

THE STUDY OF ARMENIAN MANUSCRIPTS

MICHAEL E. STONE

Address delivered on July 24, 1969 at a *Seminar on Armenian Studies*, held in connection with the exhibition "Treasures of the Armenian Patriarchate", Jerusalem.*

It is obvious that in the present context I do not need to sing the praise of the beauty or the wealth of the tradition of manuscript production nurtured and developed by Armenian scribes and painters over the past fifteen centuries. The manuscript books on display at the Exhibition are a magnificent witness to the beauty of Armenian manuscript decoration, to the richness of their illumination and to the loveliness of the miniatures themselves. We may observe, too, the extensive use¹ of the letters of the Armenian alphabet themselves as important elements in the decorative pattern and structure of the artistic work. This, together with the function of the miniatures as illustrations of the texts, may serve to remind us that manuscripts are not only works of art — though they are surely that — they are books and serve, therefore, the functions of books. They are the instrument of preservation and transmission of the intellectual, spiritual and scientific heritage of the Armenian people as well as being one of the major expressions of its artistic genius.

It is to this function of manuscripts, their role as instruments of the conservation, expression and perpetuation of intellectual, scholarly and religious culture that I wish to draw attention here. It is estimated that there are in existence today, some 25,000 Armenian manuscripts. This number is smaller than would be expected, and the loss of many manuscripts is due to the historical vicissitudes of the Armenians both in their homeland and in the Diaspora. Of these 25,000 extant manuscripts, just under half are housed in the Mashtots Matenadaran, the Institute of Ancient Manuscripts in Erevan, Armenia. A further 8,000 are divided more or less equally between two other libraries, that of the Mechitarist Fathers in Venice and that of the Armenian Patriarchate in Jerusalem. Over a thousand more are preserved in Vienna, in the Mechitarist monastery there. The remainder are scattered all over the world in smaller or larger collections, including those in such Armenian centres as New Julfa and Antelias and in some of the great European libraries such as the British Museum in London and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.¹

These manuscripts are, then, the raw material at our disposal. In order for them to yield up their contribution to the study of the cultural history of the Armenians, extensive preliminary processing is required. This involves all the technical aspects of the study of manuscripts, from cataloging to the study of scribes and scribal schools, investigation of

* The text of this address remains unchanged except for some stylistic corrections.

1. These facts are well known. See, for example: A. G. Abrahamyan, Հայ Պրի և Պրիստիանի Պատմություն (A History of Armenian Palaeography), Erevan 1959, pp. 5-11.

palaeography and historical orthography and a dozen other such technical disciplines. But the first need is to make available to the scholarly world in a concise but accurate fashion information about the contents of these manuscripts and their basic physical descriptions. In other words, the initial task is that of cataloging, and it is a formidable labour of love. Since the latter part of the last century a continuous stream of catalogues of Armenian manuscripts has been published. We will be forgiven here if we only touch upon some of the more important collections and on one or two of the minor ones.

Detailed descriptive catalogues of the Venice and Vienna collections were commenced some decades ago but while the publication of the first volumes was carried out then, only in recent years have we seen the continuation of this work. Even after the recent publication of the sequel volumes, the vast majority of the Venice collection remains uncatalogued. The catalogue of this library now contains some 450 items of a sum total of some 4,000.¹

The collection in Erevan is built around that which previously belonged to the Catholicosate of Etchmiadzin. A summary list of the manuscripts of the Catholicosate was published in 1863 by Karenian.² To this core collection, a considerable number of volumes has been added from a variety of sources, both before and after the removal of the collection to Erevan. A brief list of five thousand — less than half — of the manuscripts in the Erevan collection was published in 1965 and a second volume covering the remaining manuscripts appeared in 1970. This short list is designed to serve as a temporary stop-gap to provide basic information for scholars while the long labour of preparing and publishing the full, descriptive catalogue of this great collection continues.⁴

A series of catalogues of smaller collections of manuscripts in various localities has been published over the past seventy years by the Mechitarists in Vienna. Moreover, the major European collections were catalogued, half a century ago, by various Western Armenologists and Armenian scholars. Indeed, the situation for Western Europe is generally quite satisfactory, except of course for the Mechitarist Library in Venice.⁵

In North America the situation is also, at least potentially, a satisfactory one. There would appear to be somewhat less than 700 Armenian

2. Vienna: J. Dashian, *Catalog der armenischen Handschriften in der Mechitaristenbibliothek zu Wien*, I, Vienna 1895 and Vol. II ed. by H. Oskian, Vienna 1963 (in Armenian); Venice: B. Sarghissian, *Grande Catalogue des manuscrits arméniens de la Bibliothèque des PP. Mekhitaristes de Saint Lazare*, I-II, Venice 1914-19.4; Vol. III ed. by B. Sarghissian and G. Sarkian, Venice 1966 (in Armenian).

3. J. Karenian, *Մայր Յուզուհի Ձեռագիր Մատենից Գրադարանի Յրբայ Ախուրի Էջմիածնի (Grand Catalogue of the Manuscript Books of the Library of the Holy See of Etchmiadzin)*, Tiflis 1863.

4. O. Eganyan, A. Zeyt'nyan and P. Ant'abyan (eds.), *Յուզուհի Ձեռագրաց Մատենից Ախուրի Մատենադարանի (Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Mashtoc' Library)* I, Erevan 1965; II, Erevan 1970. The introduction to Volume I gives important information about the growth of the present collection.

5. These catalogues are listed in the bibliographies of Armenian manuscript studies. Most of them are included, for example, in Michael E. Stone, "Catalogues of Armenian Manuscripts and Associated Works in American Libraries", *J. A. O. S.* 88 (1968), pp. 455-460, and in Abrahamyan, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 1), pp. 398-402.

manuscripts in all in North America, of which about 350 are in the private library of H. Kurdian, Mr. Kurdian has promised a catalogue of his collection. Small but significant collections are to be found in certain public and institutional libraries, in the Freer Art Gallery (catalogued by Miss der Nersessian), in the University of Chicago Library, in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore and in one or two other collections. The remainder are scattered in ones and twos, through a number of libraries and in a few private collections. Some years ago, while he was in the United States, the writer commenced assembling information for a catalogue of the North American manuscripts, and this work is being continued by Professor Avedis K. Sanjian of the University of California at Los Angeles, who will publish the catalogue in the not too distant future.

The one major collection, however, for which a catalogue is being prepared at a rate which promises its completion in this generation, is the library of the Armenian Patriarchate in Jerusalem. The devoted labours of Bishop Norayr Bogharian have resulted in the publication of a descriptive catalogue which already comprises one third of the collection and which continues to appear at the rate of about one volume a year.⁶

It may be of interest to add that in Israel, in addition to the material belonging to the Patriarchate, the existence of seven manuscripts is known. Six belong to the National and University Library and one to the Isaac Wolfson Collection of Rare Books at the Chief Rabbinate in Jerusalem. A description of one of these has been published, one is currently on the press, and it is hoped that the remainder will be described in the not too distant future.⁷

As this albeit incomplete survey indicates, although great advances have been made in the cataloging of Armenian manuscripts in the last hundred years, nonetheless, as much as half of the total remains without full published descriptions.

Two further comments are relevant to this aspect of the subject. The Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in Lisbon has been supporting and encouraging the publication of manuscript catalogues as part of its programme of publication in the area of Armenian studies. As a result, recent years have seen a number of new works in this area. Secondly, the potential interest in Armenian studies and in the Armenian manuscript tradition extends beyond the confines of those familiar with the Armenian language. It is therefore greatly to be regretted that more of the editors of the catalogues of manuscripts do not follow the example of Jacobus Dashian in his great work on the Vienna Mechitarist collection, and ap-

6. Norayr Bogharian, *Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts*, I-IV, Jerusalem 1966-1969 (in Armenian). On the history of the cataloging of this collection see Michael E. Stone, *The Manuscript Library of the Armenian Patriarchate in Jerusalem*, Jerusalem 1969, pp. 3-7 [reprinted, with some additional notes *IEJ* 19 (1969), pp. 20-43].

7. Michael E. Stone, "An Armenian Manuscript in the National and University Library, Jerusalem", *REA N.S.* 4 (1967), pp. 57-61 and in Hebrew in *Kirjath Sepher* 42 (5727-1967), pp. 269-271; *idem*, "An Armenian Manuscript in the Collection of Hechal Shlomo, the Chief Rabbinate, Jerusalem", to appear in *Le Muséon*. [Since appeared: *Le Muséon*, 82 (1969), pp. 293-306.]

pend to their catalogues, which are in Armenian, at least a brief summary in a European language. This would serve the important function of making the riches of this great manuscript tradition available to the wider learned public.

When the technical aspects of the study of Armenian manuscripts are examined, the picture obtained is a mixed one. The primary area of Armenian palaeography and codicology is still largely unexplored. In particular, the need for establishing objective criteria for dating those manuscripts which do not preserve a dated colophon is most acute. Beyond the most general of criteria nothing is known in this area. A careful palaeographical and codicological study of the dated manuscripts in order to isolate criteria significant for dating is of considerable urgency. This would enable the scholars to fix dates for the very many undated manuscripts.⁸

In contrast to this, the study and collection of colophons of manuscripts is much more advanced. Two major publications have become definitive in this area, the collections of colophons by Garegin I, the late Catholicos of Sis and by Dr. Levon Khatchikian, the Director of the Matenadaran.⁹ These collections of colophons will, naturally, be increased and enriched by the continued publication of the catalogues of the manuscript collections.

Palaeography and colophons are, of course, only two aspects of the many technical disciplines associated with the study of the manuscripts, each of which raises its own problems and issues. Here, however, we may be permitted to turn our attention to the contents of the manuscripts, to the texts contained in them. The enormous range of Armenian literature makes any sort of survey of the contributions to it of the study of manuscripts too large a subject for the present lecture. Enough be it to observe that, of course, all that we know and all that we possess of Armenian literature from the period before the discovery of printing and, largely, for the subsequent two centuries, is preserved for us only in the manuscripts.

The chief tasks facing the student of this literature from the point of view of manuscript studies is the editing of texts. Many works remain unedited and unpublished. There may even be some still undiscovered. The range of writings contained in the manuscripts is as wide as Armen-

8. Compare, for example, the work being done by the Comité de Paléographie hébraïque. See the article of M. Beit-Arié, *מסעל הפליאוגרפיה העברית* (*The Hebrew Palaeography Project*), *HaUniversita* (Jerusalem) 12 (1966), pp. 53-58, and the *specimen editionis*, *Manuscripts médiévaux en caractères hébraïques*, Jerusalem 1969.

9. Catholicos Garegin I, *Յիշատակատեղեւորք և ճեւագրութեանց (Colophons of Manuscripts) I, 5th century to 1250*, Antelias 1951; Levon S. Khatchikian, *ԺԻ. Գարեգին Հայեդէն և ճեւագրութեան շիշատակատեղեւորք (Armenian Colophons of the 14th Century)*, Erevan 1950; *ԺԲ. Գարեգին Հայեդէն և ճեւագրութեան շիշատակատեղեւորք (Armenian Colophons of the 15th Century)*, Part I, 1405-1450, Erevan 1955; Part II, 1451-1480, Erevan 1958; Part III 1481-1500, Erevan 1967. There are a great many studies in books and journals, of particular scribes and scribal centers. Moreover, there is a rich literature on manuscript illumination which is not discussed in the present paper, although its contribution to the study of the manuscripts is far from negligible.

ish culture itself. Religious works, of course, form a large component of it. By religious works, naturally, are meant not only Biblical texts and liturgical books, but also extensive compositions of theological, devotional, spiritual, commentary and similar character. The great Armenian historiographic tradition, extending from the very beginnings of Armenian literature on, likewise constitutes a major part of this tradition. There are works of a scientific character; medicine, grammar, lexicography and other scientific disciplines play their role. And there are other types of literature, but all this is well known.

One of the most interesting aspects of Armenian literature is the translation literature. From the very beginning of Armenian literary activity and down to the present, numerous translations were made into Armenian from the various major culture languages of the day. These translations preserve not only writings of the Greek and Syriac churches, but also works of classical and Hellenistic culture. Likewise translations from Arabic, Georgian, Latin and other languages are to be found. In the area of translation, as in the area of the works written originally in Armenian, new discoveries are still possible, although in both areas the discovery of new, major works seem to be unlikely.

It may be of interest here to examine some new texts which have been discovered in the manuscripts of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem. This may be regarded as a preliminary announcement of the discovery of these texts, whose publication will take place in the close future. The first example is to be found in manuscript 69, which is apparently a late copy, at least in this section of it, of a 14th century manuscript which is also to be found in St. James. The text is presented under the rubric: *Ebrayec'i groc' gtak'* "We have found in the Hebrew Books." What follows, and it is a short text, deals with the authorship of the biblical books. It opens, "Moses wrote the five parts of the Law and Job" and concludes "Ezra wrote his book and the Chronicles of the kings."

This text is a rather free rendering of a Baraitha in the Talmudic tractate of Baba Bathra. The Armenian translation is not of the whole Baraitha, but only of that part of it dealing with the authorship of the Biblical books. A comparison of the Hebrew and the Armenian forms of this text reveals a number of divergences between them. Those terms, found in the Hebrew, which would not readily be recognized by a Christian reader unfamiliar with Rabbinic ideas, have been replaced by more easily understood expressions. Thus where the Talmud reads "the Men of the Great Synod" the Armenian has "Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi". Here not only the replacement of terms referred to may be observed, but it should also be noted that the Armenian translator is well enough informed to know that the expression, "the Men of the Great Synod" refers to the period of the Restoration.

As far as is known today, this is the only example of an Armenian translation of Rabbinic literature. The reason which would have made this passage of interest to an Armenian scribe is patent, and is of course due to its contents. The tradition of this passage in Armenian can be carried back, in light of the present evidence, only to the fourteenth century. It does not appear to have any significance for the criticism of the

Talmud, and its variants are unrelated to those found in the manuscripts of the Talmud. It may be the case then, that this passage was the subject of oral communication made by a Jew to an Armenian. Other pieces of evidence are extant of some contact between Armenian and Jewish scholars. Certainly the present passage is of interest, not only because of its uniqueness in Armenian literature, but also because of its witness to some extent of cultural interchange between Jews and Armenians.¹⁰

In the same manuscript, but in a part of it not copied from the 14th century exemplar, another unique text occurs. This is the "Hours of the Day and Night" a horarium listing in the twenty four hours of the day and night and the praise offered by one of the elements of creation at each of them. As well as a listing of the praise given at each hour, the text includes a mystical name for each, and the talisman for which the hour is auspicious. The text covers something under a folio of the manuscript and is written in a poor post-classical Armenian with many vulgar forms. It is corrupt in its present copy, implying some period of transmission in Armenian.¹¹

The Armenian of this text was translated from Arabic as is evident from a number of features in it, and it is possible that the translation was made as late as the seventeenth century.

What makes this apparently rather obscure document of interest and importance is its attribution; for it is attributed to *Balinas*, i. e. Apollonius, and there is no doubt that this is Apollonius of Tyana, the famous first century Pythagorean philosopher and wonder-worker who has been the subject of an extensive polemical debate initiated and spearheaded by Eusebius in his work *Contra Philoclem*. In this latter tract Eusebius attacked the view, put forward by the pagan writer Philocles, that Apollonius could be favourably compared in his life and works with Christ. These attacks on Apollonius, commenced by Eusebius, continued with considerable vigour down to the nineteenth century. Indeed, even in this century much of the literature on him is tendentious in one or another fashion.¹²

In addition to this notoriety which Apollonius gained in Christian circles, another tradition knew him as a sage and a wonder worker. Moreover, in a popular form of this tradition, and a form which can be traced back in one way and another to the second century, he is known

10. This text is to be published under the title "An Armenian Text of a Baraita in the Babylonian Talmud" in the *Harvard Theological Review*. [Since published, *HTR* 63 (1970), pp. 151-154. A manuscript, No. 3144, is listed in the *Essevan Catalogue*, Vol. I, under the title "Talmud". Its contents remain unknown, but, at the very most, it may contain some extracts, for it is only 40 folios in length.]

11. A full study of this text, together with a discussion of the material alluded to in the following paragraphs will be published soon.

12. The literature on Apollonius is rather extensive. Much of it will be discussed in the essay referred to in the preceding note. The literature up to the beginning of this century is summarized in: G. R. S. Mead, *Apollonius of Tyana*, London 1901. A more recent critical study is that of J. Hempel, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung von Apollonius von Tyana* ("Beiträge zur Religionswissenschaft", Heft 4), Stockholm, 1921. A convenient edition of the *Contra Philoclem* is included in Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* ("Loeb Classical Library") ed. F. C. Conybeare, London, 1913.

as a *magos* or "magician". He was well known in the Greek tradition, both of the post-classical and Byzantine periods, but not there alone, for in Syriac literature too, his wonder working and the talismans which he made were famous — thus witness Bar Hebraeus and Michael the Syrian among other sources. In Arabic literature, as well, Apollonius is familiar, there under the name of *Balinas*, or *Balinus*, and an extensive work attributed to him exists in Arabic. But this Arabic Balinas material does not contain the text from which the Armenian fragment was translated.¹³

In Greek, however, in a handful of mediaeval astrological manuscripts, this passage does occur. It is found in a somewhat larger work entitled *The Apotelesmata of Apollonius of Tyana*. This is an apparently apocryphal piece of Apollonius literature containing eight chapters, one of which is our horarium.¹⁴ The others concern astrological and angelological matters. It is interesting to observe that in the Armenian manuscript, too, the Apollonius horarium is preceded by an astronomical text and followed by a list of the signs of the Zodiac, but the astronomical text preceding it does not appear to be identical with any of the chapters of the Greek *Apotelesmata of Apollonius of Tyana*.

A comparison of the texts makes it evident that the Armenian version of the horarium is not directly dependent on the text type of the Greek version. It is much fuller and contains many elements which are not found in the Greek text. It appears, therefore, that not only is the Armenian a translation of an Arabic text which has not yet been discovered among the Arabic Balinas materials, but also that this Arabic text in turn witnesses to a type of text different at many points from the Greek text which has survived.

This whole situation is complicated by yet another factor. The text of this same horarium is to be found in Syriac. But the Syriac version lacks the talismans, the mystic "barbaric" names of the hours, and virtually all the magical elements. Moreover, the Syriac text is not attributed to Apollonius but to Adam, and in Syriac the text of the horarium is associated with two other short pieces which are together given the title *Testament of Adam*. The connection of this material with the Adam tradition is not just a Syriac phenomenon. In the Byzantine chronicler George Cedrenus we also find the same association with Adam. In the section of his chronicle in which he deals with Adam, Cedrenus adduces what is apparently a summary form of one of the fragments associated in the Syriac text with Adam, and follows this with the text of the horarium. In the horarium material cited by Cedrenus, too, the mystic names and the talismans lack.¹⁵ Thus there appear to be two distinct forms of the

13. Hempel's book referred to in the preceding note deals with the various traditions associated with Apollonius. Important material on the Arabic Balinas (Balinus) tradition is to be found in M. Plessner, art. "Balinus" *Encyclopédie d'Islam*, I, 1024-1026. The major ancient references to Apollonius are adduced by Nau, in the work cited in the following note.

14. This was published at about the same time, independently, by F. Nau in R. Grafia (ed.), *Patrologia Syriaca*, Pt. I, Vol. II, Paris 1907, pp. 1362-1425 and by F. Boll in *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*, Vol. VII, Brussels 1907, pp. 174-181.

15. The Syriac text is best edited by Kmosko in the volume of *Patrologia Syriaca* referred to in the preceding note, pp. 1307-1360. He also reprints Cedrenus' text. For the

transmission of this material. One is associated with Apollonius and is witnessed by the Greek, the Armenian and the hypothetical Arabic text from which the Armenian was translated. The other is associated with Adam and is witnessed by the Syriac *Testament of Adam* and by Cedrenus.

Furthermore, the antiquity of the additional material found in the Armenian version is demonstrated at least in part, by the fact that it contains some features in common with the Syriac version which are not to be found in the Greek Apollonius text. It is impossible to explain the presence of these features in both Syriac and Armenian unless they stem from the source of both.

The Syriac *Testament of Adam* was translated into Arabic and occurs in at least two different text types. The Arabic *Testament of Adam* material is associated with the Arabic version of the *Cave of Treasures*, also called *The Book of the Rolls*, and certain scholars have even suggested that the origins of the Syriac version too should be sought in this context. This Arabic text was in turn translated into Ethiopic.¹⁶ From the point of view of the present discussion it is most important to stress that this Arabic version is not, nor can it have been the original of the Armenian Apollonius text. It belongs to the *Testament of Adam* tradition, and is marked by all the special features of that tradition, commencing from the very association with Adam, continuing with the omission of the mystical names and talismans, as well as numerous other points of text and structure.

Within this complex of texts and traditions, therefore, the newly discovered Armenian Apollonius fragment assumes considerable importance from a series of points of view. First, it is of interest to find some penetration of this type of Apollonius material into the Armenian cultural tradition. Moreover, the Armenian fragment is a witness to an Arabic text which is not known to have survived in Arabic. Of even greater importance is the fact that this is the second witness in all for the Apollonius tradition of the horarium, otherwise known to exist only in the mediaeval Greek manuscripts. And since this Armenian tradition preserves readings and information which are not to be found in the Greek text, its importance extends beyond the mere confirmation of the text preserved in the mediaeval Greek manuscripts to the preservation of new textual information.

It is possible also to mention other types of literature, more or less well known, which are to be found altogether unpublished or else published in poor editions, in the Armenian manuscripts. One such is the text called *Bark' Ebrayec'woc'*, "Hebrew Vocabulary". This is extant in a great many manuscripts, generally of grammatical character. Recently the Armenian text was discussed by H. M. Amalyan in a book published in

earlier history of this text see J. B. Frey, art. "Adam, Livres Apocryphes de", in *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément, Vol. I, Paris, 1928 p. 117.

16. Published by C. Bezold, "Die Arabisch-Aethiopisch Testamentum Adami", *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. C. Bezold, Giessen 1906, Vol. II, pp. 893-912, and according to a Sinai manuscript in M. Gibson, *Studia Sinaitica*, Vol. VII, London 1902.

Erevan and devoted to the quite extensive and varied vocabulary and dictionary texts to be found in Armenian manuscripts. Amalyan did not realise, evidently, that Armenian text of the vocabulary had already been published by F. Wutz in his two volume work *Onomastica Sacra* in 1914-15. Wutz based his edition on eight manuscripts in various European libraries, the earliest of which is dated by him to the twelfth century.¹⁷

This text contains a list of Biblical proper names with their etymologies, meanings derived from the Hebrew. Such onomastica were supposedly composed by Philo, to whom some forms of the Armenian version are attributed, and by Eusebius. A Latin onomasticon by St. Jerome called *Liber Interpretationis Nominum Hebraicorum* is extant.¹⁸ There exist also fragments of Greek onomastica on papyrus from Oxyrhyncus and elsewhere, and quite extensive lists in various Greek manuscripts. As well as the Greek, Latin and Armenian texts, such onomastica also exist, *inter alia*, in Syriac, Ethiopic and Church Slavonic, but Armenian lists appear to be by far the most extensive of the oriental texts.

To the eight manuscripts which Wutz published we may add a number of 14th century texts in Erevan mentioned by Amalyan, as well as later manuscripts, totalling over 60 in all there.

In Jerusalem ten manuscripts of the vocabularies are known to exist, one of which, No. 2481 is to be dated in the 13th century, and one, No. 1682, in the 14th century. Wutz had already found, among the manuscripts which he studied, that there are in fact three different vocabularies in Armenian. The major one, and also the longest by far, also appears to be the oldest and is most widespread in the manuscripts. His second form was a shortened version of the long list, while the third is a later compilation, based in part on the first list, but also employing some other sources, including later, mediaeval Latin onomastica.

A study of the Jerusalem vocabularies, together with the four copies to be found in the Mechitarist Library in Venice, and one additional manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale unstudied by Wutz, enables us to broaden this picture considerably. Within the major list, Wutz's first type, a number of groupings of manuscripts become evident, based both on variant readings and on variant orders of the words. A previously unknown shortened form of this list is contained in Paris, B. N. 140. Moreover, a number of types and varieties of the later lists appear to exist, and at least one additional type of list which includes not only explanations of Biblical names but also of Armenian words encountered in the Armenian Biblical text. The relationship between these various lists is currently under investigation, and the relationship between them and the Greek and Latin onomastica which are extant must be further studied. It seems likely that a good deal of material will turn out to be contained in the Armenian tradition which is not to be found in the extant Greek texts.

17. H. Amalyan, *Միջին դարյան Հայաստանի Քառասնամյա պատմական և առարկայական լեզուների բառարաններ* (Mediaeval Armenian Glossary Texts), Erevan, 1966, pp. 143-154, 234; F. Wutz, *Onomastica Sacra* ("Texte und Untersuchungen", Vol. 41), Vols. I-II, Leipzig 1914-1915.

18. Published in Wutz' book, see n. 16. See most recently also D. Rokeah, "A New Onomastikon Fragment from Oxyrhyncus" *J T S.*, (1968), pp. 70-83.

We have mentioned here but a few of many texts, of larger or smaller proportions, which remain unpublished or in need of renewed examination. There is no doubt that their number could be increased tenfold; the manuscript sources are plentiful and rich.¹⁹ Clearly the investigation of the Armenian manuscript texts will continue to produce many surprises, and to illuminate not only the past of the Armenian people but of others among whom they lived or with whose writings and literature they were familiar. It is, therefore, to be hoped that exhibitions like the present one will serve not only to arouse the general public to the artistic wealth of this tradition, but also draw the attention of scholars to the breadth and variety of the Armenian intellectual heritage.

19. Some other types of little-known works are dealt with in the writer's essay, "The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition", *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, Vol. IV, No. 4, Jerusalem 1969, pp. 59-77.