

GEORGIAN DOCUMENTS.

(1) *The Old Georgian Version of the Gospel of Mark*, edited with a Latin translation by R. P. BLAKE (*Patrologia Orientalis* xx 3), Paris, 1928.

(2) *Catalogue des MSS Géorgiens . . . à Jerusalem*, par R. P. BLAKE (*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*), Paris, 1924-1926.

(3) *Une Page de St Hyppolyte retrouvée*, par R. P. BLAKE (*ibid.*), 1927.

(4) *Ancient Georgian Versions of the O.T.*, by R. P. BLAKE (*Harvard Th. Rev.*, July, 1926).

(5) *The Georgian Version of Fourth Esdras*, by R. P. BLAKE (*ibid.*, Oct., 1926).

(6) *The Athos Codex of the Georgian O.T.*, by R. P. BLAKE (*ibid.*, Jan., 1929).

The present writer is quite incompetent to write on Georgian literature, but it seems useful to draw attention to the way in which Mr R. P. Blake of Harvard University is making some of the most valuable Georgian documents available for Biblical and Patristic scholars. No. (2) contains a Catalogue of 161 MSS now preserved at the Greek Patriarchate in Jerusalem, ranging from the 11th to the 17th century. Among them is a miscellaneous codex (No. 44) of the 12th or 13th cent. containing *inter alia* sermons by Hippolytus, lost in Greek but similar to those published in German by G. N. Bonwetsch in 1904. Bonwetsch's text was taken ultimately from the Georgian MS of the monastery of Shatberd (A.D. 970), but in that MS a page was missing from Hippolytus's homily on the Blessing of Juda and of Levi. Mr Blake has been able to supply the lacuna from his cod. 44 at Jerusalem: this is (3) in the list here reviewed. No. (4) contains a study of certain Georgian MSS of the O. Test.: a tentative pedigree of the Georgian Version and its revisions is given on p. 295. No. (5) is on the Georgian text of 4 Ezra, of which Mr Blake discovered a fresh MS in the Jerusalem collection (cod. 11); he has edited the text of this MS in full with a literal Latin translation. The codex is unfortunately defective at the end, leaving off at ix 20 and having several lacunae elsewhere. Latin is used for the translation, for reasons given on pp. 318-320, where the chief ambiguities of the Georgian language from a textualist's point of view are lucidly explained after the manner of Sir Herbert Thompson's useful remarks on Coptic in J. H. Ropes's edition of Acts. Mr Blake provides also a critical Introduction, pointing out the remarkable affinity between the Georgian and the Ethiopic texts of Ezra. In No. (6) he supplements (5) by a text of 4 Ezra from the ancient Athos Codex of the Georgian O.T., giving also a full description of that famous but hitherto undescribed MS (dated 978).

But interesting as these texts are in their way, they are quite eclipsed by No. (1). If Mr Blake had brought back from the recesses of the Caucasus an ancient codex of the Old Syriac, similar to the 'Curetonian' or the 'Sinai Palimpsest', it would have been generally recognized as a great event in the textual criticism of the Gospels. If the new MS were a palimpsest, illegible in places and with some leaves gone, it would have been no more than was to be expected. The value of the find would have consisted less in the small crop of new 'various readings' that might be collected than in the support the new MS gave to the Old Syriac, i. e. to syr. *S*, as syr. *C* is not extant in Mark. But in effect this is what Mr Blake has done by his publication (with a literal Latin translation) of the 'Adysh Gospels', together with the readings of two inferior but ancient and valuable MSS akin to it. The Adysh Gospels (still preserved in the Swanetian village of that name) is a Georgian MS, dated A.D. 897; the translation which it contains is clearly made from Armenian and shews no sign of revision from the Greek, as all other Georgian texts of the Gospels do. The Armenian text from which it was taken is not identical with the present Armenian version, but is much nearer to syr. *S* and syr. *C*.

The important critical work on the 'Caesarean' text of the Gospels by Professors Lake and Blake, in which the Georgian version plays a great part, is discussed elsewhere in the JOURNAL, but it seemed not inappropriate to notice the publication of the Adysh text separately, among the other Georgian documents.

As specimens of the new text (*Ad*), with its two companions (*A*, *B*) we may note:—

- (a) Mk ii 27 *Sabbatum . . . creatum est Ad A B* = syr. *S*-vg.
 vi 45 εἰς τὸ πέραν] *A B*; *om. Ad* = W 1 & c syr. *S*.
 x 11, 12 (the woman's case first, then the man's) *Ad* = W 1
 syr. *S* [*A* and *B* have the ordinary order].

In these three readings the Armenian vulgate has the ordinary text.

(b) The following are of general interest:—

- Mk ii 14 Levi of Alphaeus *Ad A B* (against the Diatessaron).
 iii 17 Banereges *Ad A B* (= syr. arm).
 22 Belzebul *Ad*, Berzebuli *A B* (against the Syriac).
 v 1 Gergesenorum, *Ad A B*.
 vi 53 καὶ προσωμίσθησαν] *om. Ad A B*.
 viii 1 Dalmanutham regionem *Ad*, loca Magdalaē *A B*, but
hill of Magedan syr. *S* = 28.

(c) *Ad* and *A* omit, *B* contains [Mk] xvi 9-20.