

A New, Critical Edition of Armenian Deuteronomy, Forty Years after Its “Diplomatic” Predecessor

*Reflections and the Results of New Collations**

▼ **ABSTRACT** This paper serves to introduce a new critical edition of Armenian Deuteronomy, forty years after the diplomatic edition was prepared as a doctoral thesis at the University of Toronto. It deals with the challenges involved, such as how to reconstruct the underlying Greek source text and linguistic issues that are to be taken into account in collation, notably certain preferences in word order. The last half of the paper advances the rewards that repay the preparation of such a critical edition, including the recovery of an early form of the Greek source text, and, in the case of Deuteronomy, an appreciation of the contribution of the translator in shaping the theological message of the book.

▼ **KEYWORDS** critical edition, Deuteronomy, preferred word order, Septuagint, theology of the Armenian translation of the Bible, translation technique, collating manuscripts.

▼ **ISSUE** Volume 1 (December 2024), issue 2

1. Introduction

If we were offered an early fifth century manuscript (MS) of the book of OG¹ Deuteronomy, it would be an exciting day, even if bits of it were illegible for one

* This essay was a paper given in a section of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, in Denver, Nov. 19–22, 2022. As such it is a contribution to Septuagint studies but clearly, as well, to Armenian studies. It retains some of its character as an oral presentation.

¹ I am aware that this paper contains terminology and abbreviations that may not be familiar. OG = Old Greek, the earliest translation of the Old Testament into Greek. It is often used as a synonym for “Septuagint”, or

Claude E. Cox  0009-0004-8292-350X • McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton (Ontario), Canada,
(Email: c.cox@sympatico.ca)

Cite this article: Claude E. Cox, 'A New, Critical Edition of Armenian Deuteronomy, Forty Years after Its “Diplomatic” Predecessor', *Matenadaran: Medieval and Early Modern Armenian Studies (MEMAS)*, 1.2 (December 2024), 35–51

<<https://dx.doi.org/10.1484/J.MEMAS.5.150234>>

DOI: 10.1484/J.MEMAS.5.150234

This is an open access article made available under a CC BY-NC 4.0 International License.
© 2025, Brepols Publishers n.v. Published by Brepols Publishers.

reason or another. Something like this may help in envisioning the place of the Armenian translation in the textual criticism of the OG text. This version, like other secondary versions,² is not in Greek and, for that and for several other reasons, there are bits of it whose source text cannot be precisely reconstructed. I say “reconstructed” because, in collating a secondary version in the pursuit of the original OG, it is not a question of collating the translation as it stands but of collating the source text from which it has come. This is an important distinction. The analysis provided here rests on the remaking of an edition of Armenian Deuteronomy (Arm Deut), of taking a diplomatic edition and having it rise like a phoenix into an edition that presents an eclectic text, a fully critical edition, after the space of forty years. This exploration begins with the desideratum of critical editions of texts; continues into the challenges of producing an eclectic text from which the source text can be reconstructed; finally, it sets out the rewards of this entire enterprise.

2. The Desideratum: A Critically Established, Eclectic Text

The diplomatic edition of Armenian Deuteronomy was prepared as a doctoral thesis (1979), under the tutelage of John W. Wevers, and was published in 1981, as *The Armenian Version of Deuteronomy* (Cox 1981). Sample passages from some 100 MSS were collated against Wevers’ edition of the OG; text groups were established, five, and a MS chosen from MSS that preserve the “purest” form of text to serve as base MS for collation. A stemma was prepared that showed three main groups (*a b c*) and two groups descended from the third (i.e., *d e*, from group *c*). Groups *b c* (*d e*) are all descended from the earliest form of text, *a*. Representative MSS were chosen from the five groups and their variations from the base MS provided in an apparatus, two MSS from groups *a b* and one each from *c d* and *e*. An additional group *a* MS was cited from time to time. The text was compared with the Peshitta to eliminate the Peshitta as a possible source text or aid in the translation of the OG into Armenian. Collations of the newly edited text were made against Wevers’ critically established text (Wevers 1977). It was determined that the Armenian version is related to OG groups *b n d t* and somewhat closer to groups *b n* than to *d t*. Agreement with hexaplaric³ readings

LXX, which, when understood in its narrower sense, refers only to the translation of the Books of Moses, the Pentateuch, which were translated from Hebrew to Greek by the Jewish community in Egypt in the early third century BCE. M = Masoretic text, the Hebrew text. In reality, “Masoretic text” refers to the Hebrew text that the Masoretes worked on in the late first millennium CE, but it is often used anachronistically of the form of text that became the Masoretic text.

² The Armenian version is a “secondary” version, because it is a translation of a translation. The “primary” versions of the Hebrew Bible are the OG, the Syriac Peshitta, and the Latin Vulgate. The Old Latin, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Georgian, and Arabic are secondary translations, all having the OG for the most part as their source text.

³ Hexapla = third century multi-columned comparison of the OG against the Hebrew, prepared by Origen. The OG stood in the fifth of its six columns. Origen used particular signs to indicate where the OG was longer than the Hebrew; where the OG was shorter — by words, phrases or more — he added what was lacking from the sixth column, which is attributed to one Theodotion, marking what he had added with an asterisk before and a metobelus (:) after. This conflated text is called “hexaplaric”, and the entire enterprise “the Hexapla”, after

was determined to be 30%. The conclusion was drawn that the source text of Arm Deut was a Byzantine type of text that is a secondary witness to the Hexapla.⁴

In the lists of evidence for variant readings in the Göttingen editions, “Arm” and other secondary versions stand at the end, after papyri, MSS, and patristic evidence, because they are not in the original language and, by and large, their textual character remains unclassified. “Unclassified” because of the lack of critical editions of their texts (this remains true as well of the patristic evidence, which most often lacks critical editions). In the case of the Armenian, it is the old edition of Zohrabeian that has served as its representative. This edition is “head and shoulders” above many of the text editions of its day. Published in 1805, it incorporated the textual evidence of all the MSS that were available to Zohrabeian at the St Lazar monastery in Venice (Zohrabeian 1805). He chose as a base MS one that was complete and finely copied but whose textual character was unknown at the time (V1507, dated 1319). It was an early day in the development of a scholarly approach to textual criticism. Unfortunately, in Deuteronomy his base MS preserves a rather developed text: the text belongs to a subgroup (*cII*) of group *c*. (As is the case with the LXX, MSS may change their textual affiliations from book to book. So it is that Zohrabeian’s base MS preserves an excellent form of text for the book of Pss.) However, Zohrabeian had at his disposal eight other MSS, some of which attest a purer form of text (Zohrabeian 1805, XII–XIV). Major variations among these MSS from his base MS are recorded in an apparatus.

The Göttingen editions of the OG employ Zohrabeian’s text, there being none other more suitable; that is true of Deuteronomy as well. Wevers, the editor, collated Zohrabeian’s text and apparatus, as Arm^{txt} and Arm^{app} when they differ. The fact that Zohrabeian’s apparatus records many variants means that they are then recorded by Wevers for the sake of completeness. Some of these relate to inner-Armenian corruptions, so, in order to evaluate their worth, an understanding of the Armenian textual tradition is required. Few have that training. Unique Armenian readings are rendered into Latin by Wevers.

Göttingen editors were expected to handle the secondary versions; few had experience with the non-translation literatures of these languages. And there were fewer tools than are available now. In 1979 the personal computer and the internet — so taken for granted now — did not exist. The Matenadaran had no website. For undertaking a critical edition of the Armenian, there are now the following important

its supposed six columns. Its LXX/OG column became widely copied and affected much of the OG textual tradition, including the Armenian version. The Armenian version and manuscripts of it, by way of signs in the text itself and marginal readings, is an excellent witness to Origen’s work, so important for understanding the developing Greek textual tradition.

⁴ For details, see Cox 1981, 298–99. In the explanation of signs and symbols employed in his edition, Wevers places Arm (i.e., the Armenian version) with group *oII* (MSS 29, 58, 72, and 707). The translation has some sort of relationship with MS 72, but the relationship with individual MSS was not worked out for this paper. The siglum *O* and *ol* et al. denote Origen’s recension, the former the main group of witnesses and the latter other witnesses with significant hexaplaric content. The complete list of text groups is as follows: *O* and its sub-groups *ol* and *oII*; *C* and its sub-groups *cI* and *cII*, catena MSS; groups *b d f n s t y z*; “mixed” or “unclassified” MSS, of which there are ten in total.

resources. First, the Göttingen edition and Wevers' collations (1977), albeit of Zohrabeian, are in hand and immensely useful. Second, the text and apparatus of *Armenian Deuteronomy* (Cox 1981), where there is a base MS better than Zohrabeian's and an apparatus with evidence presented on the basis of the textual groupings of Armenian MSS. Third, there is the edition of the Armenian text prepared by Andranik Zeytunyan (2002). In spite of its title, it is not an eclectic text but, rather, largely reproduces the text of Zohrabeian. However, his apparatus has been most helpful in the light of the limited collations of the entire text in *Armenian Deuteronomy*. Zeytunyan collated some 41 MSS, including five used in *Armenian Deuteronomy*. He does not say on what basis he selected these MSS and, since he does not determine what text groups they belong to, the support for variant readings is simply a list. Zeytunyan used a cut-off date of 1700, unfortunate because sometimes late MSS preserve an early text form. MS BFBS (British and Foreign Bible Society) is an example, dated 1667. Further, he uses an idiosyncratic method of assigning sigla for the MSS, consisting of a capital letter (i.e., A, etc.) and a subscript number (so, A₉, et al.). There are occasional mistakes but, since more evidence is always better than less, I have found his edition to be a real advantage. Further, he provides quotations of Arm Deut from several Armenian historical works and commentaries, helpful to have. Fourth, in the 40-year interval several crucial digital resources have become available. *Accordance* and programs like it have put powerful concordancing resources at one's fingertips where the Greek text is concerned. The large Greek-English lexicon, Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ), has been supplemented now by GE (Montanari 2015).⁵ On the Armenian side, Armenian E-Bible was announced in 2017.⁶ It presents the Bible in classical Armenian according to the 1895 Constantinople edition, with an English translation (the KJV) in parallel columns, and offers click-on-the-word parsing and concordancing. The site also provides various Armenian dictionaries online. None of these resources was available forty years ago.

3. The Challenges of Reconstructing the Greek Source Text of Armenian Deuteronomy

There has long been a supposition that the Armenian Bible was first translated from Syriac and then revised to a Greek text, based on some ambiguity in the historical record. For Deuteronomy that was already excluded at the diplomatic edition stage. Then, there is evidence among the texts and manuscripts of some books of an earlier stage of translation, designated Arm 1 (perhaps some Syriac input), and a later stage, Arm 2, each with its own translation strategies, the latter being much more word-for-word, literal to the point of reproducing syntax. This too is a complex issue. The translation of Deuteronomy evinces characteristics of Arm 1, so that question

⁵ This lexicon does not replace LSJ but, for one thing, it employs newer editions of texts. For the LXX it uses not the critical editions published in Göttingen but the diplomatic edition Rahlfs 1935.

⁶ <https://arak29.org> (.) As for dictionaries on the site, I mention Ghazaryan 2000.

can be set aside too.⁷ The challenges that remain in reconstructing the Greek source text are created by the need to deal with the differences between the source text language and target text language *as languages* and the identification of elements that belong to the translator (tr.), for example, stylistic improvements. These are not mutually exclusive, because sometimes stylistic improvement may represent positive interference upon the text from the standpoint of preferences in the target language.

3.1. *Linguistic Differences between Greek and Armenian, Manifested in Armenian Deuteronomy*

The list that follows grows out of trying to meet the challenges of determining readings in the source language while taking into account the way the two languages “do things”. This is a randomized list of differences frequently encountered in collating Armenian Deuteronomy against the OG.⁸

- Armenian does not mark for gender, or rarely does so. For example, the same word can represent αὐτός, αὐτή, αὐτό.
- Armenian does not have a future indicative tense *per se* but, rather, employs the subjunctive mood to express the future. This becomes a challenge when variant readings in the OG involve the subjunctive versus the future indicative.
- Greek has two demonstrative pronouns and adjectives, “this” and “that”, whereas Armenian has three, “this” (սս), “that” (ηω), and “that over there” (իւ). The translator often uses the farther demonstrative where the OG has the “near” one.
- Greek may employ a verb in the singular number when the subject is a neuter plural; not so Armenian.
- Armenian has many words that are morphologically plural but have a meaning that is singular. For example, շէնք *shenk* “building”, where -k’ is the marker of plurality, nominative. The issue becomes confusing in the accusative case, where -s is the marker of plurality but is also the shortest form of the nearer demonstrative adjective. For example, լեռիս *lerins* can be either “mountains” (acc. pl.) or “of/to this mountain” (gen./dat. sing.).
- In Armenian a form of the subjunctive may be used to express the imperative. Which is that form in a particular context?
- Armenian does not have an equivalent for the emphatic negation οὐ μή.
- Many Greek verbs involve a simple verb to which is affixed a preposition, as in ἀκούω “I hear”, but then εισακούω, ἐπακούω. This is not so true of Armenian. The Armenian translation may employ the same equivalent for all three. Which stood in the source text? Consider also the verb προπορεύομαι, whose πρό- element is often represented by a preposition following the verb, but, where not, the trans-

⁷ See now, succinctly, “1.4.7 Armenian Translations: Secondary Translations”, in Lange and Tov 2016, 370–75.

⁸ See “The Use of the Armenian Version for the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint”, in Fernández Marcos 1985, 25–35. The list that follows draws together observations made specifically from comparing Armenian Deuteronomy with the OG in Wevers’ edition.

lator adds an equivalent (ստաջի *araji* “before” + pronoun [20.4]; յարայագոյն *yarajagoyn* “before” [31.6]). They have no expressed source text.

- Armenian participles may be used as finite verbs.
- Armenian has no equivalent for the slight adversative, *δέ*. There are stronger adversatives, but most often the Armenian translator uses *եւ* (= *καί*).
- Armenian may employ an undeclined pronoun at the head of a relative clause, *որ* — compare Hebrew *’asher* — which greatly simplifies syntax: *ὅσοι ἄν, οὓς, οἷς* can all be represented by simple *որ* (or *zor*, with *z-*, the accusative marker). But what stood in the source text?
- Armenian has a “participle of necessity”, formed with the infin. + an *-ots’* ending, and used with a copula verb to express what must take place or is expected to take place. It is often used in Deut, but does not exist in the Greek version. Its appearance is a matter of style and nuance.
- Greek has a range of synonyms. For example, *ἐναντι*, *ἐναντίον*, and *ἐνώπιον* all mean “before”. More generally, it may be difficult to differentiate among synonyms in the OG, because the Armenian translator used the same equivalent for both, or all three, in the example just given.
- In Deuteronomy, the OG may employ an additional pronoun to express reflexivity, e.g., *ἡμεῖς αὐτοί* “we ourselves”. Armenian has a separate reflexive pronoun, but collocations like *ἡμεῖς αὐτοί* are rendered simply with, for example, *մեր mek’* (= *ἡμεῖς*). It might be supposed that, in this situation, *αὐτοί* was lacking in the source text, but that is not likely so. Example: 4.16.
- Whereas Greek may feature a preposition that has a series of nouns dependent upon it, in that case Armenian may repeat the preposition before each item. This does not mean that the source text had those prepositions.
- Armenian may have two verbs, even three, together, *asyndetically*. For its part, the OG may attest a circumstantial ptcp. + finite verb, the Armenian two finite verbs (e.g., 11.28, 31); the source text did not have two finite verbs.
- In a list of two items (or three?) that have possessive pronouns, whereas the OG has a pronoun with each noun, Armenian may employ only one, which suffices for both. In such a case, the lack of a possessive pronoun does not mean that the source text was lacking one. See 11.25; 12.6, 17; 12.31; 13.6; 33.19.

4. Linguistic Preference? Matters of Style?

The single most significant issue to emerge in the preparation of a critical edition of Armenian Deuteronomy and its re-collation against the OG is that of preferred word order in Armenian. This manifests itself primarily in two situations. The first involves a group of verbs (*αἰτέω*, *δίδωμι*, *εἶπον*, *εἰσάγω*, *ἐντέλλομαι*, *ἐξάγω*, *περιαιρέω*, and *ὑπεροράω*), where the following word order obtains: verb + expressed subject + indirect pronominal object (or, rarely, a dir. obj.), rendered into Armenian with the object transposed to a position immediately after the verb.

The second collocation involves the clause *ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται* (or *ἢ*) “(that) it may be well with you”, rendered as *q̄h p̄ur̄h ḥgh p̄lq̄ zi bari lits’i k’ez*, again with the pronoun transposed to a position *after* the verb or, put differently, with the predicate adjective and verb together. The consequence of these transpositions is that the result sometimes sees Arm convene with the main Hexaplaric witnesses (*O Syh*⁹), so that, if the transpositions were *not* already in the source text of Arm, an understanding of its textual affiliations is skewed if they are so regarded. In fact, it seems more likely that they are often attributable to Armenian style and preference and belong to the translator.

4.1. OG Verb + Subject + Indir. Obj. > Arm Verb + Indir. Obj. + Subj.

The cases of the transposition involving the verb *εἶπον* are instructive; *εἶπον* occurs 102x in Deut. The formulation *εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς με* occurs 13x; in all instances the prep. phrase *πρὸς με* > *ghu — ts’is*, a single syllable — is transposed, to produce *uuuug ghu Sṭp asats’ ts’is Tēr* (“said to me the Lord”; so 1.42). In all cases the transposition is unique to Arm. Wevers does not cite the first 8x (1.42; 2.2, 9, 31; 3.2, 26; 4.10; 5.28) but does cite the last 5x (9.12, 13; 10.1, 11; 18.17). In no case is there any Greek textual evidence; this suggests that the translator made all these changes in conformance with Armenian style.¹⁰ At issue here is the fact that these single-syllable personal pronouns are enclitics, a consideration that may have escaped those collating the Armenian against the OG. Armenian word order is sometimes preferential, even if it is flexible. Hans Jensen’s remarks are most helpful, though when, in his examples, the Armenian is mirroring the Greek source text, less compelling. He does cite this example from the Gospel of John: *ἐτοιμάζω τόπον ὑμῖν* > *պատրաստեմ ձեզ տեղի* *patrastem dzez teghi* “I am preparing for you a place”, where the translator has moved the (indir.) object to a position immediately after the verb.¹¹ The translator of Deut acts on this preference. In the light of the example provided by *εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς με*, each such transposition must raise the question: Does it have an equivalence in the source text, or is it attributable to the translator’s intervention in the interest of good style?

In some cases the transposition is already attested in Greek witnesses. To take the case of the verb *δίδωμι*, there are six examples of the OG word order in Deut, e.g., *ἣν ἔδωκεν κύριος αὐτοῖς* > *qnr̄ tun ḥngu Sṭp* “which gave to them the Lord” (2.12). All six attest the transposition in the Armenian, and in five cases there is evidence for the

⁹ The Syro-Hexapla (*Syh*) is a translation of the hexaplaric text into Syriac and a major resource.

¹⁰ There are two instances that stand apart from these thirteen, where the two-word subject (*κύριος ὁ θεός*) in the Greek is modified by an articulated genitive, itself with a pronominal possessive pronoun; there then follows an indirect object. This is more easily visualized than described: *ὃν τρόπον εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ὑμῖν* “as said the Lord God of our fathers to us” (1.21; the same formulation occurs at 27.3). The Armenian translation retains this word order: *np̄l̄tu uuug un̄r̄ Ḥun̄n̄uad̄ ḥw̄rḡn̄ ḡl̄r̄nḡ ḡl̄q̄*. (Greek is unaccented when a reading is a variant to the original OG).

¹¹ Jensen 1959, § 417–20, esp. § 418.

transposition among Greek witnesses, if little (8.18; 10.4) and mixed (9.10, 11). The six passages in question are:¹²

- 2.12 W. does not cite Arm; no Greek witnesses attest the transposition.
 8.18 (ὅτι αὐτός) σοι δίδωσιν] tr 626 529 118'-537 318 Arm Syh = M
 9.10 (ἔδωκεν) κύριος ἐμοί] μοι κυριος A F M 376-ol' 422 d f. 458 t.(76 inc) y 18'-83-630' 55 59^{Lat}cod 104 Arm Bo
 9.11 (ἔδωκεν) κύριος ἐμοί] μοι κυριος (+ ο θεος 527) A F M 15'-oII⁽⁻⁷²⁾ 422 f. y 55 59 Arm = Compl¹³
 10.4 (ἔδωκεν αὐτάς) κύριος ἐμοί] μοι κυριος 44 Arm
 11.17 κύριος 2^{o14}] ad fin tr b n^{Lat}cod 100 Arm.

In 2.12 Arm is alone in attesting the transposition; W. does not cite it and it is unlikely to reflect a source text. In the case of 8.18, a few scattered Greek witnesses attest the transposition, but the list includes MSS 118'-537, group *b* MSS. At 9.10 the support for the transposition includes groups *d* *t*, also the hexaplaric group *ol*. In the next verse (9.11), group *oII* is of interest as a congener for Arm, but there is no MS from *b d n t*. At 10.4, only one Greek MS attests the change of word order, a group *d* MS, 44. (We note that in 10.4, there remains the direct object αὐτάς between the verb and the indirect object; it is an option for it to remain there after the verb). At 11.17 groups *b n* attest the transposition. That Arm alone has the transposition at 2.12, casts doubt at 10.4, where this one Greek MS attests it. The agreement is collated, but one is aware that the support is weak. Generally speaking, in Deuteronomy, Arm seems most closely related to groups *b d n t* and that knowledge comes to bear in situations like this: if the transposition in the Armenian is attested by Greek witnesses with which it usually convenes, this increases the likelihood that it existed in its source text. A "likely" reconstruction is possible.

4.2. Transposition in the Translation of the Expression: ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται (or ἦ) > զի բարի լիցի քեզ (zi bari lits'i k'ez)

4.2.1. The collocation εὖ γίνομαι occurs six times in Deut with the 2nd pers. personal pron. in the dat., σοι, occupying a position between the predicate adv. and the verb. 5x the expression is εὖ σοι γένηται and Arm renders it with the σοι > քեզ in a position after the verb, so բարի լիցի / լիցի քեզ. The five instances are, together with evidence for the transposition, as cited by W.:

- 4.40 426 Arm = M
 5.16^{Lat}cod 100 PsHi Ep XI 1 Ruf Or princ IV 3.4 Arm = M
 12.25 O Arm Syh = M

¹² For a delineation of the MS groups and abbreviations, see Wevers 1977, 44–49.

¹³ i.e., the Complutensian Polyglot, whose Greek text is of importance.

¹⁴ The little circle means the first occurrence of such-and-such — in this list, κύριος.

- 12.28 O^{-376} Arm Syh = M
 22.7 O^{-376} Arm Syh = M
 6.18 Arm.

In the sixth case of εὖ σοι γένηται , Arm places σοι *before* εὖ , perhaps for emphasis; εὖ γένηται are again not separated: (qh) $\text{քեզ բարի լիցի / լինիցի}$. Here is the support for that transposition in W.: only Arm.

4.2.2. In Deut there are six occurrences of this same expression but with the verb εἰμί , as εὖ σοι ἦ (ἔσται 19.13), or as ἵνα εὖ ἦμῖν . Arm places the σοι (ἡμῖν) after the verb thus: $\text{բարի լիցի / լինիցի քեզ (մեզ)}$. The location and support for the transpositions in these cases are:

- 5.33 Arm(*faciat tibi*) Syh
 6.3 A F V 58–72 C'' $f s^{-30'}$ y 28 55 59 319 407 646 Arm = Compl M
 6.24 (εὖ) ἡμῖν / ἦ] tr B F 15'–426 44–106*–107' 56'–75 74–134^{mg}–799^c 71'–318 128–630' 509 Arm Syh = Compl Ra¹⁵
 10.13 O Or III 551^{Lat}cod 100 Hil Ps II 15 CXVIII dalet Arm Syh Vulg = M
 19.13 O Arm Syh = M.

In the case of the sixth occurrence of the expression using εἰμί (at 15.16), the indir. obj. (αὐτῷ) follows the verb, so it is already “transposed”, and Arm follows that word order: (ὅτι) $\text{εὖ ἐστιν αὐτῷ παρὰ σοί} > \text{(qh) բարի իցէ նմա առ քեզ}$. A number of Greek witnesses rearrange the word order to reflect the common one:

$\text{ἐστιν αὐτῷ}] \text{αυτου εστι 458; tr B } n^{-458} = \text{Ra.}$

4.2.3. Finally, in two instances εὖ is used as a predicate adv. with the verb ποιέω and the dir. obj. σε positioned between the adv. and the verb, so εὖ σε ποιήσῃ (OG: ποιῆσαι) “that he might do you good” (Brenton 1851–; cf. *NETS* 2007) (8.16) and εὖ σε ποιήσῃ “he will treat you well” (30.5). The collocation εὖ ποιέω τινά (acc.) means “treat someone well” in classical Greek; less frequent is εὖ ποιέω τινί (dat. of person): so LSJ s.v. ποιέω A.III., B.2, and 3, with examples. In both instances Arm places the obj. after the verb, a word order attested by the following witnesses.

- 8.16 O Arm Syh: cf. M
 30.5 O d t Arm(*erit tibi*) Syh = M

Arm at 8.16 is $\text{եւ բարի արաւցէ քեզ}$. The pronoun քեզ may be either acc. or dat. Here it is most likely dative, “and that he might do good to you”. Greek ποιέω can take a double acc., but is that true of ωνῆναι ? See further, 8.16. For our purposes, it is enough

15 i.e. Rahlfs 1935.

to record the transposition. Of even more interest is 30.5, where the OG is *καὶ εὖ σε ποιήσει* “and he will treat you well”, and Arm is *եւ բարի եղիցի քեզ* “and it will be good for you” (W.: *erit tibi*). The transposition = M, but not the translation. In this instance the translator has adapted the translation of the phrase to its common form with *եղիցի*, the aorist subjunctive or second subjunctive of *լիլիս*. The translator may be indicating with this unique rendering a stylistic intervention in the translation, namely, variation.

4.2.4. The question is: Are these transpositions part of the source text of Arm, or were they brought about by the preference in Armenian to have the copula verb and pred. adv./adj. together? The pronoun in the posterior position? A glance at the list of examples might lead one to conclude that Arm is a first rate witness to the hexaplaric text. This proves not to be so. In the 12 instances of transposition, Arm joins O and Syh some 6x = M (in order, from first item until last through the three lists: 12.25, 28; 22.7; 10.13; 19.13; 30.5). In the remaining six cases: once Arm = M is attested by one O group MS (4.40); another Arm = M is otherwise only attested by patristic citations (5.16), weak co-attestation. In the four last examples: once Arm transposes the indir. obj. *before* *εὖ γένηται*, uniquely ≠ M (6.18); once the transposition is widely attested, = M, but, among O group MSS, has the support of only two (6.3); twice Arm is supported by the Syro-Hexapla for a transposition, but has a different translation (5.33; 30.5); twice Arm does not have the support of any Greek witnesses (6.8; 8.16 [W.: “cf. M”]). In Deut generally, the congeners of Arm are groups *b d n t*. These appear only once — and then only *d t* — in support of the transposition (30.5). The conclusion I draw is that the agreements with the main hexaplaric witnesses O Syh = M may be coincidental and derive from there being a preferred order of words in representing the Greek *εὖ σοι γένηται*. This conclusion is consistent with the translation of *εὖ* + indir. obj. + *γένηται* outside of Deut.¹⁶ For example, the transpositions occur in the Armenian translation of Judith, where there is no hexaplaric text. It seems to me that the only instance of transposition among the twelve that should be cited with respect to the OG in Deuteronomy is that at 30.5, where OG groups *d t* attest it.

5. Differences between the OG and Its Translation into Armenian that are the Result of the Translator’s Flexible Strategy

It is a paradox that the less literal a translation is, less word-for-word, but more flexible or fluid, “better”, the more difficult it is to reconstruct the source text. In this respect, the translation of Deuteronomy is highly literate and features a multitude of interventions by the translator in order to enliven the text, make its message clear, have its syntax conform with that of non-translation Armenian, provide variety of expression,

¹⁶ These data are provided in an excursus at 12.25, in the Notes that accompany the critical edition of the Armenian text of Deuteronomy.

improve its style, and interpret its content. The following list itemizes characteristics of the translator's interventions to produce such a translation. Differences between the Armenian and the OG and the apparatus in Wevers are not evidence of a different source text. Aspects of the translator's approach to translation include the following.

- The translation adds many small words of different types: personal pronouns, numerous times (15x cited, e.g., in chapter 4, namely, 4.4 ["you" pl.], 30 ["you" sg.], 38 ["you" sg.]); various particles, adverbs, and conjunctions such as *արի* "now" (1.28; 26.15; 31.28), *սիս* "look!" (1.8; 2.4); *այլ* "but" (2.36; 14.20; 15.10, 14); *զի* "for" (1.8; 14.1; 17.16; 18.2); *անսի* "from there" (6.23; 7.19); *անդէն* "to there" (24.19); *ուր* "where" (5.22); demonstratives, *սա* "that one, he" (33.29), "that" (15.22; 25.8); *իսկ* "really", a flexible little particle that has no real equivalent in English, but lends a certain emphasis (e.g., 1.19; 3.21).
- The translator sometimes omits recapitulative pronouns or adverbs (e.g., *τοῦτο* in 14.8).
- The translator may not repeat possessive pronouns in parallel collocations (e.g., 2.25 || 11.25).
- The translation employs varied equivalents for Greek words: e.g., *ἀφίστημι* occurs 6x, and has three equivalents (*զանգիւնեցուցանել*, *մերժել*, and *սպստամբել*, see 1.28; 4.9; 7.4; 13.10, 13; 32.15); the little adv. *ἐκεῖ* "there" is rendered with *ի վերայ նորա* "upon it" (14.22 1°); *անդ* "there" (14.22 2°; 16.6 2°); and *ի նմա* "in it" (16.6 1°).
- The translator simplifies the text by simplifying the syntax. So, e.g., *ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ἔργοις σου, οἷς εἰπὶ ποιῇς* "in all your works, *whatsoever* you do" > *յամենայն գործս քո անդիցես* "in all your works *that*¹⁸ you may do" (14.28).
- Prepositions are repeated before parallel items governed by one preposition in the OG: there are numerous examples (1.17; 2.37; 3.21, 27; 6.8, 14; 7.18; 11.6, 19; 13.12; 28.37; 31.9; 34.11). This is also a characteristic of style in some non-translation Armenian literature.¹⁹ On the other hand, the tr. may omit several prepositions after the first of a series of parallel prepositional phrases in the OG (14.25).
- The translator introduces slight abbreviations of the text. In the following two examples, an attributive modifier involving a prepositional phrase is reduced to an adjective: *τὰς πόλεις τὰς ἐν τῇ ὄρεινῃ* "the cities that are in the hill country" > *քաղաքս լեռնականս* "the mountain cities" (2.37); *ὁδὸν τὴν εἰς Βασάν* "the road that (is) to Basan" > *ճանապարհն Բասանու* "the road of Basan" (3.1).
- The tr. changes a post-positive attributive adj. to its cognate abstract noun: *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς* "on the good land" > *ի վերայ երկրին բարութեան* "on the land

¹⁷ The unaccented Greek, as already noted, indicates a variant reading. In this case, the critically established text is *ἄν*.

¹⁸ This is accusative, so the attraction of cases of the Greek is not reflected.

¹⁹ For example, in the history of the fifth-century writer P'awstos Buzand, as reproduced in Thomson 1989, 163: *յամենայն ի շէնս եւ ի գեղս, յամենայն կողմանս Հայոց առ հասարակ* ("in all inhabited places and in villages, in all the areas of Armenia, throughout").

of goodness” (8.10; similarly, 11.17); τὸν θησαυρὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαθόν “his good treasury” > զգանձս բարութեան իւրոյ “the treasury of his goodness”²⁰ (28.12); see also, πλήρεις πάντων ἀγαθῶν “full of all sorts of goods” > լի ամենայն բարութեամբ “full of all goodnesses” (6.11).²¹

- The tr. makes many small changes of various kinds (some of which can be considered as explanatory), slight abbreviations, exegetically motivated, or as an unexpected equivalent. None derives from a source text different than that of the source text more generally. Here are diverse samples, occasionally with an annotation. The Greek text is to the left, before the square bracket if there is one; the Armenian variation to the right. “Arm” attests each reading uniquely, unless otherwise noted. If there is a translation into Latin, that is from Wevers’ edition.

- 1.41 κατὰ πάντα ὅσα “in accordance with all that”] զհպտ *sicut* “as”.
- 2.9 κληρονομεῖν “to inherit”] ի ժառանգութիւն “for an inheritance” *in hereditatem* ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Bo = M. Also 4.36.
- 2.34 κατελίπομεν] + αὐτων Or Cels IV 58.
- 2.36 οὐ (προσέ)λθομεν]] յոր *in quam*. Explanatory.
- 3.18 ἐνοπλισάμενοι προπορεύεσθε πρὸ “arming yourselves, go before” > վանեցարուք անցք անաջի “arm yourselves, pass before”. Slightly different, visually.
- 3.20 καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσιν] զի ժառանգեցուցին *ut possideant* “so that they may take possession of”.
- 3.28 τοῦ λαοῦ] ժողովրդեան իմոյ “of my people” *populi mei* Aeth. Adds emphasis.
- 4.22 ἐγὼ γάρ] եւ արդ եւ անախի “and now, look, I” *et nunc ego ecce*. More dramatic.
- 5.10 εἰς χιλιάδας] ի հազար ազգս “to a thousand generations”; W.: *generationes* Aeth Arm Co = Targum.
- 5.25 ὅτι ἐξαναλώσει “for (this great fire) will consume”] զի մի սատակեցէ “for (this great fire) will not consume (us)” *enim* (Aeth: *et*) *ne consumat* Aeth Arm. Exegetical clarification.
- 8.5 ὥς εἴ τις παιδεύσει ἄνθρωπος “as a certain person might discipline” (*NETS*)] զհպտ այր որ իր խրատէ “just as some man who teaches”; W.: *quemadmodum homo (vir aliquis* Arm) *qui docet* ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm.
- 11.2 τὰ παιδιά ὑμῶν “your children”] վասն որոյնք *propter* “on account of your sons” *propter filios tuos* Arm.
- 11.29 ἐκεῖ] *iordanem* Aeth ընդ Յորդանան Arm.
—A clarification; no source text. As for Ethiopic, it, in fact, transposes the adv. to a position after αὐτήν. See W.
- 12.22 ἔδεται] կերիցին “they shall eat” *edent* Arm.
—Change of number of the verb to accommodate compound subject.

²⁰ This is a typical stylistic feature of classical Armenian described in works on grammar as վերացական թանձրացականի փոխարեն (“the abstract instead of the concrete”).

²¹ This example is different from the previous ones, because ἀγαθῶν is a substantivised adjective, so the translation by a noun is normal. However, had the translator wanted, he could have used the adj. բարի, which can also be substantivized.

- 15.12 զ] + կին *mulier* Arm. Clarification.
- 15.17 πρὸς τὴν θύραν ἐπὶ τὸν σταθμὸν “against the door upon the doorpost”] ի վերայ սեւնց դրան “against the doorpost of the door”. W.: τὴν θύραν] *postes ianuae* Arm. The translator collapses two prepositional phrases into one, which makes for an economy of words.
- 15.21 μῶμος πονηρός “serious defect”] + զինչ էլ գուցէ “whatever at all”.
- 16.5 οὐ δυνήσῃ (θῦσαι) “you shall not be able (to offer)” > մի ժտեցես զինուլ “you shall not dare to offer”.
—The translation makes it clear that the admonition is to be taken seriously.
- 16.10 ἰσχύει “(according as your hand) is strong” > կարող իցէ “(as much as your hand) will be able”.
—An interpretation: strength is understood to be ability.
- 17.12 ὁ ἄνθρωπος “the man” > մարդ որ “any man/a man”.
—Clarification: the admonition applies to absolutely everyone.
- 18.14 ἀκούσονται “listen to” > անսան “obey, give ear to, yield”.
—Interpretation: “listen to” means more than simple listening; it means obey, yield to.
- 19.15 (κατὰ πᾶσαν) ἀδικίαν “injustice” > (ըստ ամենայն) ապիրատութեան “wickedness”
—Interpretation: “injustice” is “wickedness”.
- 20.19 τὰ δένδρα αὐτῆς “its trees” > զծառատունկ նրա “its cultivated trees”
—Clarification: by “trees”, cultivated trees is meant.
- 24.5 ἐξελεύσεται (εἰς τὸν πόλεμον) “will go out to war” > մտցէ (ի պատերազմ) “will enter (into a war)”. W.: *ingredietur* Arm.
—The translator employs a different verb.
- 28.30 ἔξει αὐτήν “shall have her” > հանիցէ ի քն “shall take her away from you”. W.: αὐτήν] + *a te* Arm.
—Clarification; more dramatic statement.
- 28.32 δεδομένοι “given” > մատնելալ “handed over”
—Clarification: not just “given to” but “handed over to”, better contextually.
- 32.36 ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ / καὶ παρειμένους] էլ մատնելալ ի գերութիւն “and handed over into captivity”; W.: *et traditos in captivitatem* Arm.
—An exegetical interpretation that introduces the Exile. The transposition is rooted in style, the desire to have all three participles modified by the prepositional phrase: εἶδεν γὰρ παραλελυμένους αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκλελοιπότες ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ καὶ παρειμένους “For he saw them paralysed, both failed under attack and enfeebled”. (*NETS*) “Paralyzed”, “failed”, and “enfeebled” are participles in the Greek. The prepositional phrase ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ stands between the second and third participle. In the Armenian version, the Greek becomes Չի ետես զնսա լուծելալ և լքելալ և մատնելալ ի գերութիւն “For he saw them enfeebled, and discouraged and delivered up to captivity”. The prepositional phrase ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ, rendered “under attack” in *NETS*, has been translated as ի գերութիւն “to captivity”, and transposed, so that it modifies all three participles, which now follow one another, uninterrupted by the prepositional phrase. It stands at the end.

These samples of the Armenian translator's strategy show that it is unwarranted to think a different source text is involved than the witnesses we see more generally across the OG text and apparatus in Wevers' edition. Rather, the flexibility of this strategy is responsible for some of the challenges that arise in collating the Armenian for the purpose of recovering the original text of the OG.

6. The Rewards that Repay the Effort in Undertaking the Preparation of a Critical Edition of Armenian Deuteronomy

6.1. The Recovery of an Early Form of Text

The first and ultimate aim of preparing a critical edition of a text is to recover its earliest form, whatever the purpose for which that text is to be used. In this case, the text is to be employed in the recovery of the earliest form of OG Deuteronomy. Since the translation was made in the early fifth century — the same period as the significant and well-known MS Alexandrinus, the Greek source text is relatively early, if it can be recovered. I was surprised to find that occasionally whole verses or more of the Armenian translation went by without the register of a variant reading from the critical edition of the OG: yes, the Armenian text is worthwhile recovering; it is early and a witness to a relatively pure form of the Greek text.

6.2. A Critical Edition of the Armenian Reveals that Readings Preserved in Medieval Greek MSS Derive from an Early Date

Most of the MSS of Greek Deuteronomy are medieval. When their textual variants are also found in the Armenian translation, the antiquity of those readings is confirmed. They are given not only a time, but also a place of currency. The other side of the coin is that, though MSS of OG Deuteronomy may be late, variant readings may well have emerged much earlier. Of course, we know that "late" MSS can preserve an early form of a text.

6.3. A Critical Edition of the Armenian Confirms that the Collation of a Diplomatic Edition of the Text was Worthwhile

The conclusion arrived at in Wevers' work with respect to the Armenian — on the basis of Zohrabeian — finds basic confirmation in a critically established form of the same text. In part this is because Zohrabeian not only reproduced a MS, but also provided a generous apparatus where he recorded readings from other MSS that differed from his base MS (i.e., the text he reproduced). The conclusion set forth in the 1981 diplomatic edition of the Armenian was that its source was a Byzantine form of text, as preserved in (Greek) groups *b d n t*, and somewhat influenced by the

Hexapla.²² The following is a comparison of the results of collations in 1981 — first line begins with “91”, and now — the second begins with “61”.²³ The latter figures are provisional, and will likely find some adjustment as the new edition and its collation take final shape, but there is a basis for general comparison. The figures are located below sigla for the various Greek text groups and subgroups (*oI* and *oII* are subgroups of *O*).²⁴

<i>O</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>oI</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>oII</i>
91	87	78	65	52	52	51	46	33	32	30	14
61	102	107	91	92	39	53	41	36	17	23	7

Some observations. Armenian Deuteronomy’s closest congeners remain *b d n t*, but now *d* has replaced *b* by a slight margin as its closest text form among the four. Most dramatically, the relationship with the main *O* group is diminished, and this fact may serve to underline the impression that hexaplaric content in Arm Deut comes largely through hexaplaric elements that are part of the *b d n t* text groups.

6.4. A Critical Edition of the Armenian Permits the Identification and Elimination of Extraneous Readings from the Göttingen Edition Apparatus

There are two types of variants from the lemma (i.e., the printed text) in the Göttingen edition of Deuteronomy that can be set aside when a critical edition of the Armenian is brought to bear. First, because of the nature of Zohrabeian’s edition — a relatively “poor” base MS, textually, and citations of the Armenian denoted as Arm^{txt} and Arm^{app}, of which there are many, the apparatus in the edition of the OG records a great number of differences that are now recognized as inner-Armenian corruptions of one kind or another. Second, there are many variant readings unique to the Armenian. These are of two types, those that are a reflexion of the difference

²² Again, summarily, Cox 1981, 298–99. For information on the “Byzantine” type of text, see Wevers’ text histories that accompany his editions of the Greek text of the five books of Moses. The volume on Genesis has separate chapters on the groups *b d n t*, and those on Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers have chapters on the Byzantine text. The volume on Deuteronomy (Wevers 1978) contains a chapter devoted to the *n* group. Arm Deut has a relationship with MS 72 of the *oII* subgroup, and that seems to be the basis for Wevers’ placement of Arm Deut with that group in his “Key to signs and symbols”.

²³ The newer collations did not take into account +/– καὶ and δέ; divergent spellings of proper names or vocabulary; transpositions with respect to the two types of transposition treated in detail in this essay; + / – the definite article. The collation count was extended to five text groups, because *b n d t* are four in themselves; attestation by a “group” was counted when half or more MSS of a text group attested that variant reading.

²⁴ The tabulation sets out the number of agreements between the Armenian and its source text — identified by the various text groups in the Greek, the top line of the three — in descending order of number of agreements, from left to right. The text groups begin with *O*, main Hexaplaric or Origenian text group. It has two sub-groups *oI* and *oII*. *C* identifies the Catena group of MSS. The other sigla, *b d n*, etc., are text groups, that, in the list of sigla in Wevers, appear in alphabetical order, *b* through *z*. The line that begins with 91 presents the agreements of Arm with the text groups in 1981; the line that begins with 61 presents the agreements based on the critical edition of the Armenian. The letters *b d n t* are in italics, calling attention to the largest numbers of agreement. These four manuscript groups are related and attest a form of the Byzantine type of text.

between Greek and Armenian style (e.g., the addition of personal pronouns) and various types of clarifications and exegetical intrusions that the translator has made. In the reconstruction of the source text beneath the Armenian translation, a great many of these may be set aside as belonging to the exegetical analysis of an Armenian text that has been adapted for a reading audience, and contributing to an understanding of how the OG was read — fascinating (!), but not part of the textual criticism of the OG.

In the course of collating the new critically established text against the Göttingen text, a list of more than 550 such items was drawn up for removal from Wevers' apparatus, often designated "not in critical text", i.e., the Armenian critical text. That's quite a "spring cleaning".

7. Conclusion

The translation is far from a word-for-word translation. This was a surprise. It is far less such than the Armenian translation of Job, whose OG source text could hardly be less such in relation to its Hebrew source text, but is, rather, extremely flexible in its translation strategy. Armenian Job follows its Greek source text closely. The translator of Armenian Deuteronomy is highly skillful in making the text come alive, with the addition of many particles, the simplification of the syntax, variations in vocabulary, some striking non-equivalents, small clarifications and the like. There is also an exegetical perspective. For example, the phrase "the land that the Lord our God is giving (δίδωσιν) to you" occurs many times, many, and the translator always renders it with the future tense, because the event lies in the future from the standpoint of the participants; it has not yet been given to them. In addition, Armenian has a way of expressing what really should take place in the future, a verbal consisting of a participle with a special ending and a copula verb.²⁵ The phrase already occurs in 1.20: ὁ ὁ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν δίδωσιν ὑμῖν. Its translation (v.20) employs the common future, formed with the aorist subjunctive, գոր Տէր Աստուած մեր տալի՜ ձեզ (*zor Tēr Astuats mer tats'ē dzez*) "that the Lord our God will give to you". A few verses later, the translator uses the other form, գոր Տէր Աստուած տալոց է մեզ "that the Lord God will surely give us" (1.25). This nuance really doesn't have an equivalent in English; it is exaggerated in the English translation just provided. Now, throughout Deuteronomy this adjustment is made and often cited, if there are other witnesses, secondary witnesses, that also employ a future tense. However, it never existed in the source text. The knowledgeable user may know that, but maybe not.

The Armenian translation of Deuteronomy turns out to be a most interesting text with, on the one hand, its embedded Hebraisms inherited from the Greek source text and, on the other hand, the positive interference exerted upon the translation to make it more accessible and attractive to its target audience.

²⁵ Sometimes called a "participle of necessity". See Jensen 1959, § 266; Cox 1984 and cf. Thomson 1989, 77.

References

- Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee. 1851–. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English with Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. London: Samuel Bagster (reprinted many times). <https://archive.org/details/the-septuagint-version-greek-and-english-with-apocrypha-of-the-old-testament-lancelot-brenton-1851>
- Cox, Claude E. (ed.). 1981. *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 2. Chico (CA): Scholars Press.
- . 1984. “The Use of the *Participium Necessitatis* in the Armenian Translation of the Pentateuch”. In *Միջազգային հայերենագիտական գիտաժողով, Երևան, 21–25 սեպտեմբերի: Չկնիցմունք* [Proceedings of the International Symposium on Armenian Linguistics, Yerevan, September 21–25, 1982], ed. Gevorg B. Jahukian. Yerevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 337–51.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio (ed.). 1985. *La Septuaginta en la Investigacion Contemporanea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*. Textos y Estudios “Cardinal Cisneros” 34. Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano” C.S.I.C.
- Ghazaryan, Ruben. 2000. *Գրքարարի բառարան* [Dictionary of Classical Armenian]. Yerevan: Publishing House of the Yerevan State University. <http://www.nayiri.com/imagedDictionaryBrowser.jsp?dictionaryId=28>
- Jensen, Hans. 1959. *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Indogermanische Bibliothek, 1. Reihe. Lehr- und Handbücher. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. <https://archive.org/details/altarmenischegrao000jens/page/n.5/mode/2up>
- Lange, Armin and Emanuel Tov (eds). 2016. *Textual History of the Bible*, vol. 1: *The Hebrew Bible*, part 1a: *Overview Articles*. Leiden: Brill.
- Montanari, Franco. 2015. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden and Boston: Brill (the Italian original was published in 1995).
- NETS. 2007. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. New York: New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://archive.org/details/a-new-english-translation-of-the-septuagint-2007-albert-pietersma-and-benjamin-g-wright-jo-e-juizes>
- Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.). 1935. *Septuaginta*, 2 vols Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Thomson, Robert W. 1989. *An Introduction to Classical Armenian*. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books (first published in 1975). <https://archive.org/details/thomson1989introclassicalarmenian>
- Wevers, John William (ed.). 1977. *Deuteronomium*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graece III, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1978. *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 13, AAWG Nr. 106. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Zeytunyan, Andranik (ed.). 2002. *Գիրք Երկրորդումն օրհնաց. քննական բնագիր* [The Book of Deuteronomy: Critical Text]. Etchmiadzin: Publishing House of the Mother See.
- Zohrabean, Yovhannēs (ed.). 1805. *Աստուածաշունչն սատեսան չին եւ Նոր Կտակարանաց* [The Inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments]. Venice: St Lazarus Press (reprinted in 1984 with an introduction by Claude E. Cox in Classical Armenian Text Reprint Series. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books).