

THE ISRAEL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

PROCEEDINGS • VOLUME IV No. 4

*The Apocryphal Literature in
the Armenian Tradition*

by

MICHAEL E. STONE



Jerusalem 1969

© The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Jerusalem

Set on Monophoto
at the Israel Program for Scientific Translations, Jerusalem

THE APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE IN
THE ARMENIAN TRADITION

by

MICHAEL E. STONE

THE CONTRIBUTION that Armenian literature can make to the study of the apocryphal books is twofold. Armenian versions of various apocryphal books are significant witnesses to the text of the latter. The importance of these witnesses depends largely upon the particularities of the transmission of the individual books; we shall revert to some features of this aspect of the subject later. This apart, however, there exists an extensive apocryphal literature in Armenian, and it is clearly possible that among these books, many of which are of Christian origin, previously unknown, older Jewish works may be preserved. The potential contribution of Armenian to the textual criticism of the Apocrypha has been consistently neglected, and a great deal still remains to be done in this area of research. The literary tradition of the Armenians originated in the fifth century C.E., and, as with the literature of other oriental Christian nations, it commenced with translation, more particularly with the translation of the Bible. The version of the Bible translated into Armenian was the Septuagint, based in this case upon a text primarily of Origenic type. In the attempt to determine the exact limits of the Armenian Canon in ancient times similar problems arise to those encountered with respect to the Greek.¹ Nonetheless, it appears to be clear that the Armenian Bible contained, in addition to the books of the Hebrew Canon, those books that are commonly

1 See the material gathered by H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge 1914, pp. 197-230. A more recent study is that of A. Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church (Harvard Theological Studies, XX)*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1964, who gives a valuable reassessment of much of the material bearing on this problem.

called the Apocrypha, and it is possible that there were perhaps one or two other books that had a semi-canonical status.²

The textual state of the apocryphal books normally included in the Armenian Bible is the same as that of the Armenian Bible itself. This, unfortunately, leaves much to be desired. The best edition of the Bible in Armenian remains that of J. Zohrabian, which was published in Venice in 1805.³ In the main body of this edition he includes, in addition to the books of the Hebrew Canon, the following works: I Ezra (the Greek Book of Ezra), Judith, Tobit, the first three books of the Maccabees (IV Maccabees, as far as is known, does not exist in Armenian), The Wisdom of Solomon and The Book of Baruch. Daniel and Esther contain the so-called Additions — the supplementary material found in the Septuagint of these books — and at the end of Psalms, unnumbered, is to be found Ps. cli. Furthermore, Zohrabian adds at the end of the New Testament a supplement in which he prints the text of The Wisdom of Ben Sira, The Apocalypse of Ezra and The Prayer of Manasses, as well as certain New Testament Apocrypha. Zohrabian's text, although representing a great advance at the time when it was prepared, is scarcely adequate by the standards of modern textual scholarship. It was compiled on the basis of a very limited number of manuscripts, which are not quoted by sigla but simply as 'a few', 'some', 'most', etc. It is quite clear that new collations of the many manuscripts known today would result in far-reaching improvements of this text at innumerable points.⁴

2 A most important list of canonical and non-canonical books in Armenian is that of Mexit'ar of Ayirivank', which may be found in M.R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, London 1920, pp. xiii-xiv, and other sources. The books he includes in the canon are by no means all accepted generally by the Armenian Church. The subject is largely uninvestigated, and there appear to be few substantial native sources, dating from the first millenium, other than usage in Armenian writers, which is a difficult factor to evaluate. Some other canon lists exist, but have not yet all been published or discussed in detail. The Armenian Church, of course, officially accepted in this matter the decisions of those Councils of the Church to which it subscribed. In particular the Laodicene Canon was considered important in this regard. On this subject, see also M. Tēr Movsesian, *A History of the Armenian Version of the Bible*, St. Petersburg 1902 (in Russian). The Canons of the Council of Partaw of 768 contain a list apparently based on the Greek lists; see *Sion*, NS XL (1966), pp. 76-77.

3 J. Zohrabian (ed.), *Աստուածաշունչը Մատենան Հին և Կարգ Կտակարանաց (The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments)*, Venice 1805.

4 On Zohrabian's manuscript basis and principles of editing see M. Stone, 'Manuscripts and Readings of Armenian IV Ezra', *Textus*, VI (1968), pp. 48-49; B. Johnson, *Die armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarische Zeuge im I. Samuelbuch (Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series, II)*, Lund 1968, pp. 16-20. On the Armenian version in general compare also Swete, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 1), pp. 118-120 and bibliography there.

The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition

In general, it is apparent that the importance of the Armenian version for the textual study of the apocryphal books depends upon three criteria: the accuracy of the translation, the age of the translation and the situation existing in the Greek itself. Thus, it seems to be generally true that for those Apocrypha included in the Greek uncial codices of the Septuagint and in its chief minuscule manuscripts the Armenian is not of outstanding importance. Nonetheless, it may well on occasion preserve important readings. The accuracy and reliability of Armenian translations from the Greek are well known, although certain books may exhibit particular problems in this respect.⁵ This, of course, enhances the importance of Armenian as a witness, even for the text of those books that are extant in the Septuagint.

The Greek text of these apocryphal books, quite apart from any separate studies, is being published in the two major editions of the Septuagint, that of Göttingen and that of Cambridge. Quite recently, for example, we have seen the publication of Ben Sira under the editorship of Joseph Ziegler, who is recognized as one of the leading authorities on the Septuagint today.⁶ In this case, he presents the Armenian evidence in his apparatus, and in his Introduction (pp. 33–35) he discusses the sources upon which he bases the readings he adduces and the methodological considerations that guided him in this. He knows of three forms of the Armenian text. They are the Bible of Zohrabian of 1805, the Bible of Bagratuni of 1860, which was also published in Venice, and one chapter of a third recension which was published by Patriarch Eghishe Durian of Jerusalem in 1927.⁷ Since Ziegler's book appeared, portions have been published of what appears to be a most important early form of the Armenian version of Ben Sira, which was discovered in a manuscript in the Matenadaran, the library of ancient manuscripts in Erevan, Armenian SSR.⁸

5 See Swete, *ibid.*, p. 119, quoting F.C. Conybeare. Compare also R. Marcus, 'An Armenian-Greek Index to Philo's *Quaestiones* and *De Vita Contemplativa*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LIII (1933), p. 251. The matter is also discussed in the present writer's 'Some Features of the Armenian Version of IV Ezra', *Le Muséon*, LXXIX (1966), pp. 388–390.

6 *Sapientia Jesu Filii Sirach*, edited by J. Ziegler, Göttingen 1965.

7 J. Zohrabian, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 3), Suppl., pp. 2–12; A.G. Bagratuni (ed.), *Գիրք Աստուածաշունչ Մատենան Հին և Նոր Կտակարանաց* (*Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*), Venice 1860, pp. 681–704; E. Durian, 'Նորագիտ Գլուխներ Սիրաքայ Հին Քարգմանութեան' (*Newly Discovered Chapters of the Ancient Translation of the Book of Sirach*), *Ուսումնասիրութիւնք և Քննադատութիւնք* (*Studies and Critiques*), Jerusalem 1935, pp. 320–326, originally published in *Sion* (*Journal of the Armenian Patriarchate, Jerusalem*), 1927, pp. 246–250.

8 G. Abgarian, 'Սիրաքի Գրքի Հնագույն Քարգմանութեան Նորահայտ Հատ-

This publication, in the Armenian language, most unfortunately does not present the full text of the newly found manuscript. Moreover, the edition of the published fragments is by no means the last word to be said on the Armenian of Ben Sira. Indeed, the question of the relationship between the Armenian text-forms and the origin of the additional special materials found in the Armenian Ben Sira are worthy of careful re-examination.⁹ But, as in the case of all the Armenian apocryphal books, this should be done only after the collation and study of all extant manuscript material.

The unsatisfactory state of the Armenian text has resulted in Ziegler's quoting the Armenian only where further evidence is to be found to support its reading. Yet, if the Armenian Ben Sira was already known in the fifth century, as appears to be the case, and if it is an accurate rendering of the Greek, then its witness is clearly an important one, since it antedates many of the Greek manuscripts. The insufficient utilization of this text can be attributed largely to the inadequate manuscript upon which the published forms of the Armenian rest.¹⁰

It may be of interest to observe in passing that the Old Armenian is not the only translation of Ben Sira into Armenian. There are also two seventeenth century translations made from Latin, one of which is the text of Ben Sira published by Oskan in his first printed Armenian Bible of 1666.¹¹

As an example of the textual materials still unexplored, the following facts will be found illuminating. The collection of manuscripts of the Armenian Patriarchate in Jerusalem comprises about 4,000 volumes. Of these, the printed catalogue so far covers the first thousand, about a quarter of the whole. These thousand manuscripts alone contain six more copies of Ben Sira as well as related hagiographical and other works.¹² Among the 10,000 or more manuscripts in Erevan many ad-

վածներ' (Newly Discovered Fragments of the Oldest Translation of the Book of Sirach), *Eichmiadzine*, Vol. XXIII (1966), Nos. 11–12, pp. 58–70.

9 Abgarian's characterization of the type of text printed by Zohrabian as secondary is in no way proven; cf. *ibid.*, p. 59, n. 1. Furthermore, only a careful study of its relationships to the other forms of the text can determine whether, even if it is secondary in its general character, it preserves some original readings.

10 See Ziegler, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 6), p. 37. On the date of the Armenian version of Ben Sira, see Abgarian, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 8), pp. 59–60.

11 Oskan Erevanec'i (ed.), *Աստուածաշունչ Հինց և Կարոյ Կտակարանոց (Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments)*, Amsterdam 1666. The other was translated by Step'annos Lehaç'i; see Abgarian (supra, n. 8), *loc. cit.*

12 These are MS 410 (N. Bogharian, *Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts*, II, Jerusalem 1967, p. 348; in Armenian): *The Lives of the Fathers*, 1631 C.E., pp. 775 ff.; MS 501 (Bogharian, *ibid.*, p. 496): Bible, seventeenth century, foll. 564r–572r; MS 711

ditional copies are known to exist, and none, or virtually none, of these has ever been studied, nor were any of them available to Zohrabian.

The situation is no better with regard to most of the other 'Apocrypha', so-called. It may not be out of place to discuss here at least one further example illustrative of the general position, namely, The Apocalypse of Ezra (IV Ezra). This book does not always appear in Armenian Bible manuscripts, although it is included in the list of canonical books of Mexit'ar of Ayirivank'. The same work is also extant in Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Georgian, Arabic and some Coptic fragments. All these translations were made from Greek, and the Greek text is no longer extant. Therefore each of these daughter versions is a witness to this lost Greek. The Armenian version of the book, based on the text contained in a maximum of four manuscripts in Venice, in the library of the Mechitarist Fathers on the island of San Lazzaro, has been known to scholars for over one hundred and fifty years. This was the situation already when the Bible of Zohrabian appeared in 1805, and no change has taken place in the published literature since that date.¹³

The present writer carried out a careful search and examination of Armenian manuscript libraries and was able to assemble copies of a further fifteen manuscripts of the work; an additional two or three copies are known to exist. As a result, some basic features of the transmission and of the nature of the version itself have been clarified,

(Bogharian, *Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts*, III, Jerusalem 1968, p. 154; in Armenian): Bible (incomplete) and Miscellany, 1619 C.E., foll. 96–110; MS 724 (Bogharian, *ibid.*, p. 187): Bible (incomplete), seventeenth century, foll. 119v–149r; MS 840 (Bogharian, *ibid.*, p. 323): Book of Sermons, 1609 C.E., foll. 514r ff.

What is apparently an abbreviated form of Ben Sira is encountered in MS 743 (Bogharian, *ibid.*, p. 189). This manuscript was written in L'vov in 1618 C.E. and on foll. 63r–70r it contains *Բանք Իմաստնոյ Սիրաքա Համատոս* (Brief Words of Sirach the Sage). There is also a work to be found in MS 723 (Bogharian, *ibid.*, p. 167) entitled *Պատմութիւն Յեսուսն սրբոյն Սիրաքա* (History of Jesus the Son of Sirach). The manuscript is a Miscellany, written in Constantinople in 1698. The History of Sirach is found on foll. 59r–82v, and it seems most likely to be hagiographic in nature. It has apparently never been published.

Three more copies of Ben Sira in Jerusalem are known to the writer, although they are not yet included in the *Catalogue*, and doubtless a number of further copies will come to light as Bishop Bogharian continues to publish his *Catalogue*. They are all in Bible manuscripts: MS 1927, written in Constantinople in the year 1649, foll. 293v–299r; MS 1933 from Isfahan, written in 1645, foll. 327r–333v; MS 1934, also written in Isfahan, dated 1643, foll. 496r–506v. Moreover, commentaries and sermons on Ben Sira exist in Armenian; for example, in Jerusalem MSS 36, 44, 65, 106, 140.

¹³ Thus Zohrabian, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 3), Suppl., p. 1, Col. i. For a discussion of the subsequent editions and publications see Stone, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 4), pp. 47–48.

quite apart from the contribution that the Armenian translation can make to the textual criticism of the book as a whole. The final evaluation of the Armenian version must await the publication of the full critical text of the book, which is now in preparation.¹⁴

The complexity of the Armenian version of IV Ezra is increased by one additional factor. The Georgian version of the book, according to its editor Robert Blake, is based on an Armenian intermediary.¹⁵ If this is true, then it must be further noted that the Armenian text that formed the basis of the Georgian is of a very different type to that preserved in the Armenian manuscripts. The possibility remains open that this second Armenian version may still turn up in some manuscript somewhere in the world.

There are some further interesting aspects of the transmission of the materials associated with this Ezra Apocalypse in the Armenian tradition. The first is that in the first printed Armenian Bible, published by Oskan, the text of IV Ezra is not the Old Armenian version but, as was the case above with Ben Sira, a translation into late Classical Armenian from the Vulgate, and this translation was perhaps the work of Oskan himself. It includes, therefore, Chaps. i–ii and xv–xvi, as in the Latin version, and omits the ‘Missing Fragment’ which follows vii:36, resembling in this respect the Vulgate manuscripts but not the older Latin codices.¹⁶ Oskan’s Bible was published in 1666. In a Bible manuscript, written in Constantinople in 1689 and now preserved in the Matenadaran, we find, instead of the Old Armenian translation of IV Ezra, this translation of Oskan’s. The manuscript was copied by Nahapet Urfayec’i (of Edessa) who later became Catholicos, that is, supreme head of the Armenian Church.¹⁷ In the manuscript, the book is entitled ‘The Fourth Book of Ezra’, which is in line with the Latin

14 See the writer’s preliminary studies in the articles cited above in notes 4 and 5. See also his study ‘Some Remarks on the Textual Criticism of IV Ezra’, *Harvard Theological Review*, LX (1967), pp. 107–115.

15 R. P. Blake, ‘The Georgian Version of Fourth Esdras from the Jerusalem Manuscript’, *Harvard Theological Review*, XIX (1926), pp. 305–307, 317–318.

16 IV Ezra vii:35–106; cf. R. L. Bensly, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra*, Cambridge 1875; B. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV Esra)*, Leipzig 1910, pp. xv ff.

17 Erevan, MS 349, foll. 608r–619v. A brief description is to be found in S. Eganian, A. Zeyt’unian & P. Ant’abian (eds.), *Յուշակ Զեոսդրաց Մատենակ Անվան Մատենադարանի* (*Catalogue of Manuscripts of the Maštoc’ Library*), I, Erevan 1965, Cols. 303–304. The writer has a microfilm of this manuscript at his disposal thanks to the kindness of the authorities of the Matenadaran. Nahapet was Catholicos between 1691 and 1705 C.E.

numbering. In the Armenian tradition the book is known as 'The Third Book of Ezra'.¹⁸

A collection of Armenian Apocrypha was prepared at the end of the last century by Sargis Yovsep'ianc'.¹⁹ The works included in this collection were edited on the basis of the Venice manuscripts, and an English translation of the collection was published a few years later by J. Issaverdens.²⁰ In this collection is to be found a work entitled 'Inquiries Made by the Prophet Ezra of the Angel of the Lord Concerning the Souls of Men' (hereinafter: *The Inquiries of Ezra*).²¹ Yovsep'ianc' and Issaverdens base their editions on the text contained in a *Maštoc'* (Ritual), MS 570 in the library of the Mechitarist Fathers of San Lazzaro. The manuscript was written in the year 1208, and no other copy of the work except this one has been found so far. Issaverdens observes that the manuscript is incomplete: a number of pages at the end are lost and others are badly damaged. In his opinion, the work is Christian and was written before the eighth century.²²

The book is a curious one, combining questions about the fate of the soul after death with admonitions to carry out the proper memorial ceremonies. There are descriptions of the ascent of the soul to the Throne of God and of the heavenly forces and powers that it encounters on the way. Of the vision of the Godhead the prophet asks with considerable emphasis:

My Lord, when you conduct it [the soul] through such terrors, through conflicts, through wars, through such burning heat, why do you not bring it to meet the Godhead, rather than cause it only to approach the Throne?

To this the angel replies that Ezra is merely a human being, while he, an angel, has not seen the Divine for 'the Godhead is awesome and wondrous, and who is able to look at the Uncreated Godhead?'

It is clear that, in part at least, this work is dependent on IV Ezra, although the verbal coincidences with the Armenian version of that

18 In Armenian Bible manuscripts in general, I Ezra is 'Εσδρας α' of the Septuagint, II Ezra is the Hebrew book of Ezra and III Ezra is The Apocalypse of Ezra. Nehemiah generally occurs between II and III Ezra. III Ezra is not always included in Biblical manuscripts.

19 S. Yovsep'ianc', *Անկանոն Գիրք Հին Կառկորանայ (Uncanonical Books of the Old Testament)*, Venice 1896.

20 J. Issaverdens, *The Uncanonical Writings of the Old Testament Found in the Armenian MSS. of the Library of St. Lazarus*², Venice 1934.

21 Yovsep'ianc', *op. cit.* (supra, n. 19), pp. 300-303; Issaverdens, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 20), pp. 505-509.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 504.

book are by no means as striking as are the resemblances of subject matter. The Inquiries of Ezra in the unique manuscript copy is incomplete, yet the extant material falls clearly into three sections. The first contains Ezra's initial inquiry of the angel about the fate of the souls. The second comprises the discussion of the two angels, the good one, who comes to the good soul, and the wicked one, who comes to the wicked soul. It is noteworthy that the angels appear to be, partly at least, embodiments of the acts of the individual. Thus we are told: 'Not that the angel is evil, but his own [the individual's] deeds [are evil].' The third section is concerned with the ascent of the soul, the description of the Godhead and the heavenly hosts. This is followed by the markedly Christian section on salvation from Satan. Not only is the manuscript incomplete at the end, but there is reason to think that a page, preceding the section dealing with the two angels, has been lost.²³

In his study of this apocryphal work, B. Sarghissian pointed out the relationship that it bears to the Armenian apocryphon 'Inquiries Made by St. Gregory the Illuminator about the Souls of Men' (hereinafter: *The Inquiries of St. Gregory*).²⁴ He has shown that *The Inquiries of St. Gregory* and *The Inquiries of Ezra* share a common source, but that *The Inquiries of St. Gregory* is more thoroughly Christianized. It seems likely that in this complex of materials some more ancient, perhaps even pre-Christian elements, are to be found, even if we do not go so far as to suggest a Zoroastrian source, as does Sarghissian.²⁵ Yet one more form of this material may now be added to those texts

23 B. Sarghissian, *Ուսումնասիրությունք Հին Կտակարանի Անգուստ Գրքոց Վրայ* (*Studies on the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament*), Venice 1898, pp. 453 f.

24 *Ibid.*, pp. 469 f. He prints the relevant parts of both texts in two parallel columns on pp. 465–469. Sarghissian also finds similarities between *The Inquiries of Ezra* and the *Visiones Pauli et Theotoki*, both of which are extant in Armenian (pp. 470 f.). He finds a further independent use of the same source material in other Armenian sources (pp. 474 f.).

25 *Ibid.*, pp. 461 f. The idea of the personification of evil and good deeds in the form of beings who appear to the dead in the guise of two women, a beautiful one for the just and an ugly one for the wicked, is well known in Zoroastrianism; cf. J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *La religion de l'Iran ancien*, Paris 1962, pp. 332 f. This is not necessarily the direct source of the idea here, although it may be its ultimate origin. Compare the material to be found in II Baruch li: 1–6 and Test. Abraham A, Chap. xvii; B, Chap. xiii, where other crystallizations of the same idea are to be found. In Iran the two female figures are intimately connected with the soul's crossing of the bridge *Činvat*. Compare the idea of the two women with the story quoted by Xenophon (*Memorabilia*, ii:1: 20 ff.) in the name of Prodicus. There they symbolize the ways of vice and virtue. This, however, appears in a quite different context to that of the Iranian concept or that in *The Inquiries of Ezra*.

The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition

adduced by Sarghissian. It is generally admitted today that the Armenian Menologium passed through four major recensions, those associated with Ter Israël (d. 1249), Kirakos the Oriental (composed 1269), Gregory of Anawarza (d. 1309) and Gregory of Xlat' (d. 1425). It would take us outside our subject to go into the details of the development of this Menologium.²⁶ It will suffice to note that the recension of Ter Israël has never been printed. In the second recension, the 5th of the month of Arek (= 13 March) is devoted to Ezra. After dealing with the biblical Ezra, the text for this day continues:

But the other Ezra, who was called Salathiel, was in Babylon and was mourning over the destruction of Zion. To him the Lord sent his angel, and he comforted him. And he, through the spirit of God, wrote the Law and the Prophets and he made new books and he instructed the people. And he saw the return of the captivity, and he died and was buried there.²⁷

The traditions reflected in this extract are based on The Apocalypse of Ezra, specifically on the first part of Chap. iii and the latter part of Chap. xiv. Only the last sentence differs from the Apocalypse, which relates Ezra's assumption to heaven. Of more interest, however, is the distinction between the Ezra of the biblical books and the Ezra of the Apocalypse, who is called 'the other Ezra'. A similar tradition, M. R. James pointed out, exists in the Latin sources.²⁸ There, too, we find a clear differentiation between Ezra-Salathiel and the biblical Ezra. The form Ezra-Salathiel was certainly known to Mexit'ar of Ayirivank' in the thirteenth century. It appears, instead of III Ezra, as the title of the book in the list of biblical and apocryphal works attributed to him. Moreover, it also appears as the title of the book in Erevan MS 1500. This manuscript, written between 1272 and 1288, is an autograph of Mexit'ar himself.²⁹ The use of this title, and not of

26 On the Menologium see most recently J. Mercérian, 'Introduction à l'étude des Synaxaires arméniens', *Bulletin arménologique (Mélanges de l'Université de St. Joseph, XL)*, Beirut 1953. This study provides an excellent summary of past scholarship and also a very fine critical bibliography.

27 G. Bayan (ed.), 'Le Synaxaire arménien de Tër-Israël', *Patrologia Orientalis, XXI*, Paris 1930, pp. 158-159. It has since been shown that this is not the recension of Ter Israël.

28 M. R. James, 'Salathiel qui et Ezras', *Journal of Theological Studies, XVIII* (1917), pp. 167 ff.; idem, 'Salathiel qui et Esdras', *ibid.*, XIX (1918), pp. 347 ff. See also B. Violet, *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt*, Leipzig 1924, pp. xliv ff.

29 See the catalogue of the manuscripts of the Matenadaran (*supra*, n. 17), Col. 568. Some information is also to be found in Stone, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 4), pp. 50-51; a photograph of the first column of the text of IV Ezra is reproduced there. At the start

III Ezra, means that the book was not reckoned among the books attributed to the biblical Ezra. Later, however, the situation reflected by the title of the book in the manuscripts changed, for already in the next copy, Venice Bible No. 9 of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, we find the title 'Third Ezra', clearly reflecting an identification with the Ezra of the other two books of that name.

In the printed edition of the third recension of the Menologium, published in Constantinople in 1834, we find, in spite of the many errors for which this edition is notorious, a text identical in nearly every respect with that of the second recension.³⁰

In the fourth recension, however, the position is rather different. The printed text that was available to the writer was the second edition, published in Constantinople in 1730. In this, for the 4th of Arek (= 12 March) two separate feasts are listed. The second is that of Ezra and Ezekiel the Prophets. After the material on Ezekiel, there occurs a form of the same text concerning Ezra-Salathiel as in the second and third recensions. The end of this passage varies somewhat and contains material based on the demand of the biblical Ezra for the divorce of foreign women. Then follows a text that opens with the words:

He saw the angel of the Lord and asked concerning the righteous and the sinners, when they leave this world.

The following conversation between Ezra and the angel on this subject is, substantially, another form of The Inquiries of Ezra. The version of the conversation preserved in the Menologium is much shorter than that in The Inquiries of Ezra, although the two largely resemble one another. The Menologium radically abbreviates the section on the good and evil angels, and omits the description of the Divine Throne altogether. The latter part of the Menologium text, taking its departure from a point common with The Inquiries of Ezra, is quite different.

It is clear that the Menologium at this stage incorporates a piece of older writing, since the material is to be found only in the fourth recension, which was completed over 150 years after the manuscript of The Inquiries of Ezra had been written. In view of this, the material at the end of the text in the Menologium can be regarded in a number of ways. It is apparent that the short form of the Menologium presumes the longer form of The Inquiries of Ezra. Therefore it is possible that the end of

of the text, in the margin, we find 'Salathiel Ezra', while the running heads, placed in the lower margin, read either 'Ezra Salathiel' or simply 'Ezra'.

30 *Βωλογιμνίου* (Menologium) (ed. G. P'ēšdōmalčian), Constantinople 1834, for 5 Arek = 14 March.

The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition

the text in the Menologium is part of the re-working that this form of the text has undergone. On the other hand it may be that it is a more original, or at least an alternative, form of the latter section of the extant The Inquiries of Ezra. A further possibility is that in the Menologium is preserved part of the material that was once contained in the last pages of The Inquiries of Ezra that have been lost, and that the last extant section of The Inquiries of Ezra was omitted in the course of abbreviation. The question requires further investigation, and perhaps some help would be afforded by a renewed study of the damaged last pages of The Inquiries of Ezra.³¹

One further observation must be made. The form of a conversation between the angel and the seer, especially a conversation with an argumentative flavour, is one of the typical literary features of IV Ezra. The expansions found in the Armenian version of that book include not only passages attributed to one speaker, such as that published by the present writer in 1966,³² but also texts in the form of dialogues between the seer and an angel. The passage at the beginning of Chap. vi might be cited as an example. It covers about one printed page and is in dialogue form. In view of this, it is by no means surprising to find that apocryphal Ezra books have drawn their inspiration from The Apocalypse of Ezra and have employed the same literary form.³³ Clearly a good deal of work remains to be done with respect to the Armenian book, but enough has been said to give some indication of the development of the tradition of the Ezra Apocrypha.

A number of the extant and well-known apocryphal books are associated with King Solomon. Apart from familiar books, such as The Wisdom of Solomon and The Psalms of Solomon, there exist also books like the Syriac Odes and the Greek Testament attributed to this king, who was already celebrated in the Bible for his prolific literary output.³⁴ Other works bearing his name are also known to have existed, although unhappily they are lost today. Mention of riddles exchanged between Solomon and Hiram, King of Tyre, is to be found in Josephus' *Antiquities* (viii:5:3), and reflect a literature of riddles known already at the end of the first century C.E. Another such book was, in all likelihood, the *Interdictio* or *Contradictio Salomonis*, which is mentioned in the

31 The writer hopes to be able to deal with this text in detail in a future publication.

32 See Stone, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 5), pp. 395–400.

33 The Greek Christian Ezra Apocalypse published by Tischendorf (*Apocalypses Apocryphae*, Leipzig 1866, pp. 24–33) is also mainly in the dialogue form.

34 I Kings v:12.

Gelasian decree.³⁵ A work is preserved in Armenian that belongs to this same genre, and is, indeed, the only extant ancient representative of it. This is the composition entitled 'The Questions Addressed by the Queen and Answers Given by Solomon' (hereinafter: The Questions of the Queen). The work is, of course, a supplement to the biblical story of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, giving in detail the riddles that are merely alluded to there.

The Questions of the Queen was printed by Yovsep'ianc', who based his text on five manuscripts in the library of San Lazzaro, the earliest of which dates back to the year 1369.³⁶ In Erevan there are another two fourteenth century copies, and yet a further eight later copies included among the materials of that library that have been catalogued so far.³⁷ It is more than likely that there are more manuscripts of this work elsewhere, for it seems to have been rather popular.

It stands in bad need of recollation. For the present, however, we must content ourselves with the text published by Yovsep'ianc', which was rendered into English by Issaverdens.

The work opens with the Queen's question to Solomon regarding the identity, nature and form of his God. To this question Solomon replies:

My God is '[He who] is', and all which exists is from Him, and He is the highest of all beings, and resembles nothing. For everything has change and opposition and my Lord is without change and without opposition.

The next questions concern the movement of the heavens and the place of the dwelling of God before creation and after the end of the world. After he has answered these philosophical and theological conundrums, there follow the riddles proper. The first two questions relate to theories concerning the four qualities — hot, cold, moist and dry — and their

35 See M. R. James, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 2), pp. 51–53 for further details concerning such Solomonic literature.

36 Yovsep'ianc', *op. cit.* (supra, n. 19), pp. 229–232; Issaverdens, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 20), pp. 163–166.

37 The Erevan manuscripts are MS 75, 1631 C.E.; MS 341, 1365 C.E.; MS 573, seventeenth century; MS 750, fourteenth century; MS 1114, 1425 C.E.; MS 1770, 1589 C.E.; MS 1784, seventeenth century; MS 2080, eighteenth century; MS 2335, 1476 C.E.; MS 4246, fifteenth century. All of these are listed in the *Catalogue* (see supra, n. 17). No copies of the work are to be found in the three volumes of the Jerusalem catalogue published to date. The manuscripts used by Issaverdens are all in Venice: MS 423, a Miscellany of the year 1369 C.E.; MS 394, a Miscellany, undated; MS 662, 1610 C.E., like the following, contains The Chronicle of Michael the Syrian; MS 1023, dating from the end of the eighteenth century; MS 1152, dating from the end of the fifteenth or the start of the sixteenth century.

The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition

interactions. These are succeeded by several other riddles, which constitute the rest of the work.

The text is by no means lucid at every point, and there are a number of exegetical and other problems. Naturally, it would be premature to attempt to resolve these without previously studying a broader range of manuscripts than has been consulted so far. Be this as it may, the religious atmosphere of the book is well conveyed by the passage quoted above. To this we add the concluding words put into the mouth of the Queen:

We had heard of your wisdom, but we knew not that you reveal mysteries. And now, I believe that your God is the true God, God of the seen and the unseen.³⁸

On stylistic and other internal grounds both Issaverdens and Sarghissian date the book, in its Armenian version, to the seventh century. It was evidently translated from Syriac into Armenian, and there is one outstanding transliteration: *sahr* for 'moon'. Other features of the text lead to the same conclusion.

The Jacobite Syrian Patriarch Michael, who died at the end of the twelfth century, wrote a well-known chronicle covering the period from Creation to the time of his death. This chronicle was early translated into Armenian, and the Armenian version, which is known as 'The Chronicle of Michael the Syrian' (hereinafter: The Chronicle), contains in the materials relevant to Solomon a form of the text of The Questions of the Queen. The Chronicle was unknown in the original Syriac until the end of the last century. In his study of The Questions of the Queen, B. Sarghissian showed on internal grounds that the form of this text included in the Armenian translation of The Chronicle was dependent on that preserved as a separate composition in the manuscripts.³⁹ Sarghissian carried out his study about the time when the Syriac text of The Chronicle was discovered, but he had not seen it. He advanced the hypothesis, however, that The Questions of the Queen would not be found in the Syriac. He suggested that it would turn out to be confined to the Armenian translation of The Chronicle and to have been introduced into it, most probably by the translator. The Syriac text of The Chronicle was published by Chabot, and we can now confirm Sarghissian's hypothesis. The Questions of the Queen does not appear

38 The text of this paragraph, which is clearly the end of the work, is not found in Yovsep'ianc', *op. cit.* (supra, n. 19), p. 232. The Armenian is to be found in Sarghissian, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 23), p. 445; it was translated into English by Issaverdens, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 20), p. 166. The translation given here is our own.

39 Sarghissian, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 23), pp. 430-439.

in the Syriac text of The Chronicle. It may be added that the Armenian version of The Chronicle, when compared with the Syriac, may be characterized as a free re-working of it. It is noted for its introduction into the text of legendary and other materials that existed independently in Armenian.⁴⁰

This means that there is no reason for tying the date of The Questions of the Queen to that of The Chronicle and, moreover, it may confidently be stated that it antedates the latter. A further comment then becomes relevant. A careful reading of The Questions of the Queen reveals not the slightest trace of overt Christian influence. Above, its fairly detailed theological statements about the nature of God were cited, and there is nothing exceptional in them when they are examined from the Jewish point of view. There is thus a distinct possibility that this work, preserved only in its Armenian translation, is in fact a Jewish apocryphon. Naturally, a complete and detailed study of the text is required before a final and definite conclusion can be reached on this point, but, in the absence of clear Christian references, the weight of proof would seem to be on him who would deny its Jewish character.

Among the lesser known Apocrypha of which an Armenian version is extant, we may mention the pseudo-Epiphianian Vitae Prophetarum (hereinafter: Vitae). The textual tradition of this book is a most complex one. Four main forms of the Greek version are known: two associated with Epiphanius, one attributed to Dorotheus and an anonymous

40 See J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, I-IV, Paris 1899 (the nature of the Armenian version is discussed in the Introduction, I, pp. 50-51, where further bibliography is to be found); F. Haase, 'Die armenischen Rezensionen der syrischen Chronik Michaels des Grossen', *Oriens Christianus*, NS V (1915), pp. 60-82, 271-284. Other works containing Solomon's name in their titles that are found in the manuscripts in Erevan include The Words of Solomon, which is found in the following: MS 77, seventeenth century; MS 1667, fourteenth and seventeenth centuries; MS 1746, thirteenth century; MS 1887, seventeenth century; MS 3514, seventeenth century; MS 3918, 1591 C.E.; cf. also MS 2220, 1789-1790 C.E.; and MS 2271, 1724 C.E. Another composition is that published by Yovsep'ianc' under the title 'Concerning King Solomon'. This is also apparently the work occurring in Jerusalem MS 652 (undated), on p. 490, under the title *Ի Մնացորդաց յազգոս Սողոմոնի* (From the Paralipomena Concerning Solomon), and it also occurs in Erevan MS 580 of the year 1618 C.E. and in MS 2607 of the year 1300. There is also a work called *Պատմութիւն Սողոմոնի* or History of Solomon in Erevan MS 2576 (sixteenth century), MS 3854 (1471 C.E.) and MS 4231 (fifteenth century). In Jerusalem MS 652 noted above, the *Catalogue* (III, p. 76) records another piece containing Solomon's name in the *incipit*, directly following the work mentioned above. The relationship of these variously titled works to one another and to those works published in the collections of Armenian Apocrypha should be subjected to further investigation.

form, commonly regarded as the best, which is included in Codex Marchalianus of the Septuagint (Cod. Q). Most recently Torrey published a small edition, and in his Introduction he, like his predecessors, does not even refer to the existence of an Armenian version of the Vitae. There is, in fact, quite an extensive body of Armenian texts belonging to this cycle. Here we shall merely give some examples in order to indicate the nature and proportions of the problem.⁴¹

Yovsep'ianc' published an Armenian text of this work in his volume of Armenian Apocrypha.⁴² This he based on the text included in certain Bible manuscripts in the Mechitarist Library in Venice, the earliest of which is dated 1319.⁴³ Indeed, the Vitae Prophetarum, known in Armenian as The Deaths of the Prophets, are commonly found in Armenian Bible manuscripts following the respective prophetic books. This form of the tradition is widespread, and nearly all Armenian Bibles include the text. This is, therefore, the case also in Jerusalem MS 1925, the Bible of Erznka, dating from the year 1269, which is one of the most important early Bibles. When the Vitae appear in Bible manuscripts, they generally include the lives of Isaiah, the twelve minor prophets, Daniel, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. This, too, is the range of the text published by Yovsep'ianc'. There are, naturally, many more Bible manuscripts than were used by Yovsep'ianc', and even this form of the textual tradition, which is perhaps the most easily accessible and the only one that has been published, is badly in need of further study. The text of Yovsep'ianc' was translated into English by Issaverdens in 1900, and notice was taken of it at about the same time by M. R. James.⁴⁴ These facts make Torrey's neglect the more surprising.

Only Sarghissian has noted the fact that this work does not occur only in Biblical manuscripts. It is to be found in the Menologium and similar hagiographic texts and in the compositions known as *Ĉarəntir* or 'Collection of Homilies'. Sarghissian further gives two examples of the

41 C. C. Torrey, *The Lives of the Prophets* (*Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series*, I), Philadelphia 1946.

42 Yovsep'ianc', *op. cit.* (supra, n. 19), pp. 207–227.

43 The text of Yovsep'ianc' is based on Venice, Bible I, MS 1508, dated 1319; he observes that his variants are drawn from other Bible manuscripts in the Venice library, *ibid.*, Introduction, p. xiii.

44 Issaverdens, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 20), pp. 143–156; M. R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, II (*Texts and Studies*, V), Cambridge 1899, pp. 160–161. References to a number of Biblical manuscripts containing this work will be found in M. Stone, *The Testament of Levi — A First Study of the Armenian Manuscripts of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs in the Convent of St. James, Jerusalem*, Jerusalem 1969, pp. 7–17.

type of text to be encountered in the Menologium⁴⁵ — the lives of Isaiah and of Zechariah; but from what was stated above it is clear that this textual type should be submitted to thorough scrutiny in view of the development not only of the text of the Vitae but of the Menologium itself.

He further points out that a short text entitled 'The Names of the Prophets and their Order and in What Times they Were', which he finds in Venice MS 176, also contains a good deal of material from the Vitae Prophetarum.⁴⁶ That this is the case is apparent from the text, which Sarghissian has fortunately printed in full in his essay. Yet it is also clear that this is one of the expanded forms of the cycle, which includes a number of New Testament figures. Thus we note the order of the prophets in this list: Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. In respect of these, the information given is very brief. The text notes that this is the end of the twelve prophets, and then resumes with Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Nathan, Eli, Joed,⁴⁷ Elijah, Elisha, Samuel, Zacharias (father of John the Baptist), Moses, David, Ahijah, Miriam, Hulda, Elisabeth and Anna. The second part of the list provides more details about the prophets, and from this it is patent that it is dependent on an expanded cycle of the Vitae. When this list is compared with that in Torrey's Greek edition, we note the presence in Armenian of Eli, Samuel, Zacharias, David, Moses, Miriam, Hulda, Elisabeth and Anna and the omission in Armenian of Azariah and Zechariah ben Jehoiada.⁴⁸ Some of these have full Armenian 'Lives', as will be seen below, others have not yet been discovered in the Armenian manuscripts, except for this text. Moreover, it is quite clear that this list is based on a form of the Vitae not identical with that found in the Armenian Bible.

It may be of interest if, in addition to these samples of information provided by Sarghissian, we give some details of the order and structure of the Vitae as they occur in a Collection of Homilies. We take as an example the great manuscript, Jerusalem No. 1. This is an enormous work, copied at the beginning of the fifteenth century in Jerusalem

45 Sarghissian, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 23), pp. 246–248, 260–262. He prints the text of Venice, Menologium, MS 4 of the year 1441 C.E.

46 *Ibid.*, pp. 257–259.

47 The Armenian is Yo(v)as, but from the contents it is clear that *Joed* should be the correct reading. For his Vita, see Torrey, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 41), p. 31. The Greek manuscripts offer, in addition to Ἰωήδ, the forms Ἰωάθ, Ἰωάδ, Ἰωάμ; compare Torrey, p. 46, n. 79, where more forms of the name are adduced.

48 For the contents of the various forms of the cycle, see T. Schermann, *Die Vitae Prophetarum (Texte und Untersuchungen, XXXI)*, 1907, pp. 39–42.

and preserved in the Manuscript Library of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The two volumes are each composed of two different Collections of Homilies; the material of interest to us is contained in the second part of the first volume.⁴⁹ The first group of Lives is to be found on foll. 599r–601r. This includes the Vitae of Jeremiah, Nathan and Elijah. On fol. 733 The Death of Zechariah occurs; this is not Zechariah of the minor prophets, but Zechariah ben Jehoiada, whose murder in the Temple is referred to briefly in II Chron. xxiv:20–22. The Vita of this Zechariah is included in Torrey's edition, but the Armenian version, which was printed but not identified in the catalogue of the Jerusalem Manuscripts (Vol. I, p. 18), has never been studied or rendered into another language. It may be of interest, therefore, if we give a translation of it here:

He was from Jerusalem, the second [son of?] Jehoiada the priest, whom Joahaz the king killed near the altar, shedding his blood in the sanctuary [or: *debir*], inside the court. And the priests took [him] and buried him with his fathers. From then on there were no awesome signs in the Temple, and the priests were unable to see the vision of the angels of God, or to issue an oracle from the sanctuary [or: *debir*], or to enquire of the ephod, or to reply to the people with clarity [or: knowledge] as formerly.

There are a number of variations to be observed within this text as compared with the Greek.⁵⁰ Yet it is clearly an interesting witness to

49 For the full description of this manuscript, see N. Bogharian, *Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts*, I, Jerusalem 1966, pp. 1–42 (in Armenian). For fol. 733, the *Catalogue* reads, evidently a misprint: fol. 773.

50 There are various problems in this text. The first is the Armenian wording *erkrord Yudayē k'ahanayē*. This is clearly corrupt as it now stands. Torrey's Greek is ἰδιὸς Ἰωδαῖ τοῦ ἱερέως. Perhaps a word *ordi* 'son' has been lost after *erkrord* 'second' by haplography, but it would be preferable to see more manuscripts. The word 'second' may have arisen from the fact that the Armenian Bible (Zohrabian's edition) reads like the Septuagint in II Chron. xxiv:20, 'Azarias son of Jehoiada', and Zechariah may then have been explained as the 'second son'. The name *Yudayē*, apparently an ablative of *Yuda* 'Judah', is corrupt for *Yo(v)idayē*, gen. *Yo(v)idayeyay* 'Jehoiada', and this corruption has presumably caused a shift of an original gen. *k'ahanayi* to abl. *k'ahanayē*. The phrase might be reconstructed *erkrord ordi Yovidayeyay k'ahanyi* 'second son of Jehoiada the priest'. Alternatively, one might suggest a transcription of Greek Ἰωδαῖ > **Yodayē* > *Yudayē*. 'Joahaz' is found in Armenian, 'Joash' in Greek. No obvious reason appears for this. The other variants are of considerable interest, but there are no more obvious corruptions, and a fuller manuscript basis is desirable before a final decision can be reached concerning them. In addition to Torrey's small edition, to which reference has been made because of

the Greek Vita of Zechariah ben Jehoiada. This text is not included in the edition of Yovsep'ianc' of the Armenian Vitae Prophetarum.

In the manuscript, subsequently, on fol. 733r we find the title of the Vitae: 'The Names of the Holy Prophets, and Whence they Were, and How they Died and Where they Were Buried. The Discourse [lit.: having spoken] of Epiphanius of Cyprus'. Then follow the lives of the twelve minor prophets in the order noted above and with the omission of Amos. This material continues up to fol. 734v. Then various other works intervene. On fol. 757 comes an extract from II Kings dealing with Elijah, and this is directly followed, on foll. 760r–761r, by the Vitae of Elisha, Ezekiel and Daniel. Again, other writings are given, and a final group of materials is to be found on foll. 813–815, where the lives of Amos and Isaiah are given. Isolated is the life of Hosea, given for a second time on fol. 861 in connection with a series of extracts from the twelve minor prophets. Thus, in this manuscript we have a fairly full cycle of the Armenian Vitae, including the four major and twelve minor prophets as well as Nathan, Zechariah ben Jehoiada, Elijah and Elisha. These last four were not previously known in Armenian and have never been published to date.

The system of the organization of the material in the manuscript is not dictated by the structure of Vitae Prophetarum but by the internal demands and organization of The Collection of Homilies, which is intended for liturgical use. It is possible to adduce many additional examples of the materials and witnesses to the Armenian version of the Vitae Prophetarum that have not been utilized so far. But here there is neither time nor space for further investigation of these interesting matters. We have presented the text of one of the many parts of this work whose existence has previously not been noted, The Life of Zechariah ben Jehoiada. It would be premature to speak in detail of the nature of the Armenian text or of the relationship between the various modes of transmission that are discernible within the Armenian itself. Yet, even from a preliminary comparison of the Armenian Life of Zechariah with the Greek it can be stated confidently that the relationship between them is an intimate one. This enhances the impor-

its convenience, the major works on the Greek text are those of Schermann. These include his study referred to above (n. 48) and his diplomatic publication of all the recensions in *Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae, Indices Apostolorum Discipularumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto Aliisque Vindicata*, Leipzig 1907. A comparative study of our text of Vita Zachariae shows that it is closest to the Recension D of Codex Marchalianus, which is, according to Torrey, the best, and according to Schermann (*op. cit.*, n. 48 supra, pp. 126–132 and stemma on p. 132), one of the two earliest forms of the Greek.

The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition

tance of the Armenian. In any case it is now evident that scholarship is most backward in its treatment of this text—and in this respect the *Vitae Prophetarum* is not alone.

The study of the Apocrypha, as compared with that of either the Old or the New Testament, is clearly an underdeveloped area. It has recently attracted new interest, due on the one hand to developments in the study of the New Testament, and, on the other, to the investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls. For reasons beyond the scope of the present paper, this renewed interest has, on the whole, been rather selective both in the subjects to which it has devoted its attention and in the body of material subjected to its scrutiny. Nevertheless, the interest aroused by both of the above-mentioned developments has given rise to a certain amount of research in the field, which is not governed by the search for 'New Testament background' or by the re-examination of those writings showing greatest connection with the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Here we have concerned ourselves with one of the richest potential sources of new information bearing on the apocryphal literature and even of new books. This source, the apocryphal literature preserved in the Armenian language, has been neglected by all but very few scholars.⁵¹ For this reason, the present paper has been somewhat programmatic in its approach, attempting to provide a number of examples of the types of problems and texts presented by the Armenian tradition. It was felt that this, rather than the attempt to wrestle in depth with the solution of a specific problem, would be of service. In an age when astounding manuscript discoveries have become, if not an everyday event, at least not uncommon, it is important to remind ourselves of the still untapped resources of such rich and uninterrupted traditions of literature and manuscript transmission as that of the Armenian people.

Read in Hebrew 25 February 1969

51 The pioneering work of F. C. Conybeare at the end of the last century should be mentioned in this connection. Most recently Ch. Burchard in his book *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth*, Tübingen 1965, has laid the groundwork for a full scholarly treatment of the Armenian version of that work. M. de Jonge's perceptive reassessment of the Armenian version of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, while not breaking new ground in the study of the manuscripts, is of considerable importance. See in particular his book *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Assen 1953. It is sincerely to be hoped that the new *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece* series, of which two volumes have appeared, will stimulate some new interest in the Armenian texts. In addition to the above, there have been isolated studies in recent years, but their number remains woefully inadequate.

ADDENDA

to note 12:

An examination of the Jerusalem MS 723, which contains The History of Ben Sira, was possible only after the completion of this paper. It established that this unusual title was given to a copy of The Wisdom of Ben Sira.

to note 31:

After these lines were written, it came to the writer's attention that the badly preserved last pages of the manuscript do not contain the rest of The Questions of Ezra. Apparently some leaves are missing; see *Grand catalogue des manuscrits arméniens des PP. Mechitaristes de Saint-Lazare*, III, edited by B. Sarghissian & G. Sarksian, Venice 1966, Col. 68 (in Armenian).

THE ISRAEL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES
PROCEEDINGS

Volume Two

- 1 S. SAMBURSKY, *Three Aspects of the Historical Significance of Galileo*. 1964. 15 pp. (out of print).
- 2 S. H. BERGMAN, *Schelling on the Source of Eternal Truths*. 1964. 12 pp. (out of print).
- 3 Y. BAR-HILLEL, *Neorealism vs. Neopositivism — A Neo-Pseudo Issue*. 1964. 9 pp. (out of print).
- 4 E. E. URBACH, *Class-Status and Leadership in the World of the Palestinian Sages*. 1966. 37 pp. IL 1.50 / \$ 0.75.
- 5 H. J. POLOTSKY, *Egyptian Tenses*. 1965. 26 pp. (reprint). IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 6 J. PRAWER, *Estates, Communities and the Constitution of the Latin Kingdom*. 1966 (reprinted 1969). 42 pp. IL 1.50 / \$ 0.75.
- 7 S. PINES, *The Iranian Name for Christians and the 'God-Fearers'*. 1967. 10 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 8 S. SAMBURSKY, *The Concept of Time in Late Neoplatonism*. 1966. 15 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 9 H. TADMOR, *Introductory Remarks to a New Edition of the Annals of Tiglath-Pileser III*. 1967. 20 pp., 4 plates. IL 1.50 / \$ 0.75.
- 10 M. BANITT, *L'étude des glossaires bibliques des Juifs de France au moyen âge — Méthode et application*. 1967. 23 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 11 H. BEINART, *The Records of the Inquisition — A Source of Jewish and Converso History*. 1967. 17 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 12 J. SCHIRMANN, *Problems in the Study of Post-Biblical Hebrew Poetry*. 1967. 9 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 13 S. PINES, *The Jewish Christians of the Early Centuries of Christianity According to a New Source*. 1966. 74 pp. IL 2.00 / \$ 1.
- 14 D. AYALON, *The Muslim City and the Mamluk Military Aristocracy*. 1967. 19 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.

Volume Three

- 1 U. HEYD, *Ḳānūn and Shari'a in Old Ottoman Criminal Justice*. 1967. 18 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 2 A. V. LEVONTIN, *Conflict of Laws with Reference to Transnational Contracts*. 1968. 91 pp. IL 2.00 / \$ 1.
- 3 Z. A. BAR-ON, *On Possibility and Modal Analysis*. 1968. 16 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 4 A. F. RAINEY, *The Scribe at Ugarit — His Position and Influence*. 1968. 22 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.

- 5 B. AKZIN, *On Public Law*. 1968. 14 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 6 Z. BEN-ḤAYYIM, *The Contribution of the Samaritan Inheritance to Research into the History of Hebrew*. 1968. 13 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 7 S. SHAKED, *Esoteric Trends in Zoroastrianism*. 1969. 47 pp. IL 1.50 / \$ 0.75.
- 8 A. J. AYER, *On What There Is*. 1969. 17 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 9 B. R. GOLDSTEIN, *Preliminary Remarks on Levi Ben Gerson's Contributions to Astronomy*. 1969. 16 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 10 S. KÖRNER, *Categorical Change and Philosophical Argument*. 1969. 15 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.

Volume Four

- 1 S. SAMBURSKY, *Structure and Periodicity — Centenary of Mendeleev's Discovery*. 1969. 13 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 2 S. N. KRAMER, *From the Poetry of Sumer — Preview of a Supplement to ANET*. 1969. 15 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.
- 3 J. KATZ, *A State Within a State — The History of an Anti-Semitic Slogan*. 1969. 40 pp. IL 1.50 / \$ 0.75.
- 4 M. E. STONE, *The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition*. 1969. 19 pp. IL 1.00 / \$ 0.50.