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THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE ARMENIAN BIBLE
AN EXAMPLE: DEUTERONOMY 6

Claude Cox

Readers of English translations of the Bible are acquainted with marginal readings which indicate differences among manuscripts. For example, the first such textual note in the NRSV is at Gen 1:26 where that translation reads "(let them have dominion...) over all the wild animals of the earth,..." A footnote informs the reader that the translation is following the Syriac here; that the Hebrew reads "(over all the wild animals) and over all the earth." In the NT the first textual note is at Matthew 1:7. The text reads "Abijah the father of Asaph" but a footnote informs us that instead of Asaph "Other ancient authorities read Asa."

Such textual notes are also part of Zohrapián's edition of the classical Armenian Bible.¹ He too calls attention to some of the major deviations among the MSS which he employed. At Gen 1:7 the text reads Երբ աշխարհից հայրեն էր Երազ նաև իրեն, ուր էր իրեն էր "and God made the firmament. And God made a separation between the water which (was) under..." In a footnote Zohrapián records that some MSS have Երբ աշխարհից հայրեն էր Երազ նաև, They have the copula verb էր "was" in what is a noun clause in the text. Zohrapián draws our attention to hundreds of such differences among MSS.

When textual traditions diverge like this the science of textual criticism seeks to determine which reading among two or more has the greater likelihood of being original. In some cases one can be certain that a particular variant is the result of corruption of one kind or another; in other instances—at the other end of the spectrum—one can only speak of a probability that a reading is original. It is true that there are a number of helpful rules that lie at hand for textual criticism but

¹Սուրբ Կաղկանաց Սուրբ Հարություն Հայերը [Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments] (Venice: St. Lazar, 1805; repr. The Zohrab Bible, intro. by C. Cox; Delmar NY: Caravan, 1984).
each instance of textual variation calls for a variety of questions that must be kept in balance. For example, it may generally be true that the more difficult reading has a greater likelihood of originality but if one takes this too far one will certainly produce a strange kind of text: sometimes the more difficult reading can be said to have the remotest chance of originality.

There is another aspect to textual criticism that I would like to mention. Even when the critical edition of a text has been completed there still remains a place for the textual critic. That is, part of the textual critic’s domain is the explication of the history of the text, from its original production through its stages of development (others might use the words “stages of corruption”). There is a historical process at work here and for a religious community there is always the necessity of an explanation of how its Scriptures came into being and how they have been transmitted to the present moment. Such explanations involve an understanding of textual criticism: the text may now be “established” but how did it come to be so and why is it that variations from that text are regarded as just that, namely “variations from.” Seen in this light the task of textual criticism is never completed.²

The Armenian Bible: Deuteronomy

The origins of the Armenian translation of the Bible are fortunately related to us in Koriýn’s Life of Mašoc. That account need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that the Armenian Bible was translated in the early 5th century on the basis of Syriac and Greek parent texts and that sometime after 431 it underwent revision on the basis of MSS brought back to Armenia after the Council of Ephesus. In the case of the book of Deuteronomy, if there existed an original translation from Syriac there is no longer any sign of it. Rather the text as we have it derives from a type of LXX text that has been influenced by the work of the great text critic Origen (d. 253/4).

At the outset I should make clear—admit?—my reason for choosing a passage from this book for an example of text critical work. That is very simple: I prepared an edition of the text of this book so I am more familiar with Deuteronomy than any other book of the canon! The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy presents only a diplomatic edition of the text so that many text critical questions still remain

unresolved.\textsuperscript{3} This is an opportunity to speak of some of these. On the other hand, this edition is a considerable gain on the old edition of Zohrapian, as monumental as that edition has been. Further, Deuteronomy provides an understanding of the stemmatic relationships—i.e. a sort of “family tree”—of the MSS of that book, a \textit{sine qua non} for text critical work. Beyond that one can add that for Deuteronomy we have the first fruit of the Leiden Armenian Database, the \textit{Lemmatized Index of the Armenian Version of Deuteronomy},\textsuperscript{4} as well as the Göttingen critical edition of the Greek text.\textsuperscript{5} The latter presents a collation of the text of Zohrapian in the midst of an extensive apparatus where the Greek MSS are presented in families or groups. It is an invaluable resource, as is the \textit{Lemmatized Index}.

\textbf{One Aspect of Text Critical Decision-making: the Parent Text}

The Armenian text of Deuteronomy is a \textit{translation}. That fact is of supreme importance for trying to determine its original wording and shape. That is, there is a parent text; fortunately that parent text is extant to a sizeable degree in the text and apparatus of LXX Deuteronomy. That parent text was likely one Greek MS which had a particular character. Now the interest of Septuagint studies is to use the Armenian text as one of a variety of tools—alongside Greek MSS and quotations in the church fathers—to reconstruct the earliest Greek text. But of course this saw cuts both ways: the LXX translation and particularly the trajectory of the tradition of that text can be used in order to reconstruct the earliest Armenian text.

Immediately the reader can raise the question of which came first, the fish or the bicycle (or is that “the chicken or the egg”?\textsuperscript{6}). The reasoning might seem to be circular: using the Armenian translation to reconstruct the Greek, using the Old Greek translation to reconstruct the Armenian! There is some justification for that criticism, so the text critic must always bear in mind that he/she might be reconstructing a text which never existed. Not to belabor the point, the LXX tradition can profitably be used as a control for the reconstruction of the original

\textsuperscript{3}(UPATS 2; Chico CA: Scholars, 1981).

\textsuperscript{4}J.J.S. Weitenberg and A. de Leeuw van Weenen (Leiden Armenological Publications 1; SBLSCS 32; Atlanta: Scholars 1990).

Armenian text but cannot be imposed upon it since the precise MS upon which it is based does not exist any longer, only possibly the type of text to which that MS belonged.

When one looks at the list of variants for the Armenian text of Deut. 6 it is clear that the textual status of some of them can be immediately clarified by recourse to the Greek tradition. Before we turn to those matters, let us present the text of ch. 6 according to the edition mentioned above. A translation is provided as well. Since the text of Deuteronomy switches back and forth between the singular and plural number for the second person, I have indicated which pronouns and/or verbs are plural in this selection.

*The Text of Deuteronomy 6*

1 And these are the commands and laws and judgements which the Lord our God commanded you (pl.), to teach you (pl.) to do thus in the land which you (pl.) will enter to inherit. 2 In order that you (pl.) might fear the Lord our God, to keep all his laws and his commands which I am commanding you (pl.) today, you and your children and your children’s children all the days of your life. That you (pl.) might be long lived. 3 And hear Israel and take care to do, that it might be well with you and that you (pl.) might greatly increase just as the God of your fathers said to give you the land which flows with milk and honey.

4 These are the laws and the judgements which Moses commanded Israel in the wilderness when they came up from the land of the Egyptians. “Listen, Israel, the Lord our God is one God. 5 And you will love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all
your being, and with all your strength. 6 And these ordinances which I am commanding you today will be in your heart and in your being. 7 And you will make this known to your children; and you will speak about these things when you sit in the house and when you go on the road; and when you sleep and when you rise. 8 And you shall put these things as a sign on your hand; and it will be continually before your eyes. 9 And you shall write these things upon the thresholds of your houses and on your doors. 10 And it will be that when the Lord your God shall take you into the land which the Lord swore to your fathers Abraham and Isaac and Jacob to give to you, cities great and beautiful which you did not build; 11 and houses filled with every good thing which you did not fill; and dug wells which you did not dig; and vineyards and olive trees which you did not plant, and you shall eat and be filled— 12 you should watch yourself lest you might forget the Lord your God who brought you from the land of the Egyptians, from the house of servitude. 13 The Lord your God you will fear and him you will worship and to him you will attach yourself and by his name you will swear. 14 You (pl.) shall not go after foreign gods and after the gods of the nations which are round about you (pl.)— 15 since the Lord God is a jealous God in your midst; lest being enraged, the Lord your God should be angry to destroy you from the face of the earth.
16 You shall not test the Lord your God as you (pl.) tried in "the testing." 17 You shall surely keep the commands of the Lord your God: the testimonies and laws which were commanded you. 18 And you will do what is pleasant and good before the Lord your God that it might be well with you and that you may enter and inherit the good land which the Lord swore to our fathers 19 to expel all enemies from before your face as also he said.

20 And it shall be that when your son asks you in the future and says, 'What are the testimonies and laws and judgements which the Lord our God commanded us?' 21 And you shall say to your son, 'We were slaves of Pharaoh in Egypt and the Lord brought us from there with a strong hand and upstretched arm 22 and the Lord provided signs and very great and terrible miracles in the land of the Egyptians, to Pharaoh and to his house before us. 23 And he brought us from there so that he would bring us here to give to us this land which he swore to give to our fathers. 24 And the Lord commanded us to do all these laws, to fear the Lord our God so that it would be well with us always, that we might live as also today. 25 And there will be mercy for us if we are careful to do all these commands before the Lord our God just as it was commanded us.'
List of Variations among MSS for Deuteronomy 6

The list of variant readings that follows is drawn from the apparatus of Deuteronomy. The hundred or so MSS of Armenian Deuteronomy belong to five text families, the purest of which is group a and then ab; groups cde represent a more developed type of text. (I might mention that Zohrapian’s base MS for collation—V1508 [date: 1319; provenance: probably Cilicia]—belongs to a subgroup of group c.) The text groups and the MSS which represent them in Deuteronomy are, together with their date and provenance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>V1007</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>Glajor; Tarōn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J1925</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>Erznka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Cilicia (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V841</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>likely Drazark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J2561</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>V1006</td>
<td>13th–14th</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>M347</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>New Julfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>M203</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key to the abbreviations is: J = Jerusalem; LO = London, British and Foreign Bible Society; M = the Matenadaran, Yerevan; V = Venice, San Lazzaro.

All the MSS listed are Bibles; V1007 is the base MS for collation in the edition. Occasionally V1312 is also cited in Deuteronomy. It is a MS of the Pentateuch and Isaiah, of unknown provenance, copied between 1257 and 1341. The designation “rell,” i.e. “all the rest” does not include it in the citations which follow. As well the Lectionary contains 6:4–7:10 and I have added variant readings drawn from three lectionary MSS: L1 = J121 (date: 1192; provenance: Mashkevor monastery, N of Antioch in Syria); L2 = J1998 (1374; Tiwrik, about midway between Ankara and Lake Van); L3 = Leiden, Rijksuniversiteit Or. 5479 (15th; unknown); L’ = J121 + J1998 + Leiden R. Or. 5479; L = J121 + J1998.6

For the convenience of later reference I have numbered the variants. Text critical abbreviations follow those of the Göttingen edition of the LXX. See, e.g., Wevers' *Deuteronomium*, 45–46.

1. 6:1 $\delta$πός $\delta$ργός M347
2. 6:1 $\tauμψως] \tauμψως V1006 M347
3. 6:2 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ \tauμψως M203; \epsilonρπρβ V1006 M347
4. 6:2 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ \tauμψως V841-J2561 V1006 M347
5. 6:2 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ J1925; \epsilonρπρβ M347
6. 6:2 ρη λεπ M203
7. 6:2 ρη λεπ \tauμψως J1925
8. 6:2 ρη λεπ M347
9. ρη λεπ \tauμψως rell
10. 6:3 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ \tauμψως J2561 M347
11. $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ \tauμψως J2561 M203
12. 6:3 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ V841 M347] V1007*inc; $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] V1007* rell
13. 6:3 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ LO J2561
14. 6:3 ρη λεπ \tauμψως J1925
15. 6:3 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ LO J2561 mg V1006 M347
16. $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ LO J2561 M203
17. 6:4 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ V1006 M347 M203
18. 6:4 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ bis scr J2561
19. 6:4 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ J2561 M347
20. 6:4 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ V1312 rell; $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] J1925-LO V1006 M203 L2 L3
21. 6:4 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ LO
22. 6:5 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ J1925
23. 6:5 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ LO
24. 6:5 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ LO
25. 6:6 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ LO
26. 6:7 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ rell
27. 6:7 $\epsilonρπρβ[\epsilon] \epsilonρπρβ V1312 V841-J2561 V1006 M347 M203 L3

Jerusalem 121 preserves basically a group $a$ type of text and the other two lectionaries preserve a type of text that is more group $b$ than group $c$. There appear to be no original readings attested only by the lectionary MSS in Deuteronomy.
28. Հայկական Հայկական 9 L' rell  
29. ու 4° V1006  
30. դ 4° L1(1)  
31. 6:8 քանակ] քանակ LO J2561 M203 L2* L3  
32. ու 2° L3 (1)  
33. ճարգջ] ճարգջ LO L  
34. 6:9 քանակ] քանակ J2561 V1006 M347 M203  
35. 6:10 մարգ] մարգ J1925-LO V841-J2561 V1006 M203 L'  
36. ու 2° L3  
37. առավելու] առավել LO V841 M347  
38. ու 2° L2  
39. մարգ] մարգ M347  
40. ճարգջ] ճարգջ J1925; ճարգջ] V841-J2561 V1006 M203 L'; ճարգջ LO M347  
41. քար] քար LO*  
42. քանակ] քանակ V1006 M347 L3(1)  
43. ճարգջ] ճարգջ J2561  
44. կար 2°] կար J1925 L'  
45. 6:11 առավելու] առավել LO V1312-LO V841-J2561 V1006 M347 M203  
46. կար 1°] կար J1925 L'  
47. կար 2°] կար J1925-LO L'  
48. և 3° և 5° L1*  
49. ճարգջ] ճարգջ J1925  
52. 6:12 ճարգջ] ճարգջ LO  
53. առավել] առավել M347; + քար LO LO V841 V1006 M347 L3  
54. ճարգջ] ճարգջ V1006  
55. ճարգջ] ճարգջ rell  
56. 6:13 և 2° L3  
57. ճարգջ] ճարգջ J2561 L1; ճարգջ L2  
58. ճարգջ] ճարգջ L1  
59. 6:14 ճարգջ] ճարգջ M203  
60. ճարգջ] ճարգջ L1
61. զոհորձ զոհորձ V1312 L; զոհորձ J1925 V841; զոհորձ M203

62. 6:15 երաբուրդ] + ե M347 L'
63. առաջարկ 1" V1007 V1006 M347] + ե V1312 L' rell
64. երաբուրդ] երաբուրդ LO(1)

65. 6:16 բարդակ] բարդակ L1
66. բարդություն] բարդություն L3

67. 6:17 թուրքում + ե L ազատություն J1925

68. 6:18 գծերո] գծեր J2561(1); գծերո V1312 V841 V1006 M347 M203 L3
69. գծերո et գրեր tr J2561 V1006 M347 M203 L2
70. գրեր] գրեր J1925 J2561 V1006 M347 M203 L1 L3

71. թղթա] թղթա V1006 M347 M203 L2
72. թղթա] թղթա L1
73. om թղթ M347

74. 6:19 թղթա] + թղթ LO M347 L3

75. 6:20 թղթա 9-V1007-LO L1] թղթա L2 L3 rell
76. թղթա] թղթա J1925 M203 L'(թղթա L2)
77. թղթա] թղթա J1925 L3inc
78. թղթա] թղթա LO

79. 6:21 թղթա] թղթա J2561 M203 L
80. թղթա] թղթա LO V841 V1006 M347
81. թղթա] թղթա J1925
82. թղթա] թղթա V841; թղթа V1006 M347
83. թղթա] + թղթա V1006 M347 M203 L3; om L
84. թղթա] թղթա J1925 V1006; prae թղթ tr L3
85. fin] + ե L ազատություն ազատություն J1925-LO L3

(ազատություն)

86. 6:22 թղթա] թղթա J2561
87. om թղթա L3
88. թղթա] թղթա L3
89. թղթա] pr թղթ L2
90. թղթա] թղթա LO; թղթա J1925 V841-J2561 V1006 M347 M203
91. թղթա] թղթա J1925-LO J2561 V1006 M347 M203; թղթա L3
It may strike the reader that this is rather a large number of variants for just twenty-five verses. On the other hand, the number of differences among MSS which are textually significant is much smaller since the list above includes variations that are the result of simple scribal error – others represent simply a difference in spelling while others grow out of the confusion between present and aorist subjunctive forms. Ideally, we would look at each variant, one after the other, but for the purposes of this presentation I will treat the differences among MSS not individually but by kind and method of approach.

For interest sake we may note that Zohrapian’s apparatus cites, of the list above, nos. 2, 3, 11, 15 (his text reads the variant), 25, 31, 33, 34 (his text reads the variant), 51 (cites the first two of the three variants), 57 (his text includes ḫw wur), 59, 64, 68 (his text has the variant ḫw wur), 69 (his text has the variant), 74, 75 (his text has the variant), 85, 97 (his text has the variant). In addition he notes that his base MS for collation lacks ḫw in v 20, for a total of nineteen variants cited in his apparatus. Except where noted his text has the same reading as Deuteronomy in these instances. Finally the word “variant” is used simply for “the reading to the right of the square bracket” in the 102-item list above and is not intended to indicate that the reading is necessarily secondary.
Some General Text Critical Considerations

At the outset of this analysis of the variants it may be well to state that we should bear in mind a number of basic text critical considerations. These include: 1. Older witnesses generally preserve a purer form of text. All the MSS we are dealing with are medieval or later, i.e. about 800 years later than the original translation, but the general rule still applies. While it is true that a 17th century MS may have a purer form of text than one a couple of centuries older because it has been copied from a yet old exemplar, generally the older witnesses preserve a purer text because fewer copies stand between them and the original than is true of later witnesses. 2. Manuscripts belong to families or groups, some of which as a group represent an older form of text, so that one attaches importance to the patterns of MS representation in determining the likelihood of the originality of a reading. 3. Some variants must be assessed based on a study, sometimes an extensive study of the translation technique of the document relative to a particular type of rendering. 4. Individual MSS have a character of their own: even early witnesses are not free from idiosyncrasies. 5. Since the parent text of Armenian Deuteronomy is extant in the text and apparatus of Wevers' edition of that book, frequently the likelihood of the originality of a reading can readily be assessed by recourse to the Greek text tradition. I say "and apparatus" quite deliberately because a period of about seven centuries separates the translation of the LXX in the 3rd cent. BCE from the kind of MS that is the parent text of the Armenian text of Deuteronomy. That means that often one is going to find the text presumably closest to the Armenian's parent text in the apparatus. After working with the Armenian text alongside the critical edition of the Greek for a while one will see a pattern of textual affiliation emerge, i.e. the Armenian text will be seen to go with certain text groups in the Greek tradition. When those groups are identified it provides some control over text critical decisions that have to be made for the Armenian text. 6. When all else fails one simply has to follow the old witnesses. 7. In the case of Armenian there were certain grammatical developments that took place over the long period of the copying of MSS. Sometimes variations among MSS are explicable when such developments are understood. 7. An awareness of the general "family history" of the text tradition, i.e. stemmatics, helps one to assess the importance of the spread of a variant reading through the tradition and then to determine the likelihood of originality. 8. The earliest Armenian
MSS were written in uncial script—i.e. "all capital letters"—and sometimes the key to a textual corruption lies in the similarity of different letters in uncial script (e.g. θ and δ). 9. An understanding of the process by which MSS were copied can illuminate the means by which some secondary readings arose. For example, by the later medieval period spaces were sometimes left in the text for the first letter of a section; divine names were left to be filled in with a different colour of ink or, in the case of the former, for later ornamentation. In such a situation the possibility for the loss or addition of a divine name became greater.

Such considerations—not in any particular order—are part of the text critic's toolbox.

An Analysis of the List of Variants

For the sake of brevity I will group together the kinds of variants that we find in Deut. 6.

First, the most productive first step for the textual criticism of Armenian Deuteronomy is to do a comparison of variants with the Greek parent text tradition because this immediately allows one to identify many readings as secondary. This is especially true of plusses or minuses and differences of number. Variants that have textual support in the Greek tradition deserve particular attention. Such variants in the list that follows have Gk following them.

In this list I have underlined those variations from the text of Deuteronomy which appear to represent original readings. In the remainder of the cases it seems most likely that the variants are secondary.

The list is: 1, 3, 5, 6, 7Gk, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16Gk, 17, 20Gk (pr μπλαγι), 21Gk, 22Gk, 24Gk (assimilation to the citation in the NT!), 25, 29, 33, 36, 38, 45Gk (pl.), 49, 52, 57, 59, 62Gk, 63Gk (plus μπο), 67 (plus, ex par), 68, 69, 73Gk, 74, 75, 78, 79, 81, 83 (both), 84, 85 (plus, ex par), 86, 87, 88, 93, 98, 101, 102. Some of these variants are of special interest. For example, MS J1925 is an excellent witness but in Deut. 6 has a tendency to assimilate the text to parallels by means of additions: see 24, 67 and 85.

We should take a closer look at those few readings which appear to be original, i.e. where the text of Deuteronomy appears to be secondary.

20. 6:4 μπλαγι V1312 rell
45. 6:11 μπλαγι V1312-LO V841-
J2561 V1006 M347 M203
In the case of no. 20, no Greek MSS lack τοῖς νιοῖς (Ἰσραήλ) all the Armenian MSS collated for Deuteronomy represent it except the base MS for collation so it seems most likely that it has been lost by mistake. One notes that "Israel," without "children of" occurs at v 3 and later in v 4. The same is true with regard to no. 45: the Greek tradition is without exception plural ([ἱ ἅ τοῦ ὄντος ὀδοὺς] ἀγαθῶν) and all the witnesses except the base MS for collation and J1925 attest the plural. It appears to be a mistake shared by some group a MSS—at least by V1007-J1925.

Comment should also be made about no. 63 where one must reckon, I think, that the minority reading attested by the text in Deuteronomy is original:

63. 6:15 ὡμιλεῖται 1* V1007 V1006 M347] + ἡ V1312 L' rell

If one were simply "counting noses" one would have to regard the longer reading with ἡ as original. The phrase "the Lord your God" occurs so often in Deut. that one can easily understand its addition (more easily than its loss); one Greek MS also lacks the pronoun (MS 129—though this MS does not belong to a group to which the Armenian text is usually related); and while MSS V1006 and M347 are somewhat related, that is not true of V1007 and V1006 M347. So there are good grounds for regarding the shorter text as original.

Second, some of the variants are rooted in simple mistakes of one kind or another: 18, 23, 30, 32 (loss of θ. at change of line), 41, 42 (loss of θ. after θ. θ.), 48 and 56 (parablepsis), 52 (assimilation to parallels), 61 (ἀθνομ.: looks and sounds somewhat similar to the correct word), 72, 82 (ἐκ βολ.), 90 (similarity of sounds: ἐκ and ἐξ at the beginning of a word), 91 (ἀφογιάνθι, 93.

Third, a comparison of MSS reveals minor spelling variations that do not affect the meaning or textual history of the text: 9, 26, 55, 90—all the difference between endings -ny and -ény for the plural gen.-dat.-abl., i.e. the assimilation of the wo declension to the o declension7; 12 and 20 (spelling "Israel" with θ. or θ.); 54 and 82 (difference between ἐκ βολ. and ἐκ βολ.); 61 (ἀφοβερ. or ἐκ βολ. or ἐκ βολ.), 84 (ἀφογιάνθι or ἐκ βολ.).

To this group of variants we can add the problem of the spelling of the names of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob at v 10. Perhaps it would be helpful to recall those variants:

37.  ἔρρωἀσσὴν] ἔρρωἀσσὴν LO V841 M347
39.  ἔρρωἀσσῃ] ἔρρωἀσσῃ M347
40.  ἕρρωἀρῳ] ἕρρωἀρῳ J1925; ἕρρωἀρῳ V841-J2561
     V1006 M203 L'; ἕρρωἀρῳ LO M347

These variations in spelling recur over and over in the text tradition: Abraham with or without -ς-; Isaac with or without -ς-; Jacob spelled with -ῳ- or -ῳ-. (The -ῳ- ending on Jacob is an assimilation to the endings for Abraham and is secondary.) The matter of the spelling of proper names is complicated because such names have a life of their own in many languages apart from the biblical text tradition. When the Scriptures are translated into those languages the forms of the names in use in a particular community are often used, rather than straight transliterations.

(The Greek equivalents for the names of the patriarchs at 6:10 are [τῷ] Ἄβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ, i.e. Abraham has no “h,” Isaac begins with “i” and Jacob has a long “ο” vowel.)

Since there has been so little said about this problem, it might be useful to quote Jos Weitenberg’s response to my query about the spelling of the names of the patriarchs here at v 10:

I try to follow normally the spellings of the Jerusalem Bible Concordance, if only to have a semblance of structured order. If the concordance offers two variants, I choose the first. On Abraham and Abraam I have no opinion worth mentioning. [On] Yakob/Yakovb: the oldest form seems to be Yakob. It might be helpful to realize that spellings with ου from Greek omega are always artificial, even in our oldest texts. It may well be that Maštoc already introduced this convention. But if then you find a spelling with simple -ο̂- or with long ο the phonetic developments are very understandable.

In a later note Weitenberg pointed out that the issue concerning Yakob/Yakovb hinges upon establishing whether in names all omega-s have been rendered as ou. The earlier form of the name Jacob in Armenian may have been Բոն, but how was it rendered when translated from Greek in Deuteronomy?

---

8I.e. Τ‘.A. Arapkerts‘i, ΖωհուուԵրիմ. ՀԵ ԶՈՐ ՀՈՒՆՔՈՂՈՒՐՈԳ [Concordance to the Old and New Testaments] (Jerusalem: St. James, 1895).
9Personal communication, May 14, 1996.
A survey of the translation of all the proper names containing \( \text{omeg} \) in Greek Deuteronomy produced a list of seventeen proper names where the \( \text{omeg} \) vowel precedes a consonant and is rendered by \( -n\ell- \) and there is no variant in the matter of the rendering of the vowel. Those names are: "Ωγ (1:4; 3:1 [\( n\ell \) J1925*], 4, 10, 11; 29:7; 31:4); Λότ (2:9, 19); Αρμόν (2:24); Κεδμώθ (2:26); αργωβ (variant reading at 3:4); Σαμώρ (3:9); Μτώρ (3:10); Αύωθ (3:14); Ασηδώθ (3:17; 4:49); Βεσελφγώρ (4:3 [1° 2°]); Ραμώθ (4:43); Βηρώθ (10:6); Βεσώρ (23:4); Ιωσήφ (33:13, 16); Αραβώθ (34:1, 8); Σήγωρ (34:3); Φογώρ (34:6). In all the other cases of the rendering of the \( \text{omeg} \) vowel the \( -n\ell- \) is strongly attested by witnesses otherwise regarded as textually purer. There is only one exception to this equation: the word Χορηβ is throughout Deut. rendered as \( f\ell\mu\ell\ell\ell\ell \) (e.g. 1:210). In the light of this it seems most likely that the original spelling of Jacob in Armenian Deut. was \( f\ell\mu\ell\ell\ell\ell \).

The variation in the spelling of Abraham is once again:

37. 6:10 \( w\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \) \( w\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \) LO V841 M347

The Greek spelling is 'Αβρααμ. Other Greek proper names in Deut. with two \( \alpha \)lpha-s between consonants are: Γαλαάδ, Χανάαν and Βαλαάμ. In the case of Canaan, the Armenian is \( p\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \) (cf. 11:30). In Deuteronomy the text spells Gilead as \( \eta\eta\eta\eta\eta \), but at each occurrence the spelling \( \eta\eta\eta\eta\eta \) is well attested (cf. 2:36; 3:10, 12, 15; 4:43; 34:1). Similarly, Balaam is spelled \( \eta\eta\eta\eta\eta \) but the spelling \( \eta\eta\eta\eta\eta \) is well attested. It seems likely that the spellings with \( -\ell\ell\ell \) are original and that the spellings with \( -\ell\ell\ell \) arose out of the dissimilation of the two \( -\ell\ell\ell \) vowels or accommodation to a common spelling.11

The Greek spelling of Isaac is 'Ισαακ. It appears seven times in Deut., always in the phrase "Abraham and Isaac and Jacob." In the textual tradition reflected in Deuteronomy these names appear in the gen.-dat., except at 9:27. The MS tradition uniformly spells the name in the gen.-dat. as \( w\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \) except for MS M347 which has \( f\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \): so 1:8; 6:10; 9:5; 29:13 (\( f\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \) LO); 30:20; 34:4. In such stereotypical phrases a standardized spelling quickly takes over. The text at 9:27 is interesting because the three names appear with the direct object marker \( \eta \) in the sentence "Remember Abraham and Isaac and Jacob ..." Here the spelling of Isaac is \( f\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell\ell \), without variant. It would appear that most of the MS tradition has assimilated the spelling

---

10Note however that Greek MSS 458 318 preserve the spelling \( \chi\rho\eta\beta \) at 1:2, i.e. a spelling of the name with \( \omicron \).

11\( \eta\eta\eta\eta\eta \) is the spelling in A. Zeyt'union, ed., 'Εβραϊκά-Αρμենικά διάλεκτα (1976 Αρμενικά-Εβραϊκά διάλεκτα 1; Yerevan: Academy of Sciences, 1985): e.g. Gen. 39:21.
of Isaac to the common Armenian Ուղևյ and that in Deut. this one passage—a little different than the others—is a clue to this. So it is that among the witnesses collated for Deuteronomy, MS M347 may preserve the older spelling.\textsuperscript{12}

Fourth, twice the variant readings are synonyms: 11, 99. Those two citations are:

11. 6:2 τριήμερων [τριήμερων] Τριήμερων J2561 M203
99. 6:25 Πηρσώδιον βιολ] Πηρσώδιον βιολ J1925 L'

The Weitenberg/de Leeuw van Weenen concordance cites four occurrences of τριήμερων in Deuteronomy: 5:33; 6:2; 11:9; 32:47. In these four cases the underlying Greek is μακροχρόνιον—literally “be long of days”—so that the Armenian carries over the “day” element of the word in its -ορ- element. The concordance lists likewise four occurrences of κρήομαι: 4:40; 5:16; 17:20; 32:27. Except at 4:40 the LXX tradition employs the adjective μακροχρόνιον “long-lived” (5:16; 17:20) or the verb μακροχρονιζω (32:27), i.e. each time the underlying Greek contains the χρόνος “time” element. In the exception at 4:40 the LXX and majority text is (ὀπως) μακροχρονιζει (γενηθε). However MS A has a variant reading μακροχρονιζοι and, given the otherwise complete equation of μακροχρονεω- τριήμερων and μακροχρόνιον/ιζο—κρήομαι, one might suggest that the parent text of the Armenian read MS A at 4:40. The MS support for the reading τριήμερων at 6:2 is not strong and the results of a study of translation technique relative to κρήομαι and κρήομαι make it certain that τριήμερων is original. The secondary reading is the result of confusion with parallel passages.

In the second case of synonymous readings the variant has the support of the generally reliable MS J1925 and the three lectionary MSS. It is therefore an early reading.

The concordance lists only two occurrences of Πηρσώδιον βιολ “mercy, compassion” in Deut.: 6:25; 24:13. In both instances the underlying Greek is the noun ἔλεος. The cognate adj. Πηρσώδι at 4:31 is a rendering of οίκτιμων. The synonym Πηρσώδιον βιολ occurs at 5:10; 7:9; 12; 13:17 and is in each case a translation for ἔλεος/ἔλεον. The cognate verb Πηρσώδω is found at 7:2; 13:17; 28:50; 30:3, so that the shorter Πηρσωδ-νεβ-νεβ occurs 8 times whereas the longer Πηρσώδιον βιολ occurs only twice apart from 6:25. On the grounds of translation technique it is virtually certain that Πηρσώδιον βιολ is original at 6:25. The variant reading Πηρσώδιον βιολ arose because of confusion with parallel passages.

\textsuperscript{12}Zeyt'unian follows the spelling Ուղևյ and Ուղևյ but not Ողևյ. He reads Ողևյ.
where ḥūṭ/ḥūt/niṭṭētū more frequently occurs. Finally, the variant is not widely attested.

Fifth, four of the variants involve the difference between ḥūṭ and ḥūṭ at the head of a relative clause, where the antecedent is plural: 44, 46, 47, 50. In such cases the singular is usually used in classical Armenian. It appears that in these four instances we may be dealing with a scribal preference since the MS evidence is for the most part J1925 and some of its congeners (LO and the lectionary MSS). We should follow the text with ḥūṭ.

Sixth, in seven instances the difference among MSS involves the addition or loss of the demonstrative/definite marker -l at the end of a word. Those cases are:

60. 6:14  ḥūṭl  ḥūṭ L1  
66. 6:16  ḥūṭl  ḥūṭ L3  
68. 6:18  ḥūṭl V1312 V841  
    1  J2561(1); ḥūṭl V1006 M347 M203 L3  
70. 6:18  ḥūṭl J1925 J2561 V1006 M347 M203 L1 L3  
76. 6:20  ḥūṭl J1925 M203 L2(ḥūṭl L2)  
77. 6:20  ḥūṭl J1925 L3inc

In the first instance MS L1 has lost the -l after (ḥūṭ) ʾawwadny; in no. 66 the definite marker for “the Testing” has similarly been lost by mistake.

At v 18 the LXX reads καὶ ποιῆσεις τῷ ἄρεστῳ καὶ τῷ καλῷ “and you will do the pleasing and good,” i.e. the adjectives-become-substantives are both articulated and in the singular number. The plural ḥūṭl likely arose out of attraction to the plurals in v 17. The question of the definite marker -l is a bit more complicated. Numbers 68 and 70 go together because they are part of the same expression. That expression “the pleasant and (the) good” or “the good and (the) pleasant” occurs five times in Deut. In all cases the tradition clearly articulates the first word (at no. 68 the reading of J2561 is a mistake at a change of line). The five occurrences of the expression are, with the variants from the text of MS V1007:

6:18  ḥūṭl  ḥūṭl  
      MSS J1925 J2561 V1006 M347 M203 L1 L3 read ḥūṭl.  
12:25  ḥūṭl  ḥūṭl  
      MSS J1925 M347 read ḥūṭl.  
12:28  ḥūṭl  ḥūṭl

Jensen, § 226.
MSS J1925-LO V841-J2561 V1006 M347 read քեռելու։ MSS V1312 M203 read քեռելու։

13:18 քեռելու եւ քեռելո
MSS J1925 V841-J2561 M347 read քեռելու։ MS M203 reads քեռելու։

21:9 քեռելու եւ քեռելո
MSS J1925-LO M203 read քեռելու։

One notes immediately that MS M203, as at 6:18, seems to like the plural in this expression since at 12:28 and 13:18 it makes the singular into a plural. More importantly one sees variation among the MSS in whether the second adjective/substantive is articulated, except in two MSS that have been collated here, namely the base MS for collation which does not articulate and MS J1925 which does. It would appear that some scribe made a definite choice at some point in the history of the text tradition: either the second element of the expression was unarticulated and the scribe articulated them all or it was articulated and the scribe removed the definite marker. Since apart from the consistent witnesses there seems to be a tendency to add the definite marker—completely understandable because the first word has the -ո— I think that the second element was probably unarticulated originally. The tendency would have been greater to add the -ո than to lose it. That is, քեռելու եւ քեռելո is likely original.

Numbers 76, 77 are similar to what we have just discussed since they are part of an expression that contains three coordinated items: (base MS) քեռելու եւ քեռելո/:հախելու եւ հախելու ...
“what are the testinomies and laws and judgements which ...” The majority text is as reproduced here but MSS J1925 M203 L read հախելու եւ and MS J1925 reads հախելու։ It appears again that the second and third elements of this expression were unarticulated in the original. Manuscript J1925 prefers to repeat the -ո after each item in the list.

Such observations as one draws from small studies of translation technique like this one can eventually illuminate difficulties in quite a number of passages within a book.

Seventh, in three instances we find the nearer demonstrative/definite marker added or dropped. Those instances are:

95. 6:24 քեռելու] քեռելու L1*; քեռելու L1ר
97. 6:24 սվոր V1312-V1007-LO սվոր L'rell
100.6:25 առաջանություն] առաջանություն L1

In the first and third instances it seems that the scribe got carried away with the -ո marker because in each instance the noun involved is part of a phrase where the noun is followed by քեռելու, i.e. at վ 24
The word underlying ἡμέρα is σήμερον “today.” It is translated by μερός in Deut. The reading ἡμέρα is secondary, an assimilation to (ἡμέρα, ἡμέρα) which occurs a few words earlier.

Eighth, at this point we can take up three cases of confusion between the nearer and farther (demonstrative) markers -ν and -ή. They are:

2. 6:1 ἡμέραν ἡμέρα V1006 M347
31. 6:8 θείον θείον LO J2561 M203 L2* L3
34. 6:9 θείον θείον J2561 V1006 M347 M203

At v 1 the underlying Greek is οὗτος “thus.” It occurs at 5:29 and is rendered by ἡμέρα; so also at 8:5, 20; 12:22; 18:14; 22:26; 29:24 without variant. The same word οὗτος is translated by ἡμέρα at 7:5; 25:9—both with the verb “to do” as at 6:1. (At 29:24 the Greek verb is also “do” but the context favours the translation ἡμέρα: Διὰ τι ἐποίησα καὶ ὁ θεός οὗτος τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ; “Why did the Lord do thus to this people?” This is said by “all the nations.”)

The word ἡμέρα is secondary at v 1. It is attested by two related MSS. Its origin may lie either in assimilation to 5:29 or in the confusion of the letters η/θ or even ω/β.

In vv 8–9 a number of MSS read θείων instead of θυμίων. It is not the same group of MSS in each case, though MSS J2561 M203 are consistent and have θείων in both cases. It appears that θυμίων is secondary, that it represents reversion to the more common pronoun. The pronouns in vv 8–9 follow those in vv 6–7. The underlying Greek in vv 6–9 is ἐστι δὲ τὰ ἡμετα ταῦτα, ... (7) καὶ προσβασίας αὐτά καὶ ἀπεικόνισσας ἐν αὐτοῖς ... (8) καὶ ἀφάντας αὐτὰ ... (9) καὶ τοιούτα μὲ τοιούτα. “And these words will be ... (7) and you will put them forward ... you will speak about them ... (8) and you will fasten them ... (9) and you will write them ...” That is to say, the pronouns in vv 6–9 go back to “these words” in v 6, though in vv 7–9 the Greek simply says “them.” The Armenian renders τὰ ἡμετα ταύτα with ὀνομασίας or ἡμίτοις “these ordinances,” and continues with the nearer demonstrative in v 7 (ὅμως for αὐτὰ; ὑποστάλατε ἐν αὐτοῖς) and in vv 8–9. The secondary readings in vv 8–9 have lost sight of the antecedent way back there in v 6.

Ninth, in some ten cases in ch 6 there is confusion between the aorist and aorist subjunctive or between the active and middle voice or both:

First, in three instances there is confusion in the text tradition between the present and aorist subjunctive of ἡμέρα:
All three cases involve the clause "in order that it might be well with you/us." As the grammars note, the verb *išqūsh* has no aorist indicative and forms the aorist subjunctive as, e.g., 2 sg. *išqva*.  

A comparison of the 34 examples of the pres. subj. 3 pers. sg. with the 26 examples of the aor. subj. 3 pers. sg. of *išqūsh* in Deuteronomy against the LXX text leads one to the following tentative conclusions: wherever the verb has the sense of "will," i.e. is future, we find the aorist subj., often without variants; in conditions and statements of uncertainty we find the present subjunctive; similarly in the translation of the Greek optatives at 28:67 (twice); the negative *οὐκ* ἔσται becomes *αὐτ* (11:17; 18:22; 24:15 [but *αὐτ* is likely secondary]) or *δὴ* (15:4; 18:1; 23:17; 25:5, 13, 14) *išqūs*.*. There are a few exceptions to this (17:19?; 23:13) but they may be exegetically based.

The difference in usage between the two subjunctives can be illustrated in connection with the phrase above. I cite only the difference between present and aorist; where there is a variant it is cited below the item.

---

14Jensen, § 256.

15These results are in keeping with the very important comments by Jos Weitenberg concerning the aorist subjunctive in "The Use of the Classical Armenian Subjunctive Forms in the Fifth Century and in Middle Armenian Grabar Texts: Korinw and Grigor Aknercli," Computers in Armenian Philology , eds. S. Simonian, J. Weitenberg (Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia; Institute of Linguistics, Science and Technology Centre Aramazd; Yerevan: Armenian Academy, 1993) 72–100. Concerning the use of the present subjunctive of *išqūsh* to express an optative, cf. p. 83ff.: "It is worthy [sic—of note?] that Grigor Aknercli [sic] here [i.e. in the text from Grigor just cited] uses the Classical present subjunctive as an optative. To my knowledge, it has not been discussed in the scientific literature whether, in the Classical language, the use of the present subjunctive form for the expression of an optative is equivalent to an aorist subjunctive form. The examples in Jensen (1959: § 504) all are aorist subjunctives. In Eznik, an optative of the verb *išqūs* "to become" always is *išqum̄* (ι), and does not seem to occur with the present subjunctive."
In all these instances we are dealing with a translation from a Greek text that read the subjunctive after ἵνα (διότι at 6:3): e.g., ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται “in order that it might be well with you” at 4:40. However, look at 19:13 where the future καὶ εὖ σοι ἔσται is rendered τὸ ἐρωτήσεται “and it will go well for you,” without variant. I would suggest that ἐρωτήσεται is original in each of the instances above. The text in this connection is rather sure until 6:18, when the majority text becomes ἐρωτήσεται. This is a corruption that could easily take place: both ἐρωτήσεται and ἐρωτήσεται and related forms occur often in Deut. and ἐρωτήσεται easily becomes ἐρωτήσεται by parablepsis within the word, μετ’ ἀλλ’ ἀλλ’, or by abbreviation.

Finally, we may list the other cases of confusion between present and aorist subjunctive or between active and middle/passive.

4. 6:2 ἐρωτήσεται ἐρωτήσεται V841-J2561 V1006 M347 203
35. 6:10 ἐρώτησεν ἐρώτησεν J1925-LO V841-J2561 V1006 M203 L'
51. 6:11 ἐρώτησεν ἐρώτησεν J1925 M203 L2 L3; ἐρώτησεν M347; ἐρώτησεν J2561
57. 6:13 ἐρώτησεν ἐρώτησεν J2561 L1
58. 6:13 ἐρώτησεν ἐρώτησεν L1
64. 6:15 ἐρώτησεν ἐρώτησεν LO()
65. 6:16 ἐρώτησεν ἐρώτησεν L1
This list illustrates well the kind of confusion that takes place among forms of a verb in the textual tradition of Deut. In nos. 57, 58, 65 one or two witnesses replace the aorist subj. with the present; in all three L1 reads the present. At v 13 (nos. 57, 58) both verbs in question follow $\text{bphphg}_n$ and it seems likely that the aorists have been assimilated to it. In no. 64 MS LO reads the active instead of the middle voice at a change of line.

The MS evidence is greater for nos. 4, 35 and 51. At v 2 the representatives of groups $bcde$ read the present subj. ending $-\text{ph}_{pe}$ instead of the optional aorist ending $-\text{ph}_{pe}$ on the present stem. The plural $\text{bphphphpe}$ occurs four times in the base MS for collation in Deut., with the following variants:

1:21 $\text{bphphphpe}$ $\text{bphphphpe}$ J1925 V1006 M347
6:2 $\text{bphphphpe}$ $\text{bphphphpe}$ V841-J2561 V1006 M347 M203
13:4 $\text{bphphphpe}$
20:3 $\text{bphphphpe}$ rel1

There are six occurrences of the singular $\text{bphph}_n$ (3:2; 7:18, 19; 10:20; 20:1; 28:67); $\text{bphphphphpe}$ does not occur and does not appear as a variant to $\text{bphphphphpe}$. It seems most likely to me that $\text{bphphphphpe}$ is original at 6:2: the form in $-\text{ph}_{pe}$ is likely an assimilation to the more common ending.

In the case of no. 35 the form $\text{wph}_{ph}$ is likely secondary, the result of the $-\text{ph}$ verb $\text{wph}_{ph}$ “take along” being transitive. The parallel at 28:37 has $\text{wph}_{ph}$ without variant; cf. also 7:26 $\text{dph}_{ph}$ $\text{wph}_{ph}$.17

In no. 51 (6:11) all four possible forms of the verb $\text{wph}_{ph}$ “have one’s fill, be satisfied” are represented in the text tradition:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wphph}_n & \quad \text{pres. subj. pass.} \\
\text{wphph} & \quad \text{pres. subj. act.} \\
\text{wphphg} & \quad \text{aor. subj. pass.} \\
\text{wphphg} & \quad \text{aor. subj. act.}
\end{align*}
\]

Which is original? The pres. subj. pass. $\text{wphph}_n$ is the majority text but the aor. subj. pass. $\text{wphphg}_n$ is also fairly well attested: by J1925 M203 L2 L3. One might simply say that the variants are scattered and

\footnote{16}Jensen, § 243: “These forms [-ph$_{ph}$ and -ph$_{pe}$] are usually used in an imperatival or future sense, seldom in subjunctive subordinate clauses, and the plural form can indeed have an active and passive meaning; the singular form is usually passive ...”

\footnote{17}On $\text{wph}_{ph}$ in the Cilician period see J. Karst, Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen (Strassburg: Trübner, 1901; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter 1970) § 380.
not strong and leave it at that, just read FontAwesome, but is there an explanation for the confusion in the tradition here?

The verb FontAwesome occurs 10 times in Deut.; in eight of these instances it is used with the verb “eat” in the phrase “eat and be filled.” In six of those eight cases the mood is future indicative and in all of these the verbs are aorist subj. (8:10 [pres. subj. V1006 M347]; 11:16 [pres. subj. M203]; 14:28; 26:12; 27:7; 31:20 [pres. subj. act. M203]).

There is confusion between present and aorist, act. and pass. in two instances, 6:12 and 8:12. At 8:12 the verbs are part of a long protasis that begins at v 11 with ἐπάνω εἰς ἑαυτῷ, μή ... “Watch yourself, lest ...,” continues in v 12 with μή φαγὼν καί ἐμπληθεῖς ... “lest eating and being filled ...” and only comes to the apodosis at v 14 “you become arrogant ...” The Armenian translation follows, with the “lest” in v 11: FontAwesome FontAwesome FontAwesome “Look out for yourself lest ...” and repeats the FontAwesome at the beginning of v 12 and adds the word FontAwesome to make the conditional nature of the statement even firmer, so “lest when you eat and are satisfied ...” Verse 13 continues with pres. subj.; so also v 14. The confusion in v 12 arose because scribes lost sight of the conditional marker, because of assimilation to parallel passages, or because of the similarity of look and sound between pres. subj. act./pass. and aor. subj. act./pass. forms. The verbs in v 12 were all pres. subj. originally.

The same explanation suffices for the parallel at 6:12. Here the protasis begins at v 10 Καὶ ἔσται ὅταν ... “It will take place that whenever ...”; the apodosis comes at v 12 ἐπάνω εἰς ἑαυτῷ, μή “watch yourself, lest.” As at 8:12 the Greek for “and eat and be satisfied” is two aorist participles, which follow a series of participial constructions. The participles καί φαγὼν καί ἐμπληθεῖς are syntactically related to the ὅταν at the beginning of v 10 and continue the conditional nature of the statement. The translator rendered them with finite verbs, present subj., in the pass. voice, i.e. with the verb FontAwesome. The two verbs are to FontAwesome to FontAwesome “and you shall eat and be satisfied.” Note that there is no variant for FontAwesome: we do not find FontAwesome, the aor., as a variant. It appears that the corruption of FontAwesome into act. and aor. forms was the result of several factors: the act. form FontAwesome is likely an assimilation to FontAwesome; perhaps the aor. forms arose because someone saw a future after eating, i.e. “and you shall eat and will be satisfied”; and the forms look and sound similar. I take it that FontAwesome is original.

10. Finally we take up nos. 95 and 100 which involve the question of the repetition of the q- after FontAwesome “all, every,” with the direct object marker q-; further, in both cases the noun is followed by(FontAwesome) “these.” The two cases are:
CLAUDE C. COX 25

M203 L *(κρίνεταιν L1*); κρίνεταιν L1arih

In v 24 we read—citing the text of Deuteronomy—τι κρίνεταιν ἡ ἁγιότης ἡ ἡμῶν κατακρίνεσθαι ἑαυτῶν διὸ κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν “and the Lord commanded us to do all these laws.” In v 25: τι ηπειρομένην ὡς καθ' ἄλλην ἂρνημα τῆς κατακρίνεσθαι κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν “and there will be mercy for us if we are careful to do all these commands.” (The underlying phrases in Greek are, respectively, πάντα τὰ δικαιώματα ταῦτα and πάντας τὰς ἐντολὰς ταύτας.)

A survey of the 333 occurrences of κρίνεταιν in Deut.18 identifies nine phrases syntactically identical to κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν “all these laws” at 6:24. The total of ten instances is as follows, with variations in the presence/absence of the marker q- noted:

4:6 κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρί

6:24 κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρί

7:12 κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρί

11:23 κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρί

17:192 κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρί

19:9 κρί

26:16 κρί

27:8 κρί

31:1 κρί

31:28 κρί

18We may make the following minor corrections to the list in Weitenberg/de Leeuw van Weenen, Lemmatized Index, p. 3: there is no 19:154(eight lines down); 14:2 should be 14:3 (nine lines up from the bottom of the list); 23:20 should be 23:19 (eight lines up).

19The reading κρίνεταιν presumes that the parent text of these MSS had κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν because the word κρίνεταιν has been lost most likely through parablepsis by homoioarchon, i.e. κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρίνεταιν κρί

Therefore they attest the presence of the q- on the noun.
This analysis makes it very likely that the original text in each case
did not repeat the marker q- before the governing noun.
The MSS collated can be compared with regard to their use of the
q- in the ten instances cited above. For the sake of interest the dates of
the respective MSS are given to the far right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Out of Ten</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1007 (= text)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1925</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V841</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2561</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13th–14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M347</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M203</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It might be suggested that the analysis set out above should be
extended to all those cases where $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ is followed by a noun.
There are some 150 cases of this in Deuteronomy. In the majority of
instances there is no variant: e.g., $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e9\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ “all
his laws” (6:2) — the marker q- is not repeated. One notes however a
tendency to add the marker: e.g., at 5:29 we read $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e9\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ “all my commands” where MSS V841 V1006
M347 read $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$. In only two instances are the MSS collated for the Deut.
edition unanimous is repeating the q- marker with a noun following
$q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$. The first case is at 3:13 where we read  $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ “all Bashan, the kingdom of
Og.” Note that later in the verse we read  $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ “all
Bashan, which ...” In the latter instance only MS J1925 repeats the q-
marker.

The second exception is found at 12:28 where we read $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ “and you will do all the words
which.” There was a tendency to add the marker q- to $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$—as also to $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ and $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$—because, in
part, the words $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$, $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ and $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ occur so
frequently in the text of Deut. The phrase $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ occurs,
apart from instances where $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ follows (i.e. 31:1, 28), at 1:18;
4:3; 28:58; 29:9; 31:9, 24; 32:44, 46. In five of the eight cases the text
is divided between those MSS which have $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ and $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ but it
seems clear that the form without repetition of the marker after
$q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ is original.

Therefore I conjecture that at 3:13 the text originally read
$q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ and that at 12:28 it
read $\nu\text{p\u00e1\u00e7\u00e7\u037b\u0371\u037a}\nu$ $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$ $q\text{wt\u00b5}\nu$. That is, in the Armenian
translation of Deuteronomy the translator did not repeat the q-
marker
after առումի. (It should be noted that a larger collation of MSS for Deut. might well locate readings without ք - in the two exceptions I have just noted).

One might extend this inquiry one more step because in listing the passages where առումի is used in Deut. one notices a similar secondary tendency to repeat the preposition հ after առումի in phrases like առումի զարգացած որ  "in all your works": e.g. at 15:10 where mss V841-J2561 V1006 M347 M203 read առումի հ զարգացած որ.

Changes to the Text in Deuteronomy

The extensive examination of the Armenian text of Deut. 6 permits one to arrive at a form of the text which is as close to the original as one can come. From the examination set out in ten parts above the following changes are required to produce a text that is critically established.

1. At 6:4 instead of (ծանոց) հարձիքիթ read նորլու հարձիքիթ.
2. At 6:7 instead of (հ նահվա վեր իր կողմից) զարգացած հ զարգացած.
3. At 6:7 instead of (զարգացած հ) զարգացած որ կանմուշակ իթ.
4. At 6:10 instead of առումի հ զարգացած.
5. At 6:10 instead of առումի հ զարգացած.
6. At 6:10 instead of առումի հ զարգացած.
7. At 6:10 instead of իջելի թեր իթ.
8. At 6:11 instead of պարսիկ հ զարգացած.
9. At 6:18 instead of իթ թեր իթ.
10. At 6:23 instead of զարգացած իթ.
11. At 6:24 instead of կանմուշ իթ.

This is a relatively small number of changes and indicates that the text of MS V1007—and its text group: ա —offers a rather pure form of text. No MS is free from individual errors, i.e. mistakes unique to that MS, and this is true of V1007. The absence of the word նորլու հարձիքիթ at 6:4 seems to be such an error; similarly the reading կանմուշակ իթ at 6:7. Other mistakes are shared with some other MSS of group ա: e.g., the omission of հ (զարգացած) at 6:7 is shared with J1925-LO, as is the repetition of ք before կանմուշ իթ at 6:24; the singular պարսիկ հ զարգացած իթ at 6:11 is shared with J1925; the reading սուրփու իթ at 6:24 is shared with V1312-LO.
Recollection of Deuteronomy 6 against the LXX Tradition

When the Armenian text has been thus critically established its relationship to the parent Greek tradition can more precisely be determined. What follows are the results of a recollection of Deut. 6 against the text and apparatus of Wevers' *Deuteronomium*. The reader is referred to that edition for explication of the symbols and the place of the various text groups in the tradition.\(^\text{20}\) I have placed a star (*) before items where the clearer textual situation allows us to collate the Armenian differently; a double star (**) before items which are entirely new—only the omissions of κύριος at 6:3 and σου at 6:15. I have placed within double square brackets (i.e. [ ] ) cases where, in my judgement—though the collation in Wevers is technically correct—we should probably not cite the Armenian and I provide my reasons for this. The matter of citing transpositions of word order is especially unsure because the Armenian is sometimes unstable in this regard or has its own preferred word order which is not then textually rooted in the parent text.

6:1 ἐνετείλατο + vobis Arm

υμῶν V 376* 551* b -19 d 664* 799 392 18-83 55 59 Lat cod 100 Arab Bo Syh ημῶν 963 rell

ομ 72 d -106 Aeth Arm

6:2 υμῶν ημῶν A F*(c pr m) M c V 9630 -376-15-618 cl -46s 414 551* 19 125 f -246/127 s -343( ) 71-121-1392 -3 -630c 28 319 509 646 Arm Sa Syh

σου vobis Aeth Arab Arm Syh

6:3 [[σου ]] tr A F V 58-72 C ' ' f s -30' y 28 55 59 319 407 646 Arm = Compl \(\hat{M}\) —not cite because word order is unstable. Cf. vv 18, 24.]]

** ομ κύριος Arm. This item not cited in Wevers because Zohrapian has it.

6:4 κύριος 963(vid) ↓ sup ras 6 litt B; \(\nuωνης\) F M mg V 82-707c 106 53 -56 85txt 130-321 4txt 343' r 28 407 Lat cod 100 Aeth Arm Co = Compl; \(\nuωνης\) n -767'; + o θεος 376-707(vid)

C ' ' 30'-85mg 321 mg 319 424 464; + μωνης και 29

\(^{20}\text{And, beyond the edition of the text to J.W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (AWG; MSU XIII; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).}\)
6:9 γράψετε] ψείσ (φείς 15*) A M O -15-707 b 129 y -527 Latcod 100 Arm Pal Sa Syh ↓ ; ψής 527; εγγρ. 72; ψον d -106 ύμων 1*] τειμων 15* 313-551 56 669; σου 392*(c pr m) LatAmbr Ps duod I 30.3 Spec 4 Arab Arm Pal(vid) = Compl M; ∩ 2* 963* d -106 127 Latcod 100 τῶν πυλῶν] εν τοῖς πυλαῖς b Arm = ~ ύμων 2*] σου b LatAmbr Ps duod I 30.3 Spec 4 Aeth CG Arab Arm Pal = Compl M

6:10 ὀμοσευ] κυρίος (+ deus tuus Sa) B 963 344mg 318 Aeth CG Arm Sa

6:11 init] pr kai O -82 Aeth Arm Bo Pal = M lákkoς] pr et Aeth Arab Arm = M Tar ἀμπελώνας] pr kai C ⋅-16 761 319 646 Aeth Arm Sa

[[6:14 οὐ πορεύσασθε 963] οὐ μὴ πορεύσῃ M ol Latcod 100 Opt Parm I 21 Aeth ArmAp; οὐ μὴ πορευσασθε Fb 58-82 53' - 129 71' -318-527 Armte; ... —not cite because the future or subj. are both rendered by the subj. in Arm.]]

**6:15 om σου 1' 129 Arm om en σοι 2* b 55 Arm

[έξολοθρεύη] (σει B 963) B* 963] ἐξολοθρεύειται C ⋅-52 s - 346c 28 319 646 Arm— I would not cite this because Arm has used a finite verb to translate the preceding participle (μὴ) ὄργισθες and then put the following finite verb ἐξολοθρεύη into its participle. That is, Arm reversed the order of participle + finite verb. (Note: this is not the full citation of the evidence under ἐξολοθρεύειται.])

6:17 κυρίοι τοῦ θεοῦ 963 376] autou 72; + vestri Latcod 100 Arab = M; + autou rell = Ra

τα 1' B V 963 b 106 n t 407' Arm] pr kai rell = M μαρτύροι B V 963 72 761 106 n t 407' Latcod 100 Luc Athan I 6 Arm Bo] + autou rell = M

*6:18 τὸ ἀρεστὸν καὶ (> 75) to; (> 128*) kalon B 963 426 551 b n z 509 ArmAp Sa] to agathon καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν 407; om καὶ τὸ kalon 125 799; to (τον 618*) kalon καὶ to (τον 618* 500*) ἀρεστὸν rell — here we can say that the order in ArmAp in Zohranian is correct, not the order found in his text, which here is under "rell."

ἐν σου τρ Arm σου 2'] hmwn 618 54* Arm

6:19 om σου 1' ol -15 246 Arm

πρό] απο 29-72-376 52 Latcod 100 Arm = M

* ἐλάλησεν A FM 82-ol' -58 f ⋅-246 121-318-392 18-68' -120 59 Latcod 100 Armte Sa ⋅3] + (1 344 Syh) κυρίος + (deus tuus Arab) rell = M — we can now accept for sure the shorter text.

6:20 ὁ νῦς σου / αὐριον tr 381' Arm
The textual affiliations of the Armenian translation of Deut. 6 can be determined by citing those variant readings where it is part of three or fewer text groups. The following is extrapolated from the list above. The addition or omission of καὶ is disregarded. For our purposes when half or more MSS of a Greek text group attest a reading, the reading is considered to be attested by that group. For ease of calculation the groups are given after the verse.

6:1 (d) om ἐκεῖ 72 d - 106 Aeth Arm
6:9 (O b y) γράφετες ψεῖς (-ψεῖς 15*) A M O -15-707 b 129 y -527 Lat cod 100 Arm Pal Sa Syh ↓;
   -ψης 527
   (b) τῶν πυλῶν εὖ ταῖς πυλαῖς b Arm = Κ
   (b) υμῖν 2* σου b Lat Ambr Ps duod I 30.3 Spec 4
   Aeth C Arab Arm Pal = Compl Κ
6:15 (b) om εὖ ool 2* b 55 Arm
6:19 (oL) om σου 1* οL -15 246 Arm
   (oL) πρό] από 29-72-376 52 Lat cod 100 Arm = Κ
6:20 (oL) τοῦ σου / αὖρων τρ 381° Arm
6:21 (d n t) γῆ 963] > 426 414 d n t Lat cod 100 Arm Syh = Κ
   (oL) κύριος] + o θεός oL 414-417 W1 83 Arm Pal

The textual agreements for this section of text in Armenian Deuteronomy can be tabulated as follows: out of the ten variants there are four agreements with group b; three with the hexaplaric subgroup oL; one each with the main hexaplaric group O and the subgroup oL; two with group d; and one each with group n and y. This sample is too brief to draw firm conclusions, though the agreements with the b and the
hexaplaric text are in keeping with those set out in Deuteronomy. Here, however, the relationship to the subgroup \(O\) is stronger than that with \(O\).

The task of assessing textual affiliations really requires the precision that is only possible with the exacting enterprise set out here.

**Conclusion**

This paper is much longer than was intended: in textual criticism, like love, one thing leads to another. Textual criticism requires an intimate involvement with the MS tradition, that tradition's parent text *and its tradition*, as well as a variety of other tools. In this paper I have tried to provide an example of the textual criticism of a relatively brief passage. The methodology employed here can be used in various other parts of the Armenian canon.

In the process of working on the details of the text of ch. 6 one is led necessarily into other parts of the book in order to understand the translation technique of the document as a whole. The attempt to solve one problem often leads to the solution to, or insights that may lead to the solution of other problems. In the end the person who works upon the text in this detailed way will gain an appreciation of the development of the textual tradition as a whole.
THE CRITICAL TEXT OF 1–3 MACCABEES

H. M. Amalyan

The series Hay hnaguyn targmanakan hušarjanner (Monuments of the Earliest Armenian Translations) will shortly include Girk Makabayecuoc (Books of the Maccabees).1 The volume will include the text of all three books with an introduction and notes covering text-critical observations and description of the manuscripts with their orthographic peculiarities. An effort will be made in this forthcoming publication to account for as many of the typical text-critical questions raised in biblical scholarship, such as: (1) enumeration and classification of manuscripts; (2) selection of representative manuscripts and of the base text; and (3) identification of significant variants.

The books of the Maccabees are known to exist in more than a hundred Armenian manuscripts found in Armenia and abroad. The books do not exist separately, but are invariably part of the larger Scriptures, falling right after Tobit and immediately before the Psalms. The earliest of these manuscripts is no. 178 in the Matenadaran, dating from 1253–55. Unfortunately, in this manuscript the books of the Maccabees are incomplete.

The critical text is based on forty choice manuscripts, selected after the principles governing the process of selectivity. Of these manuscripts thirty-two bear early dates including some from the seventeenth century, and eight with dates from after the seventeenth century. Also accounted for in the critical apparatus are the editions by O. Erevanc’i, H. Zohrapian, and A. Bagratuni.

The Armenian text of Maccabees, in its entirety, corresponds with the Greek text except for 1 Macc. 4:1–9 which is missing in the Armenian. This omission could well be attributed to a defect in the Greek archetype of the Armenian translation.

As is to be expected, the Armenian translation itself suffered corruptions in the course of its transmission, corruptions explicable as inner-Armenian deviations. According to S. Kogian, however, the books of the Maccabees have come down to us without any deviation from the original translation, and whatever variations from the Greek, they are emendations by the translator himself.\(^2\) Moreover, there are variants of not only simple and isolated words but also of words in conjunction as also of composite words, and these are abundant in manuscripts copied since the thirteenth century and resulting for the most part from the work of G. Skewrac‘i and his followers. They were responsible for introducing brief introductions and tables of contents, bringing the arrangement into closer harmony with the Latin version. Consequently, the largest number of emendations are found in the earliest witnesses of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries; whereas most variants in subsequently copied manuscripts are predominantly orthographic.

The emendations notwithstanding, the books of the Maccabees have come down to us in close harmony with those in the Septuagint, and the translation itself provides a valuable check on the Greek text and its transmission.

The forthcoming publication has for its basis two manuscripts: Matenadaran no. 180 (dated 1295) and Venice no. 1 (dated 1319). It would be difficult to assign unqualified priority to either of the main manuscripts respectively utilized by Erevanc‘i and Zohrapian. The two manuscripts are closely related and have no significant variants between them. It is important to note, however, that Erevanc‘i’s primary manuscript, and hence his edition, suffers from the marginal readings and the dominant features of the Latinized text and may thus be considered as being slightly distorted. By contrast, Zohrapian’s edition has been hitherto regarded as the editio princeps of the Armenian Bible, based on the collective witness of the Armenian manuscripts available to him. However, it is not altogether devoid of the foreign features of the former.

The grouping of the Armenian manuscripts into families has been a major task for us. The emergence of numerous variants obtaining between the manuscripts is often verifiable among witnesses in our possession. The origin of some variants, however, cannot be attested in our witnesses. Nonetheless, we have been able to determine the relationship between the families or groups.

---

M. Ter-Movsesyan was first to schematize the relationship of all Armenian biblical manuscripts available to him. Unfortunately, he relied more on external or superficial characteristics among the manuscripts (such as canon lists—including non-canonical books, introductions and headings) rather than on minute internal characteristics which he recommended to consider for further verification. This we have already done, comparatively and even statistically, looking for correspondences between internal and external characteristics. We have based our classification on select portions of the text as samples containing eighty significant variants, or versional variants, following M. Stone's guidelines.

The seventy-five manuscripts containing the books of the Maccabees fall into four basic groups. Three of these are distinct, the fourth derives from the first group. The three distinct groups—especially the first two—seem to indicate that the Armenian translation was made from various archetypes. However, it is difficult to identify their Septuagintal recension(s) with certainty. The third group reflects the text's transmission after its translation into Armenian. As for the fourth group, its manuscripts strain from those of the first group and show much later corruptions. Nearly thirty of the variants in our sample for classification purposes are attested in the manuscripts of this fourth group, as of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries.

Biblical scholars have hitherto and necessarily paid much attention to the place of the Armenian version in establishing the Greek text. They have often noted and lamented the absence of a truly critical edition. But such an edition does not promise to resolve the unanswered questions in Septuagintal studies, especially since Armenian manuscripts from the early middle-ages no longer exist and the extant evidence seems to be somewhat inadequate for the inquiries in biblical scholarship.

The selection of a *codex optimus* for the base text is always a matter of concern. Research, however, has demonstrated that the *codex optimus* selected by Zohrapian, Venice no. 1, is truly the manuscript of choice. Hence our manuscripts have been collated against Zohrapian's published text. Emendations of erroneous or questionable readings,
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such as proposed by S. Kogian and E. Durian, as also those by A. Bagratuni and others, have been adopted into the text itself on rare occasions and only when attested in the manuscripts. In all other instances proposed emendations have been relegated to the apparatus.

In our text-critical work we have maintained a keen appreciation for classical orthography especially when it reflects classical pronunciation. Along with this, we have been mindful of the special and important place of the Scriptures in the new cultural development among the Armenian people. The Scriptures have a profound religious significance for believers everywhere, but as a literary text it did not exert equal influence on the nations that cherished it. Among the Greeks, for example, it was a new translation alongside other literary works with considerable history, attested as of the fourth-third centuries B.C. in what was the vernacular (koiné) language. Yet for the Armenians, the Scriptures were the beginning of writing and literature, part of the cultural foundations and the literary first-fruits of a nation, the first documentary attestation of the Armenian language, and which began with the words Čanačel zimastwiun ew zxorat, imanal zbans hancaroy (“To discern wisdom and counsel, to understand sage words.” Proverbs 1:2).

Armenian philologists, especially in this century, have defined the ancient language in accordance with Scriptural usage, especially in the manuscripts and extending to the printed text. And they have done so without awareness of the less known, interesting and important features preserved in certain manuscripts. All the forgotten aspects of the classical language must be resurrected from the manuscripts and be heard. Take, for example, the overlooked “z” prefix in the earliest manuscripts, where it appears as “ez”. Ačaryan treats the prefix either as of native Armenian origin or as an early borrowing from an Indo-European prototype attested in various forms in a number of Indo-European languages (azu, azi, az, zu, za, etc.).

The spelling “ez” in the manuscripts is not coincidental, since the prefix is thus spelled in manuscripts faithfully copied from earlier exemplars now lost to us. The form is authentically classical in spelling and pronunciation. So is also the use of “ew” in words where the dialectal form “iw” took over to the point of nearly supplanting through its more widespread usage the original, classical usage of “ew” which is akin to the Indo-European “epi”. A number of words like artwi, etfiwr, atbiwr, etc., are spelled with “ew” in most manuscripts. We no longer speak of variants like erkiwi, erkewi, erki, erkel and other similar forms of words. Nor is the variant spelling of proper names with “v” coincidental in the manuscripts; e.g., Aharovn - Aharon, Amovs - Amos.
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Debovra - Debora, Yakovb - Yakob, Siovn - Sion, Kebroun - Kebron, etc., all of which have an omega in Greek, which in classical Armenian must have been rendered as a long vowel “ου” and not a short “ο” or even “ο”. There are also a number of other declensional variants like Yakovbay, Yakovbu, Yakobi, etc. We have not refrained ourselves from including as variants also ordinary words with interchangeable uses of vowels, especially “υ” and “ι”, irrespective of frequency. We have left out, of course, the supplemental “y” at the end of words as also the written shewa (“ο”) where their appearance is deemed superfluous.

We may have stretched the point a little in our discussion of common variants; however, these may contain clues about the much earlier orthography which in turn reflects the more primitive pronunciation, morphology, etc. We deemed this digression important since we are dealing with the Scriptures, a reliable source for a historical approach to our language. In our opinion, it is imperative for text-critics to consider these more primitive features in the course of their work on documents with early dates of composition or translation. The role of the Scriptures in Armenian linguistic and literary considerations is well assessed by L. Ter-Petrosyan, who points out: “The publication of the critical text [of the Scriptures], doubtless, provides the grounds for a more profound and fundamental approach to linguistic research.”

The books of the Maccabees were translated into Armenian if not before the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), then immediately thereafter; in our opinion, before A.D. 440. The unknown translator must have been a sage, a master of the ancient Armenian language, of whom E. Durian says:

He must be regarded as one of the most significant members of the school of St. Mesrop. Not only he was a conscientious translator but also one who proceeded boldly to give priority to the dynamics of the language and in whose eyes the translation of the books of Kings may have seemed rather skimpy, given the precision and beauty of his art.

The Armenian translation of the books of the Maccabees is a particularly free translation which, given its large stock of vocabulary, its literary style and masterly use of the language through more vivid
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imagery and deliberately moving effect, differs markedly from the rest of the translations of the biblical books.

The production of a critical edition of the Armenian Bible ought to be at the same time an opportunity to establish the peculiarities of the Classical language in every detail. After all, a comparative approach to manuscripts is a comparative approach to language.
TEXT CRITICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE ARMENIAN VERSION OF THIRD CORINTHIANS

S. Peter Cowe

Purporting to document another painful scenario in Paul's strained relations with the scandal-ridden and heresy-mongering church at Corinth, this text has engendered an ongoing series of editions, translations and studies out of all proportion to its diminutive compass, since its emergence onto the international scholarly scene in the first decades of the eighteenth century. Attention first focused on the Armenian version, but by the late nineteenth century both a Coptic translation and a number of Latin manuscripts had come to light. The latest find is a Greek papyrus dated paleographically to the third

century and now part of the Bodmer collection. Consonant with its Egyptian provenance, the text it adduces reveals what might be called an Alexandrian character, not attesting verses 14, 22-23 and 33 from Paul’s letter. These are witnessed by three of the Latin manuscripts and the Armenian which might therefore be regarded as a more typically Western text form, in part influenced by the Acts of Paul, as well as the apostle’s canonical epistles. At the same time, since the current consensus is that the work was originally crafted in Greek, one should beware of enduing the single surviving manuscript in that idiom with the authority of an autograph on account of its early date. A cursory glance reveals its orthography is atrocious, indicating the effects of itacism and the loss of diphthongization, as will be evident from the upcoming examples. Moreover, it evinces a serious lacuna at the beginning of 2:11 regarding Satan’s aspirations toward divinization, a verse subsequently much discussed by Armenian writers.

Explanation of Sigla:
Pap: Bodmer Papyrus X (ed. M. Testuz, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana 1959)
B 13th century Latin Bible now in Berlin
L 13th century Latin Bible now in Laon
M 10th century Latin Bible now in Milan
E: The Armenian version of the Commentary attributed to St. Ephrem (Venice, 1836)
Arm: The Armenian version of Third Corinthians
Z: base text of the edition (Y. Zohrapean, Venice, 1805)
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4 See especially the citations from 1:5, 2:26, 2:32, and 2:38.

2:10-11 Pap ἡριφεὶ ὃ πολλοὶς ὅ γὰρ ἄρχων ἀδικος ὢν καὶ θεος ἠθέλων ἐσι
B ... Nam quia injustus princeps deus volens esse...
Arm ἑωθοτελεύτωρ μιχυσος μη ὅπ πο ὧνδηλη ἐρωτηθα
The cause of the loss of text is probably the most common one of parablepsis by homoeoteleuton.

As Westcott and Hort favoured the shorter text to the extent of referring to preferred longer readings in Acts as "Western non-interpolations" rather than Alexandrian omissions, it appears that a similar position has been adopted by Testuz and Klijn in the work under review.6 In accordance with this, they argue from the shorter reading adduced by the Greek manuscript in 1:6 that this text distinguishes clearly between the apostles and the author Paul, diminishing the latter's role and subordinating him to the former.

1:6 Pap οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων [ἀποστόλων]
B L neque ab aliis apostolis
Arm E κλ η ζ Ἀδικεφασιμα
However, this interpretation of the data not only does not reflect Paul's self designation in the canonical correspondence, but problematizes the rationale of the community within which the apocryphon emerged of appealing specifically to Paul's eminence to combat certain prevalent views the compilers considered heterodox, when presumably they might have selected more prestigious figures like Peter and John for the task. Textually, not only is the disputed term present in all the other extant witnesses, including the Coptic version and the commentary traditionally ascribed to St. Ephrem, which normally support the papyrus, but its absence in the latter may once again be explained by parablepsis through homoeoteleuton. Moreover, the author's reference to the apostles in 2:4 is as susceptible to an inclusive as an exclusive reading.

2:4 παρέδωκα ὑμῖν ἀ καὶ παρέλαβον ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλων...
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The commentary on Third Corinthians attributed to St. Ephrem was not available during the early scholarly debates, but was introduced into circulation by Vetter in 1890. The caveats mentioned above on employing a single manuscript to represent a work apply all the more in this case, in that the Mkhitarian edition on the basis of a codex of 999 A.D. provides us only with the Armenian translation of the commentary, the putative Syriac original not having come down to us. Doubts have been raised more recently with regard to its representation of the views of the followers of Bardaisan as the purveyors of the false teaching and the means by which these are combatted. Moreover, with regard to the language of the Armenian Vorlage, one would be hard put to isolate traces of syriacism. Consequently, the possibility has to be considered that perhaps this opusculum should be classified with the expanding
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7 The work was first published by the Mkhitarian brotherhood as Sroyn Ephremi matenagruwnk [St. Ephrem’s Complete Works] (Venice 1836), pp. 116-123, and subsequently provided with a Latin translation in S. Ephraemi Syri commentarii in epistolae D. Pauli nunc primum ex Arm. in Lat. serm. a patribus Mekitharistis translati (Venice 1893), pp. 117-124. A German rendition was provided by P. Vetter, “Der apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief, neu übersetzt und nach seiner Entstehung untersucht,” Theologische Quartalschrift 72 (1980) 627-639.

8 One of the few possible examples, almost exactly shared by the Armenian version of the epistle, occurs at 2:38 where the Greek clause οὖν μετήματα...έδειξεν is paralleled by է մնակ բռչի (+ բռչի Arm) քա ձեռնվար...whose opening construction of a conjunction followed by the personal pronoun is often encountered in translations from Syriac. However, one might compare Armenian Ephrem’s constraining profile in a parallel phrase at 2:19 reviewed later in this paper. It is also significant that on two occasions both the Armenian epistle and the commentary attest the more characteristically Greek word order with preceding genitive at 2:17 (Pap δικαίωσύνης ναόν Arm Ε միարկողբխան մատն) and 2:20 (Παπ τοι δέσων πίστιν Arm գետրուն նպատակ Ե գետրու կատ). With regard to the representation of sibilants in proper names, the commentary evinces the Greek form: e.g. Σίμων in 1:2 appears as Սիմոն. However, at 2:32 there is no basis for comparison since the manuscript employed in the Mkhitariust edition reads Elijah for Elisha.
corpus of Armenian Ps. Ephremica. 9 Despite this, citations from the epistle in authentically Ephremic works testify to the commentator's familiarity with this text. 10

Both the Armenian translations of Ephrem and the epistle adduce grammatical and stylistic features characteristic of early prose style as witnessed in the example below:

2:10 Pap ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔπεμψεν εἰς τοὺς προφήτας
E ὡρὴν μητὶς ὁμώρι ἐγκομιῶν ἐξ ἐκκρυψῆς
Arm ὡρὴν μητὶς ὁμώρι [ρή]* ἐξ ἐκκρυψῆς

Here their common text reflects the tendency toward separate representation of the pronoun subject (ἡμ) and predilection for the local adverb (ὁμώρι) over the deictic suffix(-ς) in defining the spirit. The absence of the possessor Christ from the text of the Armenian epistle may well be explained by parablepsis of the abbreviated nomen sacrum immediately after ὡρή. 11

At the same time, as has been noted, the text of Ephrem fairly regularly agrees with that of the papyrus, and its more literal technique demonstrates these affinities more directly than the Armenian epistle, even where both seem to depend ultimately on the same Greek form. Thus, in the following verse the Armenian epistle is the only extant witness to offer sin ἁπατησίας as formal equivalent of desire (ἡδονή), its exegesis perhaps influenced by a passage like Romans 6:12.

2:11 Pap καὶ τὴν πάσαν σάρκα ἀνθρώπων πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐδέσμευεν.
E (a) ἁπατησίας γιὰ γνωθίσωμαι ὁμώρι ὁμώρι αὐτῆς


10 For details see J. Kerschensteiner, Der altsyrische Paulustext, (CSCO sub. 37) (Louvain 1970), p. 67.

The variation within the witnesses to the epistle in the earlier part of the citation poses the question of whether its original reading there was not also that of Ephrem, different strategies having been employed in different branches of the tradition to simplify the unusual compound expression. This suggestion would nevertheless have to come to terms with the quotation of the majority text in the Teaching of St. Gregory, a work of relatively early origin, though one cannot rule out the possibility of its secondary accommodation to the text of the epistle which later became standard.

The variation in formulation in Armenian Ephrem which the same passage illustrates is occasioned by the commentator’s approach. On the whole he employs two methods of textual reference, glosses of a word or phrase introduced by ուսումնացել տեղեկություն էջեր, հզակագրության մեջ, և հանրապետություն մեջ ունեցած տեղեկություն. Sometimes, however, he will summarize a portion of less theological interest, such as the narrative of the dispatch of the Corinthians’ letter to Philippi. The above example affords a rare case in which the author returns to the precise formulation of the text after having alluded to it more obliquely a few lines above.

The commentary coincides with the Greek papyrus in the non-representation of 2: 14, 22-23 and 33, however it does adduce a few
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12 Sigla have been assigned to the Armenian manuscripts according to A. Zeyfutyun, “Astuacasnči hayeren tārpmanut’yan jeagraakan miavorneri dasakargman masin.” [On the Manuscript Classification of the Armenian Version of the Bible] Banber Matenadarani 12 (1977) 295-304.
slightly expansionistic readings in agreement with B, sometimes in the company of the Armenian epistle, as at 1:5. 13

Pap ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ πνεύματος ἄγειον
B ...secundum promissionem spiritus sancti
Arm E ἡ καλοπρνή ἐκραύγασμος ὁ Θεοῦ ἀπαγνωσθείν

Here it nuances the rather bald Greek formulation regarding the Spirit's role in Jesus' birth. In the next example, however, Armenian Ephrem reveals an intermediate position in the accretion of Christological titles continued by later witnesses.

1:4 Pap μετὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ
B cum domino
E ἐκ Σωτῆρος ἐκραύγασμος
L cum domino Ihesu Christo
Arm ἡ καλοπρνή ἐκραύγασμος Θεου Ἀρχιμανθῆ

On other occasions the exegesis of the commentator's text seems to have been informed by an intertextual parallel, as in the following example:

2:29 Pap εἰς κήτος καταπέποτε
E ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἀνωτάτης
Arm ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἀνωτάτης
cf. 3 Macc 6:7 ἐν καταπέποτε

There Jonah's sojourn in the sea monster's belly is rendered according to the priest Eleazar's prayer in 3 Maccabees and is in turn adopted by the Armenian epistle. Another more elaborate instance of the same technique is offered by 2:32.

2:32 Pap ὑμεῖς τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὰ ὀστά καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ ἐπεξεργάζειτε
E ἡ ἡμείς ἀγιαζομεν τον ἡμας κε αγιω της ἁγια της ἀρχιμανθῆς καταπέποτε
Arm ἡ ἡμείς ἀγιαζομεν τον ἡμας κε αγιω της ἁγια της ἀρχιμανθῆς καταπέποτε

13 Ephrem's commentary and the Greek papyrus evince what has been termed the short version along with the Coptic text and Latin MS L.
cf. Rom 5:9  ուժը են մարդիկ ու մարդիկ ու երեխաներ, որոնք հանդիպում են սուրբ, աստիճանի դրամում.
I Cor 11:27  իր տակուց գալու, հա որոշի գալու սառը եւ սառը իրեն, ու սառ իրեն սառ մարմնու սառ սառ

There the author is once more reinforcing the doctrine of the physical resurrection which had been impugned by the factionalists, this time alluding to the incident of the prophet Elisha resuscitating the son of the Shunammite woman (2 Kings 4:34-36) contact. In the continuation Armenian Ephrem followed only by the Armenian epistle significantly alters the text by distancing the Old Testament example through the construction of an a fortiori argument more typical of Pauline thought and, by substituting blood for bones, provides a clearer interpretation of contact with Christ's body in a eucharistic subtext, of which the negative corollary, unworthy reception of communion leading to illness and death, is spelled out in the passage from I Corinthians.

In other cases, although the Armenian version of the epistle does not directly follow the formulation of the text of Ephrem, its particular expression suggests the impact of that tradition. An interesting example is provided by the discussion of the proselytizing activities conducted by the opposition party at 1:2.

Pap  τὴν τίνων πίστιν ἀνατρέπουσιν φθορειμένοις λόγοις
Arm  հուրդահար զգում կանան զբաղեցրե ի մարմանից մարմի է
e  ի զգում կանան ի զույգեգան մարմանից մարմի

The Armenian version gives a reasonably appropriate rendering of the Greek phrase semantically, including the compound verb, although in a historic tense. However, it adds the epithet զբաղեցրե (charming, attractive) which lacks a formal equivalent. Instead, it seems to follow the exegesis of Armenian Ephrem in terms of the heretics' seducing some of the faithful to transfer their allegiance to the alternative creed. Hence the epithet might indirectly be considered a doublet translation of the Greek verb.

The sort of exegetical impact posited above raises the issue of how the influence might have been effected. In answer I would propose that it is a reasonable assumption that if the Armenian translation of Third
Corinthians formed part of the wider enterprise inaugurated by Mamač in the early fifth century, then the cleric responsible for it would more than likely have been familiar with various Ephremic collections. The undisputed authority of the Edessene deacon's writings at the School of the Persians until the translation of texts of Theodore is well attested, as is the role of the latter institution in training eastern clergy. However, once the commentary was armenized the possibility for secondary contamination was also opened, and that could travel potentially in both directions. That this occurred to some extent is suggested by the textual situation at 1:16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pap</th>
<th>ὅπως... τούτων ἢ ἄνοιξ ἔκδηλος γένηται</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ἡ... ἄνω ἐπιγραμμ. ... ἤ... ἄνω ἐπιγραμμ. ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Arm | կոչ անոթ այստեղ սկզբում... ոչոք սկզբում այստեղ... ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան սτորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստոρդաν ստորդաν ստորդան սτորդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան սτորդան ստորդան ստորդաν ստորդան ստոρդան ստորդան ստորդան ստորդան սτοրդան ստորդան սτοրդան ստորդան սτοրդան սτοրդան սτοրդαն սτοրδαն սτοրդαն սτορդαն սτοրդαն սτοրդαն սτορդան սτοրդան սτοրդան սτοրդան ստորդան սτորդան ստորդան սτοրդան ստորդան սτοրդան ստοրդαն սτοրդան ստորդαն սτοրդαն սτορδան սτοրդան սτորդαն սτοրդան ստորդան սτοրդαն սτορդան ստορդαն ստորդαν ստորδαն ստորդաν սτοրδαն սτοրդան սτοրդαն սτορδան սτοրդաν սτοրդαն սτοրδան ստորδան սτοրδαն սτορδαն ստորδան սτοրδα
| MSS 18 23 65 69 81 116 139 190 222 22 50 | οὐδὲν εἰς Ἴσωτον ἔστησαν... |
| Col 2:15 | ὅταν ἰδεῖτο εἰς ἰδέαν ἀποκαλυφθεῖν ἡμῖν... |

Here the Corinthians conclude their letter with one last earnest appeal to the apostle to visit them and expose the senselessness of his opponents' teaching. The combative aspect of the relished encounter is heightened in the Armenian versions which already anticipate the public affront to which the proselytizers will be subjected. The image is closely parallel to, and may have been borrowed from, a passage in Colossians in which Christ is portrayed as leading the spiritual powers and authorities as conquered hosts in a triumphal procession. However, both the Venice manuscript of St. Ephrem's commentary and the majority tradition of the epistle evince a secondary Armenian development in which the public are not neutral bystanders, but either the subject or object of admonition and reproach. Although it is possible this development occurred independently, the likelihood of contamination is quite high.

Granted that the early editions of the Armenian epistle were only based on one manuscript, Zohrapean's 1805 edition of the Bible marks an important step forward, expanding coverage to include probably all
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the evidence available in the Venice collection, if his procedure in the Old Testament serves as a yardstick.\footnote{See S. P. Cowe, op. cit. note 11, pp. 439-440.} Nevertheless, the full utility of his efforts was impaired by his failure to specify the precise manuscripts attesting the variants he inserted in the apparatus. By extending the collation pool we are able to remove a number of the blemishes which mark the base text of his edition as a secondary textual witness.

One of the first features to provoke manuscript variation and corruption is unfamiliar proper names. A brief example of this phenomenon is provided by the four presbyters who initiate the correspondence with Paul at 1:1.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
Pap \quad \Delta \acute{a} \varphi \nu o, kai \ \varepsilon u \beta w o, i o \zeta, kai \ \Theta \varphi i o, kai \ \zeta \epsilon i \nu o, n \\
Z \quad \tau o \varphi \nu o, \ \tau i \nu o n, \ \mu \sigma \iota \varphi i o, \ \mu \nu \tau o, \ \tau o \varphi \nu o, \ \mu \sigma \iota \nu o, \ \mu \sigma \iota \nu o, \ \mu \nu \tau o, \ \tau o \varphi \nu o \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{Z's confusion of } \rho \text{ and } \phi \text{ is clear evidence of the West Armenian sound shift, while the replacement of the velar } l \text{ traditionally employed in loanwords by } liwn \text{ points to the former's developing into a fricative.}\footnote{A. Meillet, Altarmenisches Elementarbuch (Heidelberg 1913), pp. 10-16.}
\]

The witness of MS 65 to early readings is noteworthy. It belongs to what I have classed as group A, which fairly consistently preserves early readings, as in the following instance.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
2:30 \quad Pap \quad o \acute{u} \delta e n \ a u t o u \ \delta i e \varphi \theta a r h \ o u t e \ e r e [\theta r i \zeta ] \ o u t e \\
E \quad \pi \acute{e} \beta i \zeta \ \pi \varepsilon \ v o \mu o \lambda \lambda h k h \ z o \ \iota \omega \rho \nu o \ \varsigma o r o w \\
Z \quad \pi \acute{e} \beta i \zeta \ v o \mu o \lambda \lambda h k h \ v o \mu o \lambda \lambda h k h \ v o \mu o \ o r o w \ \varepsilon \ \zeta \ o r o w \\
A \text{ group} \quad \pi \varepsilon \ \delta i \varepsilon \ \varepsilon o \mu o \lambda \lambda h k h \ v o \mu o \ o r o w \ \zeta o r o w \ \varepsilon \ v o \mu o \lambda \lambda h k h \ v o \mu o \ o r o w \ \varsigma o r o w \\
A \text{ group witnesses: 18-23-64-65-69-81-116-139-190-222}
\end{array}
\]

Here the A group reading \textit{\varphi o} preserves the probable original Greek form \textit{\theta r i \zeta } which is corrupt in the papyrus. The attempt to correct the mutilated text led to the substitution of \textit{\sigma a r e} which obviously underlies the Armenian majority reading \textit{\varphi o \mu r o} \textit{\rho h}. It is plausible that this later Greek version was also the \textit{Vorlage} of Armenian Ephrem, which treats
the verse paraphrastically, employing the general term ὄρθρα Χριστοῦ to incorporate the particulars of the eyelashes. Secondarily, this seems to have influenced the A group formulation. The incommensurability of the two bodily terms led to their disjunction at some point in the tradition by the creation of a separate clause for the second unit through the provision of a separate verb ἐπιθύμεις, a procedure further applied to the third unit ὄρθρα preserved by the A group. It may be that this final portion fell out of the rest of the tradition through homoeoteleuton.

At other points the original text may have been irremediably lost, though the attempt to reconstitute it may be made by conjectural emendation.

2:13 Pap κατέπεμπε πνεῦμα διὰ πυρὸς εἰς Μαρείαν τὴν Γαλατείαν
E ὄσωπῆς γεννημένος ὑπερεπέ ξηροπώρων ᾗ
Ἀρμ ὄσωπῆς ἐκ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπων γεννημένος γεννημένος ὑπερεπέ ἐν ἡμῖν... ὑπερεπέ]* ὑπερεπ

In this example the text of Ephrem offers a close approximation of the Greek text, while the Armenian version, as Klijn demonstrates, has been influenced by a passage in the Acts of Paul concerning the dispatch of the Spirit to the Virgin at the end of time. The same scholar further argues that the prepositional phrase διὰ πυρὸς defining the mode of the Spirit's advent, though unattested elsewhere, should be accepted as original. The sole reminiscence of the reading he notes is the adjective ξηροπώρων in Armenian Ephrem. Significantly, the presence of the form ὑπερεπ as formal equivalent of the above phrase at least raises the possibility that the original reading was the graphically similar variant instrumental of ὑπερεπ.

Vetter was the first to observe the significance of a major cleft in the manuscript tradition. In his estimation, Armenian Ephrem supported the Zohrab base text against the other witnesses collated and assured its greater dependability. That view is no longer tenable, as we have seen. Instead, a more important division is visible between the

---

17 See op. cit. note 6, p. 9.
18 Ibid., p. 8.
A group and the rest. In fact often the text of Ephrem agrees with it over against the other Armenian manuscripts as in example below.

2:19  Pap οὕτως τῇν θεοῦ πρόνοιαν ἁνακόπτουσέν
Z     ὧστε διαπρονέσθη ὡς ὑμας
A group E ὧστε τῇν θεοῦ πρόνοιαν ἁνακόπτουσέν

There they preserve a characteristic structure of two near synonyms in a genitival relationship, which is idiomatic in early Armenian style. The use of the conjunction ὧστε on the part of the other witnesses instead of the relative pronoun (ἢ(ῥ)) is consistent with translation from Syriac, in rendering the indeclinable dolath. At the same time, we recall the issue of genitival word order which reinforced the impression that the epistle was rendered from Greek.20 This is further implied by the sibilant utilized by the A group in the prophet's name in the next example, since the Armenian phoneme ša has no Greek equivalent.

2:32  Pap τὰ τοῦ Ἐλεεσαου ὡστὰ τοῦ προφήτου...
Z     ὧστε ὡστε ἡγιάζῃ ἐρνηώρπῃ...
       ἡγιάζῃ ἡγιάζῃ  A group

The role of Greek as a major Vorlage in the first layer of the Armenian biblical version is also emerging in other books.21 Another facet this translation shares in common with that stratum is the explication rather than replication of figures of speech encountered in the text, as illustrated in verse 2:30.22

Pap ἐκ τοῦ κατωτάτου ἄδου ἐπέκουσεν ὁ θεός
E     ἐκ τοῦ κατωτάτου ἄδου ἐπέκουσεν ὁ θεός
Arm    ἐκ τοῦ κατωτάτου ἄδου ἐπέκουσεν ὁ θεός
       ἐκ τοῦ κατωτάτου ἄδου ἐπέκουσεν ὁ θεός

Whereas Armenian Ephrem represents the Greek literally, the Armenian epistle elucidates the metaphor by a term more in tune with the situation described in the book of Jonah. There are certain

20 See the instances adduced in note 8.
22 For a more detailed treatment of this see S. P. Cowe, op. cit. note 11, pp. 427-428.
indications that this tendency was also at work in the text’s broader transmission, as indicated by the next example.

2:20  Pap τὸ πῦρ ἐστὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ  
      E ζωὴν ἢ μὴ νῦν  
      B damnationem habebit partem cum nequissimis.  
      Arm ἡμετεροφανέν ὑπὸ βασιλέως τῆς βίας ὑπαρξειν ἐγνωρίσατο

Here the rather ill-defined metaphor present in the papyrus and Ephrem has been further clarified in later witnesses. Another Antiochian trait which the Armenian version exhibits, as already observed, is the tendency toward doublets, preserving the widest spectrum of textual representation. The final example well demonstrates this feature regarding the proselytizers of the opposition.

2:38  Pap τεκνήματα ἐξείδνων εἰσεῖν  
      E ἐν δώματε ὄδηγε ἢ ἐπιμηκεῖν  
      Arm ἐν δώματε ὄδηγε ἢ ἐπιμηκεῖν ὄδηγε ἢ ἐπιμηκεῖν

Is 14: 29 ἐβιβάζει δωμάτε ὄδηγε  
Is 30: 6 ἐν ἐγκυμοσύνῃ ὄδηγε ὄδηγε ἢ ὄδηγε

The version’s first component adequately renders the papyrus text while the second clearly derives from that of Ephrem, now paralleled with the first by the insertion of a synonym for offspring.

In conclusion, we note that what the Armenian version of Third Corinthians has lost in being the sole surviving testimony to the letter it has gained in terms of its interrelations with the witnesses subsequently discovered, and especially the Ephremic commentary. Clearly a more critical edition of the latter is an urgent desideratum in attempting to unravel the different levels of intersection between it and the Armenian epistle. Meanwhile, the latter seems to emerge with a profile increasingly reminiscent of Arm 1, a factor which may provide a milieu for its production and early history. Hence its closer examination may reveal more about the methodology and approach of the early translators, much of whose work has been lost or heavily glossed over by later revisers.
THIRD CORINTHIANS: ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF PAUL

Vahan Hovhanessian

"Third Corinthians" is an alleged correspondence of two letters, the first ascribed to the Corinthian community and the second to the apostle Paul. The Corinthians’ letter is addressed to the apostle Paul, seeking his advice and help regarding problems in Corinth caused by the false teachings of the heretics. The apostle’s letter is addressed to the Corinthians as his response to the Corinthians’ inquiries and concerns. The letter of the Corinthians to Paul and the Apostle’s reply to them together with two other short narrative sections make up a body of pseudepigraphic correspondence known as Third Corinthians [hereinafter “3 Cor.”]. Some of the churches in the East, such as the Churches in Armenia and Syria, incorporated 3 Cor. into their Bible, as a canonical or deuterocanonical book, as early as the beginning of the third century and as late as the nineteenth century.¹ This is confirmed by patristic commentaries and canon lists of the Bible from the early centuries of Christianity.² For the past two hundred years, 3 Cor. has been known to scholars mainly through manuscripts of the Bible in Classical Armenian. It was not until the end of the last century that the first non-Armenian manuscript of this document was discovered. Some scholars, as late as the turn of the century, still considered 3 Cor. to be a genuine and authentic correspondence between the Corinthian


² For a survey of the early canon lists and patristic writings attesting to the incorporation of 3 Cor in the Bible, see Vahan Hovhanessian, Third Corinthians: Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy (Ph.D. Dissertation, Fordham University, New York, 1998), pp. 16-25.
community and the apostle Paul. This view, however, is completely rejected by scholars today.

The longest version of 3 Cor., and not necessarily the original one, has four sections. They are: Section I: Introduction, available only in the Coptic Heidelberg Papyrus (PHeid); Section II: The Corinthians’ letter to Paul, available in almost all the manuscripts of 3 Cor.; Section III: A short narrative passage describing the delivery of the Corinthians’ letter to Paul who is in prison; and Section IV: Paul’s response to the questions raised in the Corinthians’ letter to him. Not all manuscripts of 3 Cor. contain all of the four sections mentioned above.

The discovery and publication of the Coptic Heidelberg papyrus of the Acts of Paul (AP) in 1904 by Carl Schmidt, re-introduced 3 Cor. to western scholars. It was re-introduced, however, not as an independently circulating correspondence but as part of the apocryphal AP. It is because of PHeid that most of the scholarly work done after its discovery assumes that 3 Cor. was originally part of AP. The available manuscripts of 3 Cor. and of AP were used to support this assumption. The Acts of Paul, for example, being a late-second century document, was considered an earlier witness to the transmission of 3 Cor., compared to the Syriac and Armenian translations of the Bible—the earliest versions of which were completed between the fourth and fifth centuries. The Heidelberg papyrus of the AP, a sixth century MS, was the earliest manuscript evidence of the text of 3 Cor. before the discovery of the Greek Bodmer papyrus (PBodm X). Moreover, the fact that all four sections of 3 Cor. were found in the ‘earlier’ Coptic witness and that only sections II and IV were available in most of the ‘later’ Latin and Armenian manuscripts, was considered to be further support to the hypothesis that 3 Cor., with its four sections, was part of the apocryphal AP. It was also assumed that the narrative parts were dropped out later as 3 Cor. was extracted from AP and incorporated in the canon of the New Testament.

Theodore Zahn was the first to suggest the incorporation of 3 Cor. into a larger narrative. In volume II of his Geschichte des

---


Neutestamentlichen Kanons he suggested AP to be the original document from which 3 Cor. was extracted later on. In 1894, Vetter offered a detailed examination of 3 Cor. in which he agreed with Zahn's hypothesis incorporating 3 Cor. with AP with some modifications. This hypothesis was further developed by Schmidt in his discussion of the PHeid and his comparison of the various MSS of 3 Cor. available to him. Those who support the above hypothesis explain the origin and transmission of 3 Cor. as follows. The original version of 3 Cor., they argue, was part of AP and contained all four sections of 3 Cor., including the narrative sections. Gradually, as the AP lost popularity, 3 Cor. was extracted from it, copied and circulated separately. After dropping the narrative sections, the Syriac Church incorporated sections II and IV into its canon of the New Testament. The Armenians, influenced by the Syrian Church, copied 3 Cor. into their New Testament canon, as part of the process of translating the Scriptures into the Armenian language. This became the scholarly consensus concerning the origin and transmission of 3 Cor. This hypothesis, however, does not address or justify the existence of Latin manuscripts discovered in different regions of Northern Italy. Furthermore, the discovery of the Greek text of 3 Cor. in PBodm X, which does not include the AP and which is the oldest manuscript of 3 Cor., invalidated Schmidt's argument and introduced a new hypothesis to explain the relationship between 3 Cor. and AP.

The new hypothesis was introduced by Michel Testuz who discovered and published the Greek text of 3 Cor. in Papyrus Bodmer X-XII. Since the discovery of the Greek text of 3 Cor. in this papyrus, very few studies have attempted to examine the relationship between the AP and 3 Cor. Major contributions to this discussion have been made by A. F. J. Klijn in his article "The Apocryphal Correspondence Between Paul and the Corinthians," and by Willy Rordorf in his article, "Hérésie et Orthodoxie selon la Correspondance apocryphe entre les Corinthiens et l'Apôtre Paul." In what follows we present

---

7 P. Vetter, Der Apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief (Vienna: Mechitharist Press, 1894).
10 Vigiliae Christianae 17 (1963) 2-23.
our examination of the relationship between 3 Cor. and AP, incorporating the discussions and examples offered by the scholarly works mentioned above.

I. Manuscript and Patristic Evidence

To begin with, one must emphasize that the great majority of the manuscripts of 3 Cor. are manuscripts of the Bible. All Armenian manuscripts of 3 Cor, for example, are manuscripts of either full texts of the Bible or segments of biblical texts. All Latin manuscripts, except for the Zürich manuscript, are also complete or partial texts of the Bible. The Syriac witness to 3 Cor. is preserved as part of a commentary on the Bible. The PHeid is one of the very few MSS of 3 Cor. which are not MSS of the Bible. The PHeid, on the other hand, is the only manuscript among the MSS of AP which includes 3 Cor. The other known manuscripts of AP, including the Greek Hamburg Papyrus which is an older witness of AP than the PHeid, do not include 3 Cor. in their texts. In fact, the Hamburg Papyrus of AP does not even mention Paul's stay in Philippi.

Several patristic commentaries and canon lists of the Bible in the East treat 3 Cor. as a canonical book and include it in the canon of the Bible. To the best of my knowledge, on the other hand, not a single

12 This is a 31-line long Latin text preserved in a 10th-century MS in Zürich. See D. De Bruyne, "Un quatrième manuscrit latin de la correspondance apocryphe de saint Paul avec les Corinthiens." Revue Bénédictine 45 (1933): 189-95.

13 It is interesting that it was Schmidt himself who edited and published the Hamburg Papyrus, including AP, which does not include 3 Cor. Yet, no comment was made as to why this MS does not include 3 Cor.

14 Concerning the Greek Hamburg papyrus of AP, Montague R. James says, "The Greek text, which does not insert the correspondence with the Corinthians here ... has no account of Paul's sojourn at Philippi. There is no certainty that it was in the Coptic either; for there is no grounds for the suggested supplement 'to Philippi' on p. 288, at the end of section IV, and the passage which begins VII has been wrongly restored by Schmidt; it belongs to the account of the visit to Corinth." The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 574.

15 See note 2 above.
patristic writing discusses 3 Cor. as part of the Acts of Paul, despite the fact that the latter was a very popular document in the early centuries of Christianity in the East.\textsuperscript{16}

\textit{II. The Two Lists}

There are evident disagreements between the introductory passage in the PHeid, i.e. section I, and the remaining text of 3 Cor. First of all, one can find two listings of the various heretical teachings of the false teachers in Corinth. The first list is found in section I, the introductory passage (list I), and the second in section II, the Corinthians' letter to Paul (list II). These two lists are not identical. They disagree with each other not so much concerning the nature as the details of the false teachings. In list I we read that the heretics were saying that "God does not know the world," and that "Jesus Christ was not crucified but was a semblance." These items are not found in list II. Moreover, in list II, we read that the misleading teachers claimed that "we must not appeal to the prophets" and that "the world is not of God but of the angels." Both of these items are discussed and referred to in Paul's answer to the Corinthians. Neither of them, however, is mentioned in list I. In addition to the indisputable disagreements between the two listings discussed above, it is important to mention also the fact that the items preserved in both listings are not identical either. List I seems to include additions and further details which reflect later insertions or editions. Concerning the birth of Jesus, we read in list II that the heretics were teaching "that the Lord is not come in the flesh, nor was he born of Mary."\textsuperscript{17} List I, on the other hand, develops this point and

\textsuperscript{16}Tertullian, the third-century father of the Church, in his \textit{de Baptismo} 17, knew AP and rejected it and considered it an inauthentic document. He mentions that the author of the document was punished and defrocked because of his work. It is difficult, therefore, following Schmidt's hypothesis, to assume that Church fathers, contemporary with Tertullian and after him, such as Ephraem and Aphraat, would include a section of this document in their Bibles and treat it as an authentic and genuine letter of the apostle. AP was also rejected by Jerome, who quotes Tertullian, and by the Decretum Gelasianum, the Stichometry of Nicephorus and several other early writings. Origen, on the other hand, valued AP and did not reject it; nor did Hippolytus. See Schneemelcher, II, p. 216

Ibid., p. 254.
offers further christological details, stating that "Jesus Christ was not crucified, but was only semblance, and that he was not born of Mary, or of the seed of David." The insertion in list I of the reference to the heretical teaching that Jesus appeared to have been crucified and that he was not born in the flesh of the seed of David, reflecting a stage in the development of gnostic christology, is not found in list II. Section I further elaborates on the main theme of the document, compared to the information given in section II. While the list in section II states only that the heretics were teaching that "there is no resurrection of the flesh," section I elaborates on that, targeting the agnostic and docetic teachings, and modifies the previous statement into "there was no resurrection of the flesh but only of the spirit."\(^{18}\) This dichotomy between spirit and body is also evident in the variation between the two listings concerning the creation of man. Section II states that the heretics were teaching that "the creation of man is not God’s (work)." Section I, on the other hand, adds to the previous statement, stating that "the body of man is not the creation of God." We conclude, therefore, that the two lists clearly differ from each other and that the list in section I includes later additions and insertions not found in the list in section II.

### III. The Expectations Concerning Paul’s Life

The expectations concerning Paul’s life are quite different in the introduction than in section II.\(^{19}\) In the introduction we read that "the Corinthians were in great distress over Paul, because he was going out of the world before it was his time."\(^{20}\) This is a clear reference to Paul’s imprisonment and the expected execution. In section II, however, we read that the Corinthians already knew that Paul was set free. The Corinthians write to Paul in their letter, "We believe, as has been revealed to Theonoe, that the Lord saved you from the hand of the lawless one" (3 Cor. 1:8). They ask him, therefore, to visit Corinth now that he is free. This is once again contradicted by the information given in section III. There we are told that the deacons of the Corinthian church took the letter to Paul, "who was in prison because of Stratonice, the wife of Apollonius." It seems that the author(s) of both sections I and III were not aware of the news revealed by

---

\(^{18}\)Ibid.

\(^{19}\)Klijn, "The Apocryphal Correspondence," p. 12 and Rordorf, Hérésie, p. 28.

\(^{20}\)Schneemelcher, II. p. 254.
Theonoe, recorded in section II, that Paul has been delivered “out of the hand of the lawless.” Both sections I and III are also the only places where we read about the location of Paul’s imprisonment, Philippi. Nowhere in sections II and IV do we read about Philippi as the place of Paul’s imprisonment. In fact, the only other reference to Philippi is in the paragraph following 3 Cor. preserved in AP. There we read that “Paul came from Philippi to Corinth.”21 If we separate the two letters from the narrative sections and remove them from their immediate context in AP, nothing in them points to Philippi as the place of Paul’s imprisonment. One can argue, therefore, that the original author of the two letters did not include in them a reference to Paul’s imprisonment in Philippi. A later editor or compiler could have added the narrative sections with the references to Philippi to make the letters fit the context of AP in which they were inserted later.

*IV. The Paragraph Following 3 Cor. in AP*

In the PHeid, 3 Cor. is followed by a passage in AP describing Paul’s visit to Corinth. This passage comes as an unexpected surprise, since in Paul’s letter to the Corinthians nothing is mentioned concerning a possible trip to Corinth. In fact, 3 Cor. 2:34 implies exactly the opposite, that the Apostle had no intention of communicating with the Corinthians any further. This would have been the perfect place in the letter to inform the Corinthians about his upcoming visit to Corinth.22 Nothing, on the other hand, is mentioned in the passage following 3 Cor. in AP concerning the Corinthians’ letter, its delivery, the problems in Corinth or the Apostle’s response to it. In Corinth, according to this passage, Paul does not address any of the problems discussed in the two letters. He does not even mention the resurrection of the dead, which is the main theme of his letter to them.

There is an evident inconsistency in the author’s attitude to the Corinthians. The information concerning the faith and belief of the Corinthians expressed in Paul’s letter are categorically irreconcilable with the details preserved in the passages following 3 Cor. in AP. In section II and IV we read about the terrible things that the Corinthians were doing and how they had forgotten all that Paul had preached among them. In his reply to the Corinthians, Paul expresses his disappointment in them that “the teachings of the evil one are so

21 Ibid., p. 257.
quickly gaining ground” in Corinth. He rebukes the Corinthians for their disbelief in the resurrection of the flesh and calls them “of little faith” (3 Cor. 3:31). This attitude, however, is completely reversed in the passage immediately following 3 Cor. in AP. In this passage, the faith and Christian fellowship of the Corinthians becomes a reason for the Apostle to rejoice and praise God. The author of this passage adds, “Paul’s soul was uplifted because of the good will of the brethren.”

We read also that Paul “counted himself blessed that so singleheartedly every day they commended his affairs in prayer to the Lord.” Paul’s attitude towards the Corinthians as described in 3 Cor., therefore, is different from, and contrary to, his attitude described in the passage following 3 Cor. preserved in AP. It is very difficult to explain, therefore, how the same author could have written these two contradicting passages in one and the same document.

During his visit to Corinth, according to the paragraph in AP, Paul stayed at the house of a certain Epiphanius, and not at any of the elders or deacons of the Corinthian community mentioned in 3 Cor. who wrote and delivered the letter to the Apostle and invited him to visit Corinth. The names of the elders and deacons of the Corinthian community found in 3 Cor. are not even mentioned during Paul’s visit to Corinth. In fact, they are not mentioned anywhere else in AP. The only name mentioned in both 3 Cor. and the following passage is that of a certain Cleobius. The Cleobius of 3 Cor., however, is completely the opposite of the Cleobius of the following passage. In 3 Cor., Cleobius is the heretic who was teaching false doctrines against Paul and the gospel. The Corinthians’ letter to Paul tells us that Cleobius and Simon were heretics “who pervert the faith of many through pernicious words.” Actually, it was the teachings of Cleobius and his companions that disturbed the Corinthians and made them write the letter to Paul. The Cleobius mentioned in the passage immediately following 3 Cor., on the other hand, is a devout Christian. He is introduced as a leading figure in the Christian community who “was filled with the Spirit” and encouraged the Corinthians in their faith and perseverance. Cleobius is also the one who praises Paul’s ministry, and asks his fellow Corinthians to pray for the Apostle, saying, “brethren, now must Paul fulfill all his assignment, and go up to the city of

23Schneemelcher, II, p. 255.
24Concerning the resurrection of the dead, the author of 3 Cor. adds, referring to the story of Jonah, “After three days and three nights, God heard his prayer out of the deepest hell.... How much more, O ye of little faith, will he raise you up.”
25Schneemelcher, II, p. 257.
26Ibid., p. 254.
death."27 This further supports our argument that the two documents must have had two different authors and independent origins.

V. Paul’s Status

The Acts of Paul differs from 3 Cor. in its portrayal of Paul’s status and actions. It enhances Paul’s status in numerous ways.28 Paul is put in a position of prominence. Families go out to him with their children so that they may see him “in the flesh” and hear his teachings.29 He is depicted as a man who teaches with authority. When he teaches everybody listens, and sometimes for days.30 Thekla, we are told, “joined many women and virgins going to Paul,” so that she may be “counted worthy herself to stand in Paul’s presence.”31 Paul’s presence in a town or house is cause for rejoicing and thanksgiving to God, while his departure is a reason for mourning and sorrow. When Paul decided to leave the Christian community in Myra, we read that “there was great sorrow among the brethren who were in <Pisidia> and Pamphylia, since they yearned <after> his word and his holy presence; so that some from Perga followed Paul.”32 Paul’s prominence is further highlighted through dialogues between him and distinguished figures of the community such as governors and proconsuls, inserted in the narrative of AP. In these dialogues, Paul fearlessly preaches the gospel of Christ to pagan governors and proconsuls.33 In several passages Paul is depicted parallel to Christ. His teachings include a list of beatitudes similar to the ones taught by Jesus.34 He performs miracles almost identical to the ones performed by Christ.35 Paul’s actions, in general,

27Ibid., p. 256.
29Schneemelcher, II, 239.
30Ibid., pp. 242 & 246.
31Ibid., p. 240.
32Ibid., p. 249.
33Ibid., pp. 242 & 251.
34Ibid., pp. 239-240.
35Ibid., p. 249.
are similar to those of Jesus. The Lord appears to Thekla in the form of Paul.\textsuperscript{36}

None of the above mentioned character enhancements can be found in 3 Cor. In fact, carefully reading the text of 3 Cor. we realize that certain elements in it point exactly in the opposite direction. Paul, unlike in his canonical letters, never identifies himself as an apostle.\textsuperscript{37} He is portrayed as a subordinate figure to the rest of the apostles. In 2:4 we read Paul saying, "For I delivered to you in the beginning what I received from the apostles who were before me."\textsuperscript{38} The formula "for I delivered to you ... what I received from" is found twice in the canonical letters of Paul. The first one is in I Cor. 11:23, "For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you," the second is in I Cor. 15:3, "For I delivered to you first of all that which I received." The first reference, I Cor. 11:23, clearly states that the source of the teaching that Paul is delivering to his audience is the Lord himself. The second reference does not mention Christ as the source of the teaching received and delivered by Paul, yet it ends with a reference to the Lord’s appearance to, and calling of Paul as an apostle. This is to confirm Paul’s having received his teaching authority from the Lord himself. It is interesting to note therefore that 3 Cor. 2:4 distinctly indicates that the source of Paul’s teachings is not the Lord but the apostles. Having borrowed the phrase mentioned above from the canonical letters of Paul, the author of 3 Cor. modified it to make the apostles the source of Paul’s teachings and apostolic authority. This clearly subjects Paul’s authority to that of the apostles. In fact, as if this were not enough, the author of 3 Cor. makes Paul himself identify the apostles as those, "who were before me," thus giving them seniority over himself. This is further stressed by the fact that the Corinthians in 3 Cor. never refer to Paul as "apostle". In v.1 we read that the letter was addressed to "Paul" without any titles. In v. 16 Paul is addressed simply as "brother". There is no doubt, therefore, that 3 Cor. disagrees with AP in the prominent enhancements added to the status of Paul.

\textit{VI. Theological Differences}

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 242.
\textsuperscript{37}Cf. Rom 1:1, I Cor 1:1, 2 Cor 1:1, Gal 1:1, Eph 1:1, Col 1:1, 1 Tim 1:1, 2 Tim 1:1, Ti 1:1.
\textsuperscript{38}Schneemelcher, II, p. 255.
The Acts of Paul and 3 Cor. have theological differences as well. Theological differences are strong in AP, as the importance of celibacy and asceticism is emphasized. Sexual abstinence is dominant in every pericope. In the Acts of Thekla, section 5, for example, we find a list of Beatitudes taught by Paul which emphasize the importance of celibacy and chastity. In this list we read, “Blessed are they who have kept the flesh pure, for they shall become a temple of God. Blessed are the continent, ... Blessed are they who renounced this world, ... Blessed are they who have wifed as if they had them not, for they shall be heirs to God ... Blessed are the bodies of the virgins.” Two men in AP say concerning Paul, “he deprives young men of wives and maids of husbands, saying: ‘otherwise there is no resurrection for you except ye remain chaste and do not defile the flesh’. Paul is taken to the court and accused of not allowing “maidens to marry.” None of the above accusations or allegations are denied by Paul. In fact, in response to the proconsul's request to clarify his position concerning the above mentioned accusations, Paul answers with the conclusion, “If, then, I teach the things revealed to me by God, what wrong do I do, Proconsul?” This confirms AP's emphasis on the importance of celibacy and sexual abstinence. Neither celibacy nor asceticism is discussed or even mentioned in 3 Cor.

Another major theological theme in AP is the role of women in the Church. This theme is presented and developed through the character of Thekla, who is portrayed as the heroine of the Acts, a co-worker with Paul, and a preacher. She miraculously escapes the fires of her executioners. Fierce animals pass her by without hurting her. She baptizes herself and enlightens “many with the word of God”. She is even portrayed as having power to bring people back to life! Having said that, one must emphasize that the role of women in the Corinthian Church is not discussed in 3 Cor. In fact, except for Mary the mother of Jesus, no woman is named or even mentioned anywhere in 3 Cor. While the resurrection of the flesh based on faith in Christ, is one of the main themes of the apostle's teachings in 3 Cor., nothing is said about that in AP. In fact, not even the resurrection of Christ is discussed in
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40 Schneemelcher, II, pp. 239-240.
41 Ibid., p. 241.
42 Ibid., p. 242.
43 Ibid., p. 243
44 Ibid., p. 244.
46 Ibid., p. 244.
AP. Needless to say, none of the other themes discussed in 3 Cor. is even mentioned in AP.

VII. Style

The two documents also disagree with each other in their style. 3 Cor. is a theological refutation in a letter format. The main section of 3 Cor., as mentioned earlier, is a letter attributed to the apostle Paul. This is written as a response to another letter attributed to the elders of the Corinthian community. The letter of the Corinthians provides the introduction, context and forum for Paul’s response. The purpose of 3 Cor. is to disprove the heretical teachings listed in the Corinthians’ letter and to confirm the apostolic faith. AP, on the other hand, is a religious tract. It belongs to the genre of popular devotional writings. It is a collection of speeches, dialogues, miracle stories and anecdotes attributed to the apostle Paul and Thekla. It belongs to a collection of early Christian documents written for the purpose of edifying and entertaining the persecuted Christian community.47

Based on our discussion of the theological, textual and stylistic differences between AP and 3 Cor., in addition to the witness of the available manuscripts, one can safely conclude that 3 Cor. could not have been originally part of the Acts of Paul. It must have had an origin independent of AP. Schmidt’s hypothesis concerning the origin and transmission of 3 Cor., based on the assumption that it was originally part of AP, therefore, must be rejected. Consequently, a re-examination of the various MSS of 3 Cor. and their relationship with each other is essential at this stage of our study of the origin and transmission of the pseudepigraphic correspondence.48

48For a detailed examination of the relationship between the various MSS of 3 Cor. and the quest for the original version of the redacted document, see Vahan Hovhanessian, *Third Corinthians*, pp. 80-109.
SEBĖOS AND THE BIBLE

R.W. Thomson

The influence of the bible on Armenian writers of the classical and medieval periods was all-pervasive. For the sake of clarity we may try to distinguish different ways in which biblical imagery had an impact on Armenian authors, but the boundaries are porous.

First of all, the bible was used as a work of history. In a secular sense it was a history of the origins of mankind and of the fortunes of Israel; in a spiritual sense, the record of God’s salvific work culminating in the Incarnation, with the promise of the Future Coming and Judgment. But in addition, because it formed the basis of Christian Armenian learning, the impact of the bible extended also into what we might call the literary sphere—that is, its language conditioned the general mode of expression and the imagery of Armenian writers. So on the one hand, a historian might quote the bible to state a historical fact or to justify a theological statement; on the other hand, he might use biblical imagery in describing events which had no clear connection with the bible.

The author I have chosen to investigate today is Sebēos. This¹ is not the time or place to tackle the vexed question of the real authorship of the text published under the name of Sebēos. Here I shall simply use the name “Sebēos” as convenient shorthand for the author of a historical text which describes events from the late fifth to the mid-seventh centuries. This text is a unique witness to the place of Armenia in the dramatic period of Byzantine-Sasanian conflict and the early Islamic conquests. I would like, then, to draw attention to some ways in which the bible is used by Sebēos. He was, of course, quite typical of Armenian authors in his extensive knowledge of scripture and his ability to quote it in all contexts.

We can perhaps distinguish: 1. the bible as an unacknowledged source of imagery; 2. the bible as an explicit source of historical explanation, which in the case of Sebēos involves in particular the interpretation of prophetic utterances.

There is a third category, the use of the bible as a source of theological justification, by which I mean the use of proof-texts in debate. But theological arguments based on scripture appear only in the long defence of Armenian orthodoxy, which Sebēos claims was composed by the bishops under the guidance of the Catholicos Nersès
as a response to Constans II. However these quotations are limited to relatively few verses from the New Testament, which do not give a sufficient basis for extended comparison, so I shall concentrate today first on implicit biblical imagery, and then on explicit use of the bible.

I. Implicit Imagery

Sebēos uses biblical imagery for the mundane as well as the dramatic. Let us start with the former. It seems of no profound significance that when describing a victory he states: “The Lord strengthened his mercy for Heraclius on that day, so that they massacred them to a man.” Or that, when describing the treaty between Tēodoros Rštuni and Muawiyja, he should preface the text with his own comment: “Tēodoros, with all the Armenian nobles, made a pact with death and contracted an alliance with hell, abandoning the divine covenant.” Such language, whether a direct quotation or merely an allusion to scripture, came naturally to Armenian writers. They could put biblical allusions even into the mouths of non-Christians. It may be doubted, for example, whether shah Xosrov would have quoted the psalter in his letter to Heraclius bidding him to submit: “For if you descend into the depths of the sea, I shall stretch out my hand and seize you.”

In this usage of biblical imagery Sebēos is following a long Armenian tradition. For comparison I shall merely note some unacknowledged expressions in Elišē. When the Persian magi were about to set out for Armenia, they “rose up each from his gloomy lair,” which is a phrase taken from Judges 9.35 of the wicked Abimelech. More elaborate is Elišē’s comparison of the shah Yazkert’s anger with the ferociousness of bears in their dying pangs. This is based partly on Isaiah, 59.11, for the roaring of bears; but the comparison of bears with the last gasps of wicked rulers brings in imagery from Proverbs, 28.15.

---

2 Sebēos, pp. 148-161.
3 Sebēos, p. 126, quoting from Ps. 102.11.
4 Sebēos, p. 164, quoting from Isaiah 28.15b and 18a. It may not be coincidental that the other sections of these two verses (15a and 18b) are combined in a description of the Muslim attacks described on p. 72 of this History; see further below, n. 20.
5 Sebēos, p. 123, quoting from Ps. 138.8.
6 Elišē, p. 51.
7 Elišē, p. 8.
Returning to Sebēos, we may note that there are significantly fewer biblical allusions in the earlier part of his History than in the second part dealing with events closer to his own time. His narrative concerning shah Xosrov and the Armenians of that era, Mušēl Mamikonean or Smbat Bagratuni, is reminiscent of the "gestes" of the Mamikoneans as portrayed in the *Buzandaran*. One may suspect that when quoting or referring to tales known from oral tradition Sebēos was less inclined to elaborate them with biblical quotations; when describing events closer to his own days his recourse to biblical imagery became more frequent.

Nonetheless, when describing the Armenian troops who were to join the Byzantine army in a campaign against the Iranian usurper Vahram, Sebēos cannot resist an extended simile from I Chronicles, 12.8, which describes the troops from Gad who came to assist David: "Their faces were the faces of lions; the swiftness of their feet like the swiftness of gazelles in rapidity over the plains." And in the ensuing battle, when Vahram was defeated, there are numerous biblical reminiscences, especially from the Books of Maccabees. The books of Maccabees were particularly popular in Armenia, and historians often borrowed military imagery from that source for their own Armenian purposes. This is quite noticeable in the *Buzandaran*. And, as is well known, Elišē adapted the theme of the defence of ancestral traditions, *hayreni awrenk*, to the Armenian situation. Sebēos is following a well worn tradition.

However, on occasion he embellishes his narrative with biblical quotations where the reader might unwittingly take the passage quite straightforwardly. Thus, when describing the Muslim attack on Constantinople for which Muawiya had prepared a vast armada, Sebēos lists the various siege engines which had been stowed on board the ships. But the description of these armaments has been lifted directly from the account of the siege of Jerusalem as described in I Maccabees, 6.51. So it would be misleading to deduce from Sebēos's account of the events of 653/4 that the Muslims were provided with machines to throw Greek fire.

Among the more dramatic episodes in this History are the insulting letters which were sent to the emperor in Constantinople. The first is that supposedly sent by the Sasanian shah Xosrov in 623/4 to the

---

8 See the Introduction to Garsoian, 1989, esp. pp. 32-35.
9 Sebēos, p. 77.
10 Thomson, 1975.
11 See the Introduction to Thomson, 1982.
12 Sebēos, p. 171.
emperor Heraclius. Xosrov taunts Heraclius with his defeats at the hands of the Persians, including the loss of Jerusalem. He bids the emperor admit defeat and promises to treat him well if he submits. He tells him that his God and Christ are powerless before him, adding: "Arise, take your wife and come here. I shall give you estates, vineyards, and olive-trees, whereby you may make a living." These words recall Isaiah, 36.16-17. When Sennacherib was intending to attack Jerusalem, his envoy warned the Jews: "Trust not in the Lord, saying he will surely deliver us," and he continues in the words just quoted. King Hezekiah received the message of the king of Assyria, went into the house of the Lord, and spread it before the Lord, telling him of these insults. According to Sebēos Heraclius acted likewise. Receiving the shah's message he had it read to the patriarch. Entering the house of God—i.e. Saint Sophia—they spread the letter before the altar, so that God might see the insults which his enemies had inflicted upon him.

The same imagery is used by Sebēos on a later occasion, in the 650s, when the caliph sent a letter to the emperor Constans II bidding him abandon his vain cult and accept the great God of Abraham. Again, the emperor took the letter into the house of God, lamented these insults inflicted on the Lord, and put on sackcloth like Hezekiah. These biblical images and parallels are not made explicit. The narrative stands on its own, but its rhetorical impact is strengthened by the allusions to familiar texts.

On occasion such a detailed biblical comparison by an Armenian author does in fact have non-biblical overtones. Thus in Agaᵗ’angelos we read that as punishment for the martyrdom of Rhipsimē and her companions King Trdat was turned into the form of a wild pig, vayreni xoz, or boar, varaz, like Nebuchadnezzar. This is based on Daniel, ch.4, where the prophet explains the king's dream and says that he will be cast out to dwell with the beasts of the field, and gazans anapati. But the change from "beast" to "boar" has nothing to do with the bible. It is an assimilation of the biblical theme to the role in Iranian tradition of the wild boar as a symbol of royal and divine power.

Returning to Sebēos, we may note that frequently he quotes scripture in a deliberate fashion, mentioning his source by name.

---

13 Sebēos, p. 123.
14 Sebēos, p. 124.
15 Sebēos, p. 170.
16 Agaᵗ’angelos, paragraphs 212, 727.
17 This subject is discussed in detail in Garsoïan, 1982.
II. Explicit Use of the Bible

Sebêos does not spell out any moral or political purpose which his history might serve. In this he is unusual, for Armenian historians normally state, at least in general terms, the purposes of historical writing. These range from the straightforward recording of events to the promotion of moral imperatives—as, for example, in Elîšê. Nonetheless, Sebêos clearly thought that events occur in accordance with God’s plan, and that that plan had been obscurely adumbrated in prophetic utterances. In general terms, like many Armenians and writers of other Christian nations, Sebêos blames foreign invasions on the sins of his fellow-countrymen—a frequent enough theme in the Old Testament.

I have already mentioned the wording from Isaiah—“the pact with death and alliance with hell”—with which Sebêos describes the agreement made by Têodoros Rûtuni with the Muslims. Parts of the same verses are used earlier, in his introductory comments to the history of shah Xosrov. Sebêos states: “I shall now recount in narrative fashion the tale of destructive events which befell the world ... I shall describe those of the south, aroused with great passion ... Like the whirlwind they arose and burst out to destroy everything within.” Sebêos is again referring to the Muslims. In the full text of those verses Isaiah had made it clear that his people had brought the scourge upon themselves: “For we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves.”

This point of view is made much more explicitly in the Buzandaran, III 14, where Daniel rebukes King Tiran. For his presumption he was strangled to death. But in his argument he specifically likens the evil ways of the king and his associates to the incorrigible Jews. In return for those sins ancient Israel was torn asunder.

For Sebêos the most pressing problem of his own time with which he had to come to terms was the success of the expansion of Islam. This success he interprets in terms of various Old Testament prophecies. That the Arabs were descended from Ishmael, son of Abraham by Hagar, had been accepted by Christian writers long before the time of Muhammad. The elaborate discussion concerning the Arabs in Sozomen’s fifth century Ecclesiastical History was not available in

---

18 For a general survey see Thomson, 1996.
19 Sebêos, p. 162, describing the Muslim invasion.
20 Sebêos, p. 72. The underlined words are from Isaiah 28.15a and 18b. See above, at n. 4, for the other parts of these same verses.
21 See Genesis, ch. 16.
Armenian. But Eusebius, in his fourth century Chronicle had already identified the Ishmaelites, Hagarenes, and Saracens. The date of the translation of this Chronicle into Armenian is unclear—perhaps the early sixth century. Although Armenian historians before Sebëos had had no occasion to refer to these matters, the relationship of the Arabs to the Jews—as sons of Abraham from different mothers—was a biblical theme known to all Christian writers. As the first Armenian to describe the Arab attacks into Armenia, Sebëos took biblical parallels further. He drew on scriptural prophecies of broad application which had not been applied to the Arabs before their newly found vigour as Muslims.

The Arabs were of the stock of Abraham from Ishmael, son of Hagar. In Genesis it had indeed been stated that “Ishmael’s hands would be on all.” Jeremiah too had spoken of a scourge sent by God as a “destroying wind, xoršak.” This Sebëos interprets as the Arab invasion, referring to the tempest coming from the south. Vague predictions of doom in Deuteronomy he also interprets in light of the Arab attacks. More effective is his adaptation of a long simile from Wisdom: “Just as arrows fly from the breast of a powerful man, from a wide-arched bow to the target, so too did these speed from the desert over the whole earth, exterminating through famine and sword and great fear.” But by far the most important prophetic description of this new danger was the vision in chapter 7 of the prophet Daniel.

Daniel’s vision of the four beasts is expounded by Sebëos in great detail on the occasion of the Muslim defeat of the Sasanians in 641. The four beasts were associated in Daniel with four successive kingdoms, but those kingdoms had not been explicitly identified by the prophet. For Sebëos the first kingdom, that of the eagle, was the kingdom of the Greeks; the second, the bear, was the kingdom of the Sasanian Persians, the Medes and the Parthians; the third, the leopard, was the kingdom of the north, Gog and Magog; the fourth kingdom is that of the Muslims, “which shall consume the whole earth.” Sebëos is the first Armenian author to describe the rise of Islam and the early Arab conquests. He clearly views this new power as a greater threat to Armenia than Iran, in whose orbit the majority of his fellow-countrymen had lived up to that time.

---

22 See the introduction to Karst, 1911
24 Sebëos, p. 72, and in greater detail, p. 162, based on Jer. 51.1.
25 Sebëos, p. 176, based on Deut. 32.22.
26 Sebëos, p. 176, based on Wis. 5.22, with less precise parallels in Jeremiah.
27 Sebëos, p. 141-2.
Sebēos returns to Daniel at the end of his History, and quotes several other Old Testament prophetic warnings of disasters to come. This is a new departure for Armenian historians. The History of Agat'angelos ends with a vague description of St. Gregory's later years. The Buzandaran ends with the political decline of Armenia after the division of the country into Roman and Iranian spheres, but no biblical parallels are seen. Eliše's description of the rebellion of 450/451 ends with praise of the virtue of the women in Armenia, deprived of their menfolk who had been killed in action or were still imprisoned in Iran. Only Łazar comes to a triumphant climax with a biblical theme, drawing a parallel between Vahan Mamikonean's appointment as marzpan and David enthroning Solomon as his successor.

The pessimistic tone of Sebēos, however, becomes common in later times. John Catholicos ends on the sad theme of oppression due to the Armenians' sins. Calamity and repentence are frequently echoed thereafter, most dramatically by Aristakēs Lastivertči. In contrast, an optimistic genre of Armenian prophecy was to develop, foreseeing the eventual liberation of Armenia: this was to occur with the restoration of the Arsacid monarchy and of the line of patriarchs descended from St. Gregory. Sebēos, however, has no such consoling message.

28 Sebēos, pp. 176-7.
29 Łazar ʿArpeči, pp. 179-182.
30 See the texts collected in Sanjian, 1970.
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BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION IN THE EPIC
POETRY OF GRIGOR MAGISTROS

Abraham Terian

Introductions to both Grigor Magistros (ca. 990-1059) and the epic under consideration appear elsewhere,¹ and there is no need to repeat them here. Magistros is one of the most prominent representatives of the princely Pahlawuni dynasty, noted not only for its military feats during the reign of the Bagratids but also for its benevolent activities throughout the land of Armenia: for sponsoring a vast network of diverse constructions and for promoting piety and learning. The dynastic tradition is carried on by Magistros and his descendants, several of whom became heads of the Armenian Church and others who pursued their military prowess even in the service of Fatimid Egypt. As for the epic, henceforth referred to as Magnalia Dei after its opening words (Mec en gorck' Astuacyayn), it is the first literary epic in Classical Armenian literature.² It is a retelling of the biblical narrative in verse, culminating with a recount of the spread of Christianity and the Christianization of Armenia, and concluding with a personal confession of faith and prayer. All this is covered in just over a thousand two-part lines sufficiently balanced in syllabic count (predominantly 7 + 8 syllables) and rhyme (“—in” throughout).³


²The designation “literary epic” is to distinguish it from the better known “oral epic” in Armenian literature: that of David of Sasun.

³For more on the literary composition of the epic, see Manuk
According to the author's own "Preface," the work is aimed at convincing a Moslem theologian named Manuchir that the Koran, notwithstanding its sublimity, is imitable and therefore of human origin, contrary to Islamic claims about its inimitability and inspirational superiority to the Christian Bible.  

Although the epic is topically varied, as it touches upon the various parts of the Bible and beyond, it is tediously wearisome. It is not until after the summation of the biblical stories that we have a little of the human pathos, seen in the author's coverage of early Christianity and in his personal confession of faith (848-1016). The Koranic imitation is by no means complete; it is apparent in the poet's effort and rhyme, but does not extend to the general form or even tone and manner of that sacred book. The two-part lines are constructed on the Semitic principle of parallelism, in which thought answers to thought in clauses of repetitive or antithetical balance, such as in the Hebrew Psalms. But unlike biblical poetry and more like Syriac hymnody, the lines are further regulated by strict equivalence of syllabic measure. To the fixed number of syllables has been added rhyme, a feature introduced into Christian poetry after the appearance of the Koran and as a result of polemical encounters with Islam on the degrees of sublimity and inspiration of sacred writings. Consequently, in its form the epic approximates Umayyad and Abbasid poetry, which in the author's time had an indubitable influence on Persian and neighboring poetry—including Armenian.


The very theme and contents of the epic, however, compel us to examine all the instances where interpretation is involved in the author’s retelling of the biblical narrative and, consequently, to consider the place of the document in the history of interpretation within the Armenian biblical tradition.

**The Interpretive Tradition Available to Magistros**

As a man “most learned in divine books,” Magistros must have read and owned Philonic and patristic biblical commentaries whether in Greek or in Armenian translation, including those of the Cappadocian Fathers—as well as certain of the early Syriac Fathers. Of special note are Ephrem’s commentaries on Genesis and on the Diatessaron and, for the purposes of our document, his hymnic poetry—especially the hymns on the Nativity and those on the Feast of Theophany. As for those of the Cappadocians, in addition to their respective works on “The Six Days of Creation” (the Hexaemera), those on Baptism and the Holy Spirit are significant, as were also the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem even though these latter works do not fall strictly within the genre of commentaries. A good testimony to this rich heritage of biblical interpretation is provided by those commentaries which now survive only in Armenian translation: several of Philo’s works, Ephrem’s commentaries On the Acts of the Apostles and On the Epistles of Paul, Chrysostom’s Commentary on Isaiah, and Hesychius’ Commentary on Job. Such translations continued to appear even in the time of Magistros, as indicated by those commissioned by his son, the Catholicos Grigor II V'kayasër (in office 1065-1105), who authorized the translation of two of Chrysostom’s commentaries: On the Acts of the Apostles and On the Gospel of John. However, to further appreciate the interpretive tradition in which Magistros stands, it would be helpful to survey briefly the biblical commentaries of Armenian authorship up to his time.

The earliest known Armenian biblical interpretations are those questionably attributed to the famous historian Elišē: Commentaries on Joshua and Judges, a lost Commentary on Genesis utilized by Vardan

---

5Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, Patmut'iwn Aristakisi Lastivertc'woy (History by A. L.), ed. K. N. Yuzbaşyan (Erevan: Arm. Acad. of Sciences, 1963), p. 62. Because of his apparent Byzantine education, involvement in translating Platonic works, and educating pupils even in the sciences, Magistros must have owned numerous manuscripts on various disciplines.
Vardapet Arevelc'i (ca. 1200-1271) in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, and the *Questions and Answers on Genesis* now attributed to Vahram Vardapet Rabun (13th cent.) who wrote it for King Het'um I of Armenian Cilicia (1226-1269). The earliest of the Armenian biblical commentaries with unquestionable authorship are those by the eighth-century prolific author and translator Step'anos Siwnee'î (ca. 680-735): his commentaries on Job, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Four Gospels are well known, as are also his numerous translations including works by Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Nemesius, Cyril of Alexandria, George of Pisidia, and Pseudo-Dionysius. From the ninth century we have the *Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* by Hamam Arevelc'i (ca. 825-ca. 890) and his partial *Commentary on Job* (ch. 38), in which he depends heavily on the translation of Hesychius' *Commentary on Job*. From the tenth century, the famous *Commentary on the Song of Songs* by Grigor Narekac'i (ca. 945-1003) is well known. Less known, however, is his *Commentary on Job*. We also possess three commentaries by an exact contemporary of Magistros, namely, those of Anania Sanahneke'î (ca. 1000-ca. 1070): *Commentary on the Fourteen Epistles of St. Paul*, which is gleaned from the translation of the commentaries on these epistles by Chrysostom and Ephrem; *Commentary on Jonah*; and *Commentary on Matthew*.

Generally speaking, Armenian biblical commentaries are of derivative nature; their growth owes to earlier commentaries translated from Greek and Syriac in the fifth century. An appreciable degree of originality exists, however, in those of Step'anos Siwnee'î and Grigor Narekac'i.

*Some Observations on Narration*

More than anything else in the epic, Magistros seems to be concerned about summation and rhyme to the point of hardly ever deviating from simply retelling the biblical narrative in verse. Interpretation and imagination are so rare in this pedantic document that the few instances where they occur are conspicuous indeed. These instances shall be pointed out and, wherever possible, a brief history of the interpretive tradition that precedes them shall be given. But first, a few remarks on matters related to interpretation.

---

6 See Levon Xačikyan, “Grigor Part’evin veragrvac ‘Harc’uma’ orpes Hay matenagrut’yan eraxayrik’” (The *Quaestiones* Attributed to Grigor Partew as the First-fruits of Armenian Literature), *Banber Matenadarani* 7 (1964) 311.
The two etymological meanings given in the epic, both of them in the part on the Patriarchs, are found in the Bible: Peniel, meaning "Seeing God face to face" (160), is the name Jacob gave to the site at the Jabbok river where he wrestled with the angel of the Lord (Gen. 32:30); the other, Gershom, meaning, "Pilgrim in a foreign land" (209), is the name Moses gave to his firstborn son (Ex. 2:22). Moreover, there are two chronological references framing the section on the Patriarchs: one referring to the call of Abraham (Gen. 12:1), that it was 3,184 years prior to the time of writing this epic (114), and the other referring to the period of the Hebrews' sojourn in Egypt as 500 years (193). According to the author's "Preface," it was the year 494 of the Armenian era (AD 1045) when he wrote this work; thus, the call of Abraham falls in 2140 BC, a date removed by exactly two centuries from that in Eusebius' Chronicle (1940 BC). As for the 500-year period for the Hebrews in Egypt, it is close to that established within the chronology of the Bible itself (Ex. 12:40, giving 430 years; cf. Gal. 3:17-18). Magistros, however, seems to have rounded off the number in 1 Kg. 6:1, the 480 years from the Exodus to the building of Solomon's Temple, confusing it for the preceding period (unless he took the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt from Abraham's arrival there before that of Jacob with his sons). In either case, Magistros seems to be relying simply on his recollection of numbers and dates.

The number of Jacob's wives, four, is said to have a mystical significance (146), as also the number of the disciples, twelve (446). Magistros, however, does not specify the significance of these numbers. Nonetheless, such numerological speculations are widespread in early Christian tradition, owing to the influence of Philo's allegorization. The mystical significance of four is usually associated

---

7Eusebius began his Chronicle with the birth of Abraham, designating it the first year in his universal Canons, and went on to mark the successive years of Abraham by decades. The birth of Christ he dated to the year 2015 on the Abrahamic scale (the Patriarch was 75 years old when he responded to God's call; Gen. 12:4). See Alden A. Mossenhammer, The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition (Lewisburg, Penn.: Bucknell University Press, 1979), p. 78. Magistros must have been well acquainted with the Armenian version of the Chronicle.

8Philo's earliest work, De numeris, now lost, was on number mysticism. A page-long fragment of this work survives in Armenian only; see A. Terian, "A Philonic Fragment on the Decad," in Frederick E. Greenspahn et al., eds., Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel, Scholars Press Homage Series 9 (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1984), pp. 173-182. See also Robert
with either the four elements of the cosmos: air, water, earth, and fire, or, in Christian tradition, with the four Evangelists; and that of the number twelve, either with the twelve signs of the zodiac or, in the Judeo-Christian tradition, with the tribes of Israel.

There are several instances of confusion in Magistros’ retelling of the biblical stories. The skin garments Adam and Eve wore after their fall were made, according to the Bible, by God and not by the fallen forebears (92). Again, in Genesis, Joseph was sold by the Ishmaelites to Potiphar and not to Pharaoh, as Magistros asserts (176). A serious error is found in the ascription of the geographical location of Ezekiel to Daniel, and the latter’s prophetic role to Ezekiel (348-350): Daniel is said to have been at the river Chebar (cf. Ezek. 1:1 and passim; Daniel was at the river Hiddekel when he had one of his visions, Dan. 10:4) and Ezekiel is said to have made time predictions (cf. Dan. 7-12). An early scribal error resulting from homoioteleuton in the prophets’ names could not be ruled out. The naming of the Baptist, John, at the time of his birth, is said to have been by the family (372) and not by his father Zacharias (cf. Lk. 1:60-63). This could have been suggested by the text, where Elizabeth first blurs the name once given by the angel (vs. 13), before the father writes it down on a writing tablet. Equally noteworthy is his attribution to the heavenly voice the reference to Jesus as “Lamb of God” (441), a saying attributed to the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 1:29, 36). 9 A similar discrepancy is found in lines 680-685: Pilate handing Jesus over to Annas (cf. Jn. 18:24, where Annas sends Jesus bound to Caiaphas; and Lk. 23:7, where Jesus is sent by Pilate to Herod the Tetrarch, acknowledged in line 686), and Jesus telling Pilate words that in the Gospel narrative belong elsewhere: that He will die for the sake of Adam and woe to the man who betrayed Him (cf. Mt. 26:24 and parallels, set in the Upper Room; and 1 Cor. 15:45 on the first and second Adam).

In his endeavor to condense, Magistros often conflates related biblical stories; for example: the angelic visit to Abraham at Mamre (Gen. 18) with that to Lot and the burning of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19)— though the destruction of these two cities was disclosed to


9The attribution of the saying “Lamb of God” to the “heavenly voice” could be from common patristic attributions of it to the Voice, i.e., one of the names used for the Baptist when applying to him the prophecy of Is. 40:3 (see Mt. 3:3 and parallels; cf. Ephrem, Hymns on the Nativity, 4; Hymns for the Feast of the Epiphany, 14.3, 43-44; Gregory Nazianzus, Oration 39: On the Holy Lights, 15; Oration 45: Second Oration on Easter, 26.
Abraham during the visit at Mamre (121-127). Another example: Moses was summoned to the Sinai by God’s voice that called him from there (211). We are apt to observe a conflation here from the various theophanies recorded in Exodus, beginning possibly with the first encounter at Horeb (Ex. 3:4) and including the two later summonses to ascend Mount Sinai: the first to receive the Decalogue (19:1-3) and the second for the later theophany there (ch. 24). Other conflations, from the Gospel stories, may be cited. Joseph is told by the angel of the Lord to go to Bethlehem (378), whereas the Lucan narrative, where alone the story is told, attributes the necessity of the trip to an imperial decree (Lk. 2:1). There is an obvious Matthean conflation here, from the angel’s telling Joseph to flee to Egypt at the time when Herod was determined to kill the Child (Mt. 2:13). In Jesus’ instructions to the disciples (450-463), His breathing on them (Jn. 20:22) is linked with His empowering them at the time they were commissioned to go and baptize in the name of the Trinity (Mt. 28:19), a conflation further compounded with the commissioning of the disciples to heal the sick, to cast demons, and how to conduct themselves on their preaching mission (Mt. 10 and parallels). When recounting the plot by Judas to betray Jesus (Mt. 26:14-16 and parallels), he cites a loose paraphrase of Zech. 11:4-14, the people’s rejection of the Messianic Shepherd-King, conflated with Psalm 62:4 (61:5 LXX), on the duplicity of God’s people (602-603). In his description of the resurrection Magistros speaks about the angel who rolled away the stone covering the tomb and then sat on it (Mt. 28:2), singing with the sound of the trumpet (773). Here, doubtless, a conflation of thought has crept in from I Thes. 4:16, if not also from the infancy narrative of Luke (2:8-14): angels singing at the Messiah’s birth (384). This theme of singing he carries over (778-780) into the description of the women as they report the good news of the resurrection to the disciples (Mt. 28:8-10 and parallels).10

In his concern for brevity Magistros often omits important events only to return to them anachronistically, as afterthoughts. Such an anachronism is found at line 164, immediately following the lines where he tells of Jacob’s experience at Peniel (Gen. 32:22-23); then, as though in an afterthought, he touches on Jacob’s earlier experience at Bethel (Gen. 28:10-22). Another anachronism exists in Herod’s inquiring about the place of the Messiah’s birth (Mt. 2:4). The search in the prophets is ordered upon the king’s frustration when the Magi

---

10Magistros may be indebted to Cyril of Jerusalem, who when describing the conduct of the women at the tomb, has Mary Magdalene express her personal love for Jesus with words from the Song of Songs (Cathechetical Lectures, 14.12-14, quoting Song 3:1, 3-4; 8:7, among others).
departed by a different way instead of returning to him (397), rather
than upon their arrival in Jerusalem as in the Gospel narrative. He sums
up the Lucan Sermon on the Plain (Lk. 6:20-49) and refers in passing to
the “nine beatitudes” (instead of eight, Mt. 5:3-12), but after the
commissioning of the disciples (464-468). Similarly, when recounting
the Passion of Christ, he realizes that there is indeed much more that he
could have said and, consequently, he makes up briefly for the
omissions (704-705).

Personal sentiments are expressed at transitions from one major
biblical story to the other. These are often accompanied by apologies
for brevity and omissions in the course of summation.

Instances of Interpretation

Although we do not encounter any distinctive interpretation in the first
hundred lines, it is necessary to make some brief observations on them.
The first fifty lines are mostly on the nature of God and are replete with
attributes or titles of God or the Godhead as found in several of the
Fathers, especially in the polemical discourses of Athanasius and their
later sequel, On the Incarnation of the Word, now attributed to
Apollinaris, his friend and bishop of Laodicea (ca. 361-ca. 390). However, I
would like to suggest that in this first major section of the
epic Magistros is attempting to resonate with the Koran and is
employing a form of addressing God that is equally common in Islamic
piety. These fifty lines yield nearly a hundred names, adjectival
attributes, or descriptions of the Godhead. In fact, this part of the epic
reminds one of al-Ghazali’s ninety-nine beautiful names of God. More
than a result of a passing Islamic influence on our author, however,
these opening lines show that Magistros is rather deliberate in his
composition (at lines 31-36 we discern a possible response to a familiar
Islamic criticism of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity: that God has
no partner). So also in the next fifty lines, where in his poetic
description of Creation, Paradise, and the Fall the author employs

Quod unus sit Christus and Ad Jovianum are among other
“Athenasian” works also attributed to Apollinaris. See Ch.
Kannengiesser, ed., Sur l’Incarnation du Verbe, Sources Chrétiennes
199 (Paris: Cerf, 1973); idem, Athanase d’Alexandrie évêque et
écrivain (Paris: Cerf, 1983); Ekkehard Mühlenberg,
Psalmenkommentare aus Katenenüberlieferung, 3 vols.; Patristische
Texte und Studien 15-16, 19 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975, 1977-
paradisiac imageries common to both religious traditions, imageries which are attested also in the much earlier, lavish descriptions of Eden in the works of Aphrahat and Ephrem among the Syriac Fathers.

The notion that the generations after the Flood forgot the Creator and through their idolatry worshiped the creature instead (105) seems to be based on Romans 1:24-25, a verse often used by the Fathers in their definition of idolatry (see, e.g., Athanasius / Apollinaris, On the Incarnation of the Word, 11). A touch of allegory follows in the remark that that which was destroyed with the tower of Babel was the height of wickedness or injustice (109), a thought repeated in the various Quaestiones et solutiones on Genesis ever since Philo’s allogorization (e.g., in his De confusione linguarum, 107-108, 128-130, 152).

When Abraham was asked to offer his son Isaac (Gen. 22:2), he gave no heed to Sarah’s feelings since he was moved by a higher nature (131-133). This view, common in patristic literature, is derived possibly from Philo’s De Abrahamo, the Armenian translation of which, Kiank’ Imastnoc’, was no doubt known to Magistros. According to Philo in this treatise, Abraham is the wise man who signifies the mind which aspires to divine wisdom and surveys the supra-terrestrial realm (68-88, 119-132, 167-207). As for Isaac in the epic, he is a type, prefiguring the Lamb, and is said to have seen the Christ (138). Besides the widespread typology of the sacrifice of Isaac, the Akedah (e.g., Ephrem, Hymns on the Nativity, 1, 6, 13; Hymns for the Feast of the Epiphany, 2.29), there is a long pseudopigraphical tradition on the Patriarchs’ having seen the Christ (e.g., Book 6 of the Sibylline Oracles, a hymn to Christ, asserts that Adam and Eve “once saw Him when He first appeared,” line 16). Equally interesting is Jn. 8:56: “Your father Abraham rejoiced to think that he would see my day; he saw it and was glad” (cf. Cyril of Jerusalem: Abraham and Moses beheld the Lord [Catechetical Lectures, 10.6-7; 12.6]).

When Moses was placed in a basket on the Nile to save him from the hands of the Egyptians (Ex. 2:3), the Spirit was guarding the predestined prophet, warding off those who were about to destroy him (198-200). Although this simple interpretation is suggested by the biblical text itself, Philo in De Vita Mosis (1:11-12) and Josephus in

12[Garegin Zarphanalian, ed.], P’iloni Hbrayec’woy ārik’ t’arganealk’ i naxnec’ meroc’ oroc’ Hellen bngirk’ hasin at mez (Works of Philo Judaeus, translated by our ancestors, the Greek originals of which have come down to us) (Venice: Mekhitarist Press, 1892), pp. 105-177.

13The origin of the belief could be traced to Hellenistic Judaism, where all the Septuagintal theophanies are attributed to the Logos, a belief further developed into the Christology of the Primitive and Early Church.
the *Antiquities of the Jews* (2.9.4 [220-223]) assert that the infant was protected by Divine Providence while afloat on the river. Moreover, upon meeting Zipporah at the well (Ex. 2:16-22), Moses did not force his way on her but extended a helping hand instead (205-207). Again, this simple interpretation is suggested by the biblical narrative, as the daughters of Jethro—and Zipporah in particular—report to their father the kindness shown by Moses. Ezekiel the Tragedian, whose fragmentary work survives in Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.*, 9.28-29), has some commendable lines on Moses' behavior at the well, where he encountered the seven maidens (59-67).

The thought that Solomon held twelve sceptors (287) is also derived from the biblical narrative, since his kingdom comes at the climax of the Israelite monarchy and before the separation of the ten northern tribes from the southern tribes of Judah and Benjamin (1 Kg. 12:16-24). In his *Song of Songs* he is said to have written on the mystery of the Church (295). This book is thus explained by the Fathers, traditionally, as also in *The Teaching of St. Gregory* (441) and in the mystical *Commentary on the Song of Songs* by Grigor Narekac'ı, among Armenian sources.14

When recounting the apostasy of Israel that ended with the Exile (307-309), Magistros alludes to the martyrdom of Isaiah without detailing that well-known apocryphal tradition.15 However, he identifies the apostasy as "fire worship," projecting, no doubt, the pre-Christian faith of the Armenian people.16

Much of the rest of the prophetic coverage is on Daniel (330-335). Here, however, the Babylonian king who made a square image is said to be Belshazzar instead of Nebuchadnezzar. More than a faulty recall on the part of the author at this juncture, it seems to me that Magistros had no use for the six syllables in the latter's name and opted instead for the three syllables in Belshazzar. Curiously enough, in the hymns of Ephrem, Nebuchadnezzar is never mentioned by name, possibly for the same multi-syllabic reason; he is referred to simply as "that Babylonian" (*Nisibine Hymns*, 5.6-8). This king demanded that the idol be worshiped and had vine-wood brought from the "fire temple,'"


presumably for burnt offerings—another, somewhat confused projection from the pre-Christian Armenian religion. As for the quoted short prayer of the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace (342-343), it carries reminiscences from the Song of the Three Young Men, the apocryphal addition to Daniel 3:19-25 read in the Armenian Church on the day of the Epiphany and every day at Matins.

Some interesting details emerge from the telling of the events surrounding the birth of Christ. In the annunciation to Mary the angel Gabriel predicts the place of the Savior’s birth, David’s city (363), whereas in the Gospel narrative the prediction is about the promise of giving Him “the throne of His father David” (Lk. 1:32). In Bethlehem Mary and Joseph lodged in a cave, where Jesus was born (381). The Gospels make no mention of a cave (cf. Lk. 2:14), yet two second-century sources, Justin Martyr (Dialogue 78) and the Protevangelium of James (18:1; 19:2-3; 21:3) speak of the cave in which Jesus was born. This tradition is perpetuated within the grotto in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem ever since the Constantinian edifice was erected there, if not earlier. The shepherds are said to have joined the angels in their good wishes for humanity, an elaboration on Lk. 2:14 (385). A comparable elaboration is made by Cyril of Jerusalem, according to whom the shepherds together with the angels shall bear witness in the day of judgment against the heretics who deny the undefiled incarnation of the Only-begotten (Catechetical Lectures, 12.32).

Following Mt. 2:11, the Magi gave predictive gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh (388-391). Although Magistros does not indicate what these are predictive of, he probably had the same understanding as that of Gregory Nazianzus, that these are as to a King, and to God, and to One who died (Oration 38: On the Theophany, 17). When the Magi did not return to Herod, he ordered the slaughter of the infants below the age of three (399), whereas Mt. 2:16 has “two years old and under.” The number “three,” if not a scribal error, was probably based on an account in the Protevangelium of James asserting that Herod ordered the killing of the infants below three since he also wanted John the Baptist to be killed (22:1-23:3). Finally, there is mention of the apocryphal opening of the Temple gate at the time of the dedication of Jesus when he was forty days old (406). This long-held belief about the opening of the gate is probably based on Ezekiel 43:1-5, the Glory returning to the Temple, associated with Lk. 2:27 in Christian tradition.

Some interpretive elements are found in the baptismal narrative and the encounter between Jesus and the Baptist. Instead of Jesus

---

17 The search for John the Baptist, according to the Protevangelium (ch. 23), brought about the slaying of his father Zecharias in the Temple (an erroneous understanding of Mt. 23:25).
telling John the well-known words about the necessity “to fulfil all righteousness” (Mt. 3:15 and parallels), Jesus begs John to allow Him to become the Prophet long predicted in the Hebrew Scriptures (433-434). Such freedom of thought apparently draws its inspiration from the long and imagined dialogue between Jesus and John the Baptist at the time of the baptism in Ephrem (Hymns for the Feast of the Epiphany, 14). At the time of Jesus’ baptism the head of the Serpent is said to have been crushed in the waters of the Jordan, the prediction in Gen. 3:15 being thus fulfilled (437). This very thought is found in the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem (3.11), that at the time of His baptism Jesus vanquished the Dragon in the waters of the Jordan (cf. Basil, On the Spirit, 14.31: baptism “causes the departure of the tyranny of the devil”; and Gregory Nazianzus, Oration 39: On the Holy Lights, 15: “Jesus comes ... to bury the old Adam in the water; and before this and for the sake of this to sanctify the Jordan.”18 The accompanying voice of God heard over the water is then compared with His voice at the time when the Decalogue was written on stone tablets (438), linking Mt. 3:17 and parallels with Ex. 20:1. To my knowledge, none of the Fathers makes such an association of texts even though the Messianic fulfilment of the Law with the appearance of Christ is a commonly held notion among them, just as Magistros later on identifies Christ with the Law that was before Moses and its personification (cf. the Philonic and patristic nomos agraphos, the “unwritten Law”); Christ did away with the foreshadowing Mosaic Law through His humility (465-468).

Alluding to the Lucan account of Jesus sending His disciples two by two (10:1), Magistros adds that this was for their mutual help (449). This too is a common understanding. He then associates the breathing of Jesus on His disciples (Jn. 20:22) with the removal of the ancestral curse (450). This is perhaps because of the identical Greek verb (enephusēsen) in the Fourth Gospel as in Gen. 2:7 (LXX), when God “breathed” into Adam. The Greek Fathers were observant of the verbal—and hence theological—consonance between the two passages;

18The thought is based on the biblical belief that the sea or bodies of water are the habitat of demonic forces; see, e.g., the OT references to Leviathan and the NT references to the sea (cf. Gen. 1:2). Of some interest also is the somewhat late apocryphal Cheiropo לת of Adam, a version of which exists in the Quaestiones of Vanakan Vardapet (1181-1251). It tells of a contract on stone tablet committing the father of the human race and his descendants to serve Satan until the coming of the Messiah, purportedly attested by the impression of Adam’s hand. This tablet, concealed in the River Jordan, was duly shattered at the time of Jesus’ baptism (translations of the various versions to be published by Michael E. Stone).
e.g., Basil, *On the Spirit*, 16.39: “And He [the Spirit] did not leave him when He had risen from the dead; for when renewing man, and, by breathing on the face of the disciples, restoring the grace that came of the inbreathing of God, which man had lost, what did the Lord say? ‘Receive the Holy Ghost’ [Jn. 20:22].” So also Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures*, 17.12, after quoting Jn. 20:22: “This was the second time He breathed on man.”

The bread in the multiplication of the five loaves and two fishes (Mt. 14:13-21 and parallels) is imagined as the bread of life in the Celebrant’s hands (501), implying its Eucharistic significance—a *topos*. Other interpretations of events pertaining to the public ministry of Jesus are found in the Transfiguration story, where Peter’s words about the three lodging places (Mt. 17:4) are said to be alluding to the Trinity (524)—another *topos*. Then, as Jesus approaches Jerusalem, blind Bartimeaus calls Him “Thou First Light” (566), but not so in the Gospel narrative (cf. Mt. 20:29-34 and parallels; the name is found in Mk. 10:46). The appellation is used for God earlier in the epic (45) and is an allusion to the primordial light in Gen. 1:3, interpreted christologically (e.g., Gregory of Nyssa refers to the Son as “Only-begotten Light” (*Against Eunomius*, 1.26) and “Ungenerate Light” (ibid. 1.36; cf. 2.22); cf. the phrase “Light of Light” in the Nicene Creed; see also Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures*, 4.7; 11.4, 18).

When narrating the Passion beginning with the cleansing of the Temple (Mt. 21:12-17 and parallels), Magistros states that Jesus brought redemption to Israel right then and there and called the Gentiles to divine adoption (571-572). The words of Jesus at the Last Supper, that someone is about to betray Him (Mt. 26:21, 23 and parallels), were intended to touch the heart of Judas (610). There, in the Upper Room, the fangs of the Serpent which waited at the heel were drained in the bowls in which Jesus washed the disciples’ feet (cf. Jn. 13:5), thus making light the feet of His messengers (an allusion to Is. 52:7). In these lines (619-621) Magistros goes on to associate footwashing with baptism and the Eucharist. Just as Jesus crushed the Serpent’s head in the waters of the Jordan, so the fangs of the Serpent are drained in the foot-washing basins. Then, in the Garden of Gethsemane, Jesus allows His disciples to behold His irrevocable glory as He prays before them (Mt. 26:36-44 and parallels), yet the words (627) belong more to the dominical prayer in Jn. 17, uttered in the Upper Room (cf. Jn. 12:28 and 2:11, where the wine miracle at the wedding in Cana was to enable the disciples to see His glory, a code word in the Fourth Gospel for the Passion).

The trials and crucifixion of Jesus receive some amplification in the epic. Jesus tells Peter that notwithstanding the denial by His foremost disciple (cf. Mt. 26:69-75), He will not be left alone on the
hill (of Golgotha), but that the Father and the Spirit will be there with Him (637). This little sprinkling of Monophysite theology is understandable (cf. Gregory Nazianzus, Oration 45: Second Oration on Easter, 29: "God crucified"). Yet through his repentance (Mt. 26:75) Peter left an example for sinners to follow (661). This recalls the words of Cyril of Jerusalem, that Peter is an example of the power of repentance (Catechetical Lectures, 2.19). During His trial before Pilate, Jesus did not answer him a word (cf. Mt. 27:14 and parallels) because of his boastfulness (678). The prophecy of Is. 9:6, regarding the Divine authority being on the Messiah's shoulder, was fulfilled as Jesus carried the Cross (702-703). Although Is. 9:6 is a much quoted text by the Fathers, to my knowledge none applies it to the bearing of the Cross. So was also fulfilled the prediction by Moses in Dt. 28:66, on beholding their very lives hanging on that instrument (710), as well as the prediction by an unnamed "seer" on the Charioteer rising between the two creatures (711-712), a possible allusion to the vision of the "Chariot of Yahweh" in Ez. 1:2-28, where the enthroned rider is described as "a figure like that of a man" (vs. 26). The first of these two predictions is also first in the Athanasian / Apollinarian list of prophecies pertaining to the Cross (On the Incarnation of the Word, 35; cf. Athanasius, Oration 2.16 and Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechetical Lectures, 13.19, with reference to the Cross); but there is no mention there of the latter prediction—or anything close to it referring to Jesus between the two outlaws crucified with Him.

Those resurrected at the time of Jesus' death (Mt. 27:52-53) included all the Patriarchs and Prophets and all those others who believed in Christ ever since Adam (731-735). After all, the Cross of Jesus stood at the very burial place of Adam (739-742). Magistros follows a long-held Christian tradition here. In the Life of Adam and Eve (Vita) 30:2 and 45:2, Mount Moriah or the Temple area is Adam's burial place (the Greek text of the Life of Adam and Eve [Apocalypse of Moses] 38-42, places Adam's body back in Paradise). There, with the stool that was part of the Cross, Jesus battled it out with Satan (743-744). This stool then became His footstool (cf. Heb. 1:13; 10:13, quoting Ps. 110:1). The water that flowed from His pierced side (Jn. 19:34) is the water of life, symbolizing baptismal water (748, 757). The latter interpretation is found also in Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechetical Lectures, 3.10; 13:21.

As Peter and John rushed to the tomb (Jn. 20:3-9; cf. Lk. 24:12—Peter alone), they inquired of the angels there about the veracity of the resurrection (784)—an embellishment perhaps to

19Cf. Is. 66:15; also the Greek version of Life of Adam and Eve (Apocalypse of Moses) 22, where God comes to Paradise seated on a chariot of cherubim.
downplay the role of the women at the tomb (cf. Lk. 24:11). In His words to Mary (Jn. 20:10-18), the risen Lord is said to have revealed His obedience to and equality with the Father (793-794). Jn. 20:17 is quoted by Athanasius (De Synodi, 26 and 28) to make the same point.

A far more imaginative description is given of the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2), when the ceiling of the Temple opened up, exposing the beam of the upper room (824). The Spirit revealed Christ's new name(s): Sovereign and Self-existent (826), cited among the names of God early in the epic (the significance of these and other names looms large in patristic christology; cf. Athanasius / Apollinarius, On the Incarnation of the Word, passim; Gregory Nazianzus, Oration 31: Second Oration on the Son, 20-21; Ephrem, Homily on Our Lord, 8, on the significance of the "Name"). Magistros speaks of the Spirit coming at Pentecost as a dove and not as tongues of fire (Acts 2:3), and goes on to draw an analogy between the dove coming with a branch over the waters at Noah's ark and this dove coming with fire (831-834). The pairing of the two elements water and fire aside, which has cosmological and baptismal significance, the descent of the Spirit as a dove is a carryover from the scene of Jesus' baptism. Cyril of Jerusalem likewise explains this symbol of the Spirit, associating it with Noah's dove (Catechetical Lectures, 17.9-10). Magistros goes so far as to specify the hour of the day in which the Spirit came: exactly at the day's third hour (839). In Peter's ensuing speech, he refers to the current time of the day as "the third hour" from sunrise, when no one would be drunk (Acts 2:15). Finally, the commissioning of the disciples to preach, to baptize, and to remove the sin of Adam was given by the Spirit at Pentecost (840), whereas in the concluding words of Matthew the "great commission" was the parting word of the risen Lord to the disciples in Galilee (Mt. 28:16-20), contemplated earlier in the epic (450) in conjunction with Jesus' breathing on His disciples (Jn. 20:22).

Summary and Conclusion

The occasional biblical interpretations of Magistros seem to reflect his familiarity with the exegetical tradition found in Syriac and Greek Fathers whose works were translated earlier into Armenian. However, the common elements between his epic and the writings of Ephrem, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Chrysostom do not necessarily indicate his reliance on them as sources; rather, they all reflect a common tradition. The same observation also applies to his seeming dependence on the hymnic poetry of Ephrem that influenced
several Armenian writers before the eleventh century. Moreover, to my knowledge, Magistros reflects none of the particular interpretations in the biblical commentaries of Armenian authorship that existed in his time, and whatever he has in common with them is certainly part of the earlier, stock tradition. With them all, Magistros also shares a common Christian understanding of the Scriptures whereby the Old Testament is interpreted christocentrically, in light of the New Testament.

The author's originality at certain instances of interpretation and the particular imageries he employs may deserve further literary analysis. Even his reduction of the Scriptures to less than a thousand lines of epic poetry (subtracting the end parts on the spread of Christianity, martyrology, Armenian Christianity, and the personal confession of faith and prayer, 848-1016) is itself an interpretive process and involves originality in the overall thought at the outset. To be sure, no writing—especially religious—is devoid of interpretation, and that by the author first and foremost.

The author's utter silence about the apostle Paul remains a puzzle. Could this be explicable by the author's determined opposition to Paulician Christology, the Adoptionist theology of Paul of Samosata that had a remnant of faithful followers among the Armenians in the Tondrakian movement? Did the author carry over his strong personal sentiments about the "heretic" to the apostle after whom he was named? Or, is the omission simply a result of the author's extra effort to be brief as he was approaching the end of his work? Suffice it to say that his coverage of the spread of Christianity (848-864) is neither a retelling nor a summation of the contents of Acts. After all, Magistros is our primary source on the identity of the Tondrakians with the Paulicians.

Finally, there is no reason to deny the author his prefatory claim that he wrote the epic in seclusion, within four days, while on a visit to Constantinople, and as a result of his unexpected encounter with a Moslem theologian. In such a setting Magistros would have had no access to documentary sources with which he was familiar, whether at home in his native land and tongue, or abroad. The internal evidence shows no documentary trail whatsoever and supports the claim that the epic was written simply by recollection and in comparatively short time. Throughout, the author is relying on his own biblical knowledge,

---


and his tacit understanding of the Scriptures is discernible. Moreover, the epic is in keeping with the author’s other writings noted for their ostentatious demonstration of erudition, and is in itself a commentary on the biblical knowledge of a man reputed to be “most learned in divine books.”

Whether summaries or interpretations of biblical accounts, even deviations from the biblical narrative, Magistros has given us plenty to ponder and to imagine.
ARMENIAN FUNERAL RITES: 
AN ASSESSMENT OF A RECENT STUDY

Michael Daniel Findikyan

Andrea Schmidt's study of Armenian funeral rites\(^1\) is noteworthy for several reasons. First, it represents the first serious investigation into this area of the Armenian liturgical tradition. Second, Schmidt provides an edition of the text of the "General Rite of Burial for All Deceased" [գործարար մահացածին խաղաղ ռազմագրությունները ու երկրի] based on ms. Venice 457. This is the oldest extant Armenian manuscript euchology (Mašoc). Schmidt follows the assessment of Conybeare and Sargsean that the manuscript is to be dated to the end of the 9th c.). As a control for her edition, Schmidt uses ms. Erevan 1001 (end 10th, beg. 11th c.). A complete annotated German translation accompanies the edition.

Schmidt's work demonstrates the inestimable value of direct study of the manuscript evidence as an indispensable prerequisite to liturgie comparée. Without a sound foundation in the liturgical texts, properly classified and situated within their historical context, any attempt at comparing rites of different liturgical traditions can not rise above informed speculation. There is still an enormous amount of source material to be investigated in all areas of Armenian liturgy (Eucharist, Hours, Sacraments, Occasional Offices, Calendar). Apart from the liturgical texts themselves, the Armenians boast a singularly rich tradition of liturgical-exegetical material, theological commentaries on the Divine Liturgy, the Daily Office, and even the Lectionary. A vast body of Armenian biblical exegetical material that without a doubt contains liturgical evidence also awaits serious study. Scholarship in this sphere lags far behind the study of Byzantine liturgy.

Following an exhaustive bibliography, Schmidt's study is divided into three parts. Part A (pp. 35-66) is an introduction that examines the earliest Armenian historiographical, canonical and exegetical literature for clues regarding funerary rituals in pre-Christian and early Christian Armenia. Part B (pp. 73-172) is devoted to liturgical matters including

---

the structure of the funeral rites at the home of the deceased, in the church, and at the cemetery. The liturgical analysis concludes with a synopsis of the oldest and the present shape of the rites, along with an outline of the historical development of the Armenian funeral rite from the earliest extant manuscripts to the textus receptus. Part C (pp. 173-266) comprises the edition and German translation.

Three appendices conclude the volume. The first (pp. 267-285) provides an annotated German translation of the hymns of the funeral services according to the Armenian euchologies published in Jerusalem (1961) and Venice (1831). The second provides a German translation of the supplication-proclamation-prayer triad for the souls of the departed, as found in the Armenian Night Office and later, by the first half of the 14th century, incorporated into the Armenian funeral rites. Appendix 3 (pp. 287-307) comprises a complete Armenian glossary of the two manuscripts used in the edition (with the exception of prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns and common adverbs). This is followed by registers of Armenian, Syriac and Greek manuscripts consulted; editions of primary sources; Biblical references; and persons cited in the study.

The author's liturgical analysis is based on the funeral services as recorded in the two euchologies used for the edition. However, Schmidt lists 37 other ms. euchologies from Venice, Erevan, and Tübingen, and regularly refers to the evidence contained in them. Five printed editions were also consulted, including the editio princeps (Amsterdam, 1667). A table in Schmidt's work (pp. 168-171) compares the content and sequence of liturgical units in four of the printed editions for the three phases of the funeral rite, corresponding to the venues where it is conducted: at the home of the deceased, in the church, at the cemetery.

One edition not consulted by the author is the Constantinople Great Euchology [Ubb Uwizmy] of 1807. This Maštōc is particularly interesting for scholarly study. In the foreword its editors state that they collated a number of manuscripts, from which they freely accumulated liturgical texts, evidently for the purpose of safeguarding ancient traditions. The result is an unwieldy scrapbook of prayers, hymns, and detailed rubrics pasted together with little regard for liturgical propriety. And yet within this hodgepodge of liturgical debris we are sure to find remnants of texts and usages that have not survived in the more authoritative editions of the Maštōc.

The foreword to the 1807 Maštōc also states that the project drew its inspiration from the revision of the Armenian rite of priestly burial [gwsūwbsμβλ] undertaken in 1777 by Catholicos Simeon Erewanc'i (1763-1780). The Catholicos had compiled numerous

---

2Ubb Uwizmy [The Great Maštōc Book] (Constantinople, 1807) 3.
Maštoc manuscripts and corrected the rituals, "...removing redundancies that were introduced in later times, and filling in omissions that both scribes and printers had made in many copies. And in various places where the sense of the words was ruined, or where it seemed crude, we changed it to a correct and tasteful style, completely preserving the author's intent." Lacking the authority of the Catholicos, it seems the editors of the Constantinople Maštoc of 1807 refrained from making any abridgments, accumulating instead whatever new liturgical structures they found in the manuscripts. This is further implied by their characterization of Catholicos Simeon's revision as an "abbreviation."

Comparing the earliest structure of the funeral rite with that of the textus receptus, Schmidt observes a significant accrual of new material, especially hymns added at the beginning and at the end of the three phases of the service. Nevertheless, throughout the centuries the Armenians controlled the growth of the service in order to preserve a remarkable structural integrity in its current shape. Schmidt finds that the structure of the funeral service is made up of repeating building blocks, each of which contains (1) a psalm or psalms, (2) scripture readings, (3) diaconal intercessions, and (4) priestly prayer. Both in its earliest and in its present shape, the funeral service is composed of a series of such blocks. Any new material added to the rite over the centuries was carefully packaged in the above structure. Despite the substantial accumulation of new liturgical material, the structure of the service in constituent blocks of psalmody, readings, intercessions, and prayer is never lost. Today's service has preserved the sequence of liturgical units as found at the end of the 9th century.

This "Überlieferungstreue" (p. 154) is actually a characteristic of Armenian liturgy. The canon of psalmody (often followed by, or in conjunction with hymnography), lections, intercessions (and/or a diaconal proclamation - ṣwng), and prayer is ubiquitous in the Daily Hours, in the sacraments, and in occasional offices such as the Blessing of a Church. There can be little doubt that the Armenians inherited the

---

3Simeon Erewane'i's colophon from his revision of the rite of priest's burial is on p. 423 of the 1807 Great Maštoc.

structure from Jerusalem. In the fifth-century Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem, the ancient hagiopolite stationary synaxis was comprised of a "canon" [Karen] consisting of psalmody followed by lections.  

5 We can be sure that the canon concluded with a prayer, preceded by intercessions or some other diaconal invitation to prayer (Oremus).  

The hagiopolite canon is itself to be compared with the paradigmatic liturgical unit of a ritual action, covered by a psalm or hymn, concluded with a prayer.  

7 Indeed, several of the canons in the funeral rite correspond to a single ritual act: arrival at the tomb; interment; covering the casket with earth. The procession of the casket from the home of the deceased to the church comprises two canons, as does the procession from the church to the cemetery.  

The prayer, "God of souls and all bodies..." [Karen], said at the home of the deceased, is one of the most ancient and best known prayers of eastern Christendom. It is also found in the Ethiopian, Coptic, Syriac and Byzantine funeral rites, and traces of it appear in Serapion's Euchology, Apostolic Constitutions VIII, and Ps-Dionysius. Schmidt compares the Armenian and Greek texts (pp. 112-115) and finds that the Armenian version in ms. Venice 457 preserves an older shape of the prayer than the Greek recension in Barberini 336, the earliest extant Byzantine euchology (mid-8th c.). The latter has interpolations unattested in the Armenian.  

While the Armenians likely adopted this prayer from the Greeks, this is not emblematic of the development of the Armenian funeral tradition as a whole because the two funeral traditions developed independently. The author writes: "The close relationship of the Armenian with the Greek funeral prayer remains a unique occurrence in the funeral formularies of both churches. In structure as well as content, the rites of interment in the ninth century are otherwise fundamentally different. Both [rites] must be considered self-standing entities that have evolved independently of one another" (p. 117). So much for the old presumption that the Armenian rite is but a branch of the Byzantine. Moreover, in their funeral rites, we see yet again the


7Ibid., 202.
remarkable resourcefulness of the Armenians in the embellishment of their liturgy.

Another funeral ritual once common to many eastern churches is the anointing of the dead body with oil. At one time the Armenian, East and West Syrian, and Byzantine rites knew a rite of funerary unction. A remnant of the ritual survives only in the funeral of a priest in the Armenian and Byzantine rites. The practice goes back at least to the Greek-Syrian liturgical context of Ps-Dionysius the Areopagite, who has a departure kiss and anointing of the dead, and attests already to the antiquity of these rituals. In the late middle ages, both the Byzantines and Latins confused this funeral unction with the anointing of the sick, censuring the Armenians for allegedly dispensing the oil of the sick on dead bodies. Schmidt is quick to point out that the anointing of the dead and of the sick are independent rituals, having no connection either in origin or meaning. Until the 14th century, when the rite fell out of use, the Armenians anointed the sick with plain consecrated oil. For the dead, on the other hand, they used precious myrron. This alone belies any common origin for the rites. Schmidt shows that the anointing of the dead is rather to be compared with baptismal anointing. Following the explanation of the rite by Ps-Dionysius, well-known in early Christian Armenia, if baptismal unction is the seal of fitness for Christian life, the unction of the dead is a seal of the consummation of that life. Or, as Gregory of Tat'ew (†1411) writes in his Book of Questions, "As at his baptism [Christ] was first anointed and then buried into the water, likewise here first [the priest] is anointed and then buried into the earth." Baptism is a frequent theme of the Armenian funeral rite, which contains many verbal parallels with the rites of initiation. If baptism is a rebirth as a Christian, as a son of God, then the funeral is a rebirth into the fullness of divine sonship (see 265 n. 1 et. al.).

There is a clear structural symmetry between the funeral office at the home of the deceased and the Armenian Night Office [กาหกงาจก จกิจ]. Both offices are vigils, built around the recitation of a selection of psalms in numerical order. Several points in the author's structural analysis of the opening of the Night Office are debatable. Following Gabriele Winkler's reconstruction of the Night Office, the author

---

8 Grigor Tat'ewac'i, Ḥwē Ĥwē Ċwē Ĥwē [Book of Questions], 2nd edn. (Jerusalem, 1993) 672. Schmidt's German translation of this passage (p. 90) omits the reference to Christ.

includes the christological doxology [Blessed be our Lord Jesus Christ, Amen; ὁ ἁγίος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός] at the head of the 8th-century Night Office ordo (p. 105). This doxology, however, is attested neither in Step'anos Siwnec'i's early 8th-century commentary on the Armenian Daily Office,\textsuperscript{10} nor in the commentaries attributed (falsely) to Catholicos Yovhannēs Ôjnc'i (†c. 728);\textsuperscript{11} nor in the authentic liturgical writings of Ôjnc'i in the context of the local Armenian synod of Duin (719 A.D.).\textsuperscript{12} To sustain the antiquity of this liturgical unit necessitates accounting for the silence of all the extant early sources, which I find unlikely. The author calls the proclamation and intercessions following the Night Office invitatatory [צֵּלָהַנֶּגְּבֵּיוֹ] a "secondary development" (p. 107), since intercessions and prayer usually conclude a synaxis. However, the Night Office invitatatory is better viewed as an autonomous "canon" introducing the monastic psalmody of the night. Thus the proclamation and intercessions at the beginning of the Night Office are not displaced from the end of the synaxis; they are the conventional concluding elements of the liturgical canon. Finally, Schmidt omits the liturgical unit known as the "head of the canon" [יוֹנָהָוָהַנָּהָו] from her outline of the 8th-century ordo of the Night Office (pp. 105-106). The unit in question is the final series of psalms sung during the night, chanted with a more elaborate melody than the other psalms. The "head of the canon" is indeed attested by Step'anos Siwnec'i in his early 8th-century commentary on the Armenian Office.\textsuperscript{13}

Overall, Schmidt's German translation is a good, literal rendering of the Armenian. Line numbers in the edition and the translation facilitate consultation of the text and its translation, since they do not appear on facing pages. The editor has not taken the liberty to add punctuation to the Armenian text. As it stands, the text is almost devoid of punctuation, making the Armenian difficult to read. Most welcome


\textsuperscript{10}Findikyan, The Commentary on the Armenian Daily Office. See n. 3 above.


\textsuperscript{12}The Oratio synodalīs [יוֹנָהָוָהַנָּהָו] and Canons of the Council of Duin. See Ibid., 128-136.

\textsuperscript{13}Findikyan, The Commentary on the Armenian Daily Office. See n. 3 above.
are the copious footnotes in the German translation. They provide a wealth of explanatory information, with abundant references to relevant sources and secondary studies.

This is a superb work, a model for those who will continue the necessary and profitable task of editing and analyzing other Armenian sources which relate to the liturgical tradition of the Armenian people.
BOOK REVIEWS


Reviewed by Abraham Terian

The volumes under consideration constitute a single, monumental work, with the first volume containing a critical text of the Armenian version of Basil’s Great Asceticon (Girk’ harc’olac’) and the second volume an Italian translation of the text. Initially in this work, Basil answers the queries put to him by nascent ascetic communities on the interpretation of the gospel (the Little Asceticon, extant only in Latin and Syriac). The Greek and Armenian versions, more than twice the length of the latter, have the author expand on it until the end of his life by answering further queries as ascetic communities continued to grow. The document became the rule of several medieval Armenian monasteries.

The critical text is based on the twenty enumerated manuscripts which contain the work in its entirety (however, the contents of no. 16 [V2] = Venice 1209, are fragmentary), one of the six florilegia manuscripts (no. 1 [V1] = Venice 590, containing anthologized selections), and six of the thirteen fragments (usually folia from earlier manuscripts used in the binding of later ones). By far, the first three manuscripts (ABC) are most essential for establishing the text. These are: Erevan nos. 5595 (dated 1279), 707 (13th cent., backed by two nineteenth-century Bzommar manuscripts: 139 and 474), and 1500 (dated 1282/3, at times superseded by Casanatense 2053, a seventeenth-century manuscript in Rome). The last of these three (C) is the famous codex of the illustrious scholar Mxit’ar of Ayrivank’, known for its vast philosophical and theological contents, mostly translations of the Hellenophile School. Uluhogian is very meticulous in her description and classification of the manuscripts, providing stemmas and listing the recurring orthographic differences between the manuscripts that would be redundant to repeat in the critical apparatus. It seems to me, however, that her classification of R (Erevan no. 1330, dated 1711) is either misplaced or underrated, since it contains readings unattested in the witnesses cited in the apparatus; e.g., in the second subheading of the “Prologue,” Norin, sahmank’ krawnaworakan’ (p. 7 of the first volume), R has Norin, hramank’ krawnaworakan’ (cf. H. Anasyan, Haykakan matenagtitut’yun, 2:1361). R is placed by her in the family of
D, just as several later manuscripts are placed in the families of earlier ones and are left out of the apparatus.

Because Ulughogian had gone to such great lengths to establish the text, one cannot help but wonder why she stopped short of considering yet another viable area for her endeavor: the testimonia to the text in the twelfth-thirteenth-century commentaries on the *Girk'harc'olac* by Dawit' Vardapet K'obayrec'i and Catholicos Yakob Klayec'i. These testimonia antedate even the earliest of the extant manuscripts and are as valuable as the fragments taken into consideration by her.

The Armenian translation of Basil’s *Girk'harc'olac* is a product of the activities of the Hellenophile School of translators, whose interlinear rendering of the Greek text is well known to the few researchers in the field. Ulughogian had earlier published several articles delineating the characteristics of the translations by this school, especially those of Basil’s opus. Of interest are her observations on the occasional misreading of the Greek text by the translator (see pp. xxiv-xxv of the second volume). The preliminary pages of both volumes provide excellent detailed information, including grammatical instruction wherever necessary. Detail is included, but only where it serves a purpose; for the rest, the careful brevity is never misleading and the omission of extensive discussion of philological particulars is probably an advantage. Her edition and translation are the culmination of more than two decades of research; truly a *magnum opus*.

The popularity of Basil, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (370-379) among the Armenians rests just as much on the far-reaching influence his translated works had on Armenian Fathers as on his being one of the three great Cappadocians (he was the elder brother of Gregory of Nyssa and an intimate friend of Gregory Nazianzen). Some of the translated works that bear his name are possibly spurious and are not found in Greek. However, several of his prayers have become part of the Armenian Church’s liturgy, even its eucharistic formulary; his confessions have influenced much of the Church’s dogma; most of his canons have become part of Armenian canon law; his *Girk'harc'olac*, as mentioned earlier, became the rule of several Armenian medieval monasteries; and his homilies echo in the writings of Eznik, Mandakuni, Mayravanec'i, and others. Whether authentic or spurious, his writings loom large in the Armenian tradition. Some were translated in the fifth century (such as the homilies on the *Hexaemeron*); others, such as the *Girk'harc'olac*, in the seventh—judging from the syntactical difference in the respective translations.

Obviously, the Greek text provides a valuable control over the Armenian and helps assess the *modus operandi* of the translator—possibly a student in Constantinople (where for a century and a half some Armenian students seem to have translated from Greek in an interlinear fashion a few of their textbooks). The question-answer
format of the document (following a short, two-part introduction) lends it to be used conveniently as a textbook, in keeping with most of the translations by the Hellenophile School. Moreover, as with most other translations by this School, the identity of the translator of Basil remains elusive, even though a certain Dawit’ Tarone’i has been identified as the mid-seventh-century translator of one of Basil’s homilies: Čař i cnundn K’ristosi (variant: P’rkê’in) (On the Birth of Christ [variant: the Savior]). He accomplished it in Damascus, being sent to the Umayyad palace there on a political mission from Constantinople. It is possible (so I think) that he had previously translated the Girkharč olac.

Ulughonian has substantive introductions in both volumes, and this kind of informative guidance continues through the annotations to both the text and the translation. Even in her translation, she supplies the corresponding numbers of the queries in the Greek text since the numbers of the 361 Armenian queries do not always correspond with those of the Greek (pp. 12-26 of the second volume). Very insightfully, she provides a reverse index, Greek-Armenian numerical correspondences, at the end of the second volume (pp. 227-230). Indices of scriptural citations and of proper nouns complement the volume. The first volume ends with an interesting table showing all the variants obtained between proper nouns, whether in their lexical or inflected forms (pp. 303-310).

The particulars of the Armenian translation vis-à-vis the Greek text are exhaustively delineated by Ulughonian, thus contributing to the reliability of her translation. Devoid of speculation, her conscientious work and meticulous research cannot be overlooked in either Armenian or Patristic studies. In short, the volumes are an excellent edition and translation of high quality.
Nerses Šnorhali, Catholicos 1166-1173, was one of the most renowned Armenian poets and spiritual writers; his place in Armenian tradition is unassailable. He is also well known outside Armenian circles for his important role in theological discussions with the Byzantine church, and for his extensive correspondence with significant figures of his time. Today, as interest in Armenian history and culture is steadily growing in the world at large, and as the role of the Armenian church is highlighted by the impending 1700th anniversary of the establishment of Christianity in Armenia, an accessible English rendering of one of Nerses’ most typical works is especially welcome.

The *General Epistle*, written soon after Nerses became Catholics, was addressed to the Armenian people at large, then scattered far beyond the confines of Armenia proper. It is a particularly valuable document, not merely illustrating Šnorhali’s pastoral concerns, but giving a succinct yet vivid picture of Armenian life of the time. The different sections deal with the clergy, both monastic and secular, the princely rulers, the military, and various categories of the laity in the town or country. When set beside other contemporary texts, such as the Lawcode of Mxit’ar Goš, it can provide details about Armenian life and customs which are totally missing from the more formal Histories. One does, however, have to exercise caution, for works of this kind may include common-places mingled with the information on topical concerns. In the last and shortest section addressed to women, for example, Nerses is worried that they may resort to magic or poison (*kaxaduviun* and *deladuviun*—though *del* may here mean “love-potion” or “philtre”). Mxit’ar Goš notes that their use provides grounds for divorce. Yet the canons attributed to the fourth century Basil of Caesarea linked these two crimes much earlier. Were Armenian husbands still at risk in the twelfth century?

Fr. Aljalian provides a brief Introduction, placing Nerses Šnorhali’s work in its historical context and describing his numerous writings. The text of *General Epistle* used for this translation is the Jerusalem edition of 1871. An edition based on eight manuscripts in the Matenadaran appeared in Erevan in 1995 (too late to be used by Fr. Aljalian). In fact, given the number of exemplars of Nerses Šnorhali’s works in manuscripts elsewhere (Jerusalem, Venice, Vienna, etc.) a serious critical edition would have to be based on a much wider sounding than the holdings of the Matenadaran.
The Armenian text is divided into ten sections, and Fr. Aljalian has added numerous sub-headings to guide the reader. In the absence of an index, these make it much easier to identify specific topics. The translation is faithful, while at the same time readable in English. But there are occasional omissions. In the section addressed to priors, for example, Nersês begins with a simile based on eyes being free from disease. The translation omits the line (found in the editions available to this reviewer) referring to “the veins of light which descend from the head to the eyes,” a significant allusion to contemporary Armenian views about anatomy.

Very few works by Nersês Šnorhali are available in English, and only a few more may be found in French. For his letters and commentaries the reader without Armenian must still turn to the Latin version published by the Mkhitarists 150 years ago. Given the importance of Nersês as poet, theologian and ecumenical leader, this is a sad state of affairs. Fr. Aljalian thus deserves sincere thanks for this first English rendering of the General Epistle, a valuable addition to the small corpus of translations of the Armenian classics.

Reviewed by Michael Daniel F indikyan

This is a new Italian translation of the famous *Synodal Discourse* of the prolific and erudite Armenian theologian, mystic, and exegete Nersès Lambronaci (†1198). Most scholars associate this remarkable work with the Armenian Synod of Hromklay, convened in 1179 by Catholicos Grigor Tlây [†1193]. Nersès' work must be considered the summit of years of substantive and truly unprecedented dialogue between the Churches of Armenia and Byzantium in the mid-twelfth century. This fervent desire for mutual understanding leading to meaningful ecclesiastical union was spearheaded by Nersès' renowned grand-uncle, Catholicos Nersès Šnorhali ("The Grace-filled"), whose ecumenical dialogue with the Greek theologian Theorianois has been examined elsewhere by the editor of the present volume.¹ While Lambronaci's discourse is less refined theologically than Šnorhali's, it is nevertheless a masterful work, which exhibits the author's profound mystical sense of the blasphemy of Christian disunity, and his urgent call for the Armenian fathers of the synod to respond. One Roman Catholic scholar recently wrote, "One must say with clarity that [Nersès Šnorhali and Nersès Lambronaci] ... demonstrate a superiority of comprehension, of theological integrity, of far-sightedness that none of their interlocutors—neither Latin nor Greek—proved to possess. It is therefore to these men of the Armenian Church that we owe the lucid and impassioned vision which today we would call 'ecumenical'."²

Boghos Levon Zekiyan holds the Chair in Armenian Studies at the University of Venice, Department of Eurasian Studies, and is Adjunct Professor of Armenian Christian Studies at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, as well as a member of the Armenian Academy of Science. The present work is not his first foray into the life and work of

---


Nersès Lambronači. The substantial survey of the theologian with exhaustive bibliography in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* is Zekiyan’s work. The present translation of Lambronac’i’s *Discourse* comes almost two centuries after the Venice edition of 1812, which also included an Italian translation. An ample introduction (pp. 5-23) presents Nersès and his numerous other works, and discusses his undertakings as a church reformer and ecumenist. Zekiyan situates the *Synodal Discourse* into its historical and theological context, and outlines Lambronac’i’s theology and spirituality. Against Ormanian, who argued that the *Discourse* was a purely literary work, Zekiyan judges that it was actually pronounced at the Synod of Hromklay.

The editor has divided the text according to the divisions in Mercier’s French translation (Venice, 1947). The subheadings are logical and helpful. Effusive biblical references are conveniently placed at the foot of each page. Laudable as well are the numerous highly informative notes providing historical, theological and linguistic clarifications. The bibliography (pp. 105-109) is compiled specifically for the Italian reader. It lists several general works on Armenian history, literature, Church and spirituality, as well as editions, translations and secondary studies of the *Synodal Discourse*. Zekiyan even provides a list of the most important collections in Italy of books on Armenian studies. An index of biblical references and a table of contents conclude the volume. There is no topical index, which would have set this translation apart from all others.

The Qiqajon Press of the Bose Monastery in Southern France is to be commended for adorning its series “Texts of the Fathers of the Church” [Testi dei Padri della Chiesa] with a representative of the Armenian Church, and a good one at that. Zekiyan’s translation will make one aspect of the distinctive Christian witness of the Armenian people available to a wider European audience. In the person and writings of Nersès Lambronači among others, the Armenians have without doubt much to offer in the contemporary ecumenical arena.
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