

## Satan and the Serpent

Michael E. Stone

### 1.0 Satan

At the basis of this research stands a *CORPUS* of all the published pre-eighteenth century narrative texts in Armenian relating to Adam, Eve and the Eden story. These texts were excerpted and translated as part of a project on "Adam and Eve in the Armenian Tradition".<sup>1</sup> In the present paper, we shall analyse the views of the relationship between Satan and the serpent, to be gleaned from these texts.<sup>2</sup>

The biblical story does not mention Satan as the agent of the fall, but only the serpent. However, by the fifth century, when the Armenians started to write in their own language, they took Satan's role in the fall for granted. From this assumption, exegetical and conceptual questions followed about the relationship between Satan and the serpent, about Satan's fall itself, and about Satan's and the serpent's motivation for deceiving Adam and Eve.

Descriptions of Satan in general occur in many Armenian sources,<sup>3</sup> and it is beyond the limits this research to present even an overview of them. It is appropriate, however, to start with his name, since the present essay is dealing with identification. First, we should remark that it seems to be significant that the particular names Beliar, Beelzebub and Sadayēl are not cited in Armenian from non-biblical sources until quite late. Frik (C 13)<sup>4</sup> in

---

<sup>1</sup> The research was funded by the Israel Research Foundation, grant no. 770/99. Thanks are expressed to Dr. Aram Topchyan of the Matenadaran, Library of Ancient Manuscripts in Erevan, Armenia who rendered invaluable assistance. The results of the project are being published both as a series of analytical articles and as a collection of texts and translations. The following articles have been published to date: STONE, "Traditions"; STONE, "Naming"; and STONE, "Identity".

<sup>2</sup> STONE, "Identity" deals in shorter compass with other aspects of this issue, particularly the comparative.

<sup>3</sup> Compare STONE, *Adam's Contract*, 17-21 on Satan's appearance. The literature on Satan is extensive. J.B. RUSSELL has assembled a great deal of information in his three volumes: *Devil*; idem, *Satan*; idem, *Lucifer*; also see FORSYTH, *Old Enemy*.

<sup>4</sup> All Armenian authors are cited by name and toponym or other title if appropriate. "C 13", etc. following indicates the century of the author's *floruit*. Full references are included in the

his "Words of Praise to God" (Բանք զովորեալսն առ Աստուած), line 18 uses the name Բելիար "Beliar."<sup>5</sup> It is already to be found, of course, in 2 Cor 6:15, but is not frequent in the Armenian sources until the Middle Ages. Thus, after it cites 2 Cor, *NBHL* (p. 479a)<sup>6</sup> refers to Grigor Narekac'i poems 4.2 line 35 and 64.4, line 3. To these we readily add a number of further references, such as *ibid.* 21.2, line 13 and 28.8 line 154, *et al.*<sup>7</sup> The name Բելզաբոն "Bēlzabū" occurs in Yovhannēs ĵulayec'i (C 17).<sup>8</sup> Like Beliar, it is found in the Bible (Matt 10:25, 12:24 and 27), and is cited from Grigor Narekac'i (C 10), e.g., 51.4 line 5; and Nersēs Lambronac'i (C 12).<sup>9</sup> To these references in *NBHL* we may also add Nersēs Šnorhali (C 12), *General Epistle*, chap. 4 and other sources exist as well.

The name Sadayēl occurs in the apocryphal Armenian Adam books, connected with the myth of the primordial revolt against God.<sup>10</sup> There, in *The History of the Creation and Transgression of Adam and Eve* manuscript Y §2 we read: "Now the wicked Sadael and Beliar were heads of the divisions of Satan."<sup>11</sup> This version is obviously conflatory combining two devilish names and manuscript D's text of the same verse mentions Beliar alone. In both manuscripts, from §3 on, only the name of Satan is found. In Yovhannēs Erznkac'i (C 13), poem X "Our Lord came to the Garden" (Մեր Տէրն ի դրախտն երևել) we find the simple equation of the two.<sup>12</sup>

Ի յերկնատրաց դասուց.  
55 Սաղայլի զերեսն էր շրջեր,

---

bibliography following this article. Further information may be readily found in THOMSON, *Bibliography* and, about later authors, in BARDAKJIAN, *Reference Guide*.

<sup>5</sup> FRIK — MARGARIAN, *Frik: Poems*, 132.

<sup>6</sup> AWETIK'EAN, SIWRMELEAN and AWK'EREAN, *Dictionary*; henceforth *NBHL*.

<sup>7</sup> A search of medieval Armenian literature subsequent to Grigor Narekac'i would doubtless turn up other examples. This name is not particularly rare.

<sup>8</sup> YOVHANNES ĴULAYEC'I 1812, 146-147.

<sup>9</sup> In *NBHL* 1.487a.

<sup>10</sup> On this, see below, %%.

<sup>11</sup> LIPSCOMB, *Armenian Apocryphal Adam*, 118.

<sup>12</sup> YOVHANNES T'LKURANC'I — RUSSELL, 1987, 171; YOVHANNES ERZNKAC'I — ARMENUHI SRAPYAN, 1958, 224, line 55.

Ի յերկնից անդունդս իջեր,  
Դ՛ի ի լուսոյն խաւար մնացեր,

From the heavenly orders

Sadaēl had turned his face;

From Heaven he descended into the abyss,

And from light, he lived in darkness.

The name Բազու "Bazu" is applied to Beliar-Satan by Vardan Aygkec'ı (C 13).<sup>13</sup> Its origin is unknown.

In a powerful poem by the same author, included in *The Root of Faith*, we read:

You are adorned with sin,

and full of deeds of darkness.

You are created as an heir of fire,

and have gone forth to the outer darkness.<sup>14</sup>

For you are not prepared for a wedding,

made stinking with a tunic.<sup>15</sup>

Bound with iron chains,<sup>16</sup>

Separated by a fiery sword in between,<sup>17</sup>

Gone forth from the goodly host,

Ranked in the lot of the unbelievers.<sup>18</sup>

Vardan Aygkec'ı here gives a vivid description of the fall of Satan (unnamed in his text). This fall is intimately related to the name Sadayēl in a fifteenth century Armenian amulet scroll, Matenadaran 116, dated 1428, Sat/dayēl is described as commander of the

---

<sup>13</sup>VARDAN AYGEKC'İ — MARR, 1893, 43-44.

<sup>14</sup>Matt 8:12, 22:13 and 25:30. Here, presumably Matt 22:13 serves as the primary source.

<sup>15</sup>Satan is not ready for the heavenly wedding feast: cf. Matt 22:11-13.

<sup>16</sup>Perhaps deriving from Job 41. The binding of Satan with chains occurs in Armenian art.

Compare also Ps 149:8 *անուկապետս երկաթետս*.

<sup>17</sup>See Gen 3:24.

<sup>18</sup>This refers, undoubtedly, to the fall of Satan: see §2.0 below. Cited from VARDAN AYGEKC'İ — K'EOSEYAN and HAYRAPETEAN, 1988, 308.

fallen angels and builder of Hell. This, of course, is Satan's role in most texts. Interestingly, in this document the demons speak of themselves as angels who fell due to unwillingness to give glory to God, and who were responsible for Adam's expulsion. These are all actions usually attributed to Satan or Sadayēl, and their transfer to the demons in general is probably due to the magical context and purpose of this document. However, the amulet text does know the chief elements of the story: the prideful rebellion before creation and the fall; the honour given to Adam; the building of Hell;<sup>19</sup> the deception and expulsion of Adam; and the imprisonment of his soul and those of all the saints, up to John the Baptist. This story is complete and coherent, in small compass, in the magical text.

եւ մեր նախանձեցաք ընդ պատուի նորա . եւ տուաք ուտել ի պտղոյն / 55 / որ ոչ հրամայեաց նմայ չի ուտել . եւ հանաք զնայ ի դրախտէն . եւ զամենայն ծնունդ նորա խաբեցաք ի կռապաշտութիւն . ի պէսպէս մեղս: դասապետն մեր սատայել. շինեաց / 60 / սպարան. եւ անուանեաց դժոխք

And we envied his honour, and we gave (him) to eat of the fruit /55/ which He ordered him not to eat, and we brought him out of paradise, and we deceived all his descendants to idol worship, to various sorts of sins. Our commander, Satayēl, built / 60 / a palace and named it "Hell".<sup>20</sup>

According to Hamam Arewelc‘i (C 9), Satan was called darkness because of his pride.<sup>21</sup> David Salajorec‘i (C 17) describes Satan as black.<sup>22</sup> Yovhannēs Ĵuṣayec‘i (C 17) further develops the idea, saying that as Beelzebub defeated Adam he became luminous, but as Christ defeated him he became dark (զի Ադամաւ պայծառեցաւ յորժամ յաղթեաց, եւ Քրիստոսի խաւարեցաւ, յորժամ յաղթահարեցաւ: 1812, 146-147). It is noteworthy that, from very early times, evil or wickedness is marked by the absence of light, by darkness, or

<sup>19</sup>On Satan's kingdom in Hell, see ZAK‘ARIA KAT‘OLIKOS (C 9), 1987, 490.

<sup>20</sup>LOEFF, "Four Texts".

<sup>21</sup>HAMAM AREWELC‘I — MXIT‘AR K‘AHANAY SARIBEKYAN, 1994, 215; see also HAMAM AREWELC‘I — THOMSON, 2005, 133.

<sup>22</sup>DAVIT‘-SALAJOREC‘I — HASMIK SAHAKYAN, 1987, 372-380, line 89.

blackness.<sup>23</sup> For example, Satan is said to be "the black one" in Barn. 4:10 and described as an Ethiopian in apocryphal acts.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, though the idea of Satan as black is not attested in our Adam texts until rather late, it is in fact old in Christian (and Jewish) tradition. Associated with it is a legend that Cain learned how to kill Abel from two demons in the form of crows or ravens.<sup>25</sup> Demons and crows or ravens are black and this is how demons are represented in manuscript paintings and amulets. Kirakos Erznkac'i (C 13) called them Satan's "darkness-loving demons" and "black hosts".<sup>26</sup> Thus it is quite natural when, in the seventeenth century, Davit' Salajorec'i says that Satan is black and when Yovhannēs ĵuļayec'i in the same century<sup>27</sup> compares Satan's technique in deceiving Adam to the fashion in which crows hunt their prey.<sup>28</sup> The association of darkness with Satan, then, is profoundly rooted. Vardan Aygekc'i (C 13) says that on the fourth day of creation, night's darkness came forth from the serpent's mouth,<sup>29</sup> which is surely an associated idea.

---

<sup>23</sup>See STONE, *Fourth Ezra*, 359, on the faces of the righteous and the wicked.

<sup>24</sup>On Satan as the "black one", see GASTER, "Satan," 227-228.

<sup>25</sup>*Abel and Other Pieces*, §3.4, 148; *History of the Forefathers* §25, 193; cf. *Abel and Cain*, Second Recension, §27; the text of the first recension is corrupt here. On the demonic aspect of the crow, see, for example, the exegesis of Noah's raven in Mandaean texts cited by LUPIERI, *The Mandaeans*, 201-202 (*Right Ginza* 18). See also note 28 below.

<sup>26</sup>Demons in the form of black men are mentioned by the *Acts of Thomas* (JAMES, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 394).

<sup>27</sup>A sort of inverse statement is that of Yovhannēs ĵuļayec'i (C 17) quoted above, that Beelzebub became luminous thanks to his defeat of Adam.

<sup>28</sup>"For it is characteristic of the crows; it wants that animals be suffocated, so that it may make food for itself; (a crow) tries to tear out the eyes and blind them, and then to cast them down a cliff and eat (them). Satan, too, acted in this way; he blinded Adam's nature and made it food for himself": YOVHANNES ĴULAYEC'I — 1812, 108. In the *Physiologus* §31.2-4 we read, "The Physiologus says about the crow ... (that) it was the Jewish people that killed the celestial Word": see MURADYAN, *Physiologus*, 135-136, 160-161.

<sup>29</sup>VARDAN AYGKEC'I — NMARR, 1956, 29-30.

Satan is associated with death. Thus, Grigor Tat'ewac'i (C 14) says "there is a personified death which is Satan; through it (*or*: him) you shall die (qnj ufiñuunp ũuh nř ĩ uuuuuñuaj, řnřuı ũññuñřu)",<sup>30</sup> while in the same century Yovhannēs Erzncac'i Corcorec'i says that Satan was the first murderer,<sup>31</sup> an "honour" usually reserved for Cain.<sup>32</sup>

To summarize: (1) the idea of Satan existed from the inception of Armenian literature and in the medieval period his names varied. While "Beliar" was quite widespread, "Sadayēl" is later and exists in a specific mythological connection and other names are found as well. (2) From Hamam Arewelc'i on, the ancient characteristics of darkness and blackness appear as Satanic characteristics in Armenian literature related to Adam. (3) In still later texts the connection between crows and demons is to be found. (4) Finally, Satan is closely connected with death.

### **1.0.1 The Serpent.**

The serpent is characterized in various ways. The two cited here are typical of most. First, Grigor Tat'ewac'i says that the serpent was the beginning of man's death. And since its discourse was of two kinds, namely false and true, its tongue was forked.<sup>33</sup> Next, following an ancient typology, he says that the serpent symbolises deceptive, lascivious desire.<sup>34</sup> Such overall condemnations of the serpent are quite frequent. Further references to the serpent may be found in the succeeding sections of this paper. For our purposes, particular interest inheres in the relation between the serpent and other central evil figures. Satan was involved in Adam's fall from the inception of Armenian literature. How was he related to the serpent?

### **1.1 Satan and the Serpent.**

In the earliest Armenian literature, Satan's relationship with the serpent is described in remarkably contrasting ways. At one end of the spectrum, in the fifth century Agat'angelos

---

<sup>30</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — 1998A, 324-325; 572-573.

<sup>31</sup>YOVHANNES ERZNCAC'I CORCOREC'I — 1825, 28.

<sup>32</sup>See 1John 3:12 "We must not be like Cain who was from the evil one and murdered his brother." If the "evil one" is Satan, then this may also hint at the tradition of Cain's Satanic origin.

<sup>33</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — 1993, 218-219.

<sup>34</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — 1998B, 211.

says that the serpent was a pack animal upon which Satan rode (Agat'angelos §141),<sup>35</sup> while in the fourteenth Grigor Tat'ewac'i says that the serpent was Satan's arms and legs (թև և նոյն).<sup>36</sup> Eznik seems simply to equate them (§§46, 48 and 60).<sup>37</sup> This latter view continues throughout and, for example, in thirteenth century, Yovhannēs Erznkac'i Pluz asserts that the serpent is Satan and he deceived Eve.<sup>38</sup> A century earlier, Sargis Šnorhali had simply assumed that Adam was deceived by Satan, implying an identification of the serpent and Satan.<sup>39</sup> This relationship is the subject of intermittent discussion in subsequent centuries, which we shall describe starting with the metaphors used for it. Often, it seems, the use of the term "Satan" or "serpent" is determined by the literary context rather than by any deliberate theologically driven choice.

Another identification was discerned in Ps 91:13, in terminology analogous to the Genesis language. The verse reads, suggestively from the perspective of Genesis, "You will tread on the lion and the adder, the young lion and the serpent you will trample under foot." In the twelfth-century Yovhannēs Erznkac'i Corcorec'i (C 12) in his *Commentary on Matthew* says, "And besides, it calls Satan 'adder,' according to David, 'You shall tread upon the ... adder' (և դարձնալ իժ զսասունայ սնուսնէ, ըստ Դաւիթի՝ ի վերայ իժի զնասցես դնի)." <sup>40</sup> It is intriguing to see this verse, from the well-known apotropaic Ps 91, exegetically related to the trampling of Satan. Surely intertextual are Ps 73 (74):13-14 which speaks of God trampling the head of the *višap* dragon-snake ("13 You divided the sea by your might; you broke the heads of the dragons [վիշապաց] in the waters. 14 You crushed the *heads* of

<sup>35</sup> In *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* 13 we read, "[i]ts appearance was something like that of the camel, and he [i.e., Samael = Satan] mounted and rode upon it" (tr. FRIEDLANDER 1981, 92).

<sup>36</sup> 1993, 218-219. Թև could also be translated "wings." In 1998A, 324-325, GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I says that the serpent is the feet of the Enemy.

<sup>37</sup> ALEXANDRE, *Le Commencement*, 297, observes that Cyril of Alexandria says that Satan is transformed into the serpent and speaks as such (C. *Julianum* III [PG 76:632 B-C]). Compare *Pirqe di Rabbi Eliezer* 13, on which see STONE, "Identity".

<sup>38</sup> YOVHANNES ERZNKAC'I PLUZ — BAŁTASARYAN, 1971, 306.

<sup>39</sup> SARGIS ŠNORHALI — 1828, 134.

<sup>40</sup> YOVHANNES ERZNKAC'I CORCOREC'I — 1825, 281.

Leviathan [վիշապահն]); and perhaps Gen 3:14-15 which speaks of the crushing (laying in wait for) the *head* of the "serpent" (օձ). Thus, the exegesis of Ps 91:3 introduces the term "adder" into the arsenal of Satan's identifications. The background of the biblical material, especially of Ps 93(94):13-14 lies in old, mythological themes. To them, the Armenian biblical translation has added a pre-Christian Armenian mythical association with the water snake-dragon known as a *višap*, which joins this procession of satanic reptiles.

**1.1.1 Metaphors: Possession or Indwelling.**

Grigor Pahlawuni called Tlay "the Child" (C 12) just says that "Satan goes into the serpent (Սատանայ յաձրն ւրսաւնի),"<sup>41</sup> speaking as if Satan possessed the serpent. Satan's possession of the serpent is even more explicitly implied by a statement in the undated apocryphal work called *Adam, Eve and the Incarnation*. It is certainly later than Grigor Tlay's time (twelfth century), but nonetheless is of considerable interest here. It says that Satan entered the belly of the serpent (ւնեալ յրովայնի օձին) and spoke from the serpent's belly "with a human voice" (§2).<sup>42</sup> This evokes descriptions of ventriloquism, which is frequently an aspect of demonic possession.<sup>43</sup> Ehišē's earlier sexual imagery in his *Commentary on Joshua* that will be discussed below, has been abandoned for that of demonic possession which is implied by Grigor Tlay. By his time, possession was the way in which Satan was related to the serpent. The serpent was recipient and instrument of the Evil One (see §1.1.2): so says Grigor Tat'ewac'i, and by the term "recipient" he may be referring once more to possession.<sup>44</sup>

In the verses of Davit' Salajorec'i (C 17) we read:

Because the serpent is vengeful;  
That cursed impure Satan,

---

<sup>41</sup>GRIGOR PAHLAWUNI (TŁAY) — PALIAN, 1912. 177-179.

<sup>42</sup>STONE, *Armenian Apocrypha*, 22-23.

<sup>43</sup> For descriptions of demonic possession see ESHEL, *Demonology*, 136-144; cf. RILEY "Demons", 453.

<sup>44</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — 1998A, 324-325.



He went, entered the serpent's mouth ...<sup>45</sup>

This reflects the same understanding of Satan's relationship to the serpent as Grigor Tat'ewac'i's: because of Satan's possession, the serpent could talk.

In the ninth century, T'ovma Arcruni says that Satan "nested" (ընկնայ) in the serpent.<sup>46</sup> This introduces another image to describe their relationship, but it was not very productive or widespread, and it too implies indwelling or possession. In the texts we have assembled, "nesting" recurs only in the writings of Grigoris Alt'amarc'i (C 16) who also says that Satan nests in the serpent:<sup>47</sup> he could, of course, picked it up from T'ovma Arcruni.

Yovhannēs Erzncac'i Pluz (C 13) says simply that Satan took the serpent as his associate.<sup>48</sup> This statement should probably be related to Satan's deceit or excitement of the serpent, which is discussed below in §1.6.<sup>49</sup> In a society in which demonic possession is a known phenomenon and in which Satan was prince of demons, possession is an obvious way of describing this relationship.

### 1.1.2 Metaphors: Instrument

Nersēs Šnorhali (C 12) calls the serpent an instrument of lawlessness for Satan (զործի անօրէնութեան իննչով սասանայի).<sup>50</sup> This is the first time that the term "instrument" or "tool" occurs in our texts. Again, Grigor Tat'ewac'i says that the serpent was recipient and

<sup>45</sup>DAVIT' SALAJORC'I — 1987, 372-380.

<sup>46</sup>TOVMA ARCRUNI — THOMSON, 1985, 22.; could this be a serpent's nest?

<sup>47</sup>GRIGORIS ALT'AMARC'I — AVDALBEGYAN, 1963, 143-144. This language may derive from the idea of a serpent's nest.

<sup>48</sup>Yovhannēs Erzncac'i Pluz quoted in YOVHANNES T'LKURANC'I — RUSSELL, 1987, 167-168, 228.

<sup>49</sup>Zak'aria Bishop of Gnuni (C 16) says with no further details that Satan made the serpent his dwelling: see his Kafa on the *History of Alexander*. A kafa is a moralizing poetic comment on a historical work. In the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries, kafas on the *History of Alexander* were rather popular: see BARDAKJIAN, *Reference Guide*, 32-33. See further below note 82. Publication of Kafas may be found in SIMONYAN, *Medieval Armenian Kafas*, 1975. Even less defined is T'adēos T'oxat'ac'i (C 16) who says that Satan pretended to be the serpent. See T'ADEOS T'OXAT'EC'I — POTURIAN, 1910, 276.

<sup>50</sup>NERSES ŠNORHALI — BALDASARYAN, 1995, 161.

*instrument* of the Evil One.<sup>51</sup> This relationship, the serpent as Satan's instrument, is not explored much further. It is old, however, and has forerunners in ancient patristic sources.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, the word "instrument" also has a musical aspect. According to the Armenian Adam books, Satan plays upon the serpent like on a lyre, a musical instrument.<sup>53</sup> This metaphor, of course, implies the same sort of absolute dominance by Satan as does possession. In no context where Satan and the serpent are held apart to some extent, is initiative attributed to the serpent. Satan is always dominant.

### 1.1.3 Metaphor: Sexual Overtones.

In a passage of the of Efišē's *Commentary on Joshua and Judges* 3:10, we have what is basically an allegorical interpretation of the Genesis story:

Յնացաւ օճն զկերպարանս աներեւոյթ չարութեանն եւ եղև արու բնութիւն:

միջնորդութեամբ պտղոյ ծառոյն. պատրեաց եւ մեղկեցոյց զհինգ զգայութիւնս իգական մասինն. յապուշ կրթեաց զմիտք կնոջն եւ մոռացումն արար զպատուիրանսն Աստուծոյ.

մինչ չեւ մտեալ ի պատերազմն՝ պարտեցաւ ի հայելոյն, յորմէ դու պարտիս զգուշանալ: .

The serpent became pregnant with the forms of the invisible evil and he became the male nature through the mediation of the fruit of the tree. He seduced and stripped naked the five senses of the female part. He instructed the woman's mind in stupidity and caused (her)

---

<sup>51</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I (C 14) does not make the metaphor which stands behind "recipient" explicit: see 1998, 324-325.

<sup>52</sup>According to some of the Greek and Latin fathers the serpent was the instrument (ὄργανον] Of the enemy of truth (Theodoret, *QG*, CCCIII; Theophilus, *ad Auctolytum* II.28; Irenaeus, *Dem.* 16 *et al.* cited by ALEXANDRE, *Commencement*). Ephrem's poem (see note 53) is reminiscent of the story of the blind man and the lame man, attributed to Pseudo-Ezekiel: this story and its rabbinic parallels is discussed in SATRAN, STONE and WRIGHT, *Apocryphal Ezekiel*, 9-19. It seems likely that a comparative study of Satan's relationship to the serpent and the soul's relationship to the body and the metaphors used to describe the two relationships would yield important insights into ancient anthropology. See also STONE, "Identity" and the next note.

<sup>53</sup> The language used in the *Penitence of Adam* is that the serpent is a lyre upon which Satan plays: "[b]e you, in your form, a lyre for me and I will pronounce speech through your mouth" [44]16:4b. Ephrem, *Hymns of Paradise* 8:2 (EPHREM SYRUS — BROCK, *Hymns*, 132) talks of the soul without the body as being "without its mate, the body, its instrument and lyre."

forgetfulness of the commandments of God. Before she entered the war, she was vanquished by the looking, of which you must be wary.<sup>54</sup>

Sexual imagery permeates the passage. The serpent conceives or becomes pregnant with the forms of evil (presumably due to its possession by Satan) and in this aspect the serpent is female. This pregnant, female serpent then becomes male and overcomes the female part (= Eve) and stripped her senses naked (again a sexual association is evoked) causing the abeyance of the intellect (therefore "stupidity"). The serpent is said to use the fruit as its instrument for Eve's transformation. Once the serpent overcame the woman Eve, using the fruit as a tool, became male. This seems to imply the superiority of the male, and the serpent plays the male role in contrast to Eve.<sup>55</sup> The role of the five senses, through which Satan deceived Eve, comes to the fore in the thirteenth century, in Yovhannēs Erznkac'i Pluz<sup>56</sup> and is further stressed a century later by Grigor Tat'ewac'i.<sup>57</sup> Eve is particularly susceptible through her five senses. This reflects a distinct attitude to men and women.

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM  
**Comment:** He ate first.

It remains an open question whether, behind this formulation, lay the myth according to which Satan had intercourse with Eve and begat Cain. It is certainly possible

---

<sup>54</sup>ELIŠE VARDAPET — 1859, 176. The language of fighting referred to in this sentence is discussed below in §1.6.

<sup>55</sup>Such ideas are not infrequently encountered. Thus, for example, Philo in *de fuga et inventione* §51 shows a similar valuation of male and female characteristics [my italics below, MES]:

51 He called Bethuel Rebecca's *father*. How, pray, can Wisdom, the *daughter of God*, be rightly spoken of as *father*? Is it because, while Wisdom's name is feminine, her nature is manly? As indeed all of the virtues have women's titles, but are powers and activities of consummate men. For that which comes after God, even though it were chiefest of all other things, occupies a second place, and therefore was termed feminine to express its contrast with the Maker of the Universe, who is masculine, and its affinity to everything else. *For preeminence always pertains to the masculine, and the feminine always comes short of and is lesser than it.*

Such evaluations, and to some extent similar exegetical strategies, underlie the passage we are discussing. The language of fighting is discussed in §1.6 below.

<sup>56</sup>YOVHANNES ERZNKAC'I PLUZ — BAŁSASARYAN, 1971, 306

<sup>57</sup>1998A, 324-325. He says that the serpent makes five circular movements symbolising the five senses.

that the passage of Eznik is a retelling of some such myth, though it would be an isolated instance in the Armenian literature we have examined so far.<sup>58</sup>

In the following Tables we set forth the main metaphors that have served to describe the relationship of Satan and the serpent in Armenian Adam texts, and also the chronological range of the discussion of this issue.

<b>Relationship of Satan and the Serpent by Metaphors</b>		
<b>Image.</b>	<b>Author.</b>	<b>Century.</b>
Pack animal	Agat'angelos	C 05
Sexual	Elišē	C 05
Equivalation	Eznik	C 05
	Sargis Šnorhali	C 12
	Yovhannēs Erznkac'i	C 13
	Vardan Arewelc'i	C 13
Nesting	Tovma Arcruni	C 09
	Grigoris Aht'amarac'i	C 16
Possession	Grigor Tlay	C 12
	Grigor Tat'ewac'i	C 14
	Dawit' Salajorec'i	C 17
Instrument	Nersēs Šnorhali	C 12
	Grigor Tat'ewac'i	C 14
Associate	Yovhannēs Erznkac'i	C 13
Dwelling	Zak'aria Gnuneanc'	C 16

<b>Century</b>	<b>Image</b>	<b>Author</b>
C 05	Equivalation	Eznik
C 05	Pack animal	Agat'angelos
C 05	Sexual	Elišē
C 09	Nesting	Tovma Arcruni

---

<sup>58</sup>This myth is fairly widespread in both Jewish and other sources in the first millennium. See, for example, *Hypostasis of the Archons* 34.21 in Layton *Gnostic Scriptures*, 129; *Saltair na Rann* in SEYMOUR "Book of Adam and Eve", 129; see line 1957-1958 in GREEN and KELLY *Irish Adam*, 91 and MURDOCH *Irish Adam*, 133; SCHWARTZ *Tree of Souls*, 447-448; Epiphanius 40.5.3 in LAYTON *Gnostic Scriptures*, 197.

C 12	Equivalation	Sargis Šnorhali
C 12	Instrument	Nersēs Šnorhali
C 12	Possession	Grigor Tłay
C 13	Associate	Yovhannēs Erznkac‘i
C 13	Equivalation	Yovhannēs Erznkac‘i
C 13	Equivalation	Vardan Arewelc‘i
C 14	Instrument	Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i
C 14	Possession	Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i
C 16	Dwelling	Zak‘aria Gnuneanc‘
C 16	Nesting	Grigoris Alt‘amarac‘i
C 17	Possession	Dawit‘ Salajorec‘i

When these Tables are examined, we are struck by the variety of language and metaphor used to describe the relationship of Satan and the serpent. Beyond simple identification, seven different types of language describe this relationship. Even more surprising is the temporal distribution. The relationship between Satan and the serpent, except for one instance, is not mentioned from the sixth to the eleventh century.<sup>59</sup>

### 1.2 The *Višap* Dragon and its Identification with Satan

The word վիշապ (*višap*) "dragon," which is already used in the Bible of primordial serpents and is prominent in Rev 12, also comes to the fore connected with Satan and the serpent. The վիշապ "dragon" was originally an Armenian, pre-Christian water monster, and its name is included in the biblical translation at a number of points.<sup>60</sup> Thus, for example, Aaron's and the magician's serpents in Exod 7:9, 10, and 12 (יִנְיָ — δρόκων) are translated վիշապ. Moreover, it is the term for the dragon in Rev 12:4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 17, etc. In Job 26:13(12) it translates Greek τὸ κήτος and Hebrew Rahab, one of the names of the primordial sea dragon of pre-Israelite mythology. Such uses as these, combined with those

---

<sup>59</sup>We readily admit that our evidence is partial. We only collected published statements directly relating to Gen 1-3. It is probably that an even greater number of metaphors was used. Moreover, the frequency should only be taken as indicative and numerous instances may occur in other contexts than the Genesis stories.

<sup>60</sup>On the Armenian pagan usage, see ALIŠAN, *Ancient Religion*, 163-165; RUSSELL, *Zoroastrianism*, 205-211.

in Rev 12, led to its identification with the Genesis serpent and with Satan. In Rev 12:9 we read: "The great dragon was thrown down, the ancient serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world." (Եւ անկաւ վիշապն մեծ, օճն առաջին, որ անուանեալ կոչի բէեղգերուղ եւ Սատանայ որ մոլորեցոյց զամենայն տիեզերս երկրի:). Greek reads Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς and Armenian 2 has բէեղգերուղ եւ Սատանայ "Beelzebul and Satan". In Armenian 1 of Revelation, however, we read մատնիչ եւ Բէեղգերուղ.<sup>61</sup> Below, we discuss the terms that translate Διάβολος, observing that մատնիչ "betrayor" is typical of Armenian 1. What is important for us here is that Beelzebul occurs in Armenian 1 as equivalent of ὁ Σατανᾶς and in Armenian 2 as the equivalent of διάβολος. This shows how deeply this designation is embedded into Armenian usage.

Satan is called "rebel dragon" based on Rev 12 (Ezrik [C 5] 48).<sup>62</sup> Grigoris Aršaruni (C 7) speaks of the "dragon serpent" (վիշապ օճ) who wishes to become god of the material world.<sup>63</sup>

So our human nature wanted to hear the story of the dragon serpent which wished to become the god of the material world that God created by his wonderful wisdom.

Արդ լսել կամելով մարդկային բնութեանս զպատմութիւն վիշապ օճին որ աստուածանալն կամելով ի վերայ նիւթական աշխարհիս, զոր արար Աստուած մեծաւրանչ իմաստութեամբն իրով.

This latter role, "god of the material world," of course is Satan's. Is this just a restatement of Lucifer's ambition to become God (Isa 14:13-14) or is the serpent-dragon in the material world deliberately modeled after Satan-Lucifer whose aspiration was higher ("I will make myself like the Most High." Isa 14:14)? We doubt that such a distinction was maintained, which view also seems implied by the understanding of Yovhannēs K'orepiskopos (C 8)

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM  
**Comment:** "Prince of this world" in the NT?

<sup>61</sup>See note 134 below on the terminology of Arm1.

<sup>62</sup>Cf. Rev. 12:7-9; Isa 27:1 LXX infl by Syr Pes? Cf. R. PAYNE SMITH col. 1375b.

<sup>63</sup>GRIGORIS ARŠARUNI — Č'RAK'EAN, 1964, 183.

discussed in the next paragraph.<sup>64</sup> The serpent is called a "wicked dragon" by Grigor Martyrophile V kayasēr (C 11-12).<sup>65</sup>

In Yovhannēs K'orepiskopos's (C 8) "Concerning the Cross that was seen at Varag" we read:

Then having left for man in his will, for the sake of testing, the fallen and rebellious<sup>66</sup> dragon, which fell from the splendid glory, through which man, having fallen into the region of the bitter-spirited venom of the serpent, inherited death.

Ապա թողեալ ի կանս վասն փորձանաց մարդոյն զխորատոյգ եւ զապստամբ վիշապն, զանկեալն ի լուսափայլ փառացն, որով անկեալ մարդոյն ընդ սահմանս դառնաշունչ չարաթոյն առնին ժառանգեաց զմահ:<sup>67</sup>

Here the dragon is clearly Satan and is said to have fallen; the myth of the fall of Satan will be discussed in the next section. As in the case of Grigoris Aršaruni (C 7) — see preceding paragraph — the identification is complete. It seems that Yovhannēs K'orepiskopos is talking of different regions: the region of splendid glory from which the dragon (*višap*) fell; and the region of the venomous serpent into which the dragon fell. What is clear is that the fall from glory, here predicated of the dragon, is the fall of Satan. The identification of the two now seems complete. So, in the ninth century, T'ovma Arcruni calls the serpent who pours bitter advice into Eve's ear վիշապ (*višap*) "dragon" (18-22).

### 1.3 Satan Deceives the Serpent<sup>68</sup>

In his biblical epic poem *To Manuč'ē*, Grigor Magistros (C 10) says:

Consumed by his envy, with artful intrigue,  
Having deceived the serpent's ear, his destructive assistant's.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>64</sup>Moreover, in Gen 3:5, it is actually the serpent who speaks with Eve and offers her divinity, even though in later sources this was understood to be Satan's work. This is also discussed below, §2.0

<sup>65</sup>GRIGOR VKAYASER — 1999 45.

<sup>66</sup>The term "rebellious" is not found in the relevant verses from Rev 12. This term is most likely drawn from the story of the fall of Satan.

<sup>67</sup>YOVHANNES K'OREPISKOPOS — 1966, 24.

<sup>68</sup>See §1.1 end.

<sup>69</sup>GRIGOR MAGISTROS — 1868, 7.

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM

Comment: unclear

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM

Comment: conceptio per aurem, see Nick!

Վառեալ՝ իր նախանձու արուեստաւոր մեքենային.

Պարտեալ օձին ունկան՝ կորստական օգնականին:

Here the idea is present that Satan deceived the serpent into conniving in his attack on Adam and Eve. This event is described clearly in the primary Adam books, where Satan plays on the serpent's pride to gain his cooperation in deceiving Adam and Eve, just as his own pride motivated him to hate Adam. Thus *Penitence of Adam* 44.16.3 reads:

Why do you worship (Adam) or (why) are you fed by Adam and are not fed by the fruit of the Garden? Come on, rise up, come to me and hear what I say to you. Let us expel Adam from the Garden like us so that we may re-enter the Garden.<sup>70</sup>

ընդէ՞ր երկիր պագանես. կամ կերակրիս դու յԱդամայ. եւ ոչ կերակրիս դու ի պտղոյ դրախտին: Աղէ, արի. եկ դու առ իս եւ լուր զոր ինչ ասեմ քեզ. հանցութ զԱդամ ի դրախտէս, որպէս զմեզ, զի դարձեալ մեք մտցութ ի դրախտ անդր:

His common cause with and persuasion of the serpent to take his part is featured in Kirakos Erznkac'i's (C 13) saying, "Having taken of the animals the serpent as partner in his plans (կցորդ խորհրդոց)." <sup>71</sup> A century later, the same sort of relationship is implied by Kostandin Erznkac'i when he says, "because of envy of tempter, they were deceived by serpent."<sup>72</sup> Satan envied, but it was the serpent that acted on his behalf.<sup>73</sup>

#### 1.4 Are Satan, Serpent and Dragon Distinguished?

"He (i.e., Christ) chains the first dragon, delivers him over into the fire of Gehenna; /And his (i.e., Adam's) Deceiver, along with his (i.e. Satan's) servants" (Ջվիշապն առաջին կապէ, ի հոր զեհենին մատնէ/ եւ զբանասարկու նորին հանդերձ պաշտանէիք իւրովք):<sup>74</sup>

At first reading, this couplet by Grigor Narekac'i (C 10) in his "Poem on the Lord Coming to Lazarus" seems to distinguish between the "first serpent (or: dragon, i.e.,

<sup>70</sup>ANDERSON and STONE, *Synopsis*, 50-50E.

<sup>71</sup>KIRAKOS ERZNKAC'I — K'YURTYAN, 1965, 97.

<sup>72</sup>KOSTANDIN ERZNKAC'I — SRAPYAN, 1962, 220-223.

<sup>73</sup>This idea may be present in T'adēos T'oxat'ec'i's (C 16) statement, "Satan ... pretending to be a serpent ... ": T'ADEOS T'OXAT'EC'I — POTURIAN, 1910, 276.

<sup>74</sup>GRIGOR NAREKAC'I — 1874, 139.



վիշապ)" and Adam's Deceiver who is the serpent identified as Satan.<sup>75</sup> This latter identification appears to be certain, since the Deceiver has "his (own) servants," presumably the Satanic host of demons. Grigor Narekac'i distinguishes between Satan and the primordial serpent.<sup>76</sup> Vardan Arewelc'i (C 13) implies an identification of Satan and the serpent,<sup>77</sup> and so does Karapet Bališec'i (C 16) who says, in parallel lines: "The serpent was the cause of perdition, / The Slanderer (Deceiver) was the reason for death."<sup>78</sup>

In his *Sermon Preached on the Occasion of the Nativity and Baptism* (Քարոզ ասացեալ ի սուրբ ծնունդն եւ ի սկրստութիւնն) Grigor Narekac'i says "Liberating the first Adam from the curse of the first one." (Ազատելով զառաջինն Ադամ ի յանիծիցն ասացնի).<sup>79</sup> The phrase "the curse of the first one" refers to Satan, yet there is no biblical curse of Satan, only of the serpent. This indicates that these two figures fell together in the Armenian sources or else an apocryphal tradition added a curse of Satan to the curses of the serpent, Eve, and Adam (Gen 3:14-19). Such a tradition, with a fourfold curse, is found in Greek folktales, but is unknown so far in Armenian.<sup>80</sup>

Thus, Satan is equivalent to the serpent in many texts (see §1.1 and the Table above). Elsewhere, diverse metaphors are used that describe Satan as dominating and manipulating the serpent (§§1.1.1, 1.1.2, and 1.1.3). All these relationships, except for identity imply that there are two entities involved, Satan and the serpent. The same emerged in §1.3 above, where Satan's deception of the serpent is documented.

---

<sup>75</sup>Interestingly, Rev 12:9 reads *ὄφι* *առաջին* "first serpent (*ōj*)" and not *վիշապն* *առաջին* "first dragon (*všap*)" as does Narekac'i. Yet, Narekac'i's source must be Rev 12:9. This verse is also discussed above in §1.1.

<sup>76</sup>However, this poem is characterized by the use of parallel phrases and so the identity of the two is very likely. Compare the magical narrative given at note 20.

<sup>77</sup>VARDAN AREWELC'I — 1797, 455-456: see below §1.1.

<sup>78</sup>KARAPET BALIŠEC'I — AKINIAN, 1937, 328.

<sup>79</sup>RUSSELL, *Christian Tradition*, 132.

<sup>80</sup>STONE, *Adam's Contract*, 101-102. Alternatively, the curse might be figurative language for death or sinfulness, that the serpent introduced into Eden.

In §1.2 we saw that the *višap* dragon is sometimes identified with the serpent, and they are on occasion spoken of as Satan (see Grigoris Aršaruni – seventh century). In the next century Yovhannēs K'orepiskopos distinguishes Satan-dragon from serpent, while T'ovma Arcruni (C 9) supports the dragon-serpent identification. From all this information, we learn that these three figures, the dragon, Satan, and the serpent are sometimes identified and sometimes treated as separate beings. Often, this apparently depends not on an ontological assertion so much as a parenetic strategy.

Part of a kafa<sup>81</sup> on the *History of Alexander the Great* by Zak'aria Bishop of Gnuni (C 16) is devoted to serpents. He notes that the serpent (ՍՍ — *ōj*) is the cause of Adam's perdition. After some more general remarks about the serpent, he continues:

The serpent is the descendant of the dragon,  
Solomon wrote about it wisely;  
When the serpent comes out of the egg,  
It treads the ground equally (with man).  
But envy, the author of evil,  
Made the serpent its dwelling;

Աւձն է վիշապի ծրնունդ՝  
Սողոմոն գրեաց զնայ հանճար,  
Աւձն որ ի ձուէտ ելաւ,  
նա կոխէ՛ զերկիր հասասար:  
Իսկ նախանձ գտակ չարին.  
զաւձն արար իւրըն բնակարան.

---

<sup>81</sup>A kafa is a moralizing poetic comment on a historical work. In the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries, kafas on the *History of Alexander* were rather popular: see Bardakjian, *Reference Guide* 32-33.

Here the relationship with the *višap* dragon is incidental to the text and the dragon is plays no role. But, the dragon and the serpent belong to the same species and the serpent is the dragon's descendant. "Envy" here is probably a designation for Satan.<sup>82</sup>.

### 1.5 Psalm 73 and the Baptism

A homily on the Baptism uncertainly attributed to Efišē, highlights the parallel between Adam whom serpent (oš - oš) deceived and Christ who smashes the head of the *višap* dragon in the Jordan river in his baptism. There, Ps 73:13-14 and particularly the phrase "thou didst break the heads of the dragons in the waters" is applied to Christ's baptism. This theme is old in eastern Christian usage, though not as early as the homily's fifth-century attribution to Efišē would imply.<sup>83</sup> Still, if not in the fifth century, then some time later, the serpent was identified with the dragon because of the relationship between Adam's sin and Christ's baptism.<sup>84</sup>

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM  
**Comment:** Is this a word?

In our corpus, the connection between Ps 73 and the Baptism first occurs in a dated text in Artawazd Mzazuni (C 10):<sup>85</sup> "Jesus is baptized in the Jordan and makes it incorruptible, for He will liberate this human race from the curse and will crush the head of the lurking serpent.<sup>86</sup> The latter is said to (be able to) take the Jordan in his eye socket;<sup>87</sup> \*(Յիսուս մկրտի ի Յորդանան, անապական զնա գործէ, զի զազգս մարդկան ազատեցէ յանիծից, եւ գորջացեալ վիշապին զգլուխն ջախտեցէ, սա զՅորդանան յակնակապիճսն

<sup>82</sup>Anania Kat'olikos (C 10) states, in line with the usual exegesis of the biblical curse, that the serpent will eat earth and that its head will be crushed, is: see ANANIA KAT'OLIKOS — 1897, 137-138.

<sup>83</sup>See STONE, *Adam's Contract*, 22-24.

<sup>84</sup>It is unclear whether Gen 3:15 played any role in this exegesis. The difficult Hebrew *רָשָׁע* is translated in the Greek Bible as *τηρέω* "watch, observe closely" and faithfully reflected in Armenian *սպասն* "watch out for, await." This passage did not receive the detailed attention of either Chrysostom or (pseudo-?) Ephrem, in their Armenian works on Genesis. However, even when the verb is taken like in the Greek, a clear relationship exists between Eve's offspring and the crushing of the serpent's head and that may be interpreted of Christ crushing the serpent in the baptism.

<sup>85</sup>ARTAWAZD MAZAZUNI, TER — ARDASHES MATHÉVOSSIAN, 1995. 457-458.

<sup>86</sup>Ps 73:11-12. Cosmas of Maiumsk (C 8) uses similar language: see STONE, *Adam's Contract*, 22.

<sup>87</sup>Cf. Job 40: 23-24.

սաւր ընդունել)." Matt'ēos vardapet (C 15) states that Christ will trample the dragon's poison. This clearly combines the dragons of Ps 73 with the Genesis serpent, whose deception is regularly called "poison".<sup>88</sup>

One might, therefore, after consulting the comparative Greek and Armenian evidence, regard the use of Ps 73 in (?pseudo)-Elišē's *Homily on the Baptism* as later than the fifth century. This is argued, however, *e silentio* and the exegetical connection might have been made earlier than the seventh-eighth century date the comparative evidence suggests.<sup>89</sup> The tradition recurs in (unfortunately) undated apocryphal texts. In *Adam, Eve and the Incarnation* §49 (P 306) we read: Էւ սւց (օձ). վիշապն երեսնց: Եւ տէր մեր Քրիստոսն նոյն կոխեալ զվիշապն. "and the dragon serpent (*ōj višapn*) appeared. And our Lord Christ, with his foot having trampled the dragon."<sup>90</sup>

### 1.6 Language of Fighting

Elišē's *Commentary on Joshua and Judges* 3.10, cited in §1.1.3 says: "Before she entered the war, she was vanquished by the looking." The "looking" of course refers to Gen 3:6 and often serves to identify Eve with sense perception (see §1.1.3 above). Language of "war" and "vanquishing" is often used of Satan's attack on Eve. For example, in *Penitence of Adam* 11:4 we read "that you (i.e., Satan) fight against us unnecessarily" (զի մարտնչիս ընդ մեզ ի պարսպարսոյց); in 37.10.3 Eve upbraids the beast/serpent/Satan "that you dared to fight with this image of God" (զի համարձակեցար մարտնչիլ ի պատկերդ Աստուծոյ): cf. 4

M.E. STONE 9/1/08 9:57 PM  
**Comment:** I wonder if the *war* idiom was deemed attractive because the monastic life itself was conceived as one long battle against Satan. *Life of Adam and Eve* makes this crystal clear – there, like your section on “possession” one would have contemp rel. experience acting as lens/filter.

<sup>88</sup>MATT'EOS VARDAPET — 1750, 158-159.

<sup>89</sup>Consequently, the *Homily on the Baptism* must be dated on the basis of other considerations.

<sup>90</sup>STONE, *Armenian Apocrypha*, 66-67.

Ezra 7:92 and 127.<sup>91</sup> The language of fighting also occurs in Eznik §86 (using *որոգել*)<sup>92</sup> and Agat'angelos §141.

It recurs in the seventh century when Anania Širakac'i<sup>93</sup> refers to Satan as "he who fought with the forefather". T'ēodoros K'rt'enawor uses this type of language of Christ's conflict with Satan (*ի գործ պատերազմի կոչեր*), set into an Adamic context.<sup>94</sup> The terminology then disappears from our sources until the twelfth century when Ignatius vardapet (C 12) uses it of Satan's fight against Adam (*մարտնոցեալ*). It is found nowhere else in the sources we have collected, down to the end of the seventeenth century.

## 2.0 Fall of Satan

### 2.1 Fall of Satan: Background

The fall of Satan is an idea that is already present in the New Testament.<sup>95</sup> Moreover, it is the commonest understanding of Isa 14:12-14:

12 How you are fallen from Heaven, O Day Star,<sup>96</sup> son of Dawn!

---

<sup>91</sup> The language of war and vanquishing is old, so already in the non-Armenian versions of 4 Ezra in this context. The Armenian version, instead, uses the term *աշխատեմ* "to labour". Thus 7:92 "with great toil he laboured (*աշխատեցաւ*) against all sins" and 7:127 "Let them labour (*աշխատեցին*) upon earth to abandon evil". In both instances, *աշխատեմ* corresponds to the language of fighting in other versions. The Armenian version of 4 Ezra is of the fifth century, since Agat'angelos cites it. Using the same verb as here, another fifth-century source, translated from Greek, reads, *զի յորում ժամու պարտեցաքն ի նմին եւ յաղթեցուք փայտի դրախտին փայտի խաչին* "for at the hour on which we were overcome, in the same hour we shall prevail over the wood of the Garden by the wood of the Cross" (Eusebius of Emesa, Homily 5, 373-374). Eusebius also uses another military verb in this context, *յաղթեցուք* "we shall prevail over".

<sup>92</sup> MARIÉS and MERCIER, *Eznik de Koth*.

<sup>93</sup> ANANIA ŠIRAKAC'I — ABRAHAMYAN, 1944, 247.

<sup>94</sup> T'ĒODOROS K'RT'ENAWOR — 1953, 172.

<sup>95</sup> Luke 10:18, "I watched Satan fall from Heaven like a flash of lightning," is clearest, but in that text occasion of the fall is eschatological not protological. The pericope is well analysed by Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 46-60 and especially 50-55. Agat'angelos §280 cites 3 Corinthians, which was canonical in the Armenian tradition and which says, *Իսկ որ աւօրէն իշխանն էր իբրեւ աստուածաւալ կամեցաւ, ձեռն արկանէր ի նոսա*. "He who was the lawless prince, when he wished to become God, seized and bound all mankind by sin" (3 Cor 16). The word "prince" (*իշխան*) evokes Ps 82(81):7, see below. Satan's capturing or seizing humankind is discussed below, n. 191.

<sup>96</sup> Translated "Lucifer" in the King James version, like in the Vulgate: see below.

How you are cut down to the ground, you who laid nations low.

13 You said in your heart,

"I will ascend to heaven;

I will raise my throne above the stars of God;

I will sit upon the mount of assembly, on the heights of Zaphon;

14 I will ascend to the tops of the clouds,

I will make myself like the Most High."

15 But you are brought down to Sheol,

to the depths of the Pit.

Isaiah has dead kings in Sheol taunt the king of Babylon. Biblical commentators agree that the prophet is referring to a pagan myth, in which a heavenly figure, Day Star son of Dawn, attempts to become equal to or displace the chief deity.<sup>97</sup> Very quickly, however, particularly in Christian exegesis, this passage came to be understood to refer to Satan. Satan had rebelled against God, seeking to displace him from his throne and God cast him down. This influenced the meaning of the Armenian word *սրբուսուլ*, the designation of the planet Venus, the morning star, which is used in the Armenian translation of Isa 14:13.

Consequently, *սրբուսուլ* "morning star, Venus" is glossed in *NBHL* as *սատանուս* "Satan" and, though that use passed into Armenian literature, it was never very prominent.<sup>98</sup> In the West, following the Latin translation of the Bible, this figure was called "Lucifer", i.e., "light-bringer", which is also how the word *սրբուսուլ* is understood in the Armenian Bible.

In the Old Testament, Satan is basically an adversarial angel, as may be observed in Job 1:6-8, Zech 3:1-2 and 1 Chr 21:1.<sup>99</sup> Only at a later date did he become the incarnation of

---

<sup>97</sup> This was already a theme in pre-Israelite Canaanite religion, see CROSS, *Canaanite Myth*, 180. The rebellion in pre-Israelite religion is discussed in some detail in FORSYTH, *The Old Enemy* and he deals with the passage of Isaiah on 134-139.

<sup>98</sup> For this meaning, *NBHL* cites Nazianzus, without exact reference, and also much later authorities; cf. also AČARYAN, *Dictionary of Names*, 1972, s.v.

<sup>99</sup> See GASTER, "Satan".

evil. The Lucifer myth was interpreted as the rebellion and fall of an angel of the highest rank. This interpretation may have been stimulated both by the common feature of ancient Israelite religion, which regarded the pagan deities as angels, and also by passages about Satan in the heavenly court, such as those in Job and Zechariah.

## 2.2 Fall of Satan: Adam

In a text enumerating single sins in the past that have brought about grave results, we read in Yovhannēs Mandakuni (C 5): "Adam went out of the Garden because of one sin, ... the trembling of Cain was because of one murder; ... the fall of Satan was because of pride (վասն անբարտաւարութեան ակնումն սատանայի)".<sup>100</sup>

In which way could Satan's pride have caused his fall? An early version of the story of the fall of Satan relates it to his rebellion against God. This is to be found in *Penitence of Adam*, chaps. 12-16 and parallels. Anderson has shown that it was known to St. Ephrem as well.<sup>101</sup> At God's behest, Michael commands the angels to bow down to Adam because he was created in God's image (chaps. 13-14). Satan refuses on the explicit grounds that he is older, created before Adam (14:3-15:1). As the older he will not bow down to the younger. This makes him a rebel against God. Blind Jacob, blessing Joseph's sons, gives the prior place to the younger Ephraim. When Joseph remonstrates with him he responds, "his younger brother shall be greater than he." This is a repeated theme in the Pentateuchal narrative and its implications have been teased out by scholars.<sup>102</sup> In the Adam story, the younger Adam is to be greater than the older Satan. Yet, despite the intriguing Pentateuchal parallels, in the apocryphal Adam narrative, Satan's recalcitrance is based only on pride and envy.

Thus, we can delineate schematically the metamorphosis of a pagan god, challenger of the chief deity, into a rebellious angel who, before creation, wished to displace God. The

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM  
**Comment:** Compare Cave of Tr. And Koran that what is at issue is creature of Life as opposed creature of dust

<sup>100</sup>YOVHANNES MANDAKUNI — 1836. 199. Elsewhere, Mandakuni expressed a variant of the same idea, when he says that Satan fell because of envy: see in detail below, §3.0.

<sup>101</sup> See recently, ANDERSON, "Fall of Satan, 2000: electronic

<sup>102</sup>ANDERSON, *Genesis of Perfection*, 21-34. See also GREENSPAHN, *When Brothers Dwell*. Some further dimensions of Adam's divine image are investigated in ORLOV, *Apocalypticism*, 239-268.

idea that Satan was a rebellious angel had deep, ancient roots.<sup>103</sup> Alongside this idea and, indeed, much more commonly than it, the view arose from the exegesis of Genesis that connected Satan's rebellion with Adam.<sup>104</sup> Satan's identification with the serpent and the serpent's enmity towards Adam were the key, being a further "demythologisation" of the ancient pattern. Typologically, the myth of a primordial attack on God's throne became the story of the angels' fall at Satan's instigation. The question now may be posed, how much of the narrative of the Satanic fall was known in fifth-century Armenian literature, and in which of its various configurations?<sup>105</sup>

### 2.3 Satan's Status before the Fall

Grigor Tat'ewac'i (C 14) expressed the view that Satan refused to bow down to Adam:

"And all the angelic beings saw the Word in Adam's form and worshipped and blessed. And Satan did not worship, considering (him) mere body and all man" (եւ հրէշտակական էութիւնքն տեսին զԲանն կերպիւ Ադամայ եւ երկրպագեցին եւ օրհնեցին. եւ սասանայ ոչ երկրպագեաց սոսկ մարմին եւ մարդ կարծելով ամենայն).<sup>106</sup>

According to Step'anos Siwnec'i (C 8), the fall of Satan, the Deceiver, amazed the heavenly host because he had the mark of power.<sup>107</sup> Satan was one of the highest angels and his fall, Zak'aria Kat'ofikos (C 9) notes, left his heavenly camp empty. Indeed, Zak'aria says about Satan's role as an opposing power.

And the Rebel, having seen the good things set apart by the Benefactor for man, having become envious, deceitfully separated (him) from eternal longings, from diverse trees,

<sup>103</sup> See STONE, *Adam's Contract*, 18-20; GAYLORD, "How Satanael", 1982, 303-309; ORLOV, *Apocalypticism*, 289-293, and others.

<sup>104</sup> See in general, ANDERSON, "Exaltation of Adam. On pp. 84-85, note 5 he dismissed the "Lucifer" material used in the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* saying, "This citation is absent from the Armenian and Georgian and cannot be part of the primitive version of the tale." To be somewhat more precise, it is secondary in the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve*, but might well be older even than the well-attested rebellion over Adam. *Non liquet*.

<sup>105</sup> For other patterns of rebellion, see ANDERSON, "Exaltation of Adam."

<sup>106</sup> 1998A, 572-573.

<sup>107</sup> STEP'ANOS SIWNEC'I — AMATUNI, 1915, 637.

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM  
**Comment:** Logos? Nice adaptation (1<sup>st</sup> Adam 2<sup>nd</sup> Adam) see my section on how many En texts were bothered by vita



wishing to take possession for himself of the splendid, desirable Garden. By command of the Creator, the Garden of Eden was encircled with a flaming sword guarding in every way. But the lawless prince, doing his utmost to invent evil, besieged men with sins, taught them to be distant from the Creator and drew everyone into impious idolatry, spreading death upon human beings. He created a kingdom in Hell, having taken possession of the spirits in it; he remained there, so that not one could escape and take wing to heaven.<sup>108</sup>

The language of imprisoning and freeing is widely used of Satan's rule over humans and is very typical.<sup>109</sup> The context in Zak'aria's text implies that, by means of the fiery sword, God prevented Satan from (re)entering the Garden, while Gen 3:24 implies that the sword guards against Adam, not Satan. Similarly, Zak'aria Kat'olikos states (see above) that Satan imprisoned spirits in Hell, so they could not escape and take wing to heaven.<sup>110</sup> Indeed, Zak'aria blames Satan for the sin more than he does Adam and Eve.

#### **2.4 Satan as Rebellious but Unspecified**

Satan's fall is mentioned before the twelfth century, but the texts from the twelfth-fourteenth centuries and a small group of texts from the seventeenth century frequently mention his fall but say nothing explicit about Satan's rebellion, not that he was Lucifer, nor that he refused to bow down to God or to God's image.

---

<sup>108</sup> Եւ տեսեալ ապստամբին զբարիս մարդոյն սահմանեալ ի բարերարէն, մախացեալ պատրանաք, տարանջատէ ի յաւերժակայ բաղձիցն, ի յոգնագանն տնկոց կամելով ի յինքն ըմբռնել զվայելչական տենչացեալ դրախտին: Հրամանաւ արարչին շրջապահ հրեղէն սրով զդրախտն պարփակէ: Իսկ անարէն իշխանն ի գիտս չարութեան փութացեալ, մեղաք զմարդիք պաշարէ, ուսուցանէր հեռանալ յարարչէն, եւ զամենեսեան յանարէն կրապաշտութիւն ձգէր՝ զմահ տարածեալ ի մարդիկ: Թագաւորութիւն ի դժոխս յարիներ հոգիսն ի նմա ըմբռնեալ, անդ դադարէր զի մի ոք ճողոպրեալ ի յերկինս թեւ արկիցէ: ZAK'ARIA KAT'OLIKOS — VAN ESBROECK, 1987, 490

<sup>109</sup>See STONE, *Adam's Contract*, 69, 72, 80, 87, 90 and 168 n 24 for further references. The same language (ազատել) is used by GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — 1746, chapter 18 and elsewhere. See note 196 below.

<sup>110</sup>The idea that Satan prevents the souls flying up to heaven occurs in a number of sources: note *Questions of Ezra B 6* (STONE, "Questions of Ezra", 307). See also *Apocalypse of Abraham* 31:3, though in a different context. On Satan's kingdom in Hell and imprisonment, see the amulet scroll cited in §1.0 above.

In the twelfth century Ignatius vardapet states that Satan mindlessly rebelled and left the ranks of angels.<sup>111</sup> More specifically, in another passage Ignatius says that first he established himself in enmity against God, then rose up against the Creator and, having fallen from high honour, by deceit he persuaded us also to fall with him. Thus he became master of our nature.<sup>112</sup> So Satan lost his original very high position, caused humans to fall, and gained control over mankind.<sup>113</sup>

Satan was a rational being who had fallen. He showed Adam ways of destruction and was the adversary of primordial good: so Yovhannēs Eznkac‘i Corcorec‘i (C 12).<sup>114</sup> The categories of this statement are somewhat different to Ignatius vardapet's, and the idea that Satan was rational derives from the idea that the angels are rational, which is present in Armenian religious thought from the fifth century on.<sup>115</sup> Vardan Arewelc‘i (C 13) makes some general statements: that Satan descended to the earth and is dead forever due to his remoteness from God;<sup>116</sup> and that he tortured creatures through his fall.<sup>117</sup> Similarly Vardan Aygekc‘i says that he fell from glory<sup>118</sup> and threw away the keys of the kingdom and took the keys of Hell.<sup>119</sup>

A powerful poetic description of Satan's fall is to be found in Kirakos Erznkac‘i (C 13):

He who fell like a lightning from the celestial hosts,<sup>120</sup>

With the crafty army of darkness-loving demons.

Truly the father of sin and inventor of evil,

---

<sup>111</sup>IGNATIUS VARDAPET — 1824, 310-311.

<sup>112</sup>IGNATIUS VARDAPET — 1824, 272-273.

<sup>113</sup>On Satan's control of humans, see §2.3 (end).

<sup>114</sup>YOVHANNĒS EZNKAC‘I CORCOREC‘I — 1825, 5.

<sup>115</sup>See STONE, "Traditions", 90-92.

<sup>116</sup>VARDAN AREWELC‘I — 1797, 480.

<sup>117</sup>VARDAN AREWELC‘I — 1797, 468.

<sup>118</sup>VARDAN AYGKEC‘I — 1894, vol. 2, 1-2.

<sup>119</sup>VARDAN AYGKEC‘I — 1987, 177-178; on Satan's kingdom, see §2.3 (end).

<sup>120</sup>See Luke 10:18, note 77 above.

Head of the ranks of groups of black hosts.<sup>121</sup>

Իբրև զփայլակ անկեալն յերկնային զօրաց,

Կամակոր զարօք դիաց խաարասիրաց:

Իսկապէս հայրըն մեղաց եւ զըտակ չարեաց,

ամապէտ դասուց յընթից սեւագունդ զօրաց:

Because of the systematic nature of his writing, Grigor Tat'ewac'i presents more details. Satan, he says, was a celestial angel and became proud and opposed God.<sup>122</sup> "But one of the fallen from the celestial ranks, envying the very honourable glory of the first man, deceived him by the flaw of pride, due to which he himself had fallen from glory, 'If you eat of the fruit, you shall become as gods'<sup>123</sup> with immortal life and lofty glory." So, Satan's actions against humans were motivated by envy.<sup>124</sup> On the other hand, when Grigor considers why God created humans from dust, he concludes that He so did to shame Satan, "when this weak and clayey one entered the glory from which he, who was glorious, had fallen."<sup>125</sup>

In the seventeenth century, such references surface again, but their content is traditional. Satan is repeatedly characterized as rebellious and wicked. Satan always and eternally rebels against peace, as against Adam in the Garden.<sup>126</sup> He was an angel, called a Cherub, and man's fall paralleled Satan's: Yovhannēs jūlayec'i (C 17).<sup>127</sup> Satan fell from his dwelling, did not cease evil: so Grigor Daranałc'i (C 17).<sup>128</sup> Both these authors also take up the point made by Grigor Tat'ewac'i three hundred years earlier, that it is by playing on

---

<sup>121</sup>KIRAKOS ERZNKAC'I — 1965, 97. On demonic blackness, see above at note 23.

<sup>122</sup>1998B, 572-573.

<sup>123</sup>Gen 3:5.

<sup>124</sup>His instrument was pride, by which he himself had fallen.

<sup>125</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — 1998A, 494-495.

<sup>126</sup>YOVHANNĒS JŪLAYEC'I — 1812, 148.

<sup>127</sup>*Ibid.*, 1812, 167-168.

<sup>128</sup>GRIGOR DARANAŁC'I — NŠANIAN, 1915, 414.

Adam's pride that Satan deceives him. He planted in him the desire to become a god.<sup>129</sup>

Although the story of Satan's fall is not mentioned explicitly in the fifth-century Armenian sources studied here, the formulation in Mandakuni indicates that he knew it.<sup>130</sup> It is hard to see his reference to Satan's pride as anything else. This is also true of Agat'angelos, particularly §280: Satan, Agat'angelos says, tried to cause Adam to err, "so that he might inherit his place."<sup>131</sup> It is not clearly stated what "Adam's place" was, but this statement is an explicit reference to the exaltation of Adam. Moreover, it resonates strikingly with an early text, *Penitence of Adam* 44.16:3 where Satan says to the serpent,

<sup>129</sup>GRIGOR DARANALC'I — NŠANIAN, 1915, 414; YOVHANNES JÜLAYEC'I — 1812, 167-168.

<sup>130</sup> It is unclear whether he know the variant of the Fall story which attributed a primordial revolt to Satan before the creation of the world (see above, n. 90). This primordial revolt seems to be implied by the formulation in the Latin *Life of Adam* 15:3, and is common in European vernacular literatures of the medieval period: see STONE, *History of the Literature*, 89, 120. A later form of this version occurs in the Armenian apocryphal text *History of the Creation and Transgression of Adam* §§1-4:

1. When the Lord God created the heavens and the earth, he first made the hosts of angels for the service of his divinity. 2. Now the wicked Sadayēl and Beliar were the heads of the divisions of Satan; they were adorned gloriously, and were higher than all the angels and all the divisions of the angels. 3. But the detestable Satan did not want to bless God and was arrogant in his head, and he wanted to raise up his own throne equal to God's throne. 4. And the Lord god commanded the hammerman of the Seraphim, the great Gabriel, and the terrible Michael, and the nine divisions of angels, and they fell upon Sadayēl and all his attendants, smote them, and cast them down like hail from a cloud.

(MS Y) 1. Յորժամ ստեղծ Տէր Աստուած զերկինս եւ զերկիր, եւ արար նախ զգօրս հրեշտակաց ի ծառայութիւն աստուածութեանն իւրոյ: 2. Իսկ չարն Սաղայել եւ Բելիար դասազլուխ էին դասուց Սատանայի, մեծափառօք զարդարեալ. բարձր քան զամենայն հրեշտակք եւ զամենայն դասս հրեշտակաց: 3. Իսկ պիղծ Սատանայ ոչ կամեցաւ օրհնաբանել զԱստուած. եւ հպարտացաւ ի սրտի իւրում, եւ կամեցաւ զաթոռ իւր բարձրացուցանել հասասար Աստուծոյ աթոռին: 4. Եւ հրամայեաց Տէր Աստուած յունատր սերովբէից մեծին Գարբիէլի եւ ահատրին Միքայէլի, եւ ինն դասուց հրեշտակացն. դիմեցին ի վերայ Սաղայելի եւ ամենայն կամարարացն նորա, հարին զնոսս եւ ի վայր տուին, որպէս զկարկուտ ի յամպէն: (tr. Lipscomb, *Armenian Apocryphal Adam*, 118).

This version of the fall of Satan is first known to us in the writings of Yovhannēs Erzknac'i Pluz (C 13).

<sup>131</sup>This text is analysed further below.

"Let us expel Adam from the Garden like us so that we may re-enter the Garden."

Consequently, the "place," i.e., the Garden of Eden, had particular significance.<sup>132</sup> On the basis of the material analyzed in the present paragraph and in §3.0 below we may confidently conclude that the story of Satan's fall was current in fifth-century Armenian literature. It circulated in a version in which it preceded his deception of Adam. In this version the cause of Satan's fall was most likely his prideful refusal to bow down to Adam, as is related in *Penitence of Adam*.<sup>133</sup> His refusal was motivated by his envy of Adam's creation in God's image and of Adam's premier position among the created beings.

Ezrik, however, who also deals with this problem, mentions enmity as the cause of Satan's becoming "the slanderer," i.e., the Devil. He discusses this in connection with the question of whether Satan is created evil or good. He started good and became evil, Ezrik says, because of his enmity towards Adam (§51):

Yet because of the enmity he harboured toward man, he wilfully became "the slanderer".<sup>134</sup> Having abandoned submission to God, he began to disobey and to teach man to oppose God's commands, and subsequently he became like a rebel, and he turned away from God.

---

<sup>132</sup>Below, we will discuss the fact that here in the *Penitence of Adam*, Satan appears to be deceiving the serpent and lying to it, since no tradition is known according to which the serpent was expelled from the Garden. Indeed, there is a major chronological problem in the narrative line, for at the point at which Satan is seducing the serpent, Eve has not sinned and the curses have not been pronounced. The implication of the passage is that, prior to this point in time, the serpent had been deprived of its paradisiacal food and had been expelled from the Garden.

<sup>133</sup> See ANDERSON, "Exaltation of Adam" 105-134 = ANDERSON, STONE and TROMP, *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 83-110.

<sup>134</sup>The title բանասիրիտ "slanderer, deceiver" is very old, used of Satan. It occurs in Rev 2:10, 12:12 translating διαβόλος. In Rev 20:2 we read διαβόλος καὶ Σατανάς which is translated բանասիրիտն եւ սատանայ. In the ancient version of Revelation (Arm1) published by Frederik Murad, 1905-1911. Rev 2:10 has բանասիրիտն, while 12:12 has սատանիչն and 20:2 has սատանիչ եւ սատանայ. Intriguingly, in Jude 9, where the Greek has διαβόλος, Armenian has բանասիրիտն սատանայի, adding "Satan". The same two words are used in Arm2 of Rev 20:2. Thus, at the very beginning of Armenian Bible translation the stereotypical translation διαβόλος = բանասիրիտն did not dominate, but by the time of the Arm2 revision, it did.

եւ ի թշնամութենէ ընդ մարդոյն ունելոյ իւրն կամօք եղեւ բանասարկու: Թողեալ զԱստուծոյ հպատակութիւն՝ սկսաւ անաստել, ի հակառակ կալ Աստուծոյ հրամանացն ուսուցանել մարդկան եւ իբրեւ զապստամբ յետս կացեալ՝ թիրեցաւ յԱստուծոյ:

This text, despite its employment of the term "rebel" and the language relating to obedience, is still not explicit about the circumstances of Satan's fall. The cautious conclusion is that it should be taken simply to refer to how Satan became wicked, without making any details of his fall explicit.

In Eznik (C 5) we find another reference to Adam's fall. God says to Adam (53.85), "I did not want death in your place, nor did I want you to fall in place of the prince,<sup>135</sup> the wicked counsellor" (Ես ոչ ընդ ձեր մահ կամէի, եւ ոչ ընդ իշխանին վատ խրատտուին անկանել). Satan is called "prince", surely a reference to Ps 82 (81:7): "I say, 'You are gods, children of the Most High, all of you; nevertheless, you shall die like mortals, and fall like one of the princes'" (եւ որպէս զմի յիշխանաց անկանիք). The appellation "wicked counselor" obviously applies to Satan-serpent who deceived Eve by wicked counsel. This passage then refers to the fall of Satan, and together with the texts cited from Yovhannēs Mandakuni and Agat'angelos shows that the fall story was known in fifth-century Armenia. However, we cannot discern which form of the fall of Satan is involved, primordial or Adamic.

Satan was fearless and this was the weakness that led to his fall; humans should learn from this example (T'ēodoros K'rt'enawor [C 7]).<sup>136</sup> T'ēodoros is actually refocusing, likely for parenetic purposes, the idea of the Rebel. In the same century, Grigoris Aršaruni writes in his *Commentary on the Lections* (p. 183):

In the same way here<sup>137</sup> – even more supremely than all (other fast-) days, we begin by seizing the very same, originally evil serpent of the Garden, as ugly and horrible-

<sup>135</sup>Or, less probably from a grammatical viewpoint, "with."

<sup>136</sup>T'ĒODOROS K'RT'ENAWOR — "Elegy on the Cross", 1953, 178.

<sup>137</sup>I.e., on Good Friday.

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM

**Comment:** an old and common typos in patristic exegesis, Ezek 28 see Origen on this

looking as the thief,<sup>138</sup> and having beaten him bind (him) in indissoluble bonds. They all gather there and make him pass through the five-day-long "courts" of fasting to the royal palace of (Good) Friday, where the king of glory is crowned on the Cross. Setting the thieving serpent<sup>139</sup> in juxtaposition with the thieving man, he releases the latter from blasphemy and leads (him) to the confession of His kingdom; He dissolves the curse and takes him with himself to Paradise instead of Adam.<sup>140</sup> And the unrepentant serpent<sup>141</sup> is hung on the wood,<sup>142</sup> naked and defamed, as he was in the desert,<sup>143</sup> without a cover for the shame of his ignominy,<sup>144</sup> without a fig leaf and even without vitality. So our human nature wanted to hear the story of the dragon-serpent who wished to become the god of the material world, which God created by his wonderful wisdom, and established the man in his image to reign over it, and made him the second after himself; and (the serpent) secretly rushed upon him with brigand-like deceit, as in the night, bound him while he was ignorant and capturing him, shook from its foundation this royal residence – the world — with corruption. Because of that, the king of glory, moving from the paternal, glorious throne, together with the heavenly hosts, and pursuing the thief, cut his sinews, seizing and binding him sentenced (him) to death....

183 այսպէս էս աստ յամենայն առոր էսս վերագոյն սկսեալ, զնոյն ինքն զսկզբնաչար գորախտին օճն, իբրև զաւագակապետ ժանտատեսիլ էս ահարկու դիւօք կալեալ էս ձաղաձանակ արարեալ անլուծանելի կապանօք, ամենեցուն անդր ժողովելով անցուցանեն ընդ հինգօրեայ ապարանս պահոցն, յարքունիս

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM  
**Comment:** See Homily Nick and I are working on. Move from kingdom to cross is all over the place.

<sup>138</sup>Or: chief thief.

<sup>139</sup>Personified by the unrepentant thief.

<sup>140</sup>This point is based on Luke 23:43. Why the thief is said to be "instead of Adam" remains unclear. Does it imply that the thief was immediately introduced into Paradise, while Adam had to wait until Christ released him?

<sup>141</sup>Symbolized by the unrepentant thief.

<sup>142</sup>I.e., the Cross.

<sup>143</sup>Reference to Christ's temptation.

<sup>144</sup>R.R. Ervine made some helpful suggestions in the translation of the preceding passage.

ուրբաթուն՝ ուր թագաւորն փառաց պսակեալ ի խաչին. յանդիման առնելով զօձ աւազակն մարդ աւազակին. հանելով զնա ի հայհոյութենէն ի խոստովանութիւն արքայութեան իրոյ. լուծանէ զանէ՛ծա՛ ընդ իւր տանելով ի դրախտն, փախանակ Ադամայ. եւ զանդարձ օձն կախեալ զփայտէն, մերկ խայտառակեալ, որպէս յանապատին, ոչ ունելով ծածկոյթ ամօթոյն նախատանացն, եւ ոչ զտերև թղենոյն այլ եւ ոչ զկենդանութիւն: Արդ լսել կամելով մարդկային բնութեանս զպատմութիւն վիշապ օձին որ աստուածանալն կամելով ի վերայ նիւթական աշխարհիս, զոր արար Աստուած մեծասքանչ իմաստութեամբն իւրով. եւ կացոյց զմարդն թագաւոր ի վերայ սորա ըստ կերպարանի իւրում, եւ երկրորդ իւր առնելով. որում զաղտ ի վերայ անկանելով աւազակաբար խաբէութեամբ, իբրև ի զիշերի, անզիտութեամբն կապեալ զնա, եւ զերի վարեալ դորդեաց ի հիմանց զթագաւորաբնակ աշխարհս ապականութեամբ. վասն որոյ թագաւորն փառաց շարժեալ ի հայրական աթոռոյն փառաց հանդերձ երկնային զօրօքն. եւ հետամուտ եղեալ եհաւ զջիղս աւազակին, ձերբակալ առնելով կապեալ ած ի դատաստան մահու ...<sup>145</sup>

The thief-serpent was bound and condemned to death by the King of glory with his hosts. In Grigoris' text the serpent's sin is the seduction of humans. So at this point he is clearly speaking about the serpent of the Garden and its punishment is formulated analogously with that of the thief on the cross. Yet the running together of the serpent and Satan permeates this passage. Two sentences earlier, Grigoris has said, "So our human nature wanted to hear the story of the dragon-serpent who wished to become god of the material world" (*ibid*).<sup>146</sup> This is not the serpent's sin, and the punishment, though conceived typologically with that of the crucified thief, is Satan's and not the serpent's, for the latter was roundly cursed in Gen 3:14-15 to much more mundane punishments than being bound and condemned to death. That was the punishment of fallen angels from earliest times, see already *1 Enoch* 10:11-14, 14:5, 21:10.

<sup>145</sup>GRIGORIS ARŠARUNI — ČARAK'EAN, 1964, 182.

<sup>146</sup>This is discussed above, §1.2.



The Evil One, called *višap*, fell from his luminous, splendid glory. At this point in the primordial history, man was left with his free will<sup>147</sup> to decide whether to obey or disobey the divine commandment. This was a test for humans, who failed it and fell into the region of the venomous serpent and inherited death.<sup>148</sup> This formulation by Yovhannēs K'orepiskopos (C 8) combines a number of features. Because Satan is referred to as *višap* (dragon), and falls from his glory,<sup>149</sup> he seems to be identified as the ruler of this world in which death prevails, the venomous serpent.<sup>150</sup> In most of the texts discussed, dating from the sixth to ninth centuries, Satan's actual sin is not made explicit. In one instance it is clear, in Grigoris Aršaruni's statement discussed directly above, that he aspired to God's throne, the rarer form of the narrative of Satan's fall.

### 2.5 Fall of Satan: Primordial / Lucifer

Hamam Arewelc'i (C 9) exegetes the verse "Before its breaking, the heart of man is haughty; and before thought, it is destroyed" (Prov 18:12) to refer to Satan and says: Before the breaking, the heart of Satan became haughty, who by rebelling, wanted to become more elevated than his fellows. And, therefore, he was abased to this great rupture before mighty God. And this happened before thought,<sup>151</sup> while he still had the very same desire. He was cast down and abased before everyone. He who was a brilliant Lucifer (morning star),<sup>152</sup> on account of his haughtiness was named and became darkness. The same one defeated man who, too, was abased with him.

---

<sup>147</sup> See STONE, "Traditions", 87, 90-91.

<sup>148</sup> *Bazmavēp* 124 (1966) 24.

<sup>149</sup> Satan's glory is not mentioned either in Luke 10:18 or in Rev 12:9. The idea could, however, have developed from Isa 14:11-17 and Ezek 28:12-15, though the word "glory" is not mentioned there. See *Penitence of Adam* 12:1, where Armenian has, "I was alienated from the throne of cherubim," while the Latin *Vita Adae* has, "I was expelled and alienated from my glory": cf. ben Sira 49:16 Ms B.

<sup>150</sup> The text is ambiguous to some extent; compare §1.2.

<sup>151</sup> I.e., he acted wilfully and without due consideration.

<sup>152</sup> See the discussion of this term above, §2.1.

Որ նախքան զբեկումն բարձրացաւ սիրտն սատանայի, որ ապստամբելովն կամեցաւ բարձրանալ քան զընկերս իւր: Եւ վասն նորին յայս մեծ բեկումն կորացեալ առաջի հօրին Աստուծոյ: Եւ նախքան զկարծիսն այս եղեալ, մինչեւ ի նոյն եւս էր կամս, ի վայր բերեալ եղև, եւ կորացաւ առաջի ամենեցուն, որ էր պայծառ արուսեակ. խաւար վասն ամբառնալոյն կոչեցաւ եւ եղև: Նոյն զմարդն պարտեաց որ կորացաւ եւ նա ընդ նմա:<sup>153</sup> In this passage nearly all the features of the myth of the fall of Satan may be observed. His sin was overweening pride and excessive ambition; he fell, was abased and was made dark, lost his heavenly luminosity.<sup>154</sup> Here Hamam works out the reference to the Lucifer passage is worked out in detail.

In his biblical epic poem, *To Manuč'ē*, Grigor Magistros (C 10) has the following lines: "The Evil One considered, he who was formerly Lucifer / ... / Deceived the ear of the serpent, his destructive assistant" (Զմտաւ ածեալ չարին, այն որ յառաջ արուսեկին / ... / Պարտեալ օձին ունկան՝ կորստական օգնականին ).<sup>155</sup> This statement combines the idea of Lucifer derived from Isa 14:12, with that of Satan.<sup>156</sup> Satan was formerly Lucifer and one of the early explicit occurrences of this is the Latin version of the primary Adam book.<sup>157</sup> It is a well-established theme. Thus, the idea that Satan was an angel who fell because of his "exaltation and arrogance" (ի բարձրութենէ եւ ի հպարտութենէ), belongs to the same complex of ideas. This is the formulation of Grigor Narekac'i (C 10), so clearly the idea was well known by his time.<sup>158</sup>

In the thirteenth century, Step'anos Ōrbelean says: "The Creator took care of his image, so that it would not, reaching perfect glory too zealously, rebel like the Deceiver, grow arrogant and fall. (խնամ տարաւ

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM

Comment: Conceptio per aurem

<sup>153</sup>HAMAM AREWELC'I — MXIT'AR K'AHANAY SARIBEKYAN, 1994, 215. Compare also HAMAM AREWELC'I — THOMSON, 2005, 133.

<sup>154</sup>See Isa 14:13-14 and above, §1.0.

<sup>155</sup>GRIGOR MAGISTROS — 1868, 7.

<sup>156</sup>On Satan as Lucifer, see §2.1.

<sup>157</sup>*Latin Life of Adam and Eve* 15:3 (ANDERSON and STONE, *Synopsis*, 17-17E).

<sup>158</sup>GRIGOR NAREKAC'I — 1840, 351.

արարիչն իւրում պատկերին՝ զի մի փոյթընդփոյթ ի կատարեալն հասեալ փառս՝ նման  
բանասարկուին / ընդվզեալ հպարտասցի եւ անկցի:)<sup>159</sup>

God cared for humans so that they should not suffer from Lucifer's *hybris* "reaching perfect glory too zealously." As a result of this, they might rebel and fall like "the Deceiver," a name that stresses Satan's Adamic connection. Eznik §51 says that Satan became like a rebel because he disobeyed God's commandments and in §48 he calls Satan "rebel dragon" (compare Rev 12). The same appellation is found in Yovhannēs K'orepiskopos "Concerning the Cross that was seen at Varag" and Zak'aria Kat'ořikos (C 9) calls Satan "rebel," but in the context of his envy of Adam. The connection of "rebel" with the primordial fall is clear however in Ignatius vardapet (C 12)<sup>160</sup> when he says that first Satan established himself against God in enmity and rose up against the Creator and, having fallen from honour, by deceit persuaded humans to fall with him as well. Thus the term "rebel" is found throughout the literature and is connected mainly, but not exclusively, with the primordial fall story.

In the thirteenth century, Yovhanēs Erzncac'i Pluz wrote the following quatrain:

Ի յերկնաւորաց դասուց Սադայել երեսն էր շրդել,  
Յերկնից ի յանդունդս անկել 'ի ի լուսոյն խաւար մնացել,  
ԶԱդամ ի դրախտէն հանել 'ի անասնոց յերկիր զնա ձգել,  
'Ի ամեն Ադամայ որդիքս ենք օտար տեղիս բընակել:  
Sadayēl turned his face from the heavenly ranks,  
He fell from the heaven to the deeps, and from light, remained in darkness.

---

<sup>159</sup>This is in his *Disputation against the Diophysites*, which was published in Constantinople in 1756, 94-95. That work is sometimes wrongly attributed to the eighth-century author Step'anos Siwnec'i.

<sup>160</sup>IGNATIUS VARDAPET — 1824, 272-3; cf. 1824, 310-311.

He brought Adam forth from the Garden and cast him to the earth of the animals.

And we sons of Adam all inhabit a strange place.<sup>161</sup>

Here the poet clearly refers to the myth of the fall of Satan, but he calls Satan "Sadayēl".

This particular form of the story with the name Sadayēl, is rather uncommon, but it does occur in the apocryphal Armenian Adam books, also connected with the myth of the primordial revolt against God,<sup>162</sup> particularly in *The History of the Creation and Transgression of Adam and Eve*, §2.<sup>163</sup> The title occurs a second time in Yovhannēs Erznkac'i Pluz's poetry in line 55 of his Տաղ Ադամայ or "Poem about Adam."<sup>164</sup> In the fifteenth-century amulet quoted in §1.0 above, the guardian of the souls in Hell is also called Sat/dayēl.

Although infrequent in Armenian, this name surely belongs to a type known from non-Armenian apocryphal literature. In these texts, the angel who rebelled is called Satanel or Sataniel while in heaven; only in the magical text is Satan in Hades given this name. The element "el" is theophoric, of course, and common in angelic names such as Rapha-el, Gabri-el, etc. in Jewish and Christian literature. According to the Satanel tradition, when he rebelled against God and expelled from heaven, he lost the "el" and came to be called just Satan. The Armenian form Sadayēl surely derives from the Satanel legend, though in Armenian sources the connection of this name with Satan is not mentioned. It is known to us

---

<sup>161</sup>YOVHANNĒS ERZNKAC'I PLUZ — SRAPYAN, 1958, 144-145.

<sup>162</sup>On this, see above §1.0, especially at n. 10.

<sup>163</sup>LIPSCOMB, *Armenian Apocryphal Adam*, 118. In many manuscripts of the *Cycle of Four Works* there exist as yet unpublished homiletic passages in which Sadayēl also appears. So in manuscript M6430 we read: Թորափեաց երկնից զդասս հրեշտակացն Սադայելի զի մեծ հրեշտակ էր քսն զամենայն. "He scattered from the heavens the ranks of Sadayēl's angels, for he was the greatest angel of all." This text is undated. Kazazian and Stone published one such passage in 2004, 46-51.

<sup>164</sup>YOVHANNĒS ERZNKAC'I PLUZ — SRAPYAN, 1958, 224-227. In *NBHL* the lemma "Sadayēl" occurs, with one reference to the eleventh century authority Anania Sanahnec'i. Because *NBHL* provides no details, the exact source remains unknown.

within a limited geographic and chronographic range, from the 11-15th centuries and to date only known to these three sources, though further occurrences may well exist.<sup>165</sup>

We shall deal with one more text on Satan, a passage from the eighteenth century author Xač'atur ĵulayec'i in his *History of Persia*.<sup>166</sup> This text, part of an explanation of Christian faith to a Moslem ruler, clearly knows the story of the primordial revolt. It brings together the Lucifer tradition deriving from Isaiah with material in Rev 12. Xač'atur says: "He says: there was trouble in heaven, when Satan fought against God, when he said: 'Let me ascend and put my throne in the clouds and be like the Most High.'<sup>167</sup> Then the Lord thundered with terrible sound from heaven, increased his lightning and disturbed them, and

---

<sup>165</sup>See Slavonic version of 3 Baruch 4:7-15: tr. GAYLORD, *apud* Charlesworth, 1.666. In the apocryphal Slavonic texts, the name Sataniel is connected with the story of bowing down to Adam. For example, in Slavonic mss of 3 Baruch (GAYLORD, "How Satanel", 307), following 4:17 we read:

And he said to Michael, "Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made. And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order.

But Sataniel did not bow down and said, "To mud and dirt I will never bow down." And he said, "I will establish my throne above the clouds and I will be like the highest."

Because of that, God cast him and his angels from his face just as the prophet said. These withdrew from his face, all who hate God and the glory of God.

...Then having gone, Satanael found the serpent and he made himself into a worm. And he said to the serpent, "Open (your mouth), consume me into your belly."

And he went through the fence into Paradise, wanting to deceive Eve. "But because of that one I was cast out from the glory of God."

And the serpent ate him and went into Paradise and found Eve and said. "What did God command you to eat from the food of Paradise?"

And Eve said, "From every tree of Paradise we eat; from this tree God commanded us not to eat."

And having heard Satanael said to her, "God begrudged the way you live lest you be immortal; take and eat and you will see and give it to Adam."

And both ate and the eyes of both were opened and they saw that they were naked....

Compare further STICHEL, "Die Verführung", 116-128; ORLOV, *Apocalypticism*, 175-195, 289-308. See, of course, GAYLORD'S article cited above, note 103.

<sup>166</sup>See BARDAKJIAN, *Reference Guide*, 89-90 on this work.

<sup>167</sup>Isa 14:13-14.

shot his arrows and scattered them. Then they fell from the high heaven into the depth of the abyss, and while falling he stretched his tail and dragged the third part of the stars, that is the angels, who fell with him from the high heaven;<sup>168</sup> such a trouble happened in heaven. But on the earth Adam's eating of the fruit caused enmity and trouble, when Adam abandoned God's command and observed and accepted that of God's enemy, until he was expelled from the glorious, living Garden. And so day after day, sin, transgression and iniquity multiplied until God killed everybody by the Flood... (Աստ՛ յերկինս խռովութիւն անկաւ՝ յորժամ սատանայ մարտեաւ ընդ Աստուծոյ, յորժամ ասաց՝ ելից բարձրացայց, եւ եղից զաթոռ իմ յամպ, եւ եղէց նման բարձրելոյն. յայնժամ ահեղ թնդմամբ որոտաց տէր յերկնից՝ յաճախեաց զփայլատակունս իւր, եւ խռովեցոյց զնոսա, եւ առաքեաց զնետս իւր եւ ցրուեաց զնոսա. յայնժամ անկան յերկնից ի բարձանց՝ ի խորս անդնդոց, եւ յանկանիլն ձգեաց զտուտն իւր, եւ քարշեաց զերրորդ մասն աստեղաց, այսինքն՝ հրեշտակաց՝ որք ընդ նմա անկան յերկնից ի բարձանց, յերկինս այսպիսի խռովութիւն անկաւ: Իսկ յերկիր, պտղոյն ճաշակմանն Ադամայ եղեւ թշնամութիւն եւ խռովութիւն, յորժամ Ադամ զպատուիրանն Աստուծոյ եթող, եւ զպատուիրանս թշնամոյն Աստուծոյ պահեաց. եւ ընկալաւ, մինչ զի արտաքսեցաւ ի փառակենցաղ դրախտէն. եւ այսպէս բազմանայր օր եւ աւուր մեղքն, յանցանքն, եւ անօրէնութիւնքն, մինչ զի ջրհեղեղաւ կորոյս զամենեսեան...).

### 3.0 Satan's Envy.

Above, we considered the reasons usually adduced for Satan's primordial revolt, above all pride, *hybris*, the desire to be god or be higher than God. Now we shall discuss the reasons for Satan's actions against Adam. In Armenian literature two main motives are mentioned: envy and deceit. Yet, this statement needs further refining: envy or similar feelings seems to be the motive and deceit the means. Sometimes our sources speak of deceit as a motive and, indeed, it is possible that a wicked delight in deceit for its own sake was considered a

---

<sup>168</sup>Rev 9:4 "His tail swept down a third of the stars of heaven and threw them to the earth."

This verse has not been cited in other texts discussed.

motive. Yet, most texts talking of deceit as if it were a motive, actually refer to it as the tool Satan used.

In many sources, from Wis 2:24 on, Satan's envy is stressed. It is not always clear of what he was envious and a number of possibilities emerge from the Armenian sources. One was Satan's envy of Adam's priority in rank; another was his envy of the good things Adam was destined to receive, including eternal life, and Satan's consequent wish to replace him; a third, his envy of the benefits Adam had already received, including the image of God; and finally, his envy of Adam's paradisiacal deights, compared with his own fallen state.

Eznik §51 refers simply to Satan's "enmity" (թշմամութիւն) towards Adam. In *Penitence of Adam* 12.1 Satan says to Adam, "All my arrogance and sorrow came to pass because of you" and then relates the story of the Fall. Eznik is definitely of the fifth century, and it is likely that *Penitence of Adam* is also early. Indeed, the idea that the devil's envy was the cause of Satan's fall and Adam's, is found in the first work of Armenian literature, the translation of the Bible. In Wis 2:24 we read նախաւնձու բախարկութիւնն էնոս մահ յաշխարհի "Through the envy of the tempter death entered the world."<sup>169</sup> Since the Bible, including Wisdom of Solomon, does not tell us the reason for Satan's envy, the question may justly be posed to later texts, of what was Satan envious? The rebellion tradition mentioned above provides one motivation for Satan's envy: he was envious of Adam's priority in rank, reflected in his priority of birth,<sup>170</sup> and so refused to obey God's command to do obeisance to Adam.<sup>171</sup> It is also possible, that Satan is jealous of the image of God in Adam, though in that context *Penitence of Adam* does not state this.

---

<sup>169</sup> In "A Letter sent from the city of Amit" attributed to LAZAR P'ARPEC'I, *History*, 607-8 Wisdom's statement is attributed erroneously to "the Catholic Epistles". David WINSTON discusses this passage at length, highlighting instances of envy in primordial history: see *Wisdom of Solomon*, 121-122.

<sup>170</sup> ANDERSON, *Genesis of Perfection*, 25-29.

<sup>171</sup> Some later sources are quoted in STONE, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve*, 22-23; *Transgression of Adam and Eve*, 10-12. Compare the somewhat different view in Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i, Վասն ստեղծման աշխարհի (On the Creation of the World), §86 (STONE, "John of T'lkuran", 65).

Ezrik 55.88 states that Satan is inflamed not just by enmity in general, but specifically by envy, and similarly Łazar P'arbec'i says that the first-created one was subdued by the Devil's envy.<sup>172</sup> Neither prominent fifth-century author details either the cause of the envy or its results. Like them, T'ēodoros K'rt'enawor (C 7) says, no more specifically, that envy was the cause.<sup>173</sup> Elsewhere, he says that the Enemy deceived Adam by means of the divine name,<sup>174</sup> probably meaning that Satan argued about the divine command, using God's name, "for God knows that on the day on which you eat of it, etc." (Gen. 3:5). In any case, the statement relates to the technique Satan used to deceive Adam and not to the envy that motivated him. Again, nothing is said about its cause.

In the biblical epic poem *To Manč'ē* by Grigor Magistros Pahlavuni (C 10), envy is a major theme:

Վառեալ իր նախանձու արուեստաւոր մեքենային.

Պարտեալ օձին ունկան՝ կորստական օգնականին:

Մախանօք բանսարկուին փաղաքշանօք կեղծաւորին,

Ուտել հաւանեցան՝ յորմէ ուտել հրաման չառին:<sup>175</sup>

Consumed by his envy, with artful intrigue,

Having deceived the ear of the serpent, his destructive assistant,

By the envy of the Deceiver, the flattery of the dissembler,

They agreed to eat that of which they were commanded not to eat.<sup>176</sup>

As we have already noted, some texts, like Magistros here, do not always keep the motive and the means of the deceit distinct. The motive is envy; of what, is not said. The means used are deceit and flattery, which will be discussed below.

In his *Elegy on Jerusalem*, Grigor Tłay (C 12) states that Adam sinned as a result of envy, i.e., Satan's envy.

<sup>172</sup>ŁAZAR P'ARPEC'I — "Letter" in *History*, 608.

<sup>173</sup>T'ĒODOROS K'RT'ENAWOR — "Elegy on the Cross" in *Writings*, 1953, 195.

<sup>174</sup>T'ĒODOROS K'RT'ENAWOR — "Against Mayragumac'i," in *Writings*, 1953, 172.

<sup>175</sup> Variant reading: չուտել հրաման առին.

<sup>176</sup> GRIGOR MAGISTROS PAHLAVUNI — "To Manč'ē" (1868), 7.

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM  
 Comment: conceptio per aurem



Although he became subject to the Evil One,  
And, pitiful one, was deceived,  
And if he transgressed in accordance with envy,  
He was punished justly...  
Թէպէտ 'ի եղև հնազանդ չարին.  
Եւ յաբեցաւ ողորմելին.  
Եւ թէ յանցեաւ ըստ նախանձին.  
Եւ պատժեցաւ զիրաւացին ...<sup>177</sup>

Kostandin Erznkac'i (C 14) has a similar view, though he also introduces the serpent into the picture. As in other sources, the Devil's envy is set beside the actual deception carried out by the serpent.

ի նախանձու չար բանսարկուին.

որ եւ օձիւրն յաբեցան:

Because of the envy of the evil tempter (i.e., the Devil),  
so that they were deceived by the serpent.<sup>178</sup>

### 3.1 Satan is envious of the human state.

The idea that Satan is envious of Adam's rank occurs in a variety early sources, such as 2 *En.* 31:3-6, Latin *Vita Adae* 12:1, Armenian *Book of Adam* 15.1 (զնախանձ "envy", not in the Greek text, is added), 3 *Bar.* 4:8, and others.<sup>179</sup> Highlighting another motif, David Winston points to Theophilus, *Autol.* 2:29, who states that Satan was envious since "Adam and Eve not only were alive but had produced offspring".<sup>180</sup> This last theme, however, is not found in Armenian sources.

M.E. STONE 18/12/07 7:27 AM  
**Comment:** it is in the midrash! Also implied in Milton.

<sup>177</sup>On this work, see the recent article by Th. M. van Lint, Grigor Tlay — van Lint, 2002.

<sup>178</sup>KOSTANDIN ERZNKAC'I — SRAPYAN 1962, Poem 26, 37-38.

<sup>179</sup>WINSTON, *Wisdom of Solomon*, 121 cites abundant Rabbinic parallels.

<sup>180</sup>In *Death of Adam* §1 a different word, նախանձ, also meaning "envy," designates the deception and fall. That work is probably translated from Greek. WINSTON, *Wisdom of Solomon* also

Satan was envious of man who inherited the Garden, which was perhaps the empty camp of the rebellious angels as asserted by Zak'aria Kat'ofikos (C 9).<sup>181</sup> This would be unusual, setting Satan's pre-lapsarian abode in the Garden of Eden when usually it is in the highest heavens.<sup>182</sup> Satan's same envy of man's original state is clearly behind Xosrov Anjewac'i's (C 10) statement that Satan's aim is to prevent humans from returning to immortality.<sup>183</sup> A variation of the idea of Satan's envy of human's state, is that of his anger towards God. Satan, having fallen, was unable to harm God as he wished and so, instead, he harmed the image of God: so Ignatius vardapet (C 12)<sup>184</sup> says succinctly, "[he] wished, through enmity towards man, to dishonor the Creator, who had made him his image and likeness" (կամեցաւ մարդոյն թշնամանօքն նախաստել զարարիչն, որ արար զնա իր պատկեր եւ նմանութիւն:).<sup>185</sup>

Above we related the story drawn from the *Penitence of Adam* about Satan's refusal to bow down to Adam, God's image, at Michael's behest (§2.4). It seems that this story was known to Grigor Tat'ewac'i (C 14) who adapts it theologically. He says, God the Word, incarnated, created Adam: when the angels saw God in Adam's image they worshipped him. Satan, considering him mere body and man did not worship him.<sup>186</sup>

---

points to the theme of envy in Gnostic sources. In one manuscript of *Adam, Eve and the Incarnation* (Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha*, 22), Satan is said to envy Adam and Eve's state in the Garden. Of course, in numerous other sources the idea of envy is connected with Cain, whose name is understood to derive from the Hebrew root *qn'*, meaning "envy": cf. *Testament of Benjamin* 7:5 and see the many parallels in HOLLANDER and DE JONGE, 1985, 433; *History of the Forefathers*, §§4-5. Cain was jealous over his sister whom Abel married: See Testament of Adam fragment 2.3 (KMOSKO, "Testamentum Patris Nostri," 1344) and other sources.

<sup>181</sup>VAN ESBROECK (1989) 490.3.

<sup>182</sup>The sources we examined do not attempt to systematize all these ideas, which do not always cohere.

<sup>183</sup>BISHOP XOSROV ANJEWAC'I, 1869, 10; see also XOSROV ANJEWAC'I — COWE, 1991, 115.

<sup>184</sup>IGNATIUS VARDAPET — 1824, 276-277.

<sup>185</sup>Note the term թշնամանութիւն "enmity", used above of Satan's envy (§3.0).

<sup>186</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — 1998B, 572-573. In this passage, Tat'ewac'i, after his fashion, introduces a number of explanations of Satan's envy. Certain of these have been discussed above, but we give the whole passage here:

### 3.2 Satan's Envy of Man's Paradisiacal and Future State.

In contrast with these general statements, Agat'angelos (C 5) states explicitly that Satan saw Adam carefully observing the commandment and became jealous of the good things he would receive; for that reason he plotted Adam's expulsion.<sup>187</sup> The cause of the envy is thus made evident. Similarly, according to Eznik (C 5), Satan was jealous of the abundance of good things granted to Adam, including the image.<sup>188</sup> Later, Kirakos Erznkac'i (C 14) states that Satan "heard the command of the man's life (and) envied."<sup>189</sup> In Mambre we read "the Evil One was envious of the good of Adam and cast him down from the blessed life" (նա չարն նախանձեցաւ ընդ բարոյն Ադամայ եւ ընկէց զնա յերանելի կենացն).<sup>190</sup> These three fifth-century authors present the identical idea, that Satan envied Adam because of the good things that God had granted him, which for Eznik included the image of God in which Adam was created.

An analogous view may be found in Agat'angelos (C 5) §280. However, in this section Agat'angelos is more specific about the good things of which Satan was jealous. Beyond all, he was envious of the promise of potential immortality that Adam received. He sought to enslave him and inherit his position "having made him err, (and so) having brought him out of the promises, perchance he might be able to inherit his place" (զի զնա վրիպեցուցեալ հանեալ ի խոստմանցն՝ թերեւս հնար լիցի նմա զնորա տեղին ժառանգել). Satan's desire to enslave humans is supported by a quotation from 3 Cor 11,

---

Whence was Satan that deceived the man? The doctors say that Satan was one of the ranks of the celestial angels, and that he became proud and opposed God... And certain people say that he envied the man's honour and was thinking, what is the holy perfection, and could not comprehend... While Grigor Narekac'i says that when, in the beginning, God wanted to create the creations, God the Word appeared and was creating in incarnated appearance, like during Adam's creation, as our Grigor the Illuminator says. And all the angelic beings saw the Word in Adam's image and worshipped and blessed him. And Satan did not worship, considering (him) mere body and man.

<sup>187</sup>Teaching, §278.

<sup>188</sup>Eznik 32.28, 60.48, 68.57.

<sup>189</sup>KIRAKOS ERZNKAC'I — K'YURTYAN, 1965, 97. The phrase means, "heard the command which would give eternal life to Adam."

<sup>190</sup>DAWIT' KORIW N MAMBRE — 1833, 64.

which says that Satan "seized and bound all mankind." This statement uses the significant language of slavery and freedom associated with Satan<sup>191</sup> and it adds further specific features to our discussion of jealousy: first that Satan envied Adam's potential immortality and second, that as a result of his envy, he wished to replace Adam.<sup>192</sup> The same idea occurs, as we have already noted, in Kirakos Erznkac'i (C 14).<sup>193</sup> Vardan Arewelc'i (C 13) says in different words that the serpent was envious of Adam and Eve becoming gods,<sup>194</sup> thus also identifying Satan and the serpent.

The statements just discussed imply that Satan had already lost his heavenly place and his glory when envy beset him, which could have happened only after his initial rebellion and fall. Satan's fall is here connected with Adam's creation. In the *Penitence of Adam* 12-17, the story of Satan's fall, no hint of a statement like Agat'angelos's occurs, i.e., that Satan wished to replace Adam.<sup>195</sup> However, much later on in *The Penitence of Adam*, in the story of Satan's deceit of the serpent, he says "Come on, rise up, come to me and hear what I say to you. Let us expel Adam from the Garden like us so that we may re-enter the Garden" (Աղէ, արի, եկ դու առ իս եւ լուր գոր ինչ ասեմք քեզ. հաւնցուք զԱդամ ի դրախտէն. որպէս զմեզ. զի դարձեսալ մեր մտցուք ի դրախտ անդր: 44.16.1-4). This statement is written from the perspective of fallen Satan, just like Agat'angelos (*Teaching* §280).<sup>196</sup> More generally Yovhan Mandakuni (C 5) says about envy that "envy and grudging are the beginning of sufferings, for by that Satan fell from glory, by that Adam was went out of the Garden, and curses and sweat, thistle and thorn, death and sin ruled over all the descendants

---

<sup>191</sup>See STONE, *Adam's Contract*, 168 and Index s.v. "enslavement", "freeing," for further discussion of this idea. The language is old and widespread. See also GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — 1746, chapter 18 and Zak'aria Kat'olikos discussed above, at note 109.

<sup>192</sup>This theme is typical of Satan's discussion with the serpent: see above §1.3.

<sup>193</sup>In his poem on St. George, KIRAKOS ERZNKAC'I — K'YURTYAN, 1965, 97.

<sup>194</sup>VARDAN AREWELC'I — 1797, 455-456.

<sup>195</sup> Somewhat similar language might be observed in the Latin *Vitae Adam*, but that is different from the Armenian-Georgian text.

<sup>196</sup> It is odd because it also implies the idea that the serpent also had fallen.

of Adam..."<sup>197</sup> The order of events in this statement also implies that Satan's fall preceded his deception of Adam (see also above, §2.0).<sup>198</sup> The thirteenth-century poet, Yovhannēs Erznkac'ī Pluz, taking up the same theme, says that Satan fallen from glory envied Adam (who, presumably, still had it).<sup>199</sup>

A rather different twist is given to the envy theme by Grigor Tat'ewac'ī when he says, discussing the reason for the creation of man from dust: "Besides, he created (the man) of the dust to the shame of Satan, so that he might be ashamed when this weak and clay-made (man) entered the glory, from which he who was glorious fell." (Դարձեալ ի հողոյ ստեղծ ի նախաստիճս սաստանայի. զի յամօթ լիցի յորժամ տկարս այս եւ կաւեղէնս ի փառսն մտանէր յորմէ նա՛ որ փառասորն էր անկաւ:)<sup>200</sup> Envy of God's beneficence to Adam, and particularly of Adam's potential immortality, dominates the idea of Satan's envy in the fifth-century literature. This is a reformulation in the terms of the biblical story of the apocryphal theme that Satan's envied Adam's pre-eminence in creation. It complements the stress the Armenian sources lay upon God's ultimate purpose in creating Adam, to enable him to achieve immortality through observing the single commandment and abstaining from the fruit of the tree.

Some further statements are made in the fifth century about Satan's envy, which relate more to its results than its object. Thus, P'awstos says that Satan corrupts man by his envy, leading to deceit and falsehood.<sup>201</sup> As we will see, it is deceit that characterizes Satan's action towards humans and it is also the heart of the biblical story.

---

<sup>197</sup> YOVHANNES MANDAKUNI — 1836, 90.

<sup>198</sup> AGAT'ANGELOS — THOMSON, 2001, 77 implies that Satan's jealousy was responsible for the sin with daughters of men in Gen 6.

<sup>199</sup> YOVHANNES ERZKAC'Ī PLUZ — RUSSELL, *Mediaeval Armenian Lyric*, 1987, 167-168. GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'Ī says that some maintain that Satan envied Adam's glory: others say he envied man's honour (1998B) 572-3. See above on the idea of Adam's glory or luminous garment.

<sup>200</sup> GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'Ī — 1993, 229.

<sup>201</sup> P'AWSTOS BUZANDAC'Ī — 1933, 93 = GARSOLAN, *Epic Histories*, 130.

Much later, in the thirteenth century, Vardan Arewelc'i speaks of jealousy of the demons, which is surely a variation on the theme of Satan's envy.<sup>202</sup> Above (§1.0) we noted that in the fifteenth-century amulet scroll, the same shift from Satan to the demons was made. Vardan Arewelc'i also implies clearly that the "first serpent" envied Eve's glory.<sup>203</sup> This he infers, because the serpent deceived Eve. His text seems to imply a differentiation between the ancient serpent and Satan, but that is probably due to the differing biblical contexts from which the terms were drawn.<sup>204</sup>

195 Irrational anger was the cause of Satan, of Saul and of the Jews and of the heretics, just like that of the first serpent that was angry about Eve's glory.

Սրտմտութիւն անբան եղև պատճառ սատանայի, սաւուղի, եւ հրէիցն, եւ հերձուածողաց, որպէս զօձին առաջնոյ՝ որ ցասեալ վասն փառացն Եւայի:<sup>205</sup>  
All of this, while presenting a range of views, does not seem to show a great deal of conceptual development. The patterns already recognizable in the fifth century continue, though sometimes they are embroidered by import of new legendary material, or changed by new and different stresses deriving from the context in which they are used.

### 3.3 Satan, Deception by.

A general statement is found in some sources that Satan deceived man, caused him to worship idols and thus separated him from God: so Yovhannēs Erznkac'i Pluz (C 14).<sup>206</sup> This statement does not necessarily refer to the Eden events though the biblical narrative

---

<sup>202</sup>VARDAN AREWELC'I — 1797, 331.

<sup>203</sup>According to GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I, the evil Enemy, Satan, stole the man's honour: 1998A, 86. Here again the issue is of glory or honour, but deception is not mentioned explicitly.

<sup>204</sup>This matter is discussed above in §1.2-1.4.

<sup>205</sup>VARDAN AREWELC'I — 1797, 195. "First serpent" comes from Rev 12:9 where Arm has օձ առաջին (*ōj arajin*), where the English translation is "ancient serpent".

<sup>206</sup>YOVHANNĒS ERZKNAC'I PLUZ — SRAPYAN, 1958, 183-199.

describes the serpent as deceiving Eve and causing her to eat the fruit (Gen 3:1-6). Vrt'anēs K'ert'oł in the sixth century states that, "the first sin was born of falsehood as in the days of Adam. (Եւ մեղք իսկ առաջին ի ստորեւնէ ծնան, որպէս առ Ադաման:)"<sup>207</sup> Vrt'anēs K'ert'oł says that the first sin comes from falsehood, though actually envy was the cause and deceit the means. Indeed, envy is the dominant theme in the fifth-century writers.

Grigoris Aršaruni (C 7) makes a similarly non-specific statement that unrighteousness is caused by deception of the serpent.<sup>208</sup> In a hymn (*šarakan*), Sahak Jorop'orec'i in the same century refers in a general way to the deception of tree and seduction of serpent.<sup>209</sup> The thirteenth-century poet, Frik, says that Adam was deceived by a traitor, so it emerges that Satan called traitor.<sup>210</sup> Sargis Šnorhali (C 12) simply assumes that Satan deceived Adam.<sup>211</sup> Vardan Arewել'ի asserts in even less specific terms that Satan fraudulently deceived creatures,<sup>212</sup> again substantially identifying Satan and the serpent: see §1.4.

All these statements and some further ones that we will note, are based on the commonplace that Satan deceived Adam. Xosrov Anjewac'i (C 10) says that the serpent deceived Eve and "raised hope for her that he himself was maker of gods".<sup>213</sup> In the C 17 Anonymous Author 8 reads Օձն յսարեաց զԵւայ, զԱդամ, "The serpent deceived Eve, Adam" and introduces Eve's name.<sup>214</sup> Eve also features in the passage from Vardan Arewել'ի (C 13) noted in §3.2 above. Similarly, a kafa on the Alexander Romance by

<sup>207</sup>VRT'ANES K'ERT'OŁ — DUREAN, 1927, 62.

<sup>208</sup>GRIGORIS ARŠARUNI — Č'RAK'EAN, 1964, 135.

<sup>209</sup>*Hymnal*, 1853, 549-550.

<sup>210</sup>FRİK — MARGARIAN, 1941, 70-1. This is the word աւանանի and not the term մատնի mentioned above as ArmI biblical translation of διαβόλος: see above §1.2.

<sup>211</sup>SARGIS ŠNORHALI — 1826, 134.

<sup>212</sup>VARDAN AREWEL'C'I — 1797, 468.

<sup>213</sup>XOSROV ANJEWAC'I — 1869, 10.

<sup>214</sup>Anonymous Author 8, 1987, 644-645. Similar is EP'REM ŁAP'ANC'I — HASMIK SAHAKYAN 1987, 551.

Zak'aria Gnuneac' (C 16) highlights the relationship between the serpent and Eve,<sup>215</sup> while Arak'el Davrižec'i (C 17) speaks of "Eve's serpent."<sup>216</sup> The same idea is to be found in Azaria Ĵulayec'i (C 16).<sup>217</sup> In the same century Nahabet K'uč'ak Vanec'i mentions those (plural) who deceived Eve, most likely Satan and the serpent.<sup>218</sup>

Yovhannēs Erzncac'i Pluz (C 13) repeatedly speaks of the serpent, Satan's associate, who deceived Eve, without mentioning envy.<sup>219</sup> The serpent Satan's associate, "breached the fence of the vineyard of life" and deceived Eve.<sup>220</sup> The serpent's wiliness and deception, already featured in Gen 3:1, are highlighted by Grigor Magistros' (C 10) reference to the serpent's pernicious words of deception<sup>221</sup> and Anania Sahanahcec'i's (C 11) statement that it insinuated itself into garden.<sup>222</sup> The deception by Satan, rather than the serpent, is mentioned by Grigor Narekac'i (C 10),<sup>223</sup> and Grigor Magistros (C 10) mentions Satan's words of insinuation.<sup>224</sup> Vardan Arewelc'i's (C 13) similar statement was referred to above. A like falling together of the two figures, Satan and the serpent, is to be observed when Xosrov Anjewac'i (C 10) states that Satan raised hope in Eve that he was maker of gods.<sup>225</sup> See §1.4.

In his *Commentary on Psalms*, Vardan Arewelc'i (C 13) calls Satan a hunter, who set becoming god as a net for Adam.<sup>226</sup> The language of Satan as hunter and his deception as

---

<sup>215</sup>See SIMONYAN, *Alexander of Macedon*, 83-84.

<sup>216</sup>ARAK'EL DAVIRŽEC'I — XANLARYAN, 1990, 135.

<sup>217</sup>AZARIA ĴULAYEC'I — KOSTANEANC' 1903, 32-34.

<sup>218</sup>NAHABED K'UČ'AK VANEC'I — HASMIK SAHAKYAN 1986, 58-59.

<sup>219</sup>YOVHANNĒS ERZNCAC'I PLUZ quoted in YOVHANNĒS T'LKURANC'I — RRUSSELL, 1987, 167-168.

<sup>220</sup>YOVHANNĒS ERZNCAC'I PLUZ quoted in YOVHANNĒS T'LKURANC'I — RRUSSELL, 1987, 228.

<sup>221</sup>GRIGOR MAGISTROS — KOSTANEANC', 1910, 47.

<sup>222</sup>ANANIA SANAHNEC'I — KYŌSEYAN, 2000, 131.

<sup>223</sup>GRIGOR NAREKAC'I — *Book of Lamentation*, 1985, 405: 39.2.

<sup>224</sup>GRIGOR MAGISTROS — 1910, 47.

<sup>225</sup>XOSROV ANJEWAC'I — 1869, 10.

<sup>226</sup>VARDAN AREWELC'I — 1797, 305.



a net is determined by the verse being commented on, i.e., Ps. 91 (90):3 and occurs nowhere else in the texts discussed here. The same idea, that Satan deceived the protoplasts through the desire to become God, is to be found in Grigor Daranałc'i (C 17)<sup>227</sup> and his contemporary Yovhannēs jūlayec'i when they say that Satan sowed pride in Adam and Eve, by which he wanted to become god.<sup>228</sup>

"Because of envy of tempter, / so they were deceived by serpent (Ի նախանձու չար քանասարկուիմ / որ եւ օձիւրն խաբեցան:)" is the statement of Kostandin Erznkac'i (C 14).<sup>229</sup> In this he makes the causal relationship between Satan's envy and the serpent's deception quite clear. The means by which Satan achieves this aim are made explicit in many sources. Thus Kirakos Erznkac'i (C 14) in his "Poem on St. George" says:

Իսկապէս հայրըն մեղաց եւ զըտակ չարեաց,  
ամապէտ դասուց խըմբից սեւագունդ զօրաց:CHECK  
Անդ լրաւ զպատուէր կենաց մարդոյն մախաց,  
Կըցորդ խորհրդոց առեալ զօձն ի գազանաց,  
Որ խաբեալ էիան զԱդամ ի դրախտէն կենաց:  
Truly the father of sin and inventor of evil,  
Head of the ranks of groups of black hosts,  
There he heard the command of the man's life (and) envied.  
Having taken of the animals the serpent as partner in his plan,  
Who, having deceived, brought Adam forth from Paradise of life.<sup>230</sup>

The different roles of Satan and the serpent are quite explicit. This differentiation, discussed above in §1.3, may well be dominant when Satan's primordial rebellion, the Lucifer myth, is invoked. However, when the stress is on the deception in the Garden, and particularly on that deception as the prototype of Satan's continued deception of human beings, the roles of

---

<sup>227</sup>GRIGOR DARANAŁC'I — NŠANIAN, 1915, 414.

<sup>228</sup>YOVHANNES JŪLAYEC'I — 1812, 167-168.

<sup>229</sup>KOSTANDIN ERZKAC'I — SRAPYAN, 1962, 220-223.

<sup>230</sup>KIRAKOS ERZKAC'I — K'YURTYAN, 1965, 97

Satan and the serpent tend to fall together. In the passage of Kirakos quoted here, the focus is upon the expulsion of Adam rather than on the deception of Eve.<sup>231</sup>

### 3.4 Punishment and Curses of Satan

Grigor Tat'ewac'i states that God did not leave Satan unpunished, but punished him through the serpent, which is intelligent. There were four players in the Eden incident: Adam (reason); Eve (the senses); the serpent (desire); and Satan (the instigator of desire).<sup>232</sup> "The incorporeal serpent slandered God and deceived the first man by his tricks, and (then) the same slander, by way of recompense, was tied to the man's tongue". These are the words of Sargis Šnorhali (C 12).<sup>233</sup> Why he should call the serpent "incorporeal" is unclear to us not in any detail given of Satan's punishment. This is generally reserved for the eschatological age, and frequently related to the harrowing of Hell.

### 4.0 Curses of the Serpent

The great systematic thinker of the high Middle Ages, Grigor Tat'ewac'i enumerates the curses of that came upon the serpent. First, since he was the arms and legs of the Evil One, his arms and legs were cut off. Indeed, there is an old exegesis in both Jewish and Christian thought which infers from "you shall go on your belly" in the curse of the serpent in Gen 3:14 that, previously, the serpent had arms and legs. Second, an obscure punishment, is that since he tries to kill the beast, he is killed by every beast. The exact reference of this is unclear. Third, since he changed the blessing into curse, he was cursed and deprived of the blessing of all animals. Fourth, since he put enmity between the man and God, (God) put enmity between the man and the serpent (Gen 3:15). Fifth, as he fought against the head (i.e., the protoplasts), (his) head was killed (another interpretation on of Gen 3:15b); and moreover, still exegeting that verse, since he made the man fall from heaven to the earth, he falls under the heel of his feet. Tat'ewac'i then introduces a series of punishments, which are expressed in the serpent's bodily movements. Since he came with friendship and turned to

---

<sup>231</sup>Another functional differentiation is present when T'ADEOS T'OXAT'EC'I (C 16) states that Satan deceived Adam but serpent spoke with Eve: see 1910, 276.

<sup>232</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWACI — 1998, 324-325.

<sup>233</sup>SARGIS ŠNORHALI — 1828, 114.

enmity, so he turns back when biting. Since he envied man, he creeps upon (his) breast and belly. Since he is a deceiver, he proceeds crookedly. Since he deceived the five senses of the man, he performs five circular motions while advancing. And since he stripped the first-created ones of glory, his skin is stripped.<sup>234</sup>

### Concluding Remarks

The wealth of traditions presented above represents the working out of the understanding of the Genesis story in an Oriental Christian culture. It is intriguing that over more than a thousand years of literature, relatively little change took place in the understanding of the story. The high Middle Ages saw a certain elaboration of narrative incidents and the significance of the story's elements. Yet, in fact there are no radical transformations of this fundamental story. It would be interesting to see how other biblically derived traditions, Jewish and Christian, treat the same features over a millennium. The richness of the Armenian narrative tradition would be enhanced here were it to be combined with their artistic tradition. That, however, would be another trail to follow and this one has been long enough.

### Bibliography

- AČARYAN, H., *Dictionary of Armenian Proper Names Հայոց Անձնանունների Բառարան*, 5 vols. repr. Beirut 1972.
- AGAT'ANGELOS— ROBERT W. THOMSON, *Teaching of St. Gregory: Revised Edition* (Avant: Treasures of the Armenian Christian Tradition 1), New Rochelle 2001.
- ALIŠAN, L. *Ancient Religion of the Armenians* Հին հասարակարգի հայոց, Venice 1910, 163-165.
- ALEXANDRE, MONIQUE, *Le Commencement du livre: Genèse I-V. La version grecque de la septante et sa réception* (Christianisme antique 3), Paris 1988.
- ANANIA KAT'OLIKOS — "Anania, Kat'olikos of the Armenians On the Rebellion of Albania' Անանիայի Հայոց կաթողիկոսի Յաղագս ապստամբութեանն տանն Աղուանից", *Ararat* 6 (1897) 129-144.

---

<sup>234</sup>GRIGOR TAT'EWACI— 1993, vol. 1, 218-219.

- ANANIA SANAHNEC'Ī — YAKOB KYÖSEYAN (ed.), *Anania Sahnahneç'i Անանիա Սահահնեցի (Theological Texts and Studies 1 Աստվածաբանական Բնագրեր Ուսումնասիրություններ Ա)*, Ĕjmiacin 2000.
- ANANIA ŠIRAKAC'Ī — A.G. ABRAHAMYAN (ed.), *The Works of Anania of Širak Անանիա Շիրակացու Մատենագրությունը*, Erevan 1944.
- ANDERSON, G.A., "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan", in *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997) 105-134 = Anderson, Stone and Tromp, *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 83-110.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Fall of Satan in the Thought of St. Ephrem and John Milton", *Hugoye: A Journal of Syriac Studies* 3, no. 1 (2000) electronic.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination*, Louisville 2001, 21-34.
- ANDERSON, G.A. and STONE, M.E., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve: New and Revised Edition*, Atlanta 1999.
- ANDERSON, G.A., STONE, M.E. and TROMP, JOHANNES, *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (SVTP 15), Leiden-Boston-Köln 2000.
- ARAK'EL DAVIRŽEC'Ī — L.A. XANLARYAN (ed.), *Aṙak'el Daviržec'i, Book of Histories Գիրք Պատմութեանց*. Erevan, 1990.
- ARTAWAZD MAZAZUNI, TĒR — ARDASHES MATHÉVOSSIAN (ed.) "The Solution(es) of Tēr Artawazd Mazazuni Լուծումն Արտաազոսա Մազազունեայ տեառն" in *A Book of Knowledge and Belief by Priest David; Մատենան գիտութեան եւ հաւատոյ Դավթի քահանայի, The Oldest Armenian Manuscript on Paper, 981: Facsimilie*, Yerevan 1995, 457-458.
- AWETIK'EAN, G., SIWRMÉLEAN, X. and AWK'EREAN, M., *New Dictionary of the Armenian Language Նոր Բարկիզք Հայկացեան Լեզուի*, Venice 1837: cited as NBHL.
- AZARIA ĴULAYEC'Ī — K. KOSTANEANC' (ed.), "Poems", in *New Collection, Medieval Armenian Poems and Verses Նոր Ժողովածու, Միջնադարեան Հայոց Տաղեր եւ Ոտանատրներ*, Vataršapat 1903, 4.32-34.
- BARDAKJIAN, KEVORK B., *A Reference Guide to Modern Armenian Literature 1500-1920*, Detroit 2000.

BUZANDARAN: see P'awstos Buzand.

CROSS, FRANK MOORE, JR., *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*, Cambridge, MA 1973.

DAWIT' KORIWN MAMBRE — *Writings of the Ancestors, Dawit', Koriwn, Mambre* Մատենագրութիւնք Նախնեաց (Դաւիթ, Կորին, Մամբրէ, Դաւիթ), Venice 1833.

DAVIT' SALAJOREC'I — HASMIK SAHAKYAN (ed.), *Late Medieval Armenian Poetry (16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Centuries)* Ուշ միջնադարի հայ բանաստեղծությունը (XVI-XVII դդ.), Erevan 1987, 2.372-380.

ELIŠE VARDAPET — *Writings of Our Holy Father Elišē Vardapet* Մրբոյ Հօրն Մերոյ Եղիշէի Վարդապետի Մատենագրութիւնք, Venice 1859.

EPHREM SYRUS — S.P. BROCK (intr. tr.), *Hymns on Paradise: St. Ephrem*. Crestwood NY 1990.

EP'REM ŁAP'ANC'I — HASMIK SAHAKYAN (ed.), *Late Medieval Armenian Poetry (16th-17th Centuries)*, vol. 2. Erevan 1987.

ESHEL, ESTHER, *Demonology in Palestine during the Second Temple Period* (Ph.D. Thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Jerusalem 1999.

FORSYTH, NEIL, *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth*, Princeton 1987.

FRIEDLANDER, GERALD, see Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer.

Frik — S. Margarian, (ed.), *Frik: Poems* Բանաստեղծություններ, Erevan 1941.

GASTER, THEODORE H., "Satan", in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Nashville-New York 1962, 4:224-228.

GREENSPAHN, FREDERICK E., *When Brothers Dwell Together: The Preeminence of Younger Siblings in the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford 1994.

GRIGOR DARANAŁC'I — M.V. NŠANIAN (ed.), *Chronography* Ժամանակագրութիւն, Jerusalem 1915.

GRIGOR MAGISTROS — *Poems* Տաղասացութիւնք, Venice 1868.

- GRIGOR MAGISTROS — K. KOSTANEANC' (ed.), *The Letters of Grigor Magistros* Գրիգոր Մագիստրոսի Թղթերը, Alexandrapol 1910.
- GRIGOR NAREKAC'I — *The Writings of Grigor, Monk of the Monastery of Narek* Գրիգորի Նարեկայ Վանից Վանականի, Մատենադրոփինք, Venice 1840.
- GRIGOR NAREKAC'I — "Another Poem on the Lord Coming to Lazarus: Another Tune by Grigor Narekac'i Այլ տաղ գալստեան Տեանն առ Ղազար 'ի ձայն կենդանատուին մնացն, այլ եղանակ ի Գրիգոր Նարեկացոյ", *Ararat* 3 (1874) 139-141.
- GRIGOR NAREKAC'I — *Book of Lamentation by Grigor Narekac'i* Գրիգոր Նարեկացի, Մատենան Ողբերգութեան, P.M. Xac'atryan and A.A. Łazinyan (eds.), Yerevan 1985.
- GRIGOR PAHLAWUNI (TŁAY) — T. PALIAN (ed.), *Armenian ašuts (Minstrels)* Հայ աշուղներ, Izmir 1912, 2.177-179.
- GRIGOR TAT'EWAC'I — *Book of Questions* Գիրք Հարցմանց, Jerusalem 1993; repr. of Constantinople edition, 1729.
- \_\_\_\_\_ — *Book of Preaching, Called Winter Volume* Գիրք քարոզութեան որ կոչի Ձմեռան հասոք, Constantinople 1740; repr. Jerusalem 1998A .
- \_\_\_\_\_ — *Book of Preaching Which Is Called Summer Volume* Գիրք քարոզութեան որ կոչի Ամառան հասոք, Constantinople 1741; repr. Jerusalem 1998B.
- \_\_\_\_\_ — *The Book Called Oskep'orik* Գիրք Որ Կոչի Ոսկեփորիկ, Constantinople 1746.
- GRIGOR TŁAY — TH. M. VAN LINT, "The Poem of Lamentation Over the Capture of Jerusalem Written in 1189 By Grigor Tłay, Catholicos of All Armenians." in *The Armenians in Jerusalem and the Holy Land*, Michael E. Stone, Roberta R. Ervine and Nira Stone (eds). Leuven 2002, 121-142.
- GRIGOR VKAYASER — M. VAN ESBROECK, "Le Discours Dogmatique de Grégoire V kayaser," *Xristianskij Vostok*, NS 1 (7), 1999, p. 38-40 (introduction), p. 41-47 (text), 47-57 (French translation).

- GRIGORIS AĒT'AMARC'I — MAYIS AVDALBEGYAN (ed.), *Introduction, Critical Text and Notes* Ուսումնասիրություն, քննական բնագրեր և ծանոթություններ, Erevan 1963.
- GARRETT, SUSAN R., *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*, Fortress 1989.
- GREENE, D. AND F. KELLEY, *The Irish Adam and Eve Story from Saltair Na Rann: Volume 1, Text and Translation*, Dublin 1976.
- GRIGORIS ARŠARUNI — S. Č'RAK'EAN (ed.), *Commentary on the Lectionary of K'orepiskopos Grigoris Aršaruni* Գրիգորիսի Արշարունոյ Քորեպիսկոպոսի Մեկնութիւն Ընթերցուածոց, Venice 1964.
- HAMAM AREWELC'I — MXIT'AR K'AHANAY SARIBEKYAN (ed.), "Համամ Արեւելցի, Մեկնութիւն Առակաց Hamam Arewelc'i, *Commentary on Proverbs*", in *Step'anos Siwnec'i, Commentary on the Four Evangelists; Hamam Arewelc'i, Commentary on the Proverbs* Ստեփանոս Սիւնեցի, Մեկնութիւն չորից ատետարանաց, Համամ Արեւելցի, Մեկնութիւն Առակաց, Erevan 1994.
- HAMAM AREWELC'I — ROBERT W. THOMSON, *Hamam: Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (Hebrew University Armenian Studies 5), Leuven-Paris-Dudley MA 2005.
- HOLLANDER, HARM W. and MARINUS DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: a Commentary* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 8), Leiden 1985.
- [n.a.]. *Hymnal* Ծարական, Constantinople 1853.
- IGNATIUS VARDAPET — *Commentary on Luke* Մեկնութիւն Դուկասու Իգնատիոսի Վարդապետի, Constantinople 1824.
- KARAPET BALIŠEC'I — N. AKINIAN (ed.), "Karapet vardapet Batišec'i (1475-1550) Կարապետ վ. Բաղիշեցի (1475-1550)", *Handes Amsorya* 51 (1937), 318-343.
- KAZAZIAN, N. AND STONE, M.E., "The Commentary on the Cycle of Four Works", *Journal of Armenian Studies* 8, 1 (2004), 46-51.
- KIRAKOS ERZNAKAC'I — H. K'YURTYAN, "Unpublished Poems of Kirakos Vardapet Erznac'i

- Անտիպ տաղեր Կիրակոս Վարդապետ Երզնկացի", *Ejmiacin* 22 (1965), 91-99.
- KMOSKO, M. "Testamentum Patris Nostri Adam", in *Patrologia Syriaca* 2, edited by R. Graffin, Paris 1907, 1309-1360, 1393-1410.
- KOSTANTIN ERZNKAC'Ī — A. SRAPYAN (ed.), *Kostandin Erzncac'i, Poems*  
Կոստանդին.Երզնկացի, Տաղեր, Erevan 1962.
- ŁAZAR P'ARBEC'Ī — *History Պատմագրություն*, Venice 1933.
- LIPSCOMB, W. L., *The Armenian Apocryphal Adam Literature* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 8) Atlanta 1990.
- LOEFF, YOAV, "Four Texts from the Oldest Known Armenian Amulet Scroll: Matenadaran 115 (1428) with Introduction, Translation", (Master's Thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Jerusalem 2002.
- LUPIERI, E., *The Mandaeans: The Last Gnostics*, C. Hindley (tr.) (Italian Texts and Studies on Religion and Society), Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, U.K., 2002.
- MATT'EOS VARDAPET — *Lamentable Encomium on the Burial of the Blessed Rabunapet Gregory; Evagrius' Book on Eight Mysteries of Sins* Ներբողեան ողբերգաբար ... ի թաղումն երջանիկ բարմնապետին Գրիգորի, Գիրք ութն խորհրդոց մեղաց Եւագրեայ, Constantinople 1750.
- MURAD, FREDERIK, *The Old Armenian Translation of the Revelation of John*  
Յայտնութեան Յովիաննոսի հին հայ թարգմանություն, Jerusalem 1905-1911.
- MURADYAN, GOHAR, *Physiologus: The Greek and Armenian Versions with a Study of Translation Technique* (Hebrew University Armenian Studies 6), Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2005.
- MURDOCH, BRIAN O., *The Irish Adam and Eve Story from Saltair Na Rann: Volume 2, Commentary*, Dublin 1976.
- NAHABED K'UČ'AK VANEC'Ī — HASMIK SAHAKYAN (ed.), *Late Medieval Armenian Poetry (16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Centuries)* Ուշ միջնադարի հայ բանաստեղծությունը (XVI-XVII դդ.), Erevan 1986, 1.56-67.
- NBHL, see G. AWETIK'EAN, X. SIWRMĒLEAN and M. AWK'EREAN.
- NERSĒS ŠNORHALI — E. BAŁDASARYAN (ed.), *Encyclical Letter* Թուղթ ընդհանրական, Erevan 1995.



- ORLOV, ANDREI A., *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies on the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 114), Leiden - Boston 2007.
- P'AWSTOS BUZANDAC'I — GARSOĪAN, NINA G., *The Epic Histories Attributed to P'Awstos Buzand (Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk')* (Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies 8), Cambridge, MA 1989.
- P'AWSTOS BUZANDAC'I — *History of the Armenians* Պատմութիւն Հայոց. Ի Չորս Դպրութիւնս, 4th ed., St. Lazar 1933.
- PAYNE SMITH, ROBERT, et al. *Thesaurus Syriacus, Collegerunt Stephanus M. Quatremere, Georgius Henricus Bernstein [Et Alii]*. Oxonii: e typographeo Clarendoniano, 1879.
- PIRQE DE RABBI ELIEZER — FRIEDLANDER, GERALD, *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezer: The Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer the Great*, New York 1981.
- RILEY, G.J., 'Demons', in: Toorn, K. van der, Becking, B. and van der Horst, P.W. (eds), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Brill 1995, 445-455.
- RUSSELL, J.R., *Grigor Narekac'i*, Delmar, NY 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Zoroastrianism in Armenia* (Harvard Iranian Series 5) Cambridge, MA 1987.
- RUSSELL, JEFFREY BURTON, *The Devil*, Ithaca 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition*, Ithaca 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Lucifer: The Devil in the Middle Ages*, Ithaca and London 1984.
- SARGIS ŠNORHALI — *Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles* Մեկնութիւն եօթանց թղթոց կաթողիկէայց, Constantinople 1826 .
- SATRAN, D., STONE, M.E. and WRIGHT, B.G. *The Apocryphal Ezekiel* (SBLTT) Atlanta 2000.
- SCHWARTZ, H., *Tree of Souls: The Mythology of Judaism*, New York 2004.
- SEYMOUR, S.J.D., "The Book of Adam and Eve in Ireland" *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 36 (1922) 121-133.

SIMONYAN, HASMIG A., *Medieval Armenian Kafas, (10-16<sup>th</sup> centuries) Հայ միջնադարեան Կաֆաներ (X-XVI դդ.)*, Erevan 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_, *History of Alexander of Macedon Պատմութիւն Ալեքսանդրի Մակեդոնացոյ*, Erevan 1989.

STEP'ANNOS ÖRBELIAN — *Stepannos Siwnec'i, Disputation Against the Diophysites Ստեփաննոսի Մինեցոյ Հակաճառութիւն Ընդդէմ Երկարնակաց, 1756* (wrongly attributed), Constantinople 1756.

STEP'ANOS SIWNEC'I — AMATUNI, SAHAK VARDAPET (ed.), "Step'anos Siwnec'i 'Commentary on Divine Service Ժամակարգութեան Մեկնութիւն" *Ararat* 49 (1915, 1916, 1917), 225-240, 485-496, 634-639; 129-141, 405-412, 694-703; 199-204.

STICHEL, RAINER, "Die Verführung der Stammeltern dur Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apokalypse" *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarian*, eds. R. Lauer, and P. Schreiner. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 177), Göttingen 1989, 116-128.

STONE, MICHAEL E., *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_, "A New Edition and Translation of the *Questions of Ezra*", in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: J.C. Greenfield Festschrift*, eds. Z. Zevit, S. Gittin, and M. Sokoloff, Winona Lake 1995, 293-316.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Armenian Apocrypha: Relating to Adam and Eve* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 14), Leiden 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Adam's Contract with Satan: The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam*, Bloomingdale 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_, "John of T'lkuran on the Creation of the World" *St. Nersess Theological Review* 10 (2005), 51-75.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Adam and Eve Traditions in Fifth-Century Armenian Literature," *Le Muséon* 119.1-2 (2006), 89-120.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Adam's Naming of the Animals: Naming or Creation," in *The Poetics of Grammar and the Metaphysics of Sound and Sign*, eds. S. La Porta and D. Shulman (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 6), Leiden 2007, 69-80.

- \_\_\_\_\_, "Be You a Lyre for Me': Identity or Manipulation in Eden" *Proceedings of Cambridge Conference on Jewish and Christian Exegesis, 2007*, eds. H. Spurling and E. Grypeou, in press.
- T'ĒODOROS K'RT'ENAWOR — *The Writings of Philosopher Yovhan Oj nec'i Յովհաննու Իմաստասիրի Աձնեցոյ Մատենագրութիւնք*, Mechitarists 1953.
- T'ADEOS T'OXAT'EC'I — M. POTURIAN (ed.), "T'adēos T'oxat'ec'i Թաղէնս Թոխաբեցի" *Pazmavēb* 68 (1910), 207-208, 273-282.
- THOMSON, ROBERT W., *A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 A.D.* (Corpus Christianorum), Turnhout 1995.
- TOVMA ARCRUNI — ROBERT W. THOMSON, *History of the House of the Artsrunik'* (Byzantine texts in translation), Detroit 1985.
- VARDAN AREWELC'I — *Commentary on the Psalms of David of Vardan Barjraberdci'i Մեկնութիւն Սաղմոսաց Դարբի Վարդանայ Բարձրաբերդցոյ*, Astrakhan 1797.
- VARDAN AYGEKC'I — N. MARR (ed.), *Collections of the Fables of Vardan Ժողովածոյք առակաց Վարդանայ*, St. Petersburg 1893.
- VARDAN AYGEKC'I — *Admonitions խրատք*, Venice 1956.
- VARDAN AYGEKC'I — K'EOSEYAN, YAKOB and SHAHE HAYRAPETEAN (eds.), *Vardan Aygekec'i: Book of the Establishment and Root of Faith. Վարդան Այգեկցի. Գիրք հաստատութեան եւ արմատ հաստոյ*, Erevan 1988.
- VRT'ANĒS K'ERT'OL — E. DUREAN (ed.), "Concerning the Iconoclasts Յաղագս Պատկերամարտից." *Sion* NS 1 (1927), 23-25, 61-63.
- WINSTON, DAVID, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible) Garden City 1979.
- XOSROV ANJEWAC'I, *Commentary on the Prayers of Divine Service խորվու Անձեացեաց Եպիսկոպոսի Մեկնութիւն Աղօթից Պատարագին*, Venice 1869.
- XOSROV ANJEWAC'I — S.P. COWE (tr.), *Xosrov Anjewac'i. Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, New York 1991.
- YOVHANNĒS ERZKAC'I CORCOREC'I — *Commentary on Matthew of Nersēs Šnorhali and Yovhannēs Erzncac'i Մեկնութիւն Մատթէոսի՝ Ներսիսի Շնորհալոյ եւ Յովհաննու Երզնկացոյ*, Constantinople 1825.

- YOVHANNES ERZNKAC' I PLUZ — ARMENUHI SRAPYAN (ed.), *Yovhannēs Erzncac'i: Study and Texts* Ուսումնասիրություն եւ բնագրեր, Yerevan 1958.
- YOVHANNES ERZNKAC' I PLUZ — E. BALSASARYAN (ed.), "Epistle to the Rulers of the Region of Ekefac' Թուղթ առ իշխանս Եկեղեցաց գաւառի", *Banber Matenadarani* 10 (1971), 295-314.
- YOVHANNES ĴULAYEC' I — *Book Called Sanctification* Գիրք որ կոչի սրբազնագործութիւն, Madras 1812, 146-147.
- YOVHANNES K'OREPISKOPOS — "Concerning the Holy Cross that was seen in Varag Վասն որ ի Վարագ երեւցաւ սուրբ նշան", *Bazmavēp* 124 (1966), 14-28.
- YOVHANNES MANDAKUNI — *Homilies of Yovhannēs Mandakuni, Catholicos of the Armenians* Տեսնն Յովհաննու Մանդագունոյ Հայոց Հայրապետի Ճառք, Venice 1836.
- YOVHANNES T' LKURANC' I — J.R. RUSSELL, *Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i and the Mediaeval Armenian Lyric Tradition* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 7) Atlanta 1987.
- ZAK'ARIA KAT'OLIKOS — M. VAN ESBROEK (ed.), "[Homily] for the fifth day, by the Lord Zak'aria, Catholicos of the Armenians: on the Annunciation to the Most Blessed Theotokos Mary, ever the Virgin," *Handes Amsorya*, 1987, 487-503 (in Armenian)
- ZAK'ARIA KAT'OLIKOS — POLOS ANANEAN, *The Homilies of Zak'aria Kat'olikos* Զարարիա Կաթողիկոս Չազեցիի Ճառերը, Venice 1995.