian manuscripts". We may note in this regard that the Georgian in the passage found at the head of page 536 in Zacagni, omits both the phrases which are missing in certain witnesses and which Robinson considered to be later additions to the text, namely the gloss κατὰ συρομακεδόνας and the correlation of the month Panemos with the Egyptian Epiphi.

The kephalaia are to be found twice in the Georgian tradition. In the table above, that occurrence is given which presents a list of all the kephalaia in the corpus, given in one place at the head of the corpus. A perusal of the material will show that in Zacagni's presentation, which is broken up according to the individual epistles, each list is preceded by an ἔκθεσις. In the Georgian material, which gives a list for all the epistles together, only the ἔκθεσις given in Zacagni at the head of the list for Romans, is to be found.

The items Πρ 1 and Πρ 2 are intriguing. They are clearly each translated, or at least descended from, the subscriptions which first attracted attention when their presence in ms. H was indicated by Omont¹⁰, and in the Armenian by Conybeare. Unlike the presentation in these sources, however, the Georgian has no trace of the colophon which attests a collation with a manuscript of Pamphilus. The fact that the colophon and the subscription are separated in ms. 88 by the Navigatio (which precedes the Πρ in the Georgian) may suggest that the two were not originally linked. On the other hand, it may be rather an indication of links between the exemplar of the Georgian and the ancestor of ms. 88. The relationship of the Greek, Armenian and Georgian forms may best be presented in parallel columns.

H - 88 - 773	Armenian	Georgian (= Πρ 1)	Georgian (= Πρ 2)
προσφώνησις	Advice	Address	Command of Paul
κορωνίς εἰμι δογ- μάτων θεῶν	Chief am I, of the divine religion	Servant am I, of the divine instructions	Head I - am and of the divine instructions
διδάσκαλος	teacher	teacher	teacher
ἂν τινί με	If to anyone me	If to anyone thou	If to anyone thou
χρήσης	thou lendest	passeth on the book	passeth me on for the needs of thy friends and thy neighbours

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 28-31; 46f.

¹⁰ HENRI OMONT. Notice sur un très ancien manuscrit grec en onciales des Épîtres de Saint Paul (Paris) 1889. = Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale T. 33,1 pp. 141-192 (Paris) 1890.

H - 88 - 773	Armenian	Georgian (= Πρ 1)	Georgian (= Πρ 2)
ἀντίβιβλον λαμβάνε	thou shalt take a beautiful copy in my place	take a book in its place	thou shalt take a pledge in exchange for me
οἱ γὰρ ἀπόδοται κακοί	for these who give back are evil	for thou who give back are evil	so that thou shalt not desire easy gain for such - a - one because this time is hastening on
ἀντίφρασις	Reply	Agreement	Reply
θησαυρὸν ἔχων σε	(As) a treasure I have thee	A treasure thou hast	A spiritual treasury thou-art to me
πνευματικῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις	of spiritual blessings adorned with embellishments and desired of all men	for spiritual good and desired of all men	and an adornment for all men
ποθητόν ἁρμονίαις τὲ καὶ ποικίλαις γραμμαῖς	and with all sorts	of many parts combined and adorned with	and with various ornaments
κεκοσμημένον	of ornaments	various-coloured writing.	decorated
νῆ τὴν ἀληθείαν	yes! I speak with truth	I swear in truth	I undertake to thee in truth that
οὐ δώσω σε προχείρως τινί	I will not rashly lend thee to anyone	rashly to no one will I give (thee)	to no one will I give thee (who is) careless or a stranger
οὐδ' αὖ φθονέσω	nor again will I be jealous	nor will I be jealous	
τῆς ὠφελείας	of the well-being of anyone	of what is useful	
χρήσω δὲ τοῖς φίλοις	but when I lend thee to my friends	but I will serve my friends	If I give thee to anyone of my brethren or my be- loved ones
ἀξιόπιστον		and a worthy	in place of thee
ἀντίβιβλον λαμβάνων	a beautiful copy in thy place I will take	trusted book will take	a pledge I will take so that I shall not desire easy gain for any people at all.

These data present an intriguing picture of the translation history of a difficult text. The Armenian was first brought to attention by Conybeare and was further discussed by von Dobschuetz¹¹: it was the latter who pointed out

11 *Centralblatt fuer Bibliothekswesen* Bd. 10 t. 2 (1893) pp. 49-70.

that the translator has misunderstood the term ἀντίβιβλον. This means "a receipt" but has been broken into its constituent elements and interpreted as "a book in exchange". No comment has been made on the rendering of κορωνίς in the Armenian. It seems to be a wild guess: it may be occasioned by the fact that the use of the coronis diminished after the fourth century and that it was never used in a very thoroughgoing manner in manuscripts of Christian literature. It was not passed on in the Eastern versions, so far as I know. The interpretation, which is akin to that of the second Georgian version, seems to be derived from the context, and perhaps from the presence of the subscription at the end of a manuscript of Paul. Otherwise, the translation is a careful word for word rendering which in general conveys the meaning of its original. It does not succeed however with such a rendering of the clause οὐδ' αὖ φθονέσω τῆς ὀφελείας which must mean "nor, on the other hand, will I grudge the use (fulness) [sc. of this book]". The rendering as outright "jealousy" or "envy" has dominated the the understanding of the translator rather than the more subtle sense of "to begrudge", and this is true too of the Georgian tradition.

That tradition in its two strikingly distinct forms is hard to construe, especially in relation to the Armenian. Πρ 1, as we have termed it in the chart, shares with the Armenian the misunderstanding of ἀντίβιβλον. Yet it goes its own way in other things. κορωνίς is rendered as "servant" (მსახური), for no very evident reason¹². "Jealousy", or even "lust" (შურებაჲ usually for ζηλοῦν)¹³, renders ὀφελεία but, "what is useful" (სარგებელი) seems to be closer to the Greek original and not to be derived from the Armenian. "Thou hast" as a rendering of ἔχων σε ranks with the most flagrant examination "howlers", and has quite lost sight of the construction in the Greek, which both the Armenian and Πρ 2 have kept in view. "Worthy, trusted" for ἀξιόπιστον is a literal etymological rendering like that of the Armenian for ἀντίβιβλον, in contrast with the "beautiful" or "goodly" (thus, Conybeare) of the Armenian. We may conclude that the two stand in the same tradition, but that the Georgian as we have it cannot be a direct derivative of the Armenian (in the tradition of which there are no variants related to the peculiarities of the Georgian).

12 It may be observed that the word rendered "I will serve" in column three is გამსახურო, a verb derived from this noun.

13 Equivalents for the vocabulary of the New Testament may be conveniently found in the lexica assembled by JOSEPH MOLITOR, *Glossarium Ibericum in Quattuor evangelia et Actus apostolorum* (= C.S.C.O. voll. 228, 243) Louvain 1962, 1964: *Glossarium Ibericum. Supplementum in epistolas catholicas et Apocalypsim* (id. vol. 265) *ibid.* 1965: *Glossarium Ibericum in epistolas Paulinas* (id. vol. 373) *ibid.* 1976. These data are extended and sometimes more rationally classified for the student of Georgian in the posthumously published work of ILIA ABULADZE ძველი კართული ენის ლექსიკონი (Lexicon of the Old Georgian Language) Tbilisi 1973.

Πρ 2, on the other hand, seems unrelated to the Armenian, although it has hit on the same rendering of κορωνίς: the Armenian *գլխաւոր* and the Georgian *თავი*, have coincided in their semantic history in the meaning of “prince” or “leader”. Πρ 2 however seems to emphasise this rendering by its paraphrase of προσφώνησις as “the command of Paul”, which directly links the book with its author¹⁴. Paraphrase and adaptation are the keynote of this version: while evidently a rendering of the Greek, it brings in items of its own, and is especially fond of balance and parallel phrases. “Thy friends and thy neighbours” of the “Command” corresponds to “my brethren and my beloved ones” of the response, but also to the addition “careless or a stranger”. The “desire” (შურნი: or should we render it “jealousy, lust, envy” as in Πρ 1? It is hard to make sense of the Georgian if we do) which corresponds to φθονέσω in the “Reply”, has been brought into the “Command”. Here Πρ 2 goes its own way: faced perhaps with the probably corrupt final sentence of the προσφώνησις (οἱ γὰρ ἀπόδοται κακοί), it has sought to make a sensible reason for the warning and the undertaking. Forgetfulness over the return of loaned books is a way of easy gain, which it is not the intention of the owner to condone even if his “kindly spirit was willing to go on lending to his friends”¹⁵. The translator’s liking for the parallel construction shows itself very clearly here, with a nice touch of literary variation. Our English attempts to show this: but it is necessary to give the Georgian of the two sentences since even to those who do not know the language the identities of root will be visible.

არა ვისამე გშურდეს
ცულად შეძინებისათჳს
არა მშურდეს ცულად
ვიეთოვსმე შეძინებისა

thou shalt not desire EASY GAIN for
such-a-one.
I shall not desire EASY GAIN for any
people at all.

The introduction of the further clause “because this time is hastening on” is harder to follow. Does the translator conjecture that the reason for the “command” is that the owner of the Apostolos needs it constantly in his possession because the time (of his death?) draws on and he stands in need of its spiritual guidance?

But in one matter at least Πρ 2 is truer to the Greek, namely in the understanding of ἀντίβιβλον. He renders it correctly as *წიხდო* (= pledge): it would seem fortuitous that the Georgian *წიგნი* (book) and this word are so similar. A corruption in Πρ 1 seems unlikely.

¹⁴ It may be noted that in ms. 7 this form of the προσφώνησις is placed after the Martyrium Pauli.

¹⁵ ERNST VON DOBSCHUETZ, *The Notice prefixed to codex 773 of the Gospels in Harvard Theological Review* vol. 18 (1925) pp. 280-284, esp. the last paragraph.

Thus we have two translations, neither of which is a complete success. One stands in the same tradition of (mis)understanding as the Armenian; one is independent, and is less literal, and very much more interpretative. If we look at the chart of the contents of the Euthalian portion of the four manuscripts, we see that the position of Πρ 1 is stable, whereas Πρ 2 is to be found in three different positions. It may be that we have here a clue to the evolution of the Georgian Euthaliana: Πρ 2 is a later addition.

The affinity of Πρ 1 with the Armenian, but the absence of absolute identity between the two versions, is further corroborated by study of the chart. The Navigatio is found in both versions, but in the Armenian it follows, in the Georgian it precedes the subscription (= Πρ 1); the Pamphilus colophon is found in the Armenian but is absent from the Georgian. Further evidence of the affinity is shown in another feature of the apparatus. The stichometry given after the summary of ἀναγνώσεις (= Av) is in the Greek tradition, according to Zacagni, δ'αλζ' (= 4936)¹⁶: the Armenian and the Georgian however share the divergent figure of 5936 (Armenian րջւլ : Georgian ჰმლვ). But two differences underline the conclusion already reached, that while there is affinity, there is no direct dependence of the Georgian upon the Armenian. Another numeration, namely the number of martyriai given at the head of pg. 568 in Zacagni is ρκζ' (= 127): the Georgian tradition agrees with this, and the Armenian gives the figure 𐌕𐌖𐌔 (= 127). Again, in the Prologue, a significant passage concerning the celebration of the date of Paul's martyrdom, shows the divergence of Armenian and Georgian. The Greek at this point¹⁷ reads τῇ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν ἰουλίῳν πέμπτῃ Πανέμου μηνός. The Armenian gives, for πέμπτῃ Πανέμου μηνός, "which is the sixth day of the month Noomon, which is Mareri". This arises from a variant form of the Greek, into which a correlation with the Asian month Lous has been inserted in some witnesses: the *vox nihili* "Noomon", has arisen by a corruption.

The Georgian has nothing in common with this, although it has some peculiarities of its own. For the whole Greek phrase as given, it reads, "before the third calend of Tibi, which is the month of Panemos" (უწინდარჲს მესამისა კალანდისა თიბისასა რომელ არს პანემოსი თთუჲ). The editor supplies მეხუთჲ (= πέμπτῃ) before პანემოსი. A parallel passage in the Martyrium gives the fifth day of Panemos, and in the translation at that point the Georgian renders correctly by the ordinal numeral: nevertheless, I consider that an omission of any numeral at this point is not unlikely, as the datings at the various points in the apparatus lent

¹⁶ Zacagni 541.

¹⁷ id. 523.

themselves to expansions and correlations, and, even within the Greek tradition, to corruptions. The omission of any equivalent of *πέμπτη* seems to me not unlikely: to gloss over it and to conform it to the Greek does not further the philological cause. In any case, it is clear that the Armenian and the Georgian traditions are quite unrelated at this point. Indeed, so wide is this divergence that it may suggest that the transmission of the two has followed a very distinct course in either case.

Before we pursue the course of that transmission further, it will be well to look at that quite distinct peculiarity of the Georgian denoted by T, a table with explanatory preface, elsewhere unattested. It is another part of the apparatus whose position varies within the Georgian. It runs as follows. "There is added to specify for this Paul(ine corpus) a brief list of the *εὐαγγέλιον* at each place which agrees with the gospel of Paul. Thou shalt find this below in the order of the pages (კჳპატიონთა). The red letters signify of which gospel (თავი) it is; but the black letters provide the (means of) discovering each particular "lection" (საკითხავი). If you wish such information, you will find this list simple to use".

There follows (in three of the four manuscripts laid under contribution) a table which we transcribe, using capitals for the uncials in Danelia's edition, and numerals for the minuscule letters which are apparently used in their numeral signification. The editor gives no clue which letters are red and which black. Perusal of three of the manuscripts (viz. **ႵႶႣ**) shows that the uncials are red and the minuscules (= numerals) black.

M	MR	L	J
177	136 (v.l. 137)	261	68 (v.l. 18)
J	J	L	M
94	1	204 (v.l. 24)	76
M	M	J	L
96	316	88	21
MR		L	L
205		241	14
		J	M
		38	5

In spite of the promise at the end of the explanatory preface to this table, the clue to its use seems to have vanished in the course of transmission. The table appears to have the form of a canon-table when found at the foot of a page. The word *თავი* (literally "head") is rendered "gospel" in the translation above in accordance with this, following its use in the expression

მობთავი "fourfold gospel". But the sections of different gospels have no correspondence, and the same gospel appears sometimes more than once on a horizontal line. Nothing whatever remains to indicate the relationship to the Paulines. The only certain fact is that these must be the numbers of Ammonian sections. No other lists extend to so long a series as these presuppose.

Judging from the list already drawn up of the occurrence of the elements of the Euthalian apparatus in the Georgian tradition, this table, like Πρ 2, is a late and uncertain addition to it. It appears in differing places: and in ms. 7 consists only of the preface without the table. Unless it survives undetected in a Greek or other dress (which is within the bounds of possibility since this apparatus is not yet exhaustively charted), it is otherwise unattested.

We have observed that the coronis-subscription exists in Georgian in a dual version and we know that the κεφάλαια lists are to be found in two forms one of which is part of the apparatus preceding the Pauline corpus and one to found within the body of the text. We may examine the latter datum in the Palaeographical Album of Abuladze¹⁸ where mss. 7 and 4 are depicted. In the folia of the former we may see not only this feature but also marginal numeration of στιχοί and a subscription giving the place of origin of the epistle and its total stichometry. In the latter, we see the indication of a μαρτυρία within the text and its serial number within the epistle given in the margin. Thus the presence of the Euthalian material at the head of the corpus is related to Euthalian features within the presentation of the text of the corpus: it is not a later addition. But it has itself been added to, at least by a variant form of the coronis-subscription and a second listing of the κεφάλαια. The instability of the latter element is shown by its absence in ms. 7. We therefore enquire if there are to be found other traces of growth in the Euthalian apparatus in Georgian.

There are several places within the Greek original of the apparatus where we find parallel phraseology two of which have played a part in the discussions about the origin, growth and purpose of the work. These are the dating of Paul's martyrdom in the Prologue and in the Martyrium, and the shorter and longer listings of the martyriai with their respective programmata (S and

18 Ilia Abuladze ქართული წერის ნიმუშები. პალეოგრაფიული ალბომი. First edition (Tbilisi 1949) Plates 29 and 30 (= ms. 7), 20 (= ms. 4); Second edition (Tbilisi 1973) Plates 36 and 37 (= ms. 7), 29 (= ms. 4). Study of ms. 7 at first hand revealed the serial numbers of the μαρτυρίαι and their scriptural references noted in the margin, which Abuladze's plates do not show. It was also found that there are additional marginal references to scriptural allusions and quotations of the text, which do not find a place in the Euthalian lists.

L of the chart). Both of these upon examination show similarities of wording in the original Greek: when we compare them at these points in the Georgian, we perceive differences which allow us to apply the criterion of rendering to which versions, unlike originals, may often be subject. We give in parallel the relevant passages of the Prologue and Martyrium, and of the programmata to S and L, first in Greek, and secondly in Georgian.

Prol. (Z. 523)

τῇ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν
ἰουλίῳν, πέμπτῃ
Πανέμου μηνός,

ed. Danelia 99 (§ 8.3)

უწინარეს მესამის კალანდისა
თიბისასა რომელ არს* პანემოსი
თთუფ

Mart. (Z. 536) (cp. Robinson,
Euthaliana, 29 & 46)

πέμπτῃ ἡμέρᾳ Πανέμου μηνός, ἥτις
λέγοιτο ἂν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἡ πρὸ
τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίῳν,

id. 104 (§ 17.2)

უწინარეს სამთა კალანდათა
ივლიოსისათა რომელ არს
თიბისაჲ

* editor adds მეხუთე

We note here two distinct ways of dealing with the text to be translated. In the Prologue (apart from the absence of an equivalent of πέμπτῃ in the manuscript tradition, which we have commented upon above), καλανδῶν has become a singular, and τριῶν an ordinal, while a Georgian month name has been substituted for the Latin name ἰουλίῳν. In the Martyrium, καλανδῶν remains a plural and τριῶν a cardinal number, while ἰουλίῳν has been retained although it is glossed, with the Georgian month name.

For the comparison of the programmata, we give the text of the programma to the short list of martyriai in full, and in parallel to it, phrases identical or near-identical, which in the original occur in different positions, in that of the long list.

Z. 542

Ἀρόγραμμα¹

Ὁ διὰ τοῦ μέλανος ἀριθμὸς ποσό-
τητα² μόνον δηλοῖ τῶν ἐφ' ἐκάστης
βίβλου μαρτυριῶν³. ὁ δὲ διὰ τοῦ
κινναβάρεως^{4 5} τάξιν ὁμοῦ, καὶ πο-
σότητα τῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπιστολὴν
καὶ κανονίζεται τῷ πάλιν ἔνδον
ὁμοίως παρακειμένῳ⁶ ἀριθμῷ αὐτοῖς
τοῖς⁷ ῥητοῖς τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ⁸ τεύ-
χους⁹ ἀπολήγει δὲ ἑκάτερος αὐτῶν,
καὶ πάλιν ἄρχεται κατ' ἐπιστολὴν

ed. Danelia 107 (§ 18)

ზემო¹ წერილი

რომელ-იგი მელანიტა არს რიცხვ
რაოდენ არს² თავები³ მას ხოლო
აუწყებს. ხოლო რომელ-იგი ზან-
დუკიტა⁴ არს⁵ აუწყებს თი-
თოეულისა წიგნისა წამებათა გა-
ნწესებასა ერთბამად და რაოდენ
არს თითოეულსა მას ეპისტოლე-
სა და განჰკარგებს კუალად შინა-
გან ეგრევე მსგავსად თანა-
დაწერილისა⁶ მას რიცხუსა მათ
თვთ⁷ სიტყუათა
სამოციქულოდსა⁸ კარგთა⁹ და
დაესრულების ორკერძოვე
მათსა.

Z. 548f.

Πρόγραμμα¹

Ὁ δὲ διὰ τοῦ μέλανος ... καθολικός
ἐστὶν ἀριθμὸς πάσης τῆς βίβλου, ...
γνωρίζων ἡμῖν τὴν ποσότητα² τῶν
ἀφ' ἐκάστης βίβλου μαρτυριῶν³. //

Ἔστιν οὖν ὁ διὰ τοῦ κινναβάρεως^{4 5}
... ἀριθμὸς τὴν τάξιν, καὶ τὴν ποσότη-
τα δηλῶν τῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπιστο-
λὴν μαρτυριῶν, // Εὐρήσεις δὲ τὴν
διὰ τοῦ κινναβάρεως ἀπαρίθμησιν
κανονιζομένην τῇ πάλιν ἔνδον παρα-
κειμένῃ⁶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς⁷ ῥητοῖς τοῦ
ἀποστολικοῦ⁸ τεύχους⁹. //

συναπολήγων πάλιν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ

id. 110f. (§ 20.1-5)

ზედა¹ წერილი

რომელი-იგი მელანიტა არს ... კა-
თოლიკჳ რიცხვ ყოვლისა ამის
წიგნისაჲ ... მაუწყებს ჩუენ რაო-
დენ არიან² თითოეულისა მის
წიგნისა წამებანი³
არს უკუე აწ რომელი წითლითა⁴
წერილ არს⁵ ... რიცხვსა განწესე-
ბასა და რაოდენ არს, მას აუწყებს
თითოეულისა მის ეპისტოლესა
წამებათა
ხოლო ჰპოვო წითლითა მით
რიცხვ განკარგებული კუალად
შინაგან დაწერილი⁶ მათ⁷
სიტყუათა მოციქულისა⁸
მუკლთა⁹.
თანა-დაესრულების ეპისტოლე-
სა მას კუალად.

To assist the perusal of these data we have indicated by numbers the identical words of the Greek and the differing words of the Georgian

corresponding to these. We find that they fall into various categories. In case no. 3, we are probably dealing with a mistake of the translator through momentary oversight or a corruption: the Georgian თავები (*tavebi*) is a plural form of *tavi* which in this apparatus is the rendering of κεφάλαιον. No. 2 concerns the number of the verb "to be": with the form *tavebi* the singular is used (since this form is often collective in use), with the form *camebani* the plural is proper. It may be noted that the Greek originals here, each without verb, have been rendered in two different ways. The πρόγραμμα of the short list gives a sentence which may be rendered "sets out only how many are the *tavebi* in it": that of the long list, "how many are the martyriai of each book". Another case where supplementation has taken place is no. 5. In the parallel instances ὁ διὰ τοῦ μέλανος, we find a single form which may be rendered "that which is in black": in this case however the short list form follows the same pattern, "that which is in red", while the long list form has "that which is written in red". Case no. 7 concerns the rendering of αὐτοῖς τοῖς. Here the short list has both demonstrative and reflexive, while the long list has the demonstrative only. The remaining four cases are matters of vocabulary. The prefix of πρόγραμμα is rendered *zemo* and *zeda* in the short and long lists respectively: the difference is slight. Similarly, the participle of παρακεῖμαι is rendered by a longer compound form in the short list than in the long: it should however be noted that this longer form is found in the same πρόγραμμα rendering both παρακεῖμαι and παρατίθημι. Another case of the same root in different forms is no. 8, the rendering of ἀποστολικοῦ. The short list uses an adjectival form *samoçik'ulo* with more literal precision, the longer list *moçik'uli*, literally ἀπόστολος, which clearly is related to the Greek use of ἀπόστολος for the Pauline corpus. In the remaining cases, nos. 9 and 4, we find quite different choices of rendering. In the first case, τεύχος becomes in one case *kargi*, in the other *muhli*. Both these words are elsewhere used in the apparatus to render other Greek words: *kargi* renders ὄφη and is also used within a rendering of ἐστίχισα, while *muhli* is the regular equivalent of στίχος. No. 4 gives us variant words (*zanduki*, *çiteli*) for κινναβαρί, which also is found elsewhere rendered in a third way, namely, transliterated, in the heading to the list of κεφάλαια (Z. 573).

What do these data signify? They will immediately strike anyone who has worked on versional material of any literature as typical instances of the feature of "rendering", which often assists the researcher in relative datings and sometimes in geographical location of different stages in the production of versions. It has played a major part in the study of biblical versions. In one case at least, more recent scholarship has in fact demurred to the confident use made of this feature in this respect in the work of past

generations. This is in regard to the treatment of the Old Latin where Dom Bonifatius Fischer¹⁹ has suggested that the notion has too often been dominant that a translator must always have been consistent in rendering one word by one word. Too little room has been left for the possibility that he varied his style and vocabulary. We are mindful of this pitfall. If the apparatus lay before us without the duplication of material which we have studied, and the variation of position in which we find some of the duplicates, we should, I think, be inclined to view the data which we have just surveyed as variation of style, indicative of the difficulties of translation which were encountered. The apparatus is not the easiest of Greek documents to translate: today, as much as in earlier times, we are hampered by the absence of exact equivalents especially in the fields of rhetoric and indexing with which the original compiler and his successors were primarily concerned. However in the light of the various evidence surveyed we shall venture to propose an alternative hypothesis, bearing perhaps upon the evolution of the Euthalian apparatus, not only in Georgian, but in the original Greek. In short, it is suggested that the colophon in the form Πρ 2 and the synoptic table are later additions to the Georgian apparatus, and that the fuller list of martyriai with its programma, one form of the κεφάλαια and perhaps the Martyrium belong to this stage of the Georgian translation. One stage of the Georgian was taken from an earlier form of the apparatus: the supplements of the second stage derive from a form of the Greek apparatus to which additions had been made.

To proceed to details. The two distinct ways in which the dates are translated in the Prologue and in the Martyrium seem unlikely to come from the same translator. In the Prologue we find a bold although mistaken attempt to interpret the Latin form (which is strange in Greek). He has further supplanted the month name *ἰουλίῳ* by that of the Georgian month *Tibi* which in terms of the Julian calendar ran from June 2 to July 1. The translator of the Martyrium keeps nearer to the Greek of the dating, retaining a plural form and a cardinal numeral: he has elected to identify the month for his Georgian readers, not by a substitution, but by a relative clause indicating identity. Later in the same piece, in a passage not reproduced here, the date is repeated in the Greek original as the twenty-ninth of June. To this month-name too, retained in its Greco-Latin form, a relative clause is appended in which the month's identity with *Tibi* is also intimated. This must have been potentially misleading, even if the translator could have claimed that *Tibi* did in fact cover parts of both June and July.

19 *Das neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache* in K. ALAND (editor) *Die alten Übersetzungen des neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Berlin 1972, pp. 1-92 esp. pp. 5-16 (*Die Forschungsmethode und ihre Entwicklung*).

The major coincidence is with June however. Thus, the translator of the Prologue is the more misleading. Has the translator of the Martyrium, been influenced by the Georgian form of the Prologue in the first date, and has attempted a greater precision in the second?

Another difference of rendering may confirm the distinction suggested between these translators. ἐπισημειώ is found in the Prologue at Zacagni 529 and in the Martyrium at 536. In the former the Georgian renders it by one compound, in the latter by another, albeit of the same root. (დასწევებად in the Prologue, შევისწევით in the Martyrium).

Distinctions of the same kind may be seen in a comparison of the Prologue with other parts of the apparatus. The root /ανακεφαλαιο/ is rendered თავად-თავად განეწესა for the phrase τὴν ἀνακεφαλαιώσιν ποιοῦμενος (Z. 529). In the heading of the ἀνακεφαλαιώσις τῶν ἀναγνώσεων however, we have the distinct word შეკრება

This difference is also to be seen in the headings to the short and long lists of martyriai : the shorter list is headed თავად-თავად აღწერილი, the longer შეკრება. This may well be linked with the data of the προγράμματα. In the elucidation of these, we observe an accumulation of evidence : whereas a single instance of differing renderings might not be convincing as evidence of a different translator at work, nine cases of various distinct kinds must be.

The variant renderings of κινναβαρί by *zanduki* and *çiteli* may give a clue about the relative dating of the ἀπογράμματα. *Çiteli* is found, ostensibly, for this word, in the synoptic table (= T). This we have argued is a later addition to the Georgian Euthaliana because of its uncertain occurrence, length and position within the tradition. We may suggest then that the πρόγραμμα to the longer list of martyriai is the later of the two to be translated.

This brings us to the martyriai themselves. They are found, of course, within the body of the text, and also in the list within the apparatus. Comparison shows that the extracts in the apparatus are often quite distinct from the text of the epistles themselves. Our examination (limited to Romans) shows that there is no one pattern of variation. Parts of a quotation will coincide in vocabulary with the text of the older recensions, parts with the later. Other aspects may differ from the whole New Testament tradition but agree with the text of the Georgian Old Testament. Some will differ from all these three possibilities of comparison, suggesting thus that the translation is basically independent of the Georgian Biblical tradition, its coincidences being the result of memory. It is then later than the older recension at least and than those recensions of Old Testament books which it echoes.

There are also in the Georgian tradition of the Euthalian apparatus two sets of titles of κεφάλαια, one of which figures as part of the apparatus in three manuscripts and is missing in one other; the other set is found in the text. The two lists differ both in text and rendering. There is some record in von Soden's work of the textual variations in the τιτλοι²⁰; these are not many but we have used them as a basis of the information given. But no attestation of the variations is given so that we cannot correlate the textual aspect with any particular Greek manuscript. We can make a comparison through the work of Vardanian with the Armenian version of the apparatus. There is no constant agreement either way, but there is greater concord between the τιτλοι which are part of the apparatus and the Armenian than between it and the τιτλοι which are found interspersed in the body of the text. But this is a textual agreement: there are no Armenian calques. Here as elsewhere, we discern affinity with the Armenian rather than derivation from it or identity with it.

Thus we find that the earliest Georgian version of the Pauline epistles possesses a form of the Euthalian material. This shows various signs of relationship to parts of the Armenian version of that apparatus, but does not appear to be directly derived from it. This link coheres with that close link of the text of the earliest stratum of the Georgian Biblical tradition with the Armenian on which many scholars have written²¹; and also with the order Paulines-Acts-Catholic epistles within the Praxapostolos which this version shares with the Armenian²². The original stage of the Euthalian apparatus in Georgian contained the Prologue, the shorter enumeration of martyriai with its πρόγραμμα, one form of the κεφάλαια (probably within the text), and a form of the coronis subscription (= Πρ 1). About the Navigatio Pauli we have no comparative data by which to judge the stage of its production. Its presence before the colophon is known in one Greek minuscule. In the Armenian it follows. At a later stage in the evolution of the Georgian version, this form of the apparatus has been expanded: there have been added the Martyrium, the long list of martyriai with its corresponding πρόγραμμα, and the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν ἀναγνώσεων at the points where these are to be found in the Greek tradition. This stage also

20 HERMANN FREIHERR VON SODEN, *Die Schriften des neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt*, Berlin and Göttingen, 1902-1913. I. Teil: Untersuchungen, I. Abteilung: Die Textzeugen, pp. 461-471.

21 E.g. STANISLAS LYONNET S.J. *Les origines de la version arménienne et le Diatessaron*. Rome 1950. Ch. 4 *La version géorgienne*: ARTHUR VÖÖBUS, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, Stockholm 1954 (= *Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile* 6) Ch. 5, *The Georgian Versions*.

22 Cp. ERROLL F. RHODES, *An annotated list of Armenian New Testament manuscripts*. Tokyo 1959. Mss. 18, 78, 258, 383, 410, 422, 549, 675, 701, 711, 719.

saw a second form of the coronis subscription (= Πρ 2) (which shows some better understanding of the Greek) and a table of correspondences with the gospels which has survived only in a partial or corrupt form (= T). The place of the latter two is mobile within the manuscript tradition. This probably shows that, unlike the other items added at this later stage, they were not taken (directly at any rate) from a Greek exemplar. Much that is enigmatic remains still unexplained about them.

There is also a question unanswered about the list of κεφάλαια. This is not found in one Georgian manuscript: its place in relation to Πρ 2 and T is unstable in the others. In its renderings it does not exactly coincide with either of the other strands we have discerned: κινναβαρί is transliterated, and ἔκθεσις, which is გაწვესებდა in the Prologue, has been rendered by გამოთქმდა here (= Z. 573). All these data might suggest that the list within the apparatus was added to the Georgian version later than that which is found punctuating the text. But, as we have noted, affinity with the Armenian is closer in the list within the apparatus. This might indicate that it belongs to the earlier stage. But since this is a textual affinity rather than a linguistic, we might suggest alternatively that the source from which this list was taken had textual affinity with the source of the Armenian version's list, but was not directly related to it. If this were so, and the list within the apparatus were the later of the two lists of κεφάλαια to be translated, presumably that which punctuates the text would belong to the earlier stage of the evolution of the Georgian form of the Euthaliana. But we have been unable to discern any objective proof of this possibility.

We may also observe that in the manuscripts from which the edition has been made there are in the text, in addition to κεφάλαια, numeration of the martyriai, and stichometries. There are also at the end of each epistle subscriptions with historical data of the place of writing.

Before the production of these manuscripts in the tenth (or in one case, eleventh) century, the Georgian philologists have not only produced two recensions of their translation of the Pauline epistles, but also have paralleled this by the expansion of the Euthalian apparatus thereto attached. Armenian affinities in the parts of that apparatus which we have judged to belong to the earlier stage of its Georgian translation might suggest that that earlier form was made when recension A was made, and that the additions date from the point when recension B was made, perhaps with more direct reference to the Greek. This seems very likely, but remains hypothetical. As both recensions seem to lie behind the quotations in the Martyrdom of Susanik, which traditional dating places in the mid-fifth century, we might require a very early date for the Georgian versions of the Euthalian apparatus. If however, as the present writer thinks probable, the Martyrdom

is to be considered a pseudepigraphon, we could suggest dates more in line with the probability that the recension B, with its closer Greek contacts, postdates the schism of the Armenian and Georgian churches round about AD 600²³. The shorter Georgian Euthaliana could be dated with the earliest version sometime in the fifth century, and the expanded apparatus in the seventh century.

We may draw attention to the remarkable affinity which is to be observed with what remains of the Paulines in the much fragmented ms. H²⁴. We may show this in a comparative table:

<i>H</i>	<i>Georgian version</i>
a) kephalaia at the head of each epistle: corresponding numbers in the margins	kephalaia distributed within the epistle: marginal numbers not required
b) stichometries at end of list of kephalaia and at the end of the epistle	stichometries at the end of the epistle (no distinct list of kephalaia)
c) colophon with coronis verse	coronis verse in prose version
d) O.T. quotations noted in margin and numbered in sequence	identical
e) subscriptions with historical data	the same (exact identity not ascertainable)
f) numeration of each fiftieth stichos is <i>not</i> known in H, but is in the related ms. 88	every fiftieth stichos numbered in margin

C.H. Turner, in his discussion of the Euthalian apparatus, basing his argument on the data of H, but taking other data into account, arrives at

23 On this controversial and complex matter see, *inter alia*, the article of PAUL PEETERS, *Sainte Sousanik, Martyre en Arméno-Georgie (14 Décembre 482-484)* in *Analecta Bollandiana* 53 (1935), pp. 5-48, 245-307. See also J. NEVILLE BIRDSALL, *Evangelienbezüge im georgischen Martyrium der hl. Schuschaniki*, in *Georgica* 4 (Jena and Tbilisi, 1981). However, as intimated above, an examination of the text of the oldest recensions is in progress since after the completion of this report. This makes it probable that the A recension was made from Greek and not from Armenian (as appears to be the case — or at least the consensus — for the gospels and Acts). The fact that the Georgian Euthaliana have affinity, but not identity with the Armenian, accords with the data of the text itself. The Georgian and the Armenian versions of the Paulines may then be sisters, rather than child and parent: we may be encouraged to investigate the applicability of this definition to the text of the rest of the New Testament.

24 For a bibliography of H (015) see KURT TREU, *Die griechischen Handschriften des neuen Testaments in der UdSSR*, Berlin, 1966, pp. 31-34: for a facsimile see Kirsopp LAKE, *Facsimiles of the Athos fragments of Codex H of the Pauline Epistles*, Oxford, 1905.

the conclusion that the original form contained Martyrium, list of either the short or the long list of martyriai with its programma, the kephalaia (in a unified list, as he thinks), subscriptions to the epistles and stichometries. The presence of the Prologue in the original form he leaves uncertain. It would seem that the earliest form of the Georgian version provides further data from which to plot coordinates. The data of the Georgian, as we have analyzed it, would add weight to the view that the apparatus in H is an early, and not a late abbreviated form, of the Euthalian product.

Hints of relationship with other Greek manuscripts are fewer. There is no clear cut case in which a significant number of the features of the Georgian version is to be found in a Greek witness. Apart from the uncial H only the minuscule 88 (Naples, Bibl. Naz. II. A. 7)²⁵ has the coronis verse. Like H, but unlike the Georgian it has also the colophon linking the tradition with Pamphilus. As we have noted, the coronis verse is preceded in this manuscript by the *Navigatio Pauli*: this is shared by the Georgian. But otherwise, it is distinct from the Georgian, at least in the extent of its materials. In addition to the same content as the Georgian, it also contains the Pseudo-Athanasian argumenta, and has a very full complement of Euthalian material for the Acts and Catholic epistles. Using the material published by Willard, and other material found in the discussions of Robinson and von Soden, we have made all correlations possible, taking various features of the Georgian as our basis. We have correlated other manuscripts containing the *Navigatio Pauli*, those sharing the forms of dating found in the Prologue and in the Martyrium, those containing the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν ἀναγνώσεων and, those in which the Pauline epistles precede the Acts and Catholic epistles. In no instance is any other link with the Georgian to be found. It would appear that even in its fuller form (taking the whole of the Praxapostolos into account) there are no Greek manuscripts known to us at present with which the Georgian is very closely linked. The separation of the form of the Euthalian apparatus known in this version goes back to a considerable antiquity. The links and similarities with H which we have traced emphasize this, since H itself remains unique within the tradition.

Subsequent research has, however, brought to light, from Danelia's apparatus, confirmed from the manuscripts examined at Tbilisi, the presence of a series of glosses, mainly though not solely, identifying unnamed persons

25 See HAROLD S. MURPHY, *On the text of codices H and 93*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959) pp. 228-237; id. *The text of Romans and I Corinthians in minuscule 93 and the text of Pamphilus*, in *Harvard Theological Review* 52 (1959) pp. 119-131. (The siglum 93 belongs to an earlier period when minuscules were classified according to the parts of scripture contained in them, not infrequently by different numbers; why Murphy in 1959 used a system out of date for almost fifty years remains unclear, a relatively unimportant enigma of textual criticism).

or expanding personal names with greater biographical detail. These are to be found in I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Hebrews and II Timothy. It transpires that the majority of these are also found in certain of the manuscripts from which Zacagni drew the material of his edition, particularly from Vaticanus Reg. gr. 179 and Vaticanus gr. 1650. Van Esbroeck (*Biblica* 53 (1972) pp. 43-64), had already drawn attention to the glosses in Hebrews 11, which he knew from other Georgian manuscripts before the appearance of the Tbilisi edition: and had demonstrated their affinity not only with Ephraem the Syrian's commentary on the Pauline epistles, but also with a number of Greek commentators. Their presence in the edition of Zacagni was not, however, noted by him. No one has treated them as part of the Euthalian material, and it seems ambiguous whether Zacagni himself so regarded them. It would be premature to make an unqualified assertion, but we hazard the opinion that the evidence of the Georgian may lead to consider such glosses as part of that material; clearly there was transmission of apparatus and glosses together both in South Italy and the Caucasus.

It would take another study to investigate further ramifications of these and the other data. We need to know the Greek tradition in greater detail, while a careful examination of the Armenian and a comparison of it with the Georgian is needed, beyond what has been incidentally attempted here. If the stratification which we have traced in the Georgian has the contacts we surmise with so ancient a strain of the apparatus as H contains, a closer perusal yet of the Greek might be appropriate to establish in the light of the new data stages in the prehistory of the apparatus for which we have previously had only conjecture to guide us.

As we have intimated, the younger recensions of the Georgian Praxapostolos alone contain any form of the Euthalian apparatus to the Acts and Catholic epistles, and present traces of that to the Paulines distinct from that which has just been studied. These younger recensions are attributable to Giorgi the Athonite and Ephrem the Less respectively. They have been edited from several manuscripts, which for the most part also figure in the edition of the Pauline epistles referred to: but confusingly enough, different sigla are assigned to them (and indeed to the manuscripts of the older recensions too) in the respective editions. The recensions which in the Pauline corpus are denominated A, B, C and D, are in the Acts and Catholic epistles **Ⴀ** (ani), **Ⴁ** (bani), **Ⴂ** (gani), **Ⴃ** (doni): the manuscripts, which are known in the edition of the Pauline corpus by the sigla drawn from the Georgian alphabet, are in the earlier published editions of the Acts and Catholic epistles known by sigla of the Latin alphabet. We will give a concordance

for those of the older recensions, as well as those of the later about whose forms of Euthalian apparatus we shall speak.

Paulines

ⴐ (ani)

ⴑ (bani)

ⴒ (lasi)

ⴓ (gani)

ⴔ (vini)

ⴕ (zeni)

ⴖ (he = ē)

ⴗ (tani)

ⴘ (ini)

ⴙ (kani)

Acts-Catholic Epistles

A

does not contain these.

K

C

E

not utilised

F

G

H

I (Acts), J (Catholics)

The manuscript ⴐ (doni) (Sinai 58-31) does not contain Euthalian material and is not used in the editions of the non-Pauline parts of the *Praxapostolos*: the manuscript ⴓ (eni) (Athos, Iveron 42) is denominated D in the edition of Acts, but being a manuscript of one of the older recensions does not contain Euthalian material. The manuscripts from which the Euthalian apparatus to the Acts and Catholic Epistles has been edited are those in the above list from siglum E onward. They are to be identified as follows:

ⴔ (vini) = E — ms. A 584 of the Institute of Manuscripts
in Tbilisi

ⴖ (he) = F — ms. A 34, same collection

ⴗ (tani) = G — ms. A 137, same collection

ⴘ (ini) = H — ms. A 677, same collection

ⴙ (kani) = I or J — ms. K-4 (formerly K-12) of the
Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Leningrad

The Acts of the Apostles was edited by Ilia Abuladze in 1950²⁶. This edition contains the text of the older recensions of the scriptural book: but these, as we have said, have no Euthalian material. As in the case of the Pauline epistles, the Euthalian material from the later recensions is given at the end of the volume. The Catholic Epistles were edited by Ketevan Lortkipanidze in 1956³³. In this case, the Euthalian material is found interspersed with the text, as is the case in most of the manuscripts.

²⁶ საქმე მოციქულთა (ძველი ქართული ენის ძეგლები 7), Tbilisi 1949 (*Acts of the Apostles — Monuments of the Old Georgian Language* 7).

In Acts, the following Euthalian material is found, and in the following order.

Prologue	: Z. 403-410; M.P.G. 85.627-636
Argumentum	: Z. 421-425; M. <i>ibid.</i> 645-650
Peregrinationes Pauli	: Z. 425-427; M. <i>ibid.</i> 649-652
ἐκθεσις κεφαλαίων	: Z. 428; M. <i>ibid.</i> 652
κεφάλαια τῶν πράξεων	: Z. 428-438; M. <i>ibid.</i> 651-662
Testimonia (long list)	: Z. 415-421; M. <i>ibid.</i> 639-646

The Prologue is entitled “First account the Acts of the Apostles and Explanation of the Arrangement of the Chapters”²⁷. It is basically the Prologue identified as above: but towards its close an expansion has been made which, in a “Euthalian” style, indicates that the work undertaken at the behest of brother Athanasius, has been the arrangement of chapters in στιχοί, and the provision of numbers and asterisks distributed throughout the book to make clear the sense of each chapter. A similar, although not exactly identical, expansion has been made in the ἐκθεσις²⁸: the Greek here intimates that black notation has been used to indicate the chapters, but red the subdivisions of the chapters. The Georgian reads that “dividing numbers are in black, but chapters in red, and sub-chapters with asterisks”. The editor adds a note in the margin here, to the effect that “in the margin of the manuscript in fact the numeration of chapters is given in black writing, at the beginning of chapters the first letters are in red, but for sub-chapters an asterisk is placed”. We may anticipate somewhat to note in connection with these data a similar in the parts of the Euthalian apparatus to the Paulines contained in the later recensions. In the mss. of recension C (mss. E, F, G) a preface to the list of kephalaia is found²⁹, an expansion in fact of the ἐκθεσις on pg. 573 of Zacagni’s edition. It runs “from this point I shall list the division of these apostolic epistles chapter by chapter with numbers so that whoever wishes to read a particular passage shall without difficulty find it by the number in each epistle. But there is by (or, in addition to) the numbers before the chapters a list distinct from the one with numbers where there is an asterisk drawn as a sign, so that the listing of the passage and its sense may be conspicuous”. In all these, “asterisks” are named as part of the apparatus, and in the two instances where we have Greek equivalents, it is the use of vermillion for which the asterisk is either a substitute or a supplement. These must show a link with the notes known to us from the minuscule 1970 (Coislin 25) for Acts and from the minuscule

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 212-215.

²⁸ *Ibid.* p. 218.

²⁹ *Op. cit.* (fn. 7 above) p. 479.

307 (Coislin 30) for the Paulines, to which Robinson drew attention in his attempt to resolve some of the problems of chapter numeration especially in the Acts³⁰.

To return to the Acts, we find a further distinctive feature in the long list of testimonia. These are not given in full but in the abbreviated form of their opening words only³¹. This is a feature found in a number of manuscripts of the Greek, which like the Georgian contain only the long list³². Following Willard, we can see that of these the minuscules 82, 462, 603 and 2484 have the same content of the apparatus for Acts: none however continue this identity into the rest of the Praxapostolos.

The Georgian version of the Catholic Epistles was edited in 1956 by Ketevan Lortkipanidze³³. The later recensions contain the Prologue to the Catholic Epistles (Z. 475-477: M.P.G. 85.665-668) and the Argumenta and lists of κεφάλαια for each letter. These are found as follows in the Greek editions.

James. Argumentum.	Z. 486-487: M.P.G. 85.675-678
	Z. 487-489: M.P.G. ibid. 677f
I Peter. Argumentum.	Z. 492-493: M.P.G. ibid. 679-680
	Z. 493-494: M.P.G. ibid. 679-682
II Peter. Argumentum.	Z. 497-499: M.P.G. ibid. 681-684
	Z. 499: M.P.G. ibid. 683-684
I John. Argumentum.	Z. 501-503: M.P.G. ibid. 683-686
	Z. 503-504: M.P.G. ibid. 685-688
II John. Argumentum.	Z. 507: M.P.G. ibid. 687-688
	Z. 507-508: M.P.G. ibid. 687-688
III John. Argumentum.	Z. 508-509: M.P.G. ibid. 667-688
	Z. 509: M.P.G. ibid. 687-690
Jude Argumentum.	Z. 510-511: M.P.G. ibid. 689-690
	Z. 511-512: M.P.G. ibid. 689-692

There is some expansion of the end of the prologue. Instead of the reading of the epistles στιχηδόν, the Prologue declares the object to be the listing of the სახე და ძალი და მიზეზი of them (form and meaning [*lit.* power] and occasion). There is no reference to any signs or numerations. In the κεφάλαια however, the sub-divisions are indicated by asterisks, although no explanation of the sign is given.

30 Op. cit. pp. 22, 24.

31 Op. cit. p. 222.

32 WILLARD, op. cit. pp. 55f.

33 კათოლიკე ეპისტოლეთა ქართული ვერსიები (ძველი ქართული ენის ძეგლები 9), Tbilisi 1956. *The Georgian Versions of the Catholic Epistles (Monuments of the Old Georgian Language 9)*.

For the later recensions of the Pauline Epistles, we are indebted for our knowledge to the edition already referred to⁷. The material is gathered together at the end of the volume, which does not correspond to the format of the manuscripts. In most of these, the material is divided and appears before the epistle to which it refers. In two manuscripts (namely, **ϣ** and **ⲥ**), the material is gathered together at the head of the manuscript. All that survives in these recensions are the Pseudo-Athanasian Argumenta and the list of κεφάλαια. In recension C, as we have said, there is found at the head of the κεφάλαια, a form of the words (ἐκθεσις) found there on pg. 573 of Zacagni. This has already been discussed. In the three manuscripts of the same recension a kind of colophon is found at the end of the list of κεφάλαια³⁴, "Accept then, o honoured father, the evidence of our poverty and forgive our ignorance, because we, as you commanded, have set out this list of chapters, so that together we may glorify the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit now and always and for ever and ever". There are links here with the style and language of the Euthalian prologues; with "honoured father", we may link the πάτερ τιμώτατε of the beginning of the Prologue to the Paulines, while the form "accept then", is identical with words in that to the Catholic Epistles. The asseverations of his lack of ability have a number of links, although they are a common-place, too, of many a colophon to manuscripts of sacred content. Are these words then another instance of the tendency to expand and adapt the material which both the Prologue to Acts and that to the Catholic Epistles evinced in the later Georgian recensions?

Finally a word must be said about the stichometry. This name is often given to the whole Euthalian apparatus, but every student of the area will know that the relation of the stichometrical calculations to the work of Euthalius is one of the most problematical questions raised by the investigation. Both the early and the later Georgian versions of the Praxapostolos have stichometries. Those for the text of the individual books present no problem which relates to the Euthalian material: the variations which are to be found are readily paralleled in scriptural manuscripts of any version or the original Greek. In the Paulines, these figures are accompanied in all recensions by subscriptions about the place of origin: in the later recensions information about the number of κεφάλαια and μαρτυρίαι is to be found. In Acts, however, the stichometry of the book is given only in recension **Ⲛ**: in the Catholics, recensions **Ⲛ** and **Ⲯ** present stichometrical data at the end of most epistles recension **Ⲯ** also giving κεφάλαια and μαρτυρίαι for I Peter, and κεφάλαια only for I John and Jude.

34 Op. cit. (fn. 7 above) p. 516.

As for the stichometries within the Euthalian apparatus, we find the Prologue to Acts alone has its stichometry calculated, in the later recensions. In the Euthalian material to the Paulines, on which we have concentrated, we find the following data. The stichometry for the prologue is moved to follow the *Martyrium Pauli*. No stichometry is given for the section διειλόν ... τυγχάνοι (Z. 541) nor for the following πρόγραμμα (Z. 542). Within the sections such as the ανακεφαλαίωσις τῶν ἀναγνωσέων and the two lists of μαρτυρίαι there are sometimes divergences in the stichometry. The significance of these no doubt must await the publication of the full Greek data and a comparison with that of other versions for its elucidation.

We must be grateful that the policies of the educational and research institutions of the Soviet Republic of Georgia are such that we have full and valuable presentations of these data and the texts which they accompany at our disposal. In this regard the student of the transmission of scripture in Georgian is now better provided than his fellow in the Syriac or Armenian fields. One cannot conclude such a survey and preliminary investigation without making the plea that in the West the study of Georgian may be further promoted so that the area of scripture study and the related field of patristic study, to which recent work³⁵ has made such signal contribution, may be enhanced by the deeper research into the materials which our Georgian colleagues have placed within our reach.

35 *Corpus Christianorum. Clavis Patrum Graecorum I-IV*, (Turnhout) 1974-1983.