

The Armenian Apocryphal Literature — Translation and Creation

Michael E. Stone

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Categories of Armenian Apocrypha

Armenia, and the platitude is nonetheless the truth, stands on a crossroads between empires. Both the Byzantine Greek tradition from the west and the Syriac tradition from the south-east influenced Armenia and Armenian Christianity.¹ In addition, it developed its own distinct character in art, religion and literature. It is a “subset” neither of Iran nor of Byzantium, although views from both these perspectives illuminate essential, sometimes constitutive, elements of Armenian culture. The apocryphal literature in Armenian partakes of this threefold character — Byzantine and Syriac origins on the one hand, and native Armenian development on the other.

In order to be able to present the Armenian apocryphal literature clearly, however, we must divide it into categories. The most obvious categories available are biblical — non-biblical; created — translated. These categories intersect with the above three perspectives, forming a multi-levelled pattern.² Here we shall not broach the question

¹ The importance of the Syriac influence has been urged particularly cogently in the work of Nina G. Garsoïan: see her papers collected in N.G. GARSOÏAN, *Armenia between Byzantium and the Sasanians*, London 1985.

² The most recent general survey of the published Armenian apocryphal literature was that of STONE, «Jewish Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Church» *Le Muséon* XCV (1982), pp. 285-309 = M.E. STONE, *Selected Studies in the Pseudepigrapha with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition*, Leiden 1991, pp. 3-27, (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, IX). Note that many studies by Stone are most readily available in his volume *Studies*.

of the channels that transmitted the translated material into Armenian. Some aspects of this were discussed in an earlier paper, and translation and oral transmission are both likely.³

A. Biblical Apocrypha

By biblical apocrypha we mean apocrypha which usually occur in Armenian biblical manuscripts. In recent years an important tool for the location of such writings has been put at our disposal, Ajamian's detailed catalogue of the contents of Armenian biblical manuscripts.⁴

It is customary to divide biblical apocrypha into categories of Old and New Testament apocrypha.⁵ From the perspective of a Christian tradition such as the Armenian, such a division is rather problematic, since the revelation of the Old and New Testaments is viewed as one seamless whole. The Old Testament prefigures the New; Adam and

³ See STONE, «Jewish Apocryphal Literature», p. 286 = *Studies*, p. 4.

⁴ SHAHE AJAMIAN, *Հայկական Բայբերական Մատենագրություն* (*Catalogue of Armenian Biblical Manuscripts*), Lisbon 1992. In addition to this catalogue, much information is to be found in the detailed catalogues of Armenian manuscripts, a full list of which is to be found in BERNARD COULIE, *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues de manuscrits arméniens*, Turnhout 1992 (Corpus Christianorum). Further information is also to be found in the published volumes of H. ANASYAN, *Armenian Bibliology*, I-II, Erevan 1959, 1976 (in Armenian) who also gives lists of catalogues.

⁵ Problems of the classification of this literature have been widely discussed. Much of the debate is summarized in M.E. STONE, «Categorization and Classification of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha», *Abr Nahrain* XXIV (1986), pp. 167-177; D.G. MEADE, *Pseudonymity and Canon*, Grand Rapids 1986; M.E. STONE and R.H. KRAFT reviews of J.H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, and SPARKES, *The Apocryphal Old Testament in Religious Studies Review* XIV (1988), pp. 111-113; M.E. STONE, «Travaux actuels sur la littérature apocryphe arménienne», *Apocrypha. Le Champ des Apocryphes* I (1990), pp. 303-312.

Eve are essential for the Incarnation. Nonetheless, this division is useful from a practical viewpoint and we shall restrict our remarks here to the “Old Testament Apocrypha” and associated works.

ISSUE OF CANON

From an Armenian point of view, the Protestant division of Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha should be rejected. Councils of the Armenian church made a number of decisions relating to the biblical canon and embodied them in lists.⁶ However, these lists are frequently imitations and partly translations of Greek canon lists rather than reflections of the realities of Armenian church practice. The actual usage predominating in Armenian biblical manuscripts is perhaps the best reflection of that.⁷

⁶ M.E. STONE, «Armenian Canon Lists, I: The Canon of Partaw», *Harvard Theological Review* LXVI (1973), pp. 479-486; IDEM, «Armenian Canon Lists II: The Stichometry of Anania of Shirak», *Harvard Theological Review* LXIX (1976), pp. 253-260; IDEM, «Armenian Canon Lists III: The Lists of Mechitar of Ayrivank», *Harvard Theological Review* LXIX (1976), pp. 289-300; IDEM, «Armenian Canon Lists IV: The List of Gregory of Tathew», *Harvard Theological Review* LXXIII (1980), pp. 237-244; IDEM, «Armenian Canon Lists V - Anonymous Texts», *Harvard Theological Review* LXXXIII (1990), pp. 141-161. Observe that some of these lists mention works not extant in Armenian; others reflect stichometric reckonings that are meaningful only in Greek.

⁷ Other criteria, scarcely investigated, might include the question of which works are used in the Lectionary and which are cited as authoritative by various patristic authors. On the Lectionary, see F. MOURAD, *Հայկական Սուրբ Երեմիայի Գրքի Հայերեն Վերահաստատումը* (*The Old Armenian Translation of the Revelation of John*), Jerusalem 1905-1911, pp. [302]-[306]. The Jerusalem Lectionary has been investigated in recent years by A. RENOUX in *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121*, Turnhout-Belgique 1969, 1971 (*Patrologia Orientalis*, XXXV.I-II) and C. RENOUX, *Le lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie: Le Cašoc*, Turnhout 1989 (*Patrologia Orientalis*, XLIV.IV). Little has been done on patristic citations from this perspective, but note C. CUENDET, «Eznik et la Bible», *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* IX (1929), pp. 13-40. Moreover, it is obvious that Armenian usage cannot have remained unchanged throughout the centuries.

WORKS IN LXX

The LXX includes some works which do not occur in the Hebrew Bible. Scholars used to say that this LXX collection reflects an “Alexandrian Canon” used by Hellenistic Jews in the Greco-Roman period. This is no longer considered to be so, and the presence of these additional works is attributed to the process of evolution of the Old Testament Canon itself.⁸

Certain canon lists show that in the Middle Ages Armenians knew something of the structure of the Hebrew Bible.⁹ However, in antiquity this was not true. In that period such a consciousness is indeed embedded in the structure of some of the translated lists, but that is all.

OTHER APOCRYPHAL WORKS COMMONLY FOUND IN ARMENIAN BIBLES

In his *Catalogue of Armenian Biblical Manuscripts* Ajamian lists all works occurring in Armenian biblical manuscripts, including apocrypha (note that *1 Esdras*, *Judith*, *Tobit*, *1-3 Maccabees*, *Wisdom*, *Sirach* and *Baruch* are in the Armenian Bible itself). In the following discussion, however, we will not consider non-canonical works occurring in Armenian Bible manuscripts which are not apocrypha.¹⁰

⁸ See the works referred to in note 5, above, and also A.C. SUNDBERG, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, Cambridge, MA 1964 (Harvard Theological Studies, XX).

⁹ STONE, «Canon Lists IV», pp. 243-244; an unpublished list in Matenadaran No. 286 includes the Hebrew names of the books, and these are also to be found in the margins of the copy of the Bible included in the great *Miscellany* of Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i, Matenadaran 1500 (1271-1288) (autopsy). See also the paper by F. MACLER, «Les traductions arméniens, ont-ils utilisé l'hébreu?», *Handes Amsorya* XLI (1927), pp. 606-616.

¹⁰ We do not include here learned, homiletic, exegetical or spiritual works which are often to be found in Armenian Bible manuscripts. Such are, *inter alia*, the Canon Lists, Capita and Prefaces; writings on Psalms attributed to David the Philosopher and David «Trismegistos»

Following Genesis:

Joseph and Asenath, sometimes under the title of *Confession of Asenath* (29 copies).¹¹

History of Joseph of Pseudo-Ephrem, also entitled “*On the Seven Vahangs (?) of Joseph*” (6 copies).¹²

Vision of Enoch (1 copy).¹³

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs frequently occurs at this point, or at the end of the Pentateuch (49 copies).¹⁴ This work also occurs, in a different recension, in various sorts of non-biblical manuscripts.¹⁵

and works relating to Song of Songs.

- ¹¹ S. YOVSĒP'IANC', *ÄiÓ†i~1 ÇíflŸ èl1 é. †Ó†fl†i†Ä* (*Uncanonical Books of the Old Testament*), Venice 1898; J. ISSAVERDENS, *The Uncanonical Writings of the Old Testament found in the Armenian MSS. of the Library of St. Lazarus*, 2 ed., Venice 1932; CH. BURCHARD, *Joseph und Asenath*, Gütersloh 1983 (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, II.IV); IDEM, «Zur armenischen Übersetzung von Joseph und Aseneth», *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* XVII (1983), pp. 207-240; IDEM, «Joseph and Aseneth», *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH, New York 1985, pp. 177-247; IDEM, «More about the Armenian Text of Joseph and Aseneth», *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* V (1990-1991), pp. 65-80; IDEM, «Der jüdische Asenethroman und seine Nachwirkung. Von Egeria zu Anna Katherina Emmerick oder von Moses aus Aggel zu Karl Kerényi», *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.XX.I, Berlin 1987, pp. 544-667.
- ¹² A.H. SERJUNI, «St. Ephraem's 'On the Seven Vahangs (?) of Joseph'», *Sion* XLVII (1973), pp. 26-37, 137-144 (in Armenian); CH. BURCHARD, «Der jüdische Asenethroman», p. 560; J.S. ASSEMANUS, *Sancti patris nostri Ephraem Syri Opera omnia quae exstant Graece Syriace Latine*, II, Rome 1743, pp. 21-41 [*non vidi*]; M. GEERARD, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, II, Turnhout 1974 (Corpus Christianorum, DCCII), pp. 389f.
- ¹³ YOVSĒP'IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 378-386; ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 237-247.
- ¹⁴ YOVSĒP'IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 27-151; ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 269-358; see also M.E. STONE and J.C. GREENFIELD, «Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi», *Revue Biblique* LXXXVI (1979), pp. 214-230 = *Studies*, pp. 228-246; STONE, *The*

Following Deuteronomy

Death (or Life) of Moses the Prophet (Matenadaran Ms 1500 [M1500]).¹⁶ This *Vita*, which might be an Armenian composition, occurs in M1500, which uniquely also includes certain other *Vitae* as discussed below. The *Vitae* it includes accord with a list of the 24 prophets found in the works of its copyist, Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i.¹⁷ The theme of Moses' unwillingness to die, which is a central idea in this writing, is widespread,¹⁸ and also occurs, for example, in the apocryphal Greek *Apocalypse of Esdras* which relates the death of Esdras.¹⁹

Armenian Version of the Testament of Joseph, Missoula 1975 (Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series, VI); IDEM, «New Evidence for the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs», *Revue Biblique* LXXXVIII (1977), pp. 94-107 = *Studies*, pp. 131-144. Note also the remarks of H. W. HOLLANDER and M. DE JONGE *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, Leiden 1985, pp. 11-12; M.E. STONE, «The Epitome of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs», *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* XX (1986-1987), pp. 70-107 = *Studies*, pp. 145-183; IDEM, «The Epitome of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Matenadaran No. 2679», in *Proceedings of the International Congress on Mediaeval Armenian Literature*, Erevan 1986, in press. The writer is currently preparing a new edition of the Armenian text of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

¹⁵ The non-biblical manuscripts are almost exclusively of the *alpha* type, as in STONE, «New Evidence», pp. 95-98 = *Studies*, pp. 132-135, and IDEM, «Eight New Manuscripts of the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs», in *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, M.E. STONE and S. AJAMIAN eds., Atlanta 1994, p. 78.

¹⁶ This is published by M.E. STONE, «Three Armenian Accounts of the Death of Moses», in *Studies on the Testament of Moses*, ed. G.W.E. NICKELSBURG, Cambridge, MA 1974 (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, IV) = *Studies*, pp. 54-57.

¹⁷ The list is published in M.E. STONE, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Patriarchs and Prophets*, Jerusalem 1982, p. 174.

¹⁸ Other apocrypha relating to the Pentateuch which have been listed above sometimes also occur in this position.

¹⁹ See E. GLICKLER CHAZON, «Moses' Struggle for his Soul: A Prototype for the Testament of Abraham, the Greek Apocalypse of Ezra, and the Apocalypse of Sedrach», *Second Century V* (1985-1986), pp. 151-164, where many parallels are adduced. On the struggles for the souls of

Following Judges

List of Judges (31 copies – unpublished). This work may not be a true apocryphon, and it may resemble the various learned works which deal with biblical subjects to be discussed below.

Following 4 Kingdoms

Vita of Elijah (2 copies); *Vita of Elisha* (1 copy); *Vita of Joas* (Joad; 1 copy).²⁰ The usual situation with the *Vitae Prophetarum* is that the lives of the four major and twelve minor prophets occur after their books, as will be seen below. However, just as M1500 puts the *Life of Moses* after Deuteronomy, a couple of manuscripts include lives of various other prophets after 4 Kingdoms. These *Vitae*, however, unlike that of Moses, were drawn from *Vitae Prophetarum*. In Armenian they are usually found in homiletic or hagiographical manuscripts, being read on the days of these particular saints, and not in manuscript Bibles. In addition to the three *Vitae* mentioned, these hagiographical manuscripts also include *Vitae* of Nathan, and of other prophets.²¹

Following Ezra

4 Ezra occurs in about 33 manuscripts. It is not found, as far as I know, in any other sorts of Armenian manuscripts.²²

the righteous see M.E. STONE, «Jewish Apocryphal Literature», p. 18 and note 57 = *Studies*, p. 18.

²⁰ These texts are published and translated by STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 140-145, 152-153.

²¹ See STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 136-139.

²² M.E. STONE, *The Armenian Version of 4 Ezra*, Missoula 1979 (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies, I); see also M.E. STONE, *Textual Commentary on the Armenian Version of 4 Ezra*, Atlanta 1990 (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, XXXIV) for additional

Following Wisdom of Solomon

Concerning King Solomon (2 copies).²³ A number of different forms of small Solomonic works go by this name (see also below).

Following the Prophetic Books

Vitae Prophetarum. We have already observed that the life of each prophet follows his book in most Armenian biblical manuscripts, so here we only mention lives additional to those of the four major and twelve minor prophets.

Following Isaiah

Vita of Nathan (1 copy).²⁴ It is difficult to tell just why Nathan should be put after Isaiah.

Following Zechariah

Second Vita of Zechariah (1 copy) and *Vita of Zechariah, Father of John the Baptist* (1 copy).²⁵

information on this work.

²³ This work was published by YOVSEP'IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 228-234 and translated by ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 158-168; a new edition, translation and study were prepared by M.E. STONE, «The Penitence of Solomon», *Journal of Theological Studies*, XL (1978), pp. 1-19 = *Studies*, pp. 58-76. Since there are a number of small compositions associated with King Solomon, it is sometimes impossible to know from the title given by Ajamian exactly which one it is.

²⁴ Published by STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 136-139.

²⁵ Published by STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 146-149, 156-157. The various Zechariahs are confused, see *ibid*, p. 146.

Following Daniel

Vita of the Three Children (1 copy);²⁶ and *Seventh Vision of Daniel* (3 copies).²⁷ This apocalypse is clearly allied with the Greek and Hebrew medieval Daniel apocalypses.

Following the New Testament.

Ajamian puts certain Old Testament apocrypha at this location because of their position in the Zohrabian Bible. That is dictated, Zohrabian claims, by his understanding of traditional Armenian practice based on the biblical manuscripts at his disposal, but in fact it does not reflect the custom of the Armenian Apostolic church.²⁸ Above, we have integrated some of them, such as the *Testaments of the*

²⁶ Published by STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 154; it was written originally in Syriac but adapted into Armenian, see STONE, «Jewish Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Church», p. 17 n. 56. The text was first published and studied by STONE, «An Armenian Tradition Relating to the Death of the Three Companions of Daniel», *Le Muséon* LXXXVI (1973), pp. 111-123. See also G. GARITTE, «L'Invention géorgienne des Trois Enfants de Babylone», *Le Muséon* LXXII (1959), pp. 69ff.; IDEM, «Le texte arménien de l'Invention des Trois Enfants de Babylone», *Le Muséon* LXXIV (1961), pp. 91-108.

²⁷ Edition by YOVSĒP' IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 237-250 ; translation by Issaverdens, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 249-275. Another edition and German translation were prepared by G. KALEMKIAR, «Die siebente Vision Daniel's: armenischer Text mit deutscher Übersetzung», *Weiner Zschr. Kunde d. Morgenlands* VI (1892), pp. 109-136, 227-240. It is uncertain in which language this work was originally composed. Studies of the Daniel apocrypha were made by F. MACLER, *Les Apocalypses apocryphes de Daniel*, Paris 1895 and K. BERGER, *Die griechische Daniel-Diegeese*, Leiden 1976 (*Studia Post-Biblica*, XXVI) and further bibliography may be found in those works.

²⁸ See C. Cox, «The Zohrab Bible» in *Studies in Classical Armenian Literature*, ed. J.A.C. Greppin, Delmar (NY) 1994, p. 238. In fact, Zohrabian's practice, such as the placing of 4 *Ezra* and *The Prayer of Manasseh* at the end of the New Testament, seems to be influenced by post-Tridentine Latin usage.

Twelve Patriarchs and *4 Ezra*, into the places where they usually occur in Armenian biblical manuscripts.²⁹ In addition, we may mention the following:

Sayings of Ahikar (1 copy, J542). It is unclear why this book entered biblical manuscripts. It originally a pagan wisdom work although in *Tobit*, Ahikar is presented as Tobit's uncle.³⁰ Perhaps its similarity to the biblical wisdom books led to its inclusion. The *Prayer of Manasseh* is associated with the Jeremianic literature in the Greek tradition and excluded from the Canon in the post- Tridentine Latin practice. Ajamian lists twenty copies, and does not indicate where they occur. It is not among the Canticles in the regular Armenian Psalter.

Works extant only in a single copy do not have a strong claim to a position in the category of biblical Apocrypha, yet even without them, the number of works is striking. Presumably some were regarded in much the same way as other non-biblical compositions occurring in manuscript Bibles, and do not form part of the Canon.

²⁹ The actual position of *4 Ezra*, for example, is made explicit in Stone, *Armenian Version of IV Ezra*, pp. 6-11 and STONE, *Textual Commentary*, pp. 309-310. For the position of some manuscripts of *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, see M.E. STONE, *The Testament of Levi: A First Study of the Armenian Manuscripts of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in the Convent of St. James, Jerusalem*, Jerusalem 1969, pp. 6-18; for *Joseph and Asenath*, see BURCHARD, «Der jüdische Asenethroman», pp. 585-586.

³⁰ Tobit 1:21-22, 2:10. The oldest witness is the Aramaic papyrus of the fifth century B.C.E., conveniently edited and translated by A.E. COWLEY, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford 1923, pp. 204-248. A number of later versions were published by F.C. CONYBEARE, J. RENDEL HARRIS and AGNES LEWIS SMITH, *The Story of Ahikar from the Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Old Turkish, Greek and Slavonic Versions*, Cambridge 1913. A critical edition of the Armenian version was published by A.A. MARTIROSYAN, ժժ. Ը՞ ժԸՍ՞ ժ1 %ժժ ղflժ. Կ ղձՕժflժժՒ ղՒժժ. ղՒ1 (History and Maxims of Xikar the Wise), I-II, Erevan 1969 & 1972. At this point Ajamian also lists certain philosophical works such as «The Words of the Philosophers» (five documents or copies of documents) and a piece attributed to Plato (two copies), as well as *Sirach*.

Others, moreover, particularly the shorter ones, were doubtless viewed as annotations to the biblical books, e.g., *List of Judges*, *Concerning King Solomon*, and *Vitae Prophetarum*. The *Vitae*, for example, are as regular in their appearance after the prophetic books and as little canonical as are the capita and prefaces that precede the same works.

However, long, whole works surviving in numerous copies may have been viewed differently. Such books are *Joseph and Asenath* (29 copies); *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (49 copies); and *4 Ezra* (33 copies).³¹ They seem to have been intimately associated with the biblical canon, perhaps translated in association with it, and may have often been seen as part of it. The question still subsists, moreover, of the position of these writings within the church and of the measure of authority which they were accorded.³²

Nearly all the apocrypha found in manuscripts of the Armenian Bible were translated from Greek, not from Syriac, and most of them still exist in Greek. As far as we can tell, almost none of them was written originally in Armenian. They are all directly connected with the biblical corpus in content and a number of them occur almost exclusively in biblical manuscripts. These considerations indicate that that their

³¹ A real question surrounds the status of the *Prayer of Manasseh* (20 copies) which was discussed above. More copies of *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* exist, but they are not in biblical manuscripts. Full information on the manuscripts of this work may be found in the studies and editions cited in notes 14 and 15 above.

³² The dates of translation of most of these remain unclear. *4 Ezra* is known to have been translated in the fifth century (see STONE, *Armenian Version*, pp. 15-16 and 35). The date of the translation of *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is less certain. Our view is, provisionally, of its antiquity: see STONE, «Epitome», pp. 71-77 = *Studies*, pp. 147-153. These two works are included in the canon list of Gregory of Tat'ew, which may be assumed to be based on Armenian Church usage. See STONE, «Jewish Apocryphal Literature», p. 290

transmission (and perhaps their translation) formed part of the transmission of the Bible.³³

B. Extra Biblical Translated Apocrypha

Numerous Armenian apocrypha, however, are not included in the Armenian biblical manuscripts, and some of these have been published. In 1896, Yovsēp‘ianc‘ edited a collection of “Old Testament” apocrypha which Issaverdens translated into English.³⁴ A considerable number of other works has been published since then. These extra-biblical apocrypha will now be presented under the categories of “translated” and “created” works.

The translated works identified to date outside the biblical corpus focus on some of the same subjects as those included in the biblical corpus, although both corpora are broader than the shared subjects. The shared subjects include: (1) the patriarchs (works such as the *History of Joseph* — translated from Syriac, it seems— and the

= *Studies*, p. 8.

³³ Of course, the very creation of the Armenian Bible as a single codex probably took place in the High Middle Ages; see C. COX, «Concerning a Cilician Revision of The Armenian Bible», in *De Septuaginta (J. Wevers FS)*, ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox, Toronto 1984, pp. 209-222; IDEM, «Manuscript Groupings in the Text Tradition of the Armenian Bible», *Journal of the Society of Armenian Studies* I (1984), pp. 69-77. The paucity of older literary manuscripts makes it difficult to perceive exactly how these apocrypha might have been associated with the biblical corpus prior its collection in a single codex. The complex transmission implied by the textual character of the tenth-century *Epitome of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* indicates how much has been lost in the centuries between the actual translation and the oldest surviving manuscripts. See STONE, «Epitome», pp. 71-77 = *Studies*, pp. 147-153.

³⁴ Their works are cited above in note 11. Studies of many of these works in Modern Armenian were published at the same time by B. SARGHISSIAN, óø, ~Ûı‡, Íff~øĒÍøıŸ èÍı é. ‡Ó‡ff‡ıÍ Āı”‡ø%øfl Çff Ā ”ff‡Û (Studies on the Uncanonical Books of the Old Testament), Venice 1898 (cited below as SARGHISSIAN, *Studies*).

Testament of Jacob); (2) Solomon (certain of the short works relating to Solomon belong in this category, as well as the *Questions of the Queen and the Answers of King Solomon*, which is a translation from Syriac); (3) the prophets (such writings as the *Names, Works and Deaths of the Holy Prophets*, a translation from Latin, and the *Paralipomena of Jeremiah* — extant in a number of recensions and translated from Greek). Note that works translated from Greek dominate this category less than they do that of the biblical apocrypha, with Syriac and Latin (and in one case Arabic) playing a much larger role.³⁵ Adamic works form a numerous group within this category.

Adamic Writings

Death of Adam from the Paralipomena of the Greeks claims to be a translation from Greek and there seems to be no reason to doubt this.³⁶ There is other evidence for the existence of a work entitled something like *The Paralipomena of the Greeks*. A work bearing the title *Paralipomena III* is found in the Bible of Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i, an

³⁵ There are some cases of translation of Georgian into Armenian, as has been noted by M. van Esbroeck in the case of Epiphanius' *de gemmis*, which tradition lies behind a number of apocrypha relating to the high-priest's gems. See. M. VAN ESBROECK, *Les versions géorgiennes d'Epiphane de Chypre Traité des poids et des mesures*, Leuven 1984 (CSCO, 461; Scriptorum Iberici, 20), pp. 6-7. Compare also note 61 below. Compare also the remarks of M. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literaturgeschichte von K. Kekelidze bearbeitet von M. Tarchnišvili in Verbindung mit Julius Assfalg*, Vatican 1955 (Studi e Testi, CLXXXV). He attributes the translation of a number of apocryphal texts from Armenian into Georgian in periods from the seventh century (4 Ezra, p. 335), Book of Adam (*ibid*) and the "minor" Adam books (18th century, p. 334).

³⁶ Edition: M.E. STONE, «The Death of Adam: An Armenian Adam Book», *Harvard Theological Review* LIX (1966), pp. 283-291; re-edited with additional manuscript evidence in IDEM, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 15-31; collations of yet another manuscript may be found in IDEM, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming).

extract from 2 Chron. 36:1-23.³⁷ One form of *Concerning King Solomon* is called “From the Commentary on the Paralipomena.”³⁸ The third recension of *Paralipomena of Jeremiah* is sometimes entitled, “From the Books of the Paralipomena which I found among the books of the Greeks.”³⁹ This suggests that these four works may have derived from a Greek chronicle or a *Palaea* not identical, however, with that published by Vassiliev.⁴⁰

The History of Adam and His Grandsons relates events from Creation down to the Middle Ages with a stress on ante-diluvian chronological and genealogical matters.⁴¹ It is was written in Armenian but draws directly on bodies of tradition translated from other languages, most likely Greek.

Book of Adam is an Armenian translation of the extant Greek *Apocalypse of Moses*.⁴² It is a witness to the Greek text of that primary Adam book⁴³ but contains quite a lot of variants from the published Greek text.

³⁷ M1500, fol. 359v. This work has not been edited.

³⁸ STONE, «Penitence of Solomon», p. 1 = *Studies*, p. 58.

³⁹ See in further detail STONE, «Jewish Apocryphal Literature», p. 302 = *Studies*, p. 20 and notes there.

⁴⁰ A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, Moscow 1893, pp. 188-292.

⁴¹ Published by STONE, *Adam and Eve* (forthcoming).

⁴² YOVSĒP'IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 1-26 (text); F. C. CONYBEARE, «On the Apocalypse of Moses», *Jewish Quarterly Review* VII (1894-95), pp. 216-235 (translation) and Issaverdens, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 21-42 (translation). For further bibliographical details, see M.E. STONE, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, Atlanta 1992 (Early Judaism and Its Literature, III), pp. 12-13. Further manuscripts are listed by ANASYAN, *Bibliology*, I, p. 238 and even more unedited manuscripts copies exist, some with variant texts.

Penitence of Adam is another form of the primary Adam book. It was translated from a Greek recension which has perished and it is one of the most important witnesses to that work.⁴⁴

Testament of Adam is the source of a short work, also known as the *Hours of the Day and Night*. Two Armenian versions have been published, one of which is connected with Apollonius of Tyana and the other with Adam. The version associated with Apollonius or Balinus was translated from Arabic; the Adamic one probably from Syriac.⁴⁵

⁴³ For the categorization of the Adam books, see STONE, *History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, pp. 3-4.

⁴⁴ The edition and translation may be found in M.E. STONE, *The Penitence of Adam*, Leuven 1981 (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, CDXXIX-CDXXX, Scriptorum Armeniaci, XIII-XIV). The Georgian Adam book was translated from a closely allied, but different Greek recension. It was edited by C. K'URC'IKIDZE, «Adamis Apokrip'uli C'xovrebis K'art'uli Versia», *P'ilologiuri Dziebani*, I (1964), pp. 97-136 and translated by J.-P. MAHÉ, «Le Livre d'Adam géorgien,» in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions*, ed. R. van den Broek and M.J. Vermaseren, Leiden 1981, pp. 227-260. Compare also IDEM, «Notes philologiques sur la version géorgienne de la Vita Adae», *Bedi Kartlisa* 41 (1983), pp. 51-65. W. LÜDTKE, «Georgische Adam-Bücher», *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXXVIII (1919-1920), pp. 155-168 gives details of the other Georgian Adam writings. See also STONE, *History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, pp. 37-39. A synoptic translation is to be found in M.E. STONE and G.A. ANDERSON, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, Atlanta 1994 (Early Judaism and its Literature, V).

⁴⁵ The texts were edited and translated with notes in STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 39-80 and IDEM, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming). In fact, this is only one of the three parts of the Syriac *Testament of Adam*. One the latter, see S. E. ROBINSON, *The Testament of Adam: An Examination of the Syriac and Greek Traditions*, Chico 1982 (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, LII).

Patriarchal Writings

The Testament of Jacob is an adaptation of Genesis 49, perhaps made from the Greek text.⁴⁶

Solomonic Writings

Questions of the Queen and Answers of King Solomon is an elenchic work, rooted in the tradition of riddles associated with King Solomon. Long known only in Armenian, its surmised Syriac original has recently been discovered.⁴⁷ The literature of riddles connected with King Solomon is ancient, known already to Josephus Flavius, and it was widespread in the Middle Ages.⁴⁸ The Armenian text of *Questions of the Queen* was preserved embedded in the Armenian version of the *Chronicle of Michael the Syrian*.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ M.E. STONE, «The Testament of Jacob», *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* V (1968), pp. 264-270; IDEM, «The Testament of Jacob - An Additional Note», *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* VI (1969), pp. 103-104 and see in general IDEM, «Jacob, Testament of», in *Encyclopedia Judaica*, IX, Jerusalem 1971, p. 1213.

⁴⁷ YOVSĒP'IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 229-232; ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 163-66. The Syriac text was published by S.P. BROCK, «The Queen of Sheba's Questions to Solomon: A Syriac Version», *Le Muséon* XCII (1979), pp. 331-345.

⁴⁸ STONE, «Jewish Apocryphal Literature», p. 294, n. 36 = *Studies*, p. 12; M.R. JAMES, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, London 1920, pp. 52-53.

⁴⁹ ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 159-160; SARGHISSIAN, *Studies*, pp. 430-439; STONE, «Jewish Apocryphal Literature», p. 301 = *Studies*, p. 19. On the Armenian recensions of the *Chronicle of Michael the Syrian*, see F. HAASE, «Die armenischen Rezensionen der syrischen Chronik Michael des Grossen», *Oriens Christianus* NS V (1915), pp. 60-82, 271-284.

Prophetic Writings

Names, Works and Deaths of the Holy Prophets. This work, which was patterned after the *Vitae Prophetarum*, seems to have been translated from Latin. It draws on some traditions not found in the *Vitae*, but known in other oriental sources.⁵⁰

Paralipomena of Jeremiah is extant in three different published recensions in Armenian. It was apparently translated into Armenian from Greek and came to play a role in the Synaxarion.⁵¹ The Greek text exists in numerous manuscripts.⁵²

Second Translation of 4 Ezra and *The Book of Esdras*. These writings are parts of a second, later translation of 4 Ezra made from the Vulgate. This translation includes the first and last two Latin chapters, which are later additions not found in the oriental versions.⁵³

⁵⁰ The text was edited in STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 158-173. SARGHISSIAN, *Studies*, pp. 257-259 also gives the full text of another work of this type, *The Names of the Prophets and their Order and in What Times they Were*, apparently also translated from Latin.

⁵¹ The texts are edited in YOVSEP'IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 348-378 and a translation may be found in ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 194-232. An older edition is Karapet vardapet [Tēr Mrktč'ean], « Նիմօ՛Ւի՛ք՛ ի՛քի, ի՛քի՛ն ի՛ Չի՛ն Ա՛քի՛ն թ՛յ (Of Jeremiah the Prophet from the Book of Baruch)», *Ararat* XXVII (1895), pp. 81-82. The Armenian text is studied in the paper of M.E. STONE, «Some Observations on the Armenian Version of the Paralipomena of Jeremiah», *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* XXXV (1973), pp. 47-59 = *Studies*, pp. 77-89.

⁵² Those edited so far are in J. RENDEL HARRIS, *The Rest of the Words of Baruch: A Christian Apocalypse of the Year 136 A.D.*, London 1889 ; R.A. KRAFT and A.-E. PURINTUN, *Paralipomena Jeremiou*, Missoula 1972 (Texts and Translations, I; Pseudepigrapha Series, I).

⁵³ M.E. Stone, «Two New Discoveries Concerning the Uncanonical Ezra Books», *Sion* LII (1978), pp. 54-60 (Armenian); IDEM, *Commentary on 4 Ezra*, p. 5; IDEM, «The Book of Esdras», *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* IV (1988-89), pp. 209-212. This translation was first printed in Oskan Erevanc'i (ed.), *The Bible*, Amsterdam 1666, pp. 719-

Other Writings

The Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius is extant in two Armenian fragments, apparently translated from Syriac.⁵⁴ This work had very great influence in the Byzantine and Western realms alike.⁵⁵

Signs of the Judgment. This work is clearly a translation probably from a Western source language and numerous versions exist in European languages.⁵⁶ Its Armenian version attributes it to “The Books of the Jews.”

C. Associated Extra-Biblical Translated Writings

A significant function of Armenian apocryphal and associated writings is to embellish the Bible. One aspect of this is scholastic and another is the desire to expand upon and enrich the biblical narrative. A considerable corpus of what we may call “associated

744 (Armenian). R.P. Blake claimed that the Georgian version of 4 Ezra was translated from Armenian. If so, it was from yet a third, lost translation. See R.P. BLAKE, «The Georgian Version of Fourth Esdras from the Jerusalem Manuscript», *Harvard Theological Review* XIX (1926), pp. 305-307.

⁵⁴ STEP‘ANNOS ORBELIAN, *History of the Province of Sisikan*, Tiflis 1910, pp. 144-157; *Question* in STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming). Dr. R. Ervine of Jerusalem informs me that the extract found in the document entitled *Question* also occurs in unpublished manuscripts of the *Book of Questions* written by Vanakan vardapet.

⁵⁵ See for further information PAUL J. ALEXANDER, *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1985; G.J. REININK, «Der Verfassername “Modios” der syrischen Schatzhöhle und die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius», *Oriens Christiana* LXVII (1983), pp. 46-64.

⁵⁶ The text is edited, translated and discussed in M.E. STONE, *Signs of the Judgment, Onomastica Sacra and The Generations from Adam*, Chico 1981, pp. 3-57; see further IDEM, «Jewish Tradition, the Pseudepigrapha and the Christian West», in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context*, ed. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, Sheffield 1994, pp. 431-449. The European versions are analyzed in W.W. HEIST, *The Fifteen Signs before Doomsday*, East Lansing 1952.

Names of the Wives of the Patriarchs gives these names. The names themselves go back to Hebrew and Aramaic sources from the pre-Christian period. It is unknown how they were transmitted into Armenian, but the list may well have come through Greek.⁶⁰

72 Translators and Further Texts Associated with Epiphanius, de Mensuris et Ponderibus. These texts draw on traditions going back to the *Epistle of Aristeas* as developed in Epiphanius' *de Mensuris et Ponderibus*. Van Esbroeck claims that the Armenian version of this writing, which only survives in fragments, was translated from Georgian.⁶¹

D. Extra-Biblical Apocrypha Created in Armenian or Uncertain

The collection of texts published by Yovsēp'ianc' and the corresponding translations by Issaverdens also contain apocryphal works which were created in Armenian.⁶² A number of other similar texts were included in old printed books, often just entitled “*ā~ō~ḥ̄ḥ̄ (Miscellany)*”, as well as in various hagiographical and liturgical compositions. More recently, further works of this type have been edited by Stone, Lipscomb, and others.

⁶⁰ Text, translation and commentary may be found in STONE, *Adam and Eve* (forthcoming); another such list was published by W.L. LIPSCOMB, «A Tradition from the Book of Jubilees in Armenian», *Journal of Jewish Studies* XXIX (1978), pp. 149-163.

⁶¹ Van Esbroeck, «Les versions géorgiennes», pp. 6-7 and see note 35 above. On the Armenian text see M.E. STONE, «Concerning the Seventy-Two Translators: Armenian Fragments of Epiphanius' *de mensuris et ponderibus*», *Harvard Theological Review* LXXIII (1980), pp. 331-336 ; an edition of all the known texts associated with this cycle is being prepared by R. ERVINE and M.E. STONE. See also note 57 above.

⁶² Some of those may in fact be translated, though that has not yet been proved and they are, consequently, left in the present category.

In the course of the study of Armenian manuscript collections we have also recorded the existence of numerous such writings but have not published them all. We shall integrate some indications of categories of these works and the biblical figures with whom they are connected into the following discussion, giving details of published works but leaving the detailed treatment of unpublished documents for the future.

APOCRYPHAL TEXTS

1. *Abraham*. Under the name of Abraham we have recorded as many as twelve writings, none of which has been produced in a modern edition or translation.⁶³ The chief works are the following: (a) *History of Abraham*; (b) *Concerning Abraham's Hospitality on the Way*; (c) *It is a Memorial of the Great Patriarch and Father of Faith*; (d) *Story of Abraham, Isaac and Mambre*.⁶⁴ We have examined some of these and so far none seems to be related to the Greek *Testament of Abraham* or the Slavonic *Apocalypse* of the same patriarch.

2. *Adam*. Adamic writings are particularly numerous in Armenian. As well as the translated works already discussed, we may note the following compositions.

a. *Cycle of 4 Works*. Four writings which are part of a single cycle were first published by Yovsēp‘ianc‘ and most recently edited and translated, with new manuscript evidence by Lipscomb. The same four works exist in Georgian, likely

⁶³ It is our intention to do this in a future volume of Armenian apocryphal texts. One work was printed in *Մեծ Գրքերի Մասին* (Miscellany), Constantinople 1717, pp. 55-60 (and later reprints): see ANASYAN, *Bibliology*, I, col. 138. A number of unpublished documents are listed there.

⁶⁴ Some material on Abraham is also integrated into *Biblical Paraphrases*, see STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 93-98.

translated from Armenian.⁶⁵ They take the story of the world from the revolt of the angels before creation through the incidents touching upon Cain, Abel and Seth. The names of the four individual compositions are:

History of the Creation and Transgression of Adam

History of Expulsion of Adam

History of Cain and Abel

Words of Adam to Seth.

b. *Work concerning the letter which God gave to Adam.* This is an unpublished document the details of which are unknown.⁶⁶

c. *Adam Fragments 1 and 2.* These two short pieces both deal with the tradition of the Quest of Seth and Eve for the Tree of Life. One of them usually occurs as an Appendix to the *Death of Adam* (discussed above). They have been published.⁶⁷

d. *Adam Story 1 and Adam Story 2.* These two short texts are embedded in a longer document dealing with the traditions of Genesis. Other than this fact, there is no particular connection between them. *Adam Story 1* deals briefly with events down to the birth of Enoch. It includes the legend of the cheirograph and a form of the

⁶⁵ Full bibliography is to be found in STONE, *History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, pp. 102-104. Further manuscripts of this work exist in various libraries and a new edition is now desirable. The Georgian works were discussed by LÜDTKE, «Georgische Adam-Bücher».

⁶⁶ Its existence is noted by ANASYAN, *Bibliology*, I, col. 243; STONE, *History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, p. 107.

⁶⁷ STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 2-11; a new manuscript is published in STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming). On the quest of Seth, see E.C. QUINN, *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life*, Chicago 1962.

tradition of the iron helmet worn by Enoch as a penance.⁶⁸ *Adam Story 2* highlights the chronological and typological correspondences between the life of Adam and that of Christ.⁶⁹

e. *History of the Forefathers, Adam and His Sons and Grandsons*. This important apocryphon is a partly scholastic and partly narrative work dealing events and issues from the life of the protoplasts and as far down as the flood.⁷⁰ It contains varied and sometimes competing traditions, including some which must have been created in Syriac. It is uncertain whether it should be regarded as a translated or a created apocryphon, but it certainly contains substantial units of translated material.

f. *History of the Repentance of Adam and Eve*. As far as is known today, this writing survives in a single manuscript in Yerevan. It is a narrative dealing with the protoplasts and is dependent, in part, on *The Book of Adam* and the Armenian version of Genesis.⁷¹

h. *Adam, Eve and the Incarnation* takes history from the creation, expulsion and death of the protoplasts to the birth, baptism and eventual crucifixion of Christ. We have

⁶⁸ On this, see STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 85; IDEM, *Adam and Eve*, p. 107 (forthcoming).

⁶⁹ Both these texts are published by STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming).

⁷⁰ See M.E. STONE, «The History of the Forefathers, Adam and His Sons and Grandsons», *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* I (1984), pp. 79-91 for a description and discussion; it is published in full with translation and commentary in STONE, *Adam and Eve* (forthcoming).

⁷¹ This work was published by YOVSEP'IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 325-330; ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 71-80 and LIPSCOMB, *Armenian Apocryphal Adam Literature*, pp. 210-244. On literary relationships, see *ibid*, pp. 70-82 and see STONE, *History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, p. 104.

studied it in three manuscript copies, each of which presents a different recension. One manuscript is in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and the other two in the Matenadaran, Institute of Ancient Manuscripts in Erevan. The book makes explicit the underlying rationale of much of the Adam literature, viz. that Adam's sin actually brought about the incarnation of Christ.⁷² It contains the legend of the cheirograph of Adam. The legend relates the second deception of Adam and Eve by Satan and their signing a contract with him. It occurs in a range of Greek, Romanian, Russian and Bulgarian sources, as well as in several Armenian writings, including the *History of the Expulsion of Adam and Eve*.⁷³

Three further published works contain Adam traditions. *Abel and other Pieces* is a collection of narrative fragments embedded within a larger hortatory work on Genesis. Fragments deal with Enoch, the Giants, the Sethites and the Cainites and the like. *Question*, mentioned above in connection with the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*, also contains important Adam material. An associated work is *Sethites and Cainites*, which deals with traditions relating to the descendants of Seth and Cain.⁷⁴

i. *Other unpublished Adam works*. The manuscripts we have assembled for eventual publication contain a number of Adamic writings. These include documents entitled as follows, some of which may be copies of the same work or of works listed above: (a) *History of Adam the Forefather*; (b) *Concerning the Life of Adam (in) Paradise* ;

⁷² This work will be published in STONE, *Adam and Eve* (forthcoming).

⁷³ A study of the cheirograph will be published soon in a book by G.A. Anderson and M.E. Stone on the apocryphal Adam literature.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* These three documents are included in STONE, *Adam and Eve* (forthcoming).

(c) *This is the Writing written by the Finger of God and Sealed*; (d) *Adam Text*; (e) *Adam Text and Prayers*; (f) *Concerning Adam*; (g) *History of Eve who ate of the Fruit*. There is also some Adamic material in *Biblical Paraphrases* (see below)

Ark Story 1 and *Ark Story 2* are two short, unpublished works which deal with the Ark of Noah, highlighting its typological significance, as is done in the *Story of Noah* in *Biblical Paraphrases*.⁷⁵

History of the Ark of the Covenant. This text is unpublished and its character is unknown.

Biblical Paraphrases is a work which gives an epitome of the biblical account from creation to Joshua, with the integration of many apocryphal details and traditions. Two recensions of it have been published.⁷⁶

Daniel. A number of unpublished works dealing with Daniel have been noted. One is entitled *Portion of Daniel the Prophet*, while other works are related to dream interpretation. The character of all these is unknown.⁷⁷

David. We have noted two works about David, *Portion of David the Prophet* and *History of Story of David*. The character of these works is unknown. David is also the subject of part of *Biblical Paraphrases*.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ These two short texts are currently being prepared for publication.

⁷⁶ See STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 81-126.

⁷⁷ The Armenian version of Daniel clearly contains the so-called «additions to Daniel» while the *Seventh Vision of Daniel*, a fairly widespread work which has been published and translated, is discussed above.

⁷⁸ It should be noted that Psalm 151 is found with the Armenian Psalter, as is normal in Christian

Elijah. One Elianic work, the *Short History of Elijah* was included in the collection of Yovsēp‘ianc‘ and translated by Issaverdens.⁷⁹ It opens with an extract from the *Vita Eliae* and various incidents follow relating to Elijah and based on the biblical Elijah stories. The incident with the priests of Baal is much developed.⁸⁰ *Concerning Elijah* is an unknown work.

Enoch. The apocalyptic *Vision of Enoch the Just* is to be found in the standard collections of Yovsēp‘ianc‘ and Issaverdens.⁸¹ The work is being studied by A. Hultgård. It has no immediate connection with the well-known Ethiopic or Slavonic Enoch apocalypses or with allied material from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some further traditions about Enoch are embedded in the Adamic texts as well as in the work entitled *Abel and Other Pieces*.⁸²

Esther. There exists an apocryphal story of Esther. Its character is unknown.

usage.

⁷⁹ YOVSĒP‘IANC‘, *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 333-342; ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 171-184. Additional manuscripts exist.

⁸⁰ See for a brief discussion and description, M.E. STONE and J. STRUGNELL, *The Books of Elijah, Parts 1 and 2*, Missoula 1979 (Texts and Translations, Pseudepigrapha Series V), pp. 98-100. Citations in Armenian from other Elianic apocrypha are presented and discussed in that work.

⁸¹ YOVSĒP‘IANC‘, *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 378-386; ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 235-247. See also SARGHISSIAN, *Studies*, pp. 133-134.

⁸² Published by STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming). Certain of these are mentioned above in the discussion of *Adam Story 1*.

Ezekiel. There are a number of Armenian traditions relating to Ezekiel. One work, *Vision of Ezekiel*, has been studied and edited.⁸³ It is an exegesis of Ezekiel 1, also reflecting extensive working out of the typology of four implicit in the faces of the Chariot.⁸⁴ There are also additional biographies of Ezekiel included in various hagiographic collections. These are not identical with the *Vita of Ezekiel* to be found in *Vitae Prophetarum*, and have been edited and translated. They are currently in the press.⁸⁵

Questions of Ezra is a work which contains a dialogue between the prophet Ezra and an angel concerning the souls of humans. Two recensions of it have been published and a new edition, translation and commentary are in press. On the one hand it is related to Armenian elenchic literature, such as the *Questions of St. Gregory* and, on the other, to the apocryphal Esdras works in Greek and Latin.⁸⁶

⁸³ A translation and discussion of it may be found in M.E. STONE, «The Armenian Vision of Ezekiel», in *Christians among Jews and Gentiles: K. Stendahl Festschrift*, ed. G.W.E Nickelsburg and G.W. MacRae, Philadelphia 1986, pp. 261-269. An edition of the Armenian text is to appear in M.E. STONE, D. SATRAN and B. WRIGHT, *The Apocryphal Ezekiel*, Atlanta (Texts and Translations, Pseudepigrapha Series), (forthcoming).

⁸⁴ This typology is commonplace, of course, in many types of Armenian works. A recently published example is the colophon of Het'um Bayl, published by S. AJAMIAN, «The Colophon of the Gospel of Hethum 'Bayl'», in *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, pp. 1-13. Other examples are to be found in the essay by N. Stone, «The Four Rivers of Paradise: An Iconographical Study», *Proceedings of the Jerusalem Conference on Jewish and Oriental Christian Exegesis of Genesis*, (forthcoming).

⁸⁵ STONE, SATRAN and WRIGHT, *Apocryphal Ezekiel*, (forthcoming).

⁸⁶ YOVSEĀP'IANC', *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 300-303; ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 504-509; M.E. STONE, «Two New Discoveries Concerning the Uncanonical Ezra Books», *Sion* LII (1978), pp. 54-60 (Armenian).; IDEM, «Questions of Ezra», in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, I, Garden City 1983, pp. 591-599 (English translation); IDEM, «A New Edition and Translation of the Questions of Ezra», in *Solving*

Sermon Concerning the Flood. This is a homily, but contains a number of distinct passages of apocryphal traditions which have been prepared for publication. They relate to the Sethites and the Cainites and other analogous materials.⁸⁷

Response to the Epistle of Jeremiah. This is unpublished work is presumably based on the *Epistle of Jeremiah*, a small apocryphon which is often reckoned as the final, sixth chapter of *Book of Baruch*.

Job. There is a corpus of works associated with Job. I have transcribed some and I have microfilms of others. It is not yet clear just how many writings are involved, but apparently none of them is identical with the Greek *Testament of Job*.⁸⁸ The works bear titles like *History of Job the Just* and *History of Job*.

Jonah. One work connected with this prophet was published by Yovsēp‘ianc‘ and translated by Issaverdens. It is a narrative work entitled *Preaching of the Prophet Jonah in the city of Nineveh* and other works exist entitled *Story of Jonah*, *Concerning Jonah*, etc.⁸⁹

Riddles, Untying Knots. Biblical and Epigraphic Studies in Honor of J.C. Greenfield, ed. Z. Zevit, S. Gittin and M. Sokoloff (in press). See also Sarghissian, *Studies*, pp. 452-484. The chief apocryphal Esdras works are *The Greek Apocalypse of Ezra*, *The Apocalypse of Sedrach*, and *Revelatio Beati Esdrae*. For basic bibliography on these, see STONE, *Fourth Ezra*, pp. 43-47.

⁸⁷ Edited in STONE, *Adam and Eve* (forthcoming).

⁸⁸ S.P. BROCK and J.-C. PICARD, *Testamentum Iobi edidit S.P. Brock et Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece edidit J.-C. Picard*, Leiden 1967 (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece, II, eds. A.-M. Denis and M. de Jonge).

⁸⁹ YOVSEḶP‘IANC‘, *Uncanonical Books*, pp. 343-348; ISSAVERDENS, *Uncanonical Writings*, pp. 185-191.

Concerning the Bringing of Joseph to Egypt. The character of this unpublished work is unknown.

Apocryphal Story of Judith. The character of this unpublished work is unknown.

Melchizedek. There is a considerable literature about Melchizedek in a number of languages. The *Story of Melchizedek* is an unpublished work, the character of which is unknown.

Moses. Three works connected with Moses are known, *History of Moses*, *Life of Moses*, and *Story of Moses*. The first two of these have been published, *History of Moses* as part of *Biblical Paraphrases* and *Life of Moses* (see above, among the biblical apocrypha).⁹⁰

Solomon. A number of short texts relating to king Solomon exist. One of these occurs in a biblical manuscript, while there is evidence that another may have been translated. The published texts have been reworked and re-assessed, but a good amount of unexamined manuscript material still exists. The chief works are *From the Commentary on the Paralipomena*, *Concerning King Solomon* and *Concerning the Books of Solomon I and II*. Among the unpublished texts we note *Solomon and the Building of the Temple* though the possible relationship of this work to *Testament of Solomon* remains unclear.⁹¹

⁹⁰ For *History of Moses* see STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 109-116 and for the *Life of Moses* see *ibid*, pp. 154-155 and IDEM, «Three Armenian Accounts of the Death of Moses» = *Studies*, pp. 54-57.

⁹¹ For bibliography concerning published Armenian Solomonic works, see note 23, above. The Greek text of *Testament of Solomon* is most readily available in the edition of C.C. MCCOWN, *The Testament of Solomon*, Leipzig 1922.

Apocryphal story of Susanna. The character of this unpublished work is unknown.

Apocryphal story of Tobit. The character of this unpublished work is unknown.

Associated Texts

There also exists a substantial body of “associated texts” written in Armenian. A number of these may be translations or extracts from works in other languages, but as long as that is not definitely established, we have chosen to list them here. They are recorded in short order and indications are given of texts which have been published.

Adam Material

The 10 Features of Adam before the Fall; About the Bones of Adam; Concerning the Sevenfold Sins and Punishments of Adam; Poem On the Fall of Adam (published);⁹²

There were 12 Blessings in Paradise, which Adam Destroyed; What Sort of Words did Adam Speak on his Expulsion from Eden?

Concerning the Three Children

Concerning the Three Children, Ananites, who were in Babylon; Inventio of the Remains of the Three Children; Martyrdom of the Holy Children, Anania, Azaria and Mishael; Life of the Three Children (published).⁹³

⁹² Published in STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming).

⁹³ See note 26 above.

Lists

Names of Jewels of Breastplate of Aaron and *The 12 Gems*⁹⁴ seem to deal with the jewels on the high-priest's ephod. *The Names of 12 Nations which know writing* (published)⁹⁵ and *The 72 Tongues* (published)⁹⁶ are ethnographic lists, the latter containing names of a number of unidentified peoples. *Months of the Hebrews* (published) is a combination of the Jewish month names with a calculation which resembles the Armenian calendar.⁹⁷ *Peoples of the Sons of Noah* (published)⁹⁸ expands upon the division of the earth in Gen 10:2 and 2 Chron. 1:5-12.

Angelological Texts

Angelological Text;⁹⁹ *Concerning Classes of Angels; Concerning Destruction of Angels; Concerning the Names of Archangels*. These documents often have a medical

⁹⁴ These works might be connected with the Epiphianian *de gemmis* material. A number of Armenian texts related to Epiphanius' treatise have been published. See ROBERT P. BLAKE, *Epiphanius De Gemmis*, London 1934 (Studies and Documents, II) and M.E. STONE, «An Armenian Epitome of Epiphanius' *De gemmis*», *Harvard Theological Review* LXXXII (1989), pp. 467-76.

⁹⁵ See STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming).

⁹⁶ STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming); more manuscripts are now known to exist.

⁹⁷ M.E. STONE, «The Months of the Hebrews», *Le Muséon* CI (1988), pp. 5-12.

⁹⁸ This text, quite widely spread, embroiders the division of the earth among the three sons of Noah. See STONE, *Onomastica Sacra*. There are quite numerous other re-uses of this material in Armenian texts.

⁹⁹ See M.E. STONE, «Some Armenian Angelological and Uranographical Texts», *Le Muséon* CV (1992), pp. 147-157. Much angelological material is contained in the amulets published by F. FEYDIT, *Amulettes de l'Arménie chrétienne*, Venice 1986 (Bibliothèque arménienne de la Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian).

or apotropaic character and angels feature largely in Armenian amulets and similar texts.

Chronological Texts

There are numerous schematic chronological texts. Many of them give the spans of time between various patriarchs or events of Old Testament history leading up to the Incarnation of Christ or later. Some of these texts have been published, but many more remain in manuscript.¹⁰⁰ It seems desirable that a thorough study of this tradition be made. Chronological data are perhaps also to be found in the following documents: *Generations of Noah* (published); *Times of the 12 Prophets, Concerning the Six Millennia* (published).¹⁰¹

Onomastic Texts

Names of the Four Matriarchs (published); *Names of the Patriarchs* (published); *Praises of the Prophets' names*; *Names of the Translators*; *Wives of the Ancestors and Patriarchs*.¹⁰² Some of these are extracts from the *Onomastica Sacra* and the character of others remains unclear.

¹⁰⁰ Some such texts have been published by STONE, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 82-83; STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming).

¹⁰¹ STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming).

¹⁰² One such list was published by LIPSCOMB, «Book of Jubilees in Armenian». Analogous material is to be found in STONE, *Adam and Eve*, (forthcoming).

Other Works

*Sermon from Sirach; Praises of the Prophets; Exegesis on the Tower; Concerning the Tower of Babel; Sermon concerning the Sodomites; Concerning the Resurrection; Concerning the History of Tortures of Soul in Hell; Concerning the Unsleeping Worm; Uranographic Texts.*¹⁰³

FUNCTION OF THE APOCRYPHA IN THE ARMENIAN CHURCH

The range of apocrypha listed above, both biblical and non-biblical, is quite extraordinary. The number of works could perhaps be doubled by further consultation of catalogues of Armenian manuscripts, of the manuscripts themselves and of old printed books. A literature of such proportions must have been created purposefully, and it must have influenced Armenian literature, thought and culture. The clarification of these issues, however, has received scant attention, as have the books themselves. Why were apocrypha created in the Armenian tradition, why were they transmitted from generation to generation and how did they function? These remain obscure questions.

The manuscripts and contexts in which the works are transmitted must teach us something about how they were used. A fairly distinctly defined corpus of apocrypha is associated with the Bible in manuscripts. Such works served to fill out and enrich the biblical stories and, indeed, some of them may have had a status close to the corpus of biblical scripture. In this sense, their function was partly hortatory and partly learned. Some of the works served to bring home the moral and religious

messages of the biblical books. Others helped expand, embellish and complement elements of the biblical books and narratives. The Bible was, of course, the foundational document of Armenian Christian culture.

Most apocrypha intimately connected with the Bible were translated from Greek. Many of the extra-biblical apocrypha and the associated materials were translated from Syriac and Latin, while others were created in Armenian. This seems to indicate the particular character of the biblical corpus in Armenian and its strong Hellenizing orientation. Yet the interest in and urge to create apocrypha continued well after the fifth century when the Bible was translated.

The function of some apocryphal writings is also implicit in their use in hagiographic collections. Apocrypha served as the readings for the days of the biblical saints. Thus, they played the hortatory, exemplary and intercessory function which was part of the role of saints. The chief such collections containing apocryphal texts are the *Ĉarëntir* (Collection of Homilies) and the *Yaysmawurk* (Synaxarion).

In an analogous way, a few works explain current practices of the Armenian church as stemming from the actions of the patriarchs. The Ařajawor fast, the week before Lent, is connected in the Armenian tradition with Adam. The basis of this fast is said to be the penitential fast which Adam and Eve undertook after their expulsion from the Garden. The *Questions of Ezra* explain in detail the reasons for funeral masses and the censing of graves practiced in the Armenian Church.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ STONE, « Armenian Angelological and Uranographical Texts ».

¹⁰⁴ R.W. THOMSON, « The Maccabees in Early Armenian Historiography », *Journal of Theological Studies* XXVI (1975), 329-341 points out the importance of the Maccabean struggle against Syrian oppression as a pattern for Armenians fighting religious coercion. Such

The Armenian tradition took considerable interest in scholastic matters. Lists of biblical names, onomastic explanations, the enumeration of the names of the translators of the LXX, the list of the traditional 72 languages and similar texts abound. They are not found in biblical manuscripts, but in Miscellanies which assembled material about different topics of interest to the learned and scholarly. The proliferation of Canon Lists probably stems from the same motive, since frequently they do not appear to reflect the actual usage and decisions of the Church.¹⁰⁵

The story of the influence of the apocrypha on Armenian literature remains untold. Traditions drawn from the apocrypha entered into chronographies and histories (like the *Chronicle of Michael the Syrian*), into poems (like T'lkuranc'i's *On the Creation of the World*), and into theological and exegetical treatises, such as the *Teaching of St. Gregory* or the *Commentary on Genesis* by Vardan vardapet.

R. Evine has pointed out that the *Book of Questions*, an elenchic work by Vanakan vardapet, uses and transmits many apocryphal traditions and texts. This work has not been edited and Dr. Ervine has examined it in manuscripts.¹⁰⁶ The great scholastic Vanakan vardapet (1181-1251), was a student of Mxit'ar Gos (d. 1213). He was, in turn, the teacher of a generation of distinguished scholars, including the renowned Vardan Arawelc'i, Tēr Israyēl (redactor of the Synaxarion) and others. He is,

a direct use of apocryphal tradition, however, is rare and, anyway, *Maccabees* is part of the Armenian Bible.

¹⁰⁵ See the remarks in STONE, «Jewish Apocrypha Literature», p. 289 = *Studies*, p. 7.

¹⁰⁶ I am indebted Dr. Ervine for this valuable information. Her paper on *The Book of Questions* will be published in *Proceedings of the Jerusalem Conference on Jewish and Oriental Christian Exegesis of Genesis*, (forthcoming). Information on Vanakan vardapet may be

therefore, a central figure in medieval Armenian learning. His use of apocrypha not only provides dates *ante quem* for certain of these works but, even more significantly, indicates their role in the dominant Armenian intellectual tradition.

What is evident is that this corpus of literature is very large, and much remains to be investigated. It reflects a remarkable confluence of Greek, Syriac and Latin sources; yet it contains many works created in Armenian. It was both translated and created. The fuller acquaintance with this literature and understanding of its function will reveal in an aspect of Armenian antiquity which is barely known today.

found in N. Bogharian, *Հայ Գրականությունը (Նախա-և հետադարձ) (Armenian Authors [V-XVII centuries])*, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 290-291.

