An Armenian Job Fragment from Sinai and its Implications *

Since Western scholars started journeying to Mt. Sinai last century they have found the library of St. Catherine's monastery to be a veritable "treasury of mysteries", always full of new surprises, of which the most recent came to light only a decade and a half ago1. Access to those riches was facilitated by the Library of Congress microfilming expedition of 1950 which, in the course of its investigations, uncovered the fragment which forms the focus of the present study² (see plates 1 and 2). This too is an unexpected find when we consider that the monastery possesses no Armenian collection, but merely an 18th century copy of Aristotle's Categories with commentary³. Moreover, most recent reports seem to contradict initial statements about the existence of a cache of Armenian materials among those recently discovered. Hence the editor of this journal may be proved right in suggesting that what was so designated is actually Georgian in nushuri script⁴ (as opposed to asomt'avruli majuscule). Presumably the library numeration it bears, 'Αριθμ. 34 'Αρμενιακόν refers not to its position within a group of Armenian codices or fragments but rather to a miscellany of the latter of which it may be the only Armenian portion. Perhaps it became preserved in this way after serving as a flyleaf to ensure the protection of another manuscript and was thus pared down to fit the new dimensions.

Currently the parchment folio 5 measures 23 × 16 cm. and contains two

^{*} This study was completed during tenure of a fellowship at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C. for which the writer expresses his debt of gratitude.

¹ See inter alia J.H. Charlesworth, The New Discoveries in St. Catherine's Monastery: A Preliminary Report on the Manuscripts, ASOR monograph series 3, 1981.

² K.W. Clark, Checklist of Manuscripts in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, Washington, D.C., 1952, pp. viii, 21.

³ M. Kamil, Catalogue of all Manuscripts in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, Wiesbaden, 1970, p. 53.

⁴ J. Assfalg, "Kongressberichte", OrChr 65 (1981), p. 220. This gains in plausibility from the inclusion of the Armenian manuscript as no. 87 of the Georgian collection. Similarly, a Latin exemplar forms part of the Slavonic series.

⁵ There seems to be an error in the description of the fragment in Clark, Checklist of Manuscripts, p. 21 where it is referred to as "2 f.". As the continuation makes clear ("On two illum negatives"), what is meant is the two sides of one folio.

columns of writing in fourteen lines. Calculation of the textual gap between the point where recto col. 1 breaks off (37:17b) and col. 2 begins (v. 22b) indicates a further fourteen to fifteen lines would be required. This is corroborated for the verso where col. 1 gives out at 38:13a and col. 2 opens at v. 18a, as well as for the lacuna between the faces, the recto ending at 38:2b and verso commencing at v. 7b. From this we may conclude the folio originally consisted of 28-29 lines. Its putative dimensions may have been $31 \times 26 \,\mathrm{cm}$. 6 and would thereby have resembled the gospelbook, Matenadaran no. 2877 (10th-11th century)⁷. Its original compass would have been Job 37:12-c. 38:28.

Obviously, to determine the extent of the codex to which it once belonged we must assign it to the appropriate type. Clark suggests it derives from a lectionary⁸, but this is unlikely since the old Jerusalem rite on which the Armenian is founded has no lection from Job 37. The first part of the divine speech (38:2-28) was read during the paschal vigil and in its entirety along with Job's contrite response (38:2-40:5) in the canon for catechumens preceding the Lenten fast⁹. Consequently, it probably emanated from a part-Bible¹⁰. Exactly what the latter's compass might have been is hard to determine since Job appears in several anomalous configurations¹¹, yet the most plausible would be a grouping with the Solomonic corpus (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Cantica, Wisdom) and Sirach. From the preponderance of exemplars of this type preserved we can deduce the popularity of the wisdom books as a text for monastic meditation and on the curriculum of theological schools¹².

As there are no external data by which to date the piece, an approximate estimate must be obtained from paleographic examination. Even a cursory glance suffices to establish its relative antiquity on the basis of its rounded

⁶ This estimate was arrived at by doubling the length of the columns (12 cm) and the upper margin (3.5 cm) as well as the width of the column of writing and tripling the width of the central margin (2 cm).

⁷ See L. Xač'ikyan and A. Mnac'akanyan (eds.), C'uc'ak Jeragrac' Maštoc'i anvan Matenadarani, vol. 1, Erevan: 1965. The latter has only 23-24 lines of writing, since the scribe would have required extra space for the Eusebian canons below.

⁸ Loc. cit. note 5.

⁹ A. Renoux (ed.), Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121, PO 36, fasc. 2, Turnhout:1971, pp. 235, 303. This is paralleled by the later Georgian evidence. See M. Tarchnischvili (ed.), Le grand lectionnaire de l'église de Jérusalem, CSCO vol. 205, Louvain:1960, p. 126.

¹⁰ The introduction of the full Bible in Armenian is credited to Nerses Lambronac'i (1153-1198).
See S. P. Cowe, "A Typology of Armenian Biblical Manuscripts", REA N.S. 18 (1984), p. 57.

¹¹ Thus Matenadaran Ms no. 10175 (14th cent.) contains Wisdom, Job, 1-4 Kingdoms and 1 Chronicles, while no. 2113 (1691 A.D.) comprises Isaiah, Job and Sirach.

¹² On this hypothesis the original manuscript would have run to c. 150 folios. Another possible type might be as second half of the Old Testament including the prophets and perhaps the Psalter, but this is less likely because of its unwieldy size. See Cowe, "A Typology", p. 60.

uncial script (bolorgic erkat'agir). More detailed analysis reveals certain characteristic traits. Fortunately, the folio offers an almost complete alphabetical range: only the 6 (recto, col. 1, 1. 14) is obscured. Generally, the horizontal bars at the middle or base of letters are straight and show no signs of the later tendency to slope downwards (e.g. μ , η , μ , λ , λ , λ , λ , λ). Sometimes these contrast notably in this respect with the Lazarean Gospels (Matenadaran, no. 6200, A.D. 887), the oldest dated Armenian manuscript and hence often utilized as a basis for comparison 13. See in particular p (verso, col. 2, 1. 9) 1, η , \hat{u} and the steep incline on the corresponding form in the gospelbook. Other letters betray distinctly early features. The 4 has a scarcely recognizable "neck" at the base and its horizontal bar lies just below the line. The maintains a fairly large upper loop, the ρ has no curves on the crossbar and the left stroke of the 4 reaches only to the upper line and not beyond, though the lower extends below the bottom line. In other instances the folio approximates more closely to the gospelbook e.g. w, b with a very small loop and >. The letter , has developed a "beak" at the upper extremity, but this is not yet very pronounced. The above factors suggest it antedates the Lazarean manuscript, while at the same time postdating certain other published fragments, thus indicating an 8th century dating to be a reasonable appraisal.

In the transcription which follows the early punctuation of the manuscript by a simple period (*) has been retained. Word separation has been introduced and hyphens added to indicate word-break at the end of lines. Letters written above or below the main text at that point in the line have been incorporated as being part of normal scribal practice ¹⁴. Reconstructions, where these are fairly assured, appear in square brackets, while (...) denotes illegible portions of text. In the apparatus appended to each column the lemma derives from Zohrab's edition (Z) ¹⁵, substantive variants of the fragment are noted and agreements cited with readings in Zohrab's apparatus (Zap) ¹⁶ as well as from the Erznka Bible (Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem no. 1925, A.D. 1267) which has consistently preserved a relatively good early text form ¹⁷.

¹³ The evidence is most conveniently set out in tabular form by A. G. Abrahamyan in Hayoc' gir ew grč'ut'yun, Erevan:1973. For a facsimile of the Lazarean Gospels see G. Xalat'eanc' (ed.), Évangile traduit en langue arménienne ancienne et écrit en l'an 887 Edition phototypique du Ms. de l'Institut Lazareff des langues orientales, Moscow:1899.

¹⁴ At other points they have been retained in situ as they probably result from lapsus calami.

¹⁵ H. Zohrapean (ed.), Astuacašunč' matean hin ew nor ktakaranac' Venice, S. Lazar:1805.

¹⁶ For the manuscripts at Zohrab's disposal and his method of citation in the apparatus see S. P. Cowe, "The Armenian Version of Daniel Diplomatic Edition and Investigation of its Textual Affinities" (Ph.D. thesis submitted to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983), pp. 400-402.

¹⁷ It was assigned to the first textual group in 1 Samuel by B. Johnson in J. Schreiner (ed.), Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch, a Festschrift for Joseph Ziegler, "Fünf armenische Bibelhandschriften aus Erevan", Würzburg: 1972. In Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs it was allocated to the

Henrymis การเการ์การ์การการการ HE GOLSHINE THE THE WEISPULUELLUW WYLUUT 431.260 m-604-ru300. 3045. Angellachten THE CRUSTUSTUSTUSTER QUITHIHITE TO THE TEUT SAFEFURTIFE BOSTULE SHUS-ET-STARUFHE LASI Ururhouture 9kft-9ft ara-craisuruss repersuestuf EUL9 FUTHURET SEISHULL " SELTIFICE GERULLUZELIE SINAI Armenian 34

second sub-group of Group Alpha. See M.E. Stone, "The Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Selection of Manuscripts", Sion 49 (1975), pp. 207-214. In Deuteronomy it was classed in group al. See C.E. Cox, The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 2, Chico:1981, p. 55. In Daniel it adduced a rather more developed text and was accordingly ascribed to the Cl group. See Cowe, "Armenian Daniel", pp. 25-26. However, in Ruth its text was found to be one of the purest and was therefore once again assigned to group Al. See S.P. Cowe, "The Armenian Version of Ruth and its Textual Affinities", N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporanea, Madrid:1985, p. 190. In a paper entitled "Text Forms and Stemmatics in the Armenian Text of Job" which was circulated at the workshop "Priorities, Problems and Techniques of Text Editions" in Sandbjerg, Denmark, 1989, C.E. Cox noted the suitability of the Erznka Bible to be the base text of an edition of the Armenian version of Job.

recto col. 1

այն ինչ զոր Հրամայեսցէ
նոցա • սոքա կարգեալ են առ
ի նմանէ ի վերայ երկրի» ե
« Թե ի խրատել և եԹե յերկիր

5 » իւր • եԹե յողորմուԹիւն
գտցէ զնա ունկ դիր այսմիկ
յովբ • կաց և խրատեաց զրզաւրուԹիւն տն • գիտեմք
զի ած եղ զգորս իւր • լոյս

10 արար ի խաւարէ • գիտէ զքննուԹիւն ամպոյ • արՀաւիրք են յանցանք չարագործաց • և քո Ջերմ պատմուծան Հանդարտեայ կայ ի վե-

37:13 խրտան խրտան 1:8 1.4 | յերկեւ q^{19}] յերկիր իւր II. 4-5 Zap "some" = G գտցեն] գտց f 1.6 Zap "some" J1925 = G 15 խտարի] pr f Zap "many"; f խտարի f 1.10 J1925 = G 16 տնպոց] -պոյ 1.11.

recto col. 2

ի վերայ այսոցի մեծ են փառք · և ոչ գտանեն զայղ ոք նմանող զաւրուԹեան նորա · որ զար դառնի ոչ Համարիցիս լսել նմա · վասն որոյ երկիցեն ի նմանէ մարդիկ · երկիցեն ի նմանէ իմաս-

¹⁸ Possibly the result of "dittography" of the following cf. G εἰς παιδείαν. See plate 1.

¹⁹ Z's secondary reading appears an adaptation to context, being visually similar to the variant with Greek support and semantically parallel to μημωπ and πηπηδηιβήι. ...

տունք սրտիւք : յետ դադարե-10 [լոյ] եղիուսայ ի խաւսիցն աս [է տր] ցյ[ովբ] ի մ․․․է և յամպոյ: Ո՞է ՝ դա որ Թաքուցանէ յինէն զխոՀուրդս Ժողովեալ զբանս սրտի ※ և Համա-

37:23 գտանենք] -նեն l. 3 | 38:1 խստելոյ] խտակիցն l. 10 Zap "some"; tr ante եղիուսա J1925 cf. G 2 h] om l. 14.

verso col. 1

Հրշտակք իմ գովեցին • փակեցի զծով դրամբք • յոր-Ժամ ծնաւ յորովայնէ մաւ իւրոյ ելանել • եդի նմա 5 զմէգ ի Հանդերձ • և զմառախուղ նմա ի խանձարուրս եդի նմա սաՀմանս • եդեալ փականս և դրունս ... և ասացի ցայդ վայր եկեսցես և մի 10 անցանիցես • այղ անդէ (?) ն ի քեզ խորտակեսցին ալիք քո • Թե առ քև կարգեցի գրլոյսն առաւտին • արաւսեակն ետես գկարգ իւր • Հաս-

38:11 init. pr և l. 8 | այլ 20 1°] om l. 9 J1925 = G | այդրէն] անդ. l. 9 Zap "nonnulli" | 12 եթէ] թե l. $^{12^{21}}$

²⁰ A typical case of secondary expansion in Z, perhaps partly influenced by the presence of wyl (fulfilling another syntactic role later in the sentence).

²¹ Undoubtedly one of the most common minor variants in Armenian manuscripts.



col. 2

լայնութ ... առ ի ներքոյ
... իցս • աղեա պատմեա ինձ
որչափ իցէ • զինչ երկիր իցէ
յորում լոյսն ագանիցի կամ
գինչ տեղի խաւարի • տանիցիս զիս ի սաՀմանս նոցա
※ եթե խելամուտ իցես չաւ※ ղաց նոցա • թերեւս գիտիցես
և ընդ այն ժամանակս իսկ
ծնեալ իցես • և Թիւ աւուրց
քոց բազում իցէ • երթեալ
յի չտեմարանս ձիան • և
զգանձս կարկտի տեսեալ ի-

ցէ · Համբարեալ կաց բեզ(?)

38:22 fightu 1°] om 1. 12 J1925 | fightu 2°] fight 1. 14 J1925 23 fillingt 1 fillingt 1. 1422.

As the corrections indicate, the scribe had not taken special care in his assignment. Thus he amended the forms qqnpu (recto, col. 1, 1.9) and w_jungh (recto, col. 2, 1.1) by infralinear additions and reconstituted above the line the second part of the lexeme $qwpqwp\hat{u}$ which had been omitted through parablepsis by homoeoarcton. Similarly he completed the conjunctive form qwggh (verso, col. 2, 1.14) which he may at first have mistaken for the imperative (cf. recto, col. 1, 1.7). As he did not intervene to rectify a series of other minuses, one cannot distinguish categorically whether these derive from the copyist or his exemplar viz. the non-representation of h at recto, col. 2, 1.14, omission of the final letter of uup (verso, col. 1, 1.3) and haplography in $uunumh\hat{u}$ (verso, col. 2, 1.13) cf. $uununumh\hat{u}$. Neither can one definitely ascribe to him the origin of the singular $uunumh\hat{u}$ (recto, col. 1, 1.11) and the idiosyncratic reinforcement of h by its consonantal equivalent f (verso, col. 2, 1.12). Nevertheless, bearing in mind the extent of Greek support its text

²² Variation between the present and agrist forms of the conjunctive is regular in manuscripts. The present case is complicated further by the similarity of l and q in uncial script.

²³ Among the most recent systematic studies in this field was a paper at the Sandbjerg Workshop (see note 17) by J. J. S. Weitenberg entitled "Linguistic and dialectal features of text edition".

²⁴ For the variation see A. Meillet, Altarmenisches Elementarbuch, Heidelberg:1913, p. 13.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 200.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 194. For the view that Δρ₂μπμ is a later and mainly dialectal form see H. Ačaryan, Hayeren armatakan bararan, vol. 3, Erevan:1977, p. 135.

²⁷ See discussion in Ačaryan, armatakan bararan, vol. 1, 1971, p. 333. Here J1925 witnesses the developed form шршиныц.

²⁸ The variant derives from the second form of the root funct. For parallel dialectal forms see *ibid.*, vol. 2, 1973, p. 409.

²⁹ Here J1925 reads the composite form δ/μωω.

enjoys over against Z, our overall textcritical assessment must be that the fragment represents a defective copy of a fundamentally sound tradition. In company with J1925 it once again highlights the secondary character of many of the readings in the base manuscript of Zohrab's edition (Venice Mkhitarist Collection no. 1508, A.D. 1319).

The folio, as one of the earliest witnesses to the Armenian text of Job, is also important for the hexaplaric signs it has preserved. Like MS 33³⁰ of Zeyt'unyan's listing ³¹ (Venice Mkhitarist Collection no. 841, 13th cent.), it evinces a metobelus (:) after 37:12c (recto, col. 1, 1. 2). Judging from this, it is very likely that an asterisk stood in the left margin of 1. 1 to mark the beginning of the passage which has since been removed to accommodate the folio to function as a flyleaf in another manuscript. The folio supports J1925 in adducing an asterisk before v. 13 (col. 1, 1. 3) and closes the passage with a metobelus (col. 1, 1. 6). The accuracy of both these cases is corroborated by Greek evidence ³². Another asterisk occurs at 38:2b (recto, col. 2, 1. 14) in agreement with MS 102mg of Zeyt'unyan (Jerusalem Armenian Patriarchate no. 297, 15th cent.). However, Ziegler notes in this instance the Syrohexapla, the most reliable witness to Origen's activity, reads an obelus instead ³³. A final set of asterisks and metobelus appears at v. 20b (verso, col. 2, ll. 7-8), but lacks any outside confirmation.

Although the folio rests at Sinai, that is no guarantee of its ultimate provenance. St. Catherine's is still a popular pilgrim centre and there is much evidence both historical and epigraphic testifying to the arrival of groups from Armenia³⁴. In fact Anastasius Sinaita mentions this as a regular occurrence³⁵. Moreover, pilgrim dedication in the middle ages played an important role in enriching the holdings of the Armenian patriarchal library of Sts. James in Jerusalem. However, the normal donation would have been a gospelbook which, depending on the donor's financial circumstances, might be illuminated and bound in precious metal. Also Sts. James was an Arme-

³⁰ C. E. Cox, Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 21, Atlanta:1986.

³¹ A. Zeyt'unyan, "Astuacašunč'i hayeren t'argmanut'yan jeragrakan miavorneri dasakargman masin", *Banber Matenadarani* 12 (1977), pp. 295-304.

³² J. Ziegler (ed.), *Iob*, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum vol. xi, 4. Göttingen:1982, pp. 380-381.

³³ Ibid., p. 383.

³⁴ For details see S.P. Cowe, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem by the Eastern Churches", L. Kriss-Rettenbeck and G. Möhler (eds.), Wallfahrt kennt keine Grenzen, Munich:1984, pp. 316-330 and especially M. E. Stone, The Armenian Inscriptions from the Sinai, Cambridge, Mass.:1982.

³⁵ F. Nau (ed.), "Le texte grec des recits du moine Anastase sur les saints pères du Sinai", OrChr 2 (1902), § xxxviii, p. 81: "Εθος ἐστὶν 'Αρμενίοις καθὼς πάντες ἐπίστανται, τοῦ εἰσέρχεσθαι συχνῶς εἰς τὸ ἀγιον ὅρος τοῦ Σινᾶ. The chapter is devoted to the visit of a company of 800 pilgrims noteworthy for the miraculous events that accompanied it.

nian foundation from which their various shrines at the holy places could be administered, whereas available information regarding Armenian membership of St. Catherine's brotherhood is very vague.

There are a number of references to isolated hermits scattered throughout the surrounding region. A disciple Sergius is mentioned in the mid sixth century 36 and several others in the following. Vahan, a general under Heraclius in disgrace after the battle of Yarmuk, fled for refuge there 37 and an Abba Kosmas emerges from Anastasius' account, living fifteen miles distant from the main complex 38. The nearest we get to the *coenobium* itself is in the person of Elissaios, a deacon at the church on the peak of Mt. Moses 39.

Nevertheless, Sinai was in regular contact with the more northerly monasteries of Palestine and there we have firm evidence of Armenian communities of monks settled in the *coenobium* of St. Theodosius and *laura* of St. Sabas. A member of the latter was, indeed, a prime informant of the saint's biographer. In both cases the congregations were large enough to warrant their own place of worship in their own language⁴⁰. Both centres were international and Mar Saba in particular became noted for its literary creativity in Greek⁴¹, Arabic⁴² and Georgian⁴³, the last notably in the period from the eighth to tenth centuries. Even if Blake's overall scenario of the decline in this activity is no longer tenable, it is significant that several of the oldest manuscripts in the Sinai collection derive from Mar Saba⁴⁴. Indeed, we are in a position to trace the southerly movements of some of those scribes, such as the Georgian Ioane Zosime who, after some years' writing in the Judaean Desert where he produced his Palestino-Georgian calendar⁴⁵, appears in Sinai during the

³⁶ D.J. Chitty, The Desert a City, Oxford:1966, p. 169.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 175.

³⁸ Nau, "Le texte grec", § xxxi, p. 78.

³⁹ Ibid., § xxxvii, p. 81.

⁴⁰ See inter alia A. J. Festugière, O.P. (trans), Les moines d'orient, vol. 111/1, Paris:1962, pp. 32, 43-45 for Cyril of Scythopolis' Life of St. Sabas and vol. 111/3, 1963, p. 127 for Theodore of Petra's Life of St. Theodosius.

⁴¹ See E. Ehrhard, "Das griechische Kloster Mar Saba in Palästina", Römische Quartalschrift 7 (1893), pp. 32-79 and S. Vailhé, "Les écrivains de Mar-Saba", Echos d'Orient 2 (1899), pp. 1-11; 33-47.

⁴² S.H. Griffith, "Greek into Arabic: Life and Letters in the Monasteries of Palestine in the Ninth Century; the Example of the Summa Theologiae Arabica", *Byzantion* lvi (1986), pp. 117-138 and the literature cited there.

⁴³ G. Peradze, "An Account of the Georgian Monks and Monasteries in Palestine", *Georgica* 4-5 (1937), pp. 181-246.

⁴⁴ R. P. Blake, "La littérature grecque en Palestine", Le Muséon 78 (1965), pp. 377-378.

⁴⁵ G. Garitte, Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (x siècle), subsidia hagiographica, vol. 30, Brussels:1958.

years 973-986⁴⁶. This traffic in copyists and codices might thus plausibly account for the folio's presence at St. Catherine's.

The fact that the manuscript to which it belonged does not seem to have survived there would therefore be explicable in terms of its lack of utility for the brotherhood in the absence of a regular Armenian contingent. In the above-mentioned Armenian manuscripts of the sapiential books Job not infrequently occupies final position and our folio, coming as it does at the end of the work, would be at most risk of dislocation and loss. At that point it might have been pressed into service to prolong the life of other works held in higher esteem, in parallel to the widespread medieval practice of architectural re-use of masonry.

Paucity of writing material at Sinai also explains the large number of palimpsests: materials in languages no longer comprehended provided an ideal opportunity. Hence, it is not inconceivable that other parts of the manuscript in question suffered the fate of one now in the possession of the University of Graz⁴⁷. This tenth century Georgian Psalter is composed of portions of at least eight manuscripts, the underscript of one of these being the Gospel of John in Armenian, paleographically dated to the eighth-ninth century. A Sinai provenance would not be inappropriate for a few palimpsests in German libraries. The monastery at Beuron owns eleven folios from an Armenian manuscript of the Pauline Epistles paleographically dated to the seventh-eighth centuries with a tenth century Arabic upper text containing a homily attributed to St. Chrysostom⁴⁸. Even more convincing is the case of two fragments in the Adam, Goslar collection where the Armenian text of Chrysostom's Psalter commentary dated c. 700 underlies an early Syriac Melkite paraklētikē in estrangelo⁴⁹. A systematic study of the many other palimpsests still in situ at St. Catherine's might reveal further instances 50. A similar likelihood of Sinaitic or at least Palestinian origin applies to a palimpsest in the Mingana Collection of Birmingham. The upper script is an early kufic hand dated c. 850 under which is discerned a portion of the Armenian version of Hebrews not incompatible with a pre-ninth century dating 51.

⁴⁶ Id., "Une édition commentée du calendrier palestino-géorgien de Jean Zosime", BK 30-31 (1958), pp. 18-20.

⁴⁷ See A. Šanije, "Kart'uli helnacerebi Grac'ši", Tp'ilisis universitetis moambe 9 (1929), pp. 310-353.

⁴⁸ J. Assfalg and J. Molitor (eds.), Armenische Handschriften (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland), Wiesbaden:1962, pp. 114-116.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. xii, 117-120.

⁵⁰ Clark, Checklist of Manuscripts, p. viii.

⁵¹ The folio in question is Mingana Chr. Arab. Add. 124: see A. Mingana, Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts, vol. 111, Cambridge:1939, p. 20, no. 166. In the introduc-

134 Cowe

Not only did the Library of Congress project uncover the Armenian parchment leaf, but led to the edition and publication of compositions translated from Armenian, on the basis of witnesses from Sinai. These texts may have reached the monastery by the means outlined above. Significantly, they are all Chalcedonian in tenor and virulently opposed to the 'national' Armenian church. Because of the relative paucity of information concerning the ideals and aspirations of the minority Armenian movement which engendered them, these documents are of particular value. With the demise of a social group committed to their preservation, the originals have largely disappeared 52, however a Greek rendition of six items is extant in miscellany MS 1699 (14th cent.). Of these one of the most influential, though at first sight perhaps rather unexpected, is the Vision of St. Sahak excerpted from Łazar P'arpec'i's history (I, 16-17)⁵³. In it the hierarch, last primate of the Gregorid house of Armenia, relates a strange spectacle he witnessed in his youth at the church in Valaršapat and the interpretation of its symbolism vouchsafed him by an angel. The essence of the latter is that though many of his successors will be unworthy, the primacy will ultimately revert to a scion of his family who will restore its values. At the same time, the monarchy would return to the Arsacid dynasty which had been overthrown in 428.

The Greek text seems to have been known to Constantine Porphyrogenitus who applied the final 'prophecy' to his grandfather, Basil I, claiming Arsacid ancestry ⁵⁴. However, reapplications of the ecclesiastical predictions are far more common. The continuator of T'ovma Arcruni records its adaptation to the consecration of Dawit' I as catholicos of Alt'amar in the 14th cent. ⁵⁵, while T'ovma Mecop'ec'i refers it even more triumphantly to the accession of Kirakos Virapec'i in 1441, which re-established the line of the catholicate at

tion it is specifically stated that several of the items came from Sinai and Palestine. For the text of the underscript see S. Brock, "An Early Armenian Palimpsest Fragment of Hebrews", *REA* N.S. 2 (1965), pp. 129-134. A Sinai or Palestinian provenance is also likely for two further Armenian fragments: see R.P. Blake, "Catalogue of the Georgian Manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library", *Harvard Theological Review* xxv (1932), pp. 207, 224. The folios in question were acquired with a number of Georgian fragments from Tischendorf in 1876.

⁵² Similarly, although Gregory Pacurian arranged for the typicon of the monastery he founded at Bačkovo to be available in Greek, Georgian and Armenian, presumably with the decline of the Armenian Chalcedonian community there, their version of the rule also disappeared. That Gregory himself, though an adherent of the orthodoxy of the Empire, was ethnically Armenian is highly likely from the fact that he appended his signature to the work in Armenian characters. See L. Petit, Typicon de Grégoire Pacourianos pour le monastère de Petritzos, Visantiiskij Vremennik, xi (1904), suppl. 1.

⁵³ G. Garitte, "La vision de S. Sahak en grec", Le muséon 71 (1958), pp. 255-278.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 256, note 10.

⁵⁵ N. Akinian, "K'nnut'iwn teslean S. Sahakay", Handes Amsoreay 50 (1936), col. 477.

Ejmiacin ⁵⁶. In the centuries immediately preceding it had been located in Cilician Armenia and its environs, much to the frustration of eastern clerics, wary of its latinophile tendencies there. Despite supreme authority now being vested in the East, a catholicos with a much more restricted jurisdiction continued to reside in the old Cilician capital of Sis.

It is clear the vision performed an even more intensely ideological function for Chalcedonians, circulating not only in Greek, but in Georgian also ⁵⁷. Moreover, the persona of St. Sahak was so cultivated it gave rise to two later Greek invectives ⁵⁸, of which the second was also translated into Georgian and incorporated into the *Dogmatikon* of Arsen Iqalt oeli (11th-12th cents.) ⁵⁹. From extracts like the following one can easily see how Armenian Chalcedonians might have used the text to their own advantage to impugn the validity of ordination in the 'national' church and the moral integrity of their prelates:

«γνῶθι ὅτι καθέζεσθαι μέλλουσί τινες ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ άγίου Γρηγορίου, οἵτινες οὐ κατὰ τὴν πρόσταξιν τῶν άγίων ἀποστόλων οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς άγίας συνόδου τῶν άγίων τιη πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαία χειροτονοῦνται εἰς τὴν οὐράνιον διακονίαν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ κόσμου ἐκτείνονται μετὰ ἀναιδείας, οἵτινές εἰσι φιλάργυροι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι»⁶⁰.

In his detailed, but unfortunately incomplete study of the vision and its relation to Łazar's first book (druag)⁶¹ Akinian argues plausibly that the former's substratum exhibits pronounced affinities with the predictions of the chorepiscopus Daniel and the vision of the future primate Yusik included in the epic histories of P'awstos⁶². The angel's generalizing interpretation to Yusik has been understood to refer to the period of office of his grandson Nersēs (c. 353-373), the main hero of P'awstos' account. This too was to be followed by a series of undeserving candidates who are presumably to be

⁵⁶ Ibid., col. 478.

⁵⁷ L. Melik'set'-Bek, "K'art'uli versia Sahak Part'elis cinascar-metqvelobisa", *Tp'ilisis Universitetis Moambe* (1922-1923), pp. 223-260.

⁵⁸ For the first see "Sancti Patris Nostri Isaaci ... Oratio invectiva adversus Armenios", PG 132, coll. 1155-1218 and the second "Sancti Isaaci Oratio Invectiva adversus male sentientes ac haereticos Armenios", ibid., coll. 1217-1238.

⁵⁹ For a critical edition of the text see Z. Alek'sidze, "Arsen Vač'esdze 'Dogmatikonši' šesuli antimonop'izituri traktati da misi gamojahili somhur mcerlobaši", *Mravaltavi* 1 (1971), pp. 146-157.

⁶⁰ Garitte, "Vision de S. Sahak", p. 273.

⁶¹ N. Akinian, Tesil s. Sahakay. Matenagrakan-patmakan k'nnut'iwn, Vienna, Mkhitarist Press:1948. On the basis of the author's notes Fr. P. Tēr-Poghossian pursued the line of argument in a series of articles under the general heading "Matenagrakan hetazōtut'iwnner Łazar P'arpec'i", in Handēs Amsōreay 86 (1972), coll. 257-272, 385-414; 87 (1973), coll. 1-22, 129-154, 257-286.

⁶² See N. G. Garsoïan (trans.), *The Epic Histories attributed to P'awstos Buzand*, Cambridge, Mass.:1989. Yusik's vision is found in 3,v (pp. 70-72) and Daniel's prediction in 3,xiv (pp. 88-90).

136 Cowe

identified with those intervening between Nersēs and his son Sahak. They are discredited in the sources not only for their un-Gregorid lineage, but more importantly, because their consecration was arranged locally and not at the hands of the bishop of Caesarea. The upshot of this, according to P'awstos, is that they lost the right to ordain suffragan bishops for their jurisdiction ⁶³.

In its present form, it is arguable that St. Sahak's vision adumbrates the ecclesiastical oversight of Surmak, Brk'išo and Šamuēl, all of whom were appointees of the Persian King, the last two being Syrian, as indicated by their names 64. Hence, being consecrated in Armenia without reference to Caesarea, they would have transgressed the fourth canon of Nicaea whereby: τὸ δὲ κῦρος τῶν γινομένων [προσῆκεν] δίδοσθαι καθ'ξκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτη 65. According to Łazar, the Syrian prelates also infringed the third canon by indecorously consorting with women in their households 66. Consequently, though not lineally descended from Sahak, the accession of his pupil, the martyr Yovsep' could certainly be acclaimed as a reaffirmation of his principles and programme for church government. Meanwhile, the investiture of Vahan Mamikonean as marzpan in 485 might serve as a realization of the prophecy concerning the restoration of the Arsacids, since he was related to the dynasty through his mother, Sahak's daughter. In this way the vision, coming as it does towards the end Łazar's first book, highlights some of the most important themes of the two subsequent parts 67.

63 Ibid., 5, xxix (pp. 219-211) and the commentary ad loc.

65 C. H. Hefele (ed. and trans.), Histoire des conciles, Paris, Letouzey et Ané, vol. 1: 1907, p. 539. As one might expect, the Armenian form of this regulation has been adapted to later usage, viz. ημωπηρίδ և ηγδηρίδ ημμωπηρίδ ωρθωδ ξ ωω, ωμυρδρίδ μωθηηρίμησηδ. See V. Hakobyan,

Kanonagirk' hayoc', Erevan:1964, p. 119.

66 G. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean and S. Malxasean (eds.), Łazaray P'arpec'woy Patmut'iwn Hayoc', Tiflis: 1904, p. 26.

67 At the same time, it must be admitted that the vision's texture is rather complex and had clearly undergone certain changes in formulation before the earliest complete manuscript of the history, which is dated 1672. That this is true of other parts of the work has been

⁶⁴ In contrast, Ter-Poghossian (Handes Amsōreay 87 (1973), coll. 15-22) represents Akinian as denying the historicity of this episode, claiming that Sahak had not been ousted in 428, but had fulfilled his normal duties until his death some ten years later. He supports the view by argumentum ex silentio, namely that Koriwn, writing in the 440's makes no mention of any such disruption. However, apart from the usual panegyrical tone the hagiographer maintains, it is generally accepted that he presents the official view of events current in the circle of disciples of Sahak and Maštoc' which would necessitate glossing over a number of delicate issues. Similarly, the doctrinal correspondence from Proclus and Acacius of Melitene cannot provide conclusive proof of Sahak's official status at the time, since the letters themselves (as opposed to the titles which must derive from the compiler of the collection) give no indication of rank (see Girk' T'lt'oc', Tiflis, Rōtineanc 4 and Šaracē:1901, pp. 1-8, 14-15). Nor can the unanimity of the nobles with Sahak's ecclesiastical ordinances in the introduction to the canons of the Council of Šahapivan (c. 444) be taken as a guage of contemporary opinion since this also derives from a later period. In fact Akinian is inclined to date the prologue to the eighth century (Handēs Amsōreay 50 (1936), col. 471).

The vision was known to the compiler of a list of Armenian catholicoi from St. Gregory to Sahak III Joraporec'i (678-c. 705) the Greek translation of which is also found in Sinai MS 1699⁶⁸. Indeed, whereas many of the incumbents are summarily dealt with simply by name, origin and length of tenure, the description of Sahak I's primacy and its aftermath forms the work's first climax. The author underlines the transformation in orientation from Caesarea to Iran and subsequent necessity of ratifying candidates for consecration with the šah. For him the move constituted a serious breach with the traditions of St. Gregory and the other early Armenian Fathers which, instead of being healed, had been permitted to deteriorate further.

That basic premise informs another, more familiar composition contained in the same Sinai manuscript, the *Diēgēsis*, better known as the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*⁶⁹. Approximately contemporary with the preceding list and reviewing a similar historical span, this Greek abridgement of a longer Armenian original ⁷⁰ sets out to chart how the 'national' church fell into schism and upheld this position despite repeated Byzantine attempts at reconciliation. Armenian participation at the Council of Nicaea in the person of Aristakēs, son of St. Gregory, is the first historical datum to be noted,

decisively demonstrated by the publication of uncial fragments by P. Muradyan and K. Yuzbašyan in "Łazar P'arpec'u norahayt patarike", Banber Matenadarani 11 (1973), pp. 7-32. Nevertheless, Akinian's attempt to distinguish three redactors involved in the process, the last of whom flourished in the eighth century, is insufficiently substantiated. Obviously, the Greek version, which seems to have been produced by Armenian Chalcedonians, is destined to play a valuable role in the textual criticism of the passage. For example, Akinian regards the reference to the trisagion "h qUnipp Цишпишди hpqthu" (Patmut'iwn hayoc', p. 30) as the interpolation of the second redactor whom he would place in the sixth or seventh century. He justifies this by positing the Armenian adopted it from the Syrians with Peter the Fuller's addition of 481 and that the practice is first documented in the Syrians' letter to Catholicos Nerses II in the mid sixth century (Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 53). On the one hand, Cyril of Scythopolis mentions that when the Armenian community at Mar Saba first took possession of the 'Godbuilt' curch in 501 they sang the hymn in its original form and only at some later point appended the disputed addition (Les moines d'orient, vol. 111/2, p. 44). Consequently, it cannot be precluded that, had he so wished, Łazar himself (writing c. 500) could easily have inserted the item. More importantly, though, the phrase is absent from the Greek text as well as from the manuscripts of two Armenian editions of the vision, suggesting that it is the product of medieval copyists rather than an early redactor (see Garitte, "La vision de S. Sahak", p. 266).

68 For a description of the manuscript see B. N. Beneševič (ed.), Opisanie grečeskix rukopisei monastyrja svjatoi Ekateriny na Sina', tome 3, part 1, Petrograd:1917, pp. 160-161. For an edition of the work see G. Garitte, La Narratio de rebus Armeniae, CSCO subsidia 4, Louvain:1952, pp. 402-405. It is followed on p. 405 by list of Armenian "kings".

69 Garitte gives the variants of the Sinai codex in "Un nouveau manuscrit de la 'Narratio de rebus Armeniae' Le Sin. Gr. 1699", Le Muséon 71 (1958), pp. 243-251.

70 The second and third parts of the *Narratio* have in turn been further excerpted in a Georgian compilation (see note 160). In contrast, the history of the separation of the Armenian from the Georgian Church by Arsen Sap'areli generally offers a fuller witness to their common Armenian source that does the *Narratio*.

138 Cowe

symbolizing the country's full integration into the faith and order of the Catholic Church. While this had taken place ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου καὶ ἁγίου Κωνσταντίνου 71 , its undoing was caused τῆ προστάξει τῶν Περσῶν βασιλέως 72 , from which something of the author's political sympathies may be gleaned. The occasion for the transition is once again attributed to the deposition of St. Sahak and his replacement by Surmak who, in accepting this licence, typifies the presumption displayed by Persarmenian hierarchs thereafter (μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις τῆς αὐτοῦ χώρας) 73 .

For the compiler of the list of catholicoi, the second climax is provided by compounding schism with heresy in the condemnation of Chalcedonian Christology as Nestorian at the second Council of Duin in 555. In keeping with this, the Cyrilline doctrine of one nature after the union is re-affirmed and liturgically articulated by official adoption of Peter the Fuller's addition to the *trisagion*. Measures are taken to propagate the creed by the consecration of three monophysite bishops to serve in Mesopotamia. These meagre details are filled out by the *Narratio* which envisages the whole process as deriving from the initiative of certain Syrian Julianists who pleaded their case with the Armenians by appealing to the writings of Timothy Aelurus and Philoxenus of Mabbug. Subsequently, letters were sent to church leaders in the province of Siwnik' and neighbouring lands of Albania and Georgia to gain support for the new promulgations. However, the overtures were rejected as unwarranted innovations of the apostolic faith 74.

The clear implication is that before the above-mentioned council, the Caucasian nations, if not actively pro-Chalcedonian, were certainly not opposed. The assumption is stated explicitly in the list of catholicoi: π ερὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν σύνοδον τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι ... οὐδεμίαν ἀμφιβολίαν εἶχον ἕως τῆς συνόδου Τιβίν 75 . It appears that the view is in part determined by the writers' ecclesiology which did not allow for the possibility of error. Later developments have also been anticipated in order to depict the Armenians as totally isolated doctrinally. Significantly, after the council, the Armenian prelates begin to be described as heretics. In fact, Petros bishop of Siwnik' had been a signatory to its statement of concord 76 . However, at about that time Vahan, prince of the region, came to an agreement with the šah Khusrau I Anūšīrvān that his domain should no longer be considered administratively part of Armenia, but should be subsumed under the province of

⁷¹ Garitte, Narratio, § 1, p. 26.

⁷² Ibid., § 32, p. 30.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, § 33, p. 30.

⁷⁴ Ibid., § 60-88, pp. 34-38.

⁷⁵ Ibid., List of Catholicoi § 36, p. 404.

⁷⁶ Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 73.

Atrpatakan⁷⁷. The ensuing ecclesiastical corollary involved Petros' transfering obedience to the catholicos of Albania, a status his successors maintained until the time of the Armenian catholicos Abraham (c. 607-610)⁷⁸. One of those bishops named Vrt'anēs is chided for being in communion with Nestorians and Chalcedonians in a letter from catholicos Yovhannēs Gabelean (c. 557-574). The latter reminds him of the conciliar decisions and bids him put all such 'heretics' under ban and thus perpetuate the faith of St. Gregory unadulterated ⁷⁹.

The situation in Albania is similar. Catholicos Abas (552-596) was likewise recipient of an urgent missive from his Armenian counterpart outlining the dangerous spread of the same foul doctrines within his jurisdiction and requesting him to send some of his bishops for proper instruction against these perversions⁸⁰. The result, Movsēs Dasxuranc'i informs us⁸¹, was positive, leading to the expulsion of some of the 'false' teachers, including a certain T'ovmas. He emerges soon afterwards in Jerusalem at the Monastery of Pand (which Anastas vardapet cites as an Albanian possession⁸²) and approaches Patriarch John IV (574-594) to remonstrate with his master from a Chalcedonian perspective. We are fortunate in that this valuable document survives⁸³, and judging from Albania's disaffection until into the next century we may deduce it was not without effect.

The Narratio's particularly forceful (and rhetorically appropriate) Georgian response to Armenian overtures also presents a falsely monolithic semblance in a period of major political and ecclesiastical upheavals. Political vicissitudes continually led to violent shifts in ecclesiastical affiliation. First the Georgians rendered assistance to Vardan Mamikonean III in his revolt against Iran in 572. But in defeat their kingdom fell into abeyance and they were subject to a Persian marzpan. In the next decade they joined Maurice's alliance and

⁷⁷ G.V. Abgaryan (ed.), *Patmut'iwn Sebēosi*, Erevan:1979, § viii, pp. 67-68 and note 135, pp. 232-233. During the Armenian revolt against the Persians in 572 P'ilipos, prince of Siwnik' fought on the Persian side. The province reverted to its previous status after the fall of the Sasanian dynasty. Already at the first conclave of bishops called by Smbat, *marzpan* of Hrcania c. 607 we find K'ristap'or, bishop of Siwnik' in attendance (*Girk' T'It'oc'*, p. 146).

⁷⁸ Part of the reunion settlement included extending the bounds of the diocese of Siwnik' and elevating its status to metropolitan see.

⁷⁹ Girk' T'lt'oc', pp. 78-80.

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 81-84.

⁸¹ C. J. F. Dowsett (trans.), The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movses Dasxuranc'i, London:1961, 2, viii, p. 75.

⁸² A.K. Sanjian, "Anastas Vardapet's list of Armenian Monasteries in Seventh-Century Jerusalem: A Critical Examination", *Le Muséon* 82 (1969), p. 269.

⁸³ K. Tēr-Mtrtč'ean (ed.), "Erusałēmi Yovhannēs episkoposi t'ult'erē ar Abas Aluanic' kat'ulikos", Ararat (1896), pp. 252-256. For a latin translation see A. Vardanian, "Des Johannes von Jerusalem Brief an den albanischen Katholikos Abas", OrChr N.S. 11 (1912), pp. 64-77.

140 Cowe

sought him to grant them an indigenous monarch. However, by the end of the century, King Stephen I had once more acknowledged Iranian suzerainty. Pilgrimage to the hermitage of St. Symeon Stylites the Younger (c. 518-592) at the Mons Admirabilis probably offered stimulus to the propagation of Chalcedonian doctrine 84. So also, it has been argued, did the activities of the venerable 'thirteen holy fathers' of whom at least one, St. Abibos is portrayed in an early life as being in correspondence with the stylite 85. Ultimately, of course, it would encompass the severance of communion between the Armenian and Georgian churches at a later Council of Duin in 608/9.

What is much more striking, though, is the resounding silence in which the first Council of Duin is shrowded for apologetic purposes. Although the Narratio singles out Anastasius for criticism of his anti-dyophysite policies, it nevers mentions Zeno's henotikon nor the support it received in the East. For the council convened in 506 under the presidency of Catholicos Babgēn assembled Georgian and Albanian leaders to an unprecedented show of unity against the Persian Nestorians. After a full exposition of the creed to monophysite sympathizers in Iran, Babgēn proclaims dramatically: «quiju Lulum Znnnūp li ulip Zuijp li Uppe li Uppe

Equating the Nestorian understanding of Christ's human nature with Arius' Christology, he therefore appeals to Nicaea as an authority for the irreproachability of the Armenian position. Hence, alongside figures of ecumenical significance he cites «¿ρῦωη ζωյρ dեր Առիստակէս, զաւակն արդարուθեան սրբոյն Գրիգորի, և զՀայոց եղեալ սկիզբն և պատճառս աստուածային սիրոյն և Հաշտուθեան» 88.

84 For his impact on Georgia see W.Z. Djobadze, Materials for the Study of Georgian Monasteries in the Western Environs of Antioch on the Orontes (CSCO372, subsidia 48) Louvain:1976, pp. 64-66.

⁸⁵ For a recent re-investigation of the traditions see B. Martin-Hisard, "Les 'treize saints pères'. Formation et évolution d'une tradition hagiographique géorgienne (vi-xiie siècles)", Revue des études géorgiennes et caucasiennes (1985), pp. 141-168 and 2 (1986), pp. 75-111 where see pp. 76-80 for the translation of a seventh century life of St. Abibos. The more detailed analysis of the evolution of the texts, promised for vol. 3 of the journal, has not yet appeared.

⁸⁶ Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 45.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 48. In a letter of c. 604 to his Georgian counterpart, the Armenian catholicos Movses reminds him of the conciliar unity which existed between the two countries and the ground on which it rested: ի ժամանակա Կաւատայ արջայից արջայի խնդիր եղև քննուԹեան Հաւատոց. և Հոռոմբ զջաղկեղոնին ընկալան զՀաւատս. և մեր աչխարՀս և ձեր Հրաժարեցին և Հեռացան. և դեռ ևս գրով կայ և պաՀի մեր և ձեր միաբանուԹիւն Հաւատոյ. See Uxtanes episkopos, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, Vałarsapat, S. Kat'ołike Press:1871, 2, ii, p. 10. This is re-iterated in Vrt'anes K'erdoł's encyclical letter (*Girk' T'lt'oc'*, p. 130).

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 51.

Maintaining continuity with Nicaea (nuanced according to the point of view) was thus to become a fundamental tenet of both sides in the inner-Armenian doctrinal debate of the sixth and seventh centuries. In this case, it would appear there was no sudden policy reversal in the Caucasus to parallel Justin's accommodation of the pope. Contending principally against Nestorian proselytization from the South-East, the re-evaluation of Chalcedon there is likely to have been a slow, fitful process. So well informed on so many other facets of the ecclesiastical history of the time, the *Narratio* is judiciously mute on this issue.

Finally, however, under Maurice, a number of bishops changed allegiance and the Armenian Chalcedonian church came into being. Having aided Khusrau II Parvēz in overcoming the rebel Bahrām Chōbīn, the Emperor gained most of Armenia in return as far as the outskirts of Duin 89. Though not as zealous a proponent of Chalcedonianism as his cousin Domitian who made it a policy to eject monophysites from their churches and monasteries, he called a convocation of Armenian bishops at Constantinople. However, this was boycotted by the Persarmenian bishops under Catholicos Movsēs. Instead, we are informed from a letter of Yovhannēs Mayragomec'i 90 that they summoned a rival gathering at which they rejected all religious contact with the Byzantines. Consequently, when the Byzantine Armenian bishops returned from the capital, having partaken of communion with the Emperor, they were disowned by their co-religionists.

At this juncture the Armenian Chalcedonians took the intiative of establishing their own primate. At a further council held at Theodosiopolis under the aegis of the local bishop Theodore 91, they consecrated the stylite 92 Yovhannēs Bagaranc'i as anti-catholicos, who took up residence provocatively at Awan in the proximity of Duin. Catholicos Movsēs' inevitable response was non-recognition of the clergy Yovhannēs ordained. Thus, as the Narratio succinctly observes, πολλὴν δὲ ἔνστασιν εἶχον... μετ'ἀλλήλων... ἕως τῆς τελευτῆς Μαυρικίου καίσαρος 93. Already in his letter to Bishop Vrt'anēs of Siwnik' Catholicos Yovhannēs Gabelean had referred to Nestorians as anti-Christs 94. In this period of more flagrant antagonism apocalyptic language becomes increasingly common as, for example, in another Persarmenian epistologra-

⁸⁹ For a map of the precise lines of division between the two spheres of influence see P. Goubert, S.J., Byzance avant l'Islam, vol. 1, Paris:1951, end insert.

⁹⁰ See Dowsett, History of the Caucasian Albanians, II, 46, pp. 171-173.

⁹¹ G. Garitte, "Saint Théodore, évêque de Karin-Théodosiopolis (vie siècle)", Armeniaca, Venice, S. Lazar:1969, 1-8. This is patently the figure whom the Georgian excerpt of the Narratio adduces as the actual anti-catholicos.

⁹² The term siwnakan can also bear the more general designation of hermit.

⁹³ Garitte, Narratio, § 108, p. 41.

⁹⁴ Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 80.

pher's comment that wars and rumours of wars have constantly beset Rome since the promulgation of Leo's Tome⁹⁵.

As a corollary of this line of reasoning, the legitimacy of the Persarmenian catholicate was an obvious source of contention between the two ecclesiastical polities. It has been proposed that the origin of the title catholicos in Armenia is to be associated with Nersēs II and the second Council of Duin 98. Moreover, this position might seem to be supported by the usage of both the Narratio and the Girk Titoc. However, it is surely significant that the first occurrence of the term in the letter collection is found in a letter by the Syrian Abdišo to Nersēs some time prior to the council. The ordering of the following letters also suggests that the Syrian's episcopal consecration preceded the main assembly: Ananean has postulated it took place in 55199. In view of this, it is more likely Abdišo is simply observing the accepted nomenclature in styling Nerses \(\lumber \frac{\text{\text{Theor}}}{\text{\text{Theor}}} \)

Similarly, one must approach the *Narratio*'s data with some reserve since, although Nersēs II is first to be designated catholicos, there is a hiatus in the source of approximately a century from the tenure of Yovsēp' where the compiler deals exclusively with theological developments external to Armenia. That Yovsēp's office is referred to merely as ἐπισκοπή may be explained by

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 105.

⁹⁶ Łazar, Patmut'iwn hayoc', I, 17, p. 33.

⁹⁷ Garitte, "Vision de S. Sahak", p. 272. Even if one were to argue the longer text did not originate with the Armenian Chalcedonians, it is nevertheless understandable why they would have preserved this variant.

⁹⁸ M. van Esbroeck, "Un nouveau témoin du livre d'Agathange", REA N.S. 8 (1971), p. 143.

⁹⁹ P. Ananean, "Patmakan yišatakaran mě Duini II žołovk'i masin", *Bazmavēp* (1958), p. 66.

¹⁰⁰ Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 52.

the fact that he is closely affiliated to Sahak and his policies and hence the old order of things as well as by Łazar's comment on his status: «βξωξω և ηλειδωμηριωθεωδι πιῶξρ' υωμωρῦ μωθ πημηπιωθεωδι ξη վիδωμεωμωρωμωνων με μοθωθων με το link the catholicate with Armenia's autocephaly, then, for the compiler, this takes its origin from Surmak. It is surely noteworthy that though he does not explicitly use the term in that context, it may well be implicit; for his designation of bishops with the right to consecrate others as οἱ πρῶτοι αὐτῶν 103 bears a remarkable affinity to the gloss on catholicos in the Syriac abridgement of the life of St. Gregory (καρασία κ.) 104. Finally, we have to take into account the familiarity with the term on the part of P'awstos and Łazar, which implies it must have been current in the later fifth century 105.

Although at that stage the institution may have been accepted de facto, there are clear indications that in the second half of the following century moves were afoot to improve its de iure claim. As in the West, apostolicity became a secondary criterion for autocephaly. Its effect is visible on Yovhannes Gabelean's account of the foundations of Armenian church order, one of the pillars of which was unique Paphanphnu uppnju Gunqlinuh jungnaphi 106. This seems to represent a union of the northern "Hellenic" tradition of the Gregorids with the south-western "Syrian" background of much of P'awstos' source material 107. This is set forth more circumstantially in the abovementioned Syriac life of Gregory in which the saint's conception is located at Thaddeus' grave at Artaz.

Meanwhile, the Chalcedonian supporters of Yovhannes Bagaranc'i would have claimed descent from the mission of St. Bartholemew¹⁰⁸. Despite the subtle understatement in the *Narratio*'s passing reference to the apostle and the church he founded in what became Theodosiopolis, it clearly has propaganda value and must have played a vital role in justifying Byzantine Armenia's schismatic stance over against Duin. The verisimilitude of the altercation is enhanced by a parallel attempt at disengagement orchestrated by the Albanian clergy.

¹⁰¹ Garitte, Narratio, § 29, p. 30.

¹⁰² Łazar, Patmut'iwn hayoc', 2, 38, p. 71.

¹⁰³ Garitte, Narratio, § 31, p. 30.

¹⁰⁴ M. van Esbroeck, "Le résumé syriaque de l'Agathange", AnBoll 95 (1977), § 237, p. 344.

¹⁰⁵ See esp. Garsoïan, The Epic Histories, pp. 323, 537.

¹⁰⁶ Girk' T'It'oc', p. 78 and p. 189 for Catholicos Abraham's employment of the formula. See further Uxtanēs, Patmut'iwn Hayoc', 2, 63, 65, pp. 119, 121.

¹⁰⁷ See Garsoïan, *The Epic Histories*, pp. 411-412 where the commentator argues against interpreting the references to Thaddeus as later interpolations.

¹⁰⁸ M. van Esbroeck, "La naissance du culte de Saint Barthélémy en Arménie", REA N.S. 17 (1983), pp. 171-185.

The latter had been regarded as dependent on Armenia because according to tradition, their king Urnayr had sought St. Gregory to appoint a member of his family as their spiritual head 109. At this juncture, however, they advanced the view that they had been evangelized before the Armenians by a certain Ełišē/Ełiša, "one of the disciples of the Lord" who anticipated the Armenians also in founding a church 110. Relations remained severed into the first decade of the seventh century, so that their catholicate was not represented at the consecration of Catholicos Abraham c. 610. Later in his tenure (or under his successor Komitas as Arsen records) a reconciliation was effected through which the Albanian jurisdiction was augmented by seven bishoprics. At this point the foundation legends coalesced in such a fashion as to reconstitute Armenian pre-eminence. In this variant, Ełišē appears as Thaddeus' disciple who, upon his master's martyrdom at Artaz, returns to be ordained. Thereafter, he makes his way to Albania where he preaches in various regions until he meets his end at the hands of idolaters 111.

Another facet of the same issue of Persarmenian autocephaly debated at this period ¹¹² reflects the impact of Ps. Dionysian thought on canon law. In his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy ¹¹³ he distinguishes only two triads in the church viz. that of the teaching church (bishop, presbyter, deacon) and that of the church under instruction (monk, laity, catechumen-energumen-penitent). However, nine orders of clergy were subsequently enumerated as earthly antitypes of the angelic choirs of his Celestial Hierarchy ¹¹⁴. On either side of the former teaching triad were set the hierarchical (patriarch, archbishop, metropolitan) and unordained clerical orders (sub-deacon, clerk, reader). It was then queried whether the Armenian church satisfied these criteria. In the response which followed, the Albanian catholicos was assigned the degree of archbishop and the Georgian counterpart that of metropolitan. However, in consequence of the breakdown in relations between Abraham and Kiwrion, the latter's position devolved upon the bishop of Siwnik^c.

¹⁰⁹ Dowsett, The History of the Caucasian Albanians, p. 8.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 177. See also the reply of Catholicos Abraham castigating the Albanian bishop Mxit'ar of Amaras for various aberrant opinions. In addition to holding inappropriate views which might imply he was Chalcedonian, he is alleged to have stated that the Albanians are the equal of the Armenians because both were enlightened by apostles (2, 49, pp. 178-181). Moreover, Abraham explicitly mentions both Georgia and Albania were infected by Chalcedonianism in his encyclical (*Girk' T'It'oc'*, p. 193).

¹¹¹ Uxtanēs, Patmut'iwn Hayoc', 2, 65, p. 123. In a similar way, the south-western Syrian tradition of Armenia is subsumed to the northern at P'awstos III, 14 where the chorepiscopus Daniel is presented as a pupil of St. Gregory, Garsoïan (The Epic Histories, p. 367) believes this may be a later gloss.

¹¹² Ibid., 2, 63, p. 119.

¹¹³ S. Dionysius Areopagita, De ecclesiastica hierarchia, PG 3, coll. 369-584.

¹¹⁴ P. Hendrix (ed.), Pseudo-Dionysii Areopagitae De Caelesti Hierarchia, Leiden, Brill:1959.

Linked with the issue of liturgical orders is that of eucharistic practice, which further divided the two Armenian communities. In this regard the oftquoted quip of Catholicos Movses (οὐ μὴ φάγω φουρνιτάριον, οὐδ'οὐ μὴ πίω θερμόν) in rejecting Maurice's offer to attend a council in Constantinople is probably more profound than is usually imagined. Doubtless, he had in mind the example of his predecessor, Yovhannes Gabelean's compromised confession. Hence, presumably, he already perceived the divergent Byzantine usage of employing leavened bread and adding water to the eucharistic cup as symptoms of a more serious doctrinal disparity. The mixing of water and wine symbolized on one level the dogma of two natures after the union. Additionally, for Armenian Julianists the action conveyed the corruptibility of Christ's flesh until the resurrection; for later controversialists were to argue, the product of water in wine is vinegar, just as leavened bread gives rise to mould. Hence, the eighth canon of the Council of Duin presided over գգինին անապակ Հանել ի սուրբ սեղանն" (emphasis added) 115.

Significantly, another of the Greek writings (translated from an Armenian original) to find a place in Sinai MS no. 1699 is a short catena entitled Πρὸς τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας τὸ ἄγιον τῆς μυσταγωγίας ποτήριον κιρνώμενον ὕδατι¹¹⁶. As one might expect, the majority of the five citations derives directly from liturgical books. It is interesting that the anaphorae of St. James and St. Basil as utilized by the Persarmenian church lacked any mention of mixing the chalice, whereas the forms cited here are complete. Clearly, in entering into communion at Constantinople, the Byzantine Armenian bishops also accommodated their rite to the practice there and reformed their texts accordingly. At the same time, though small, the florilegium is indicative of the theological initiative of the Armenian compiler in selecting citations such as the one from Irenaeus' Adversus Haereses (V, 2, 2) and that of Athanasius' commentary on Ps. 74:9 which do not figure in Greek works of similar nature.

116 G. Garitte, "Un opuscule grec traduit de l'arménien sur l'addition d'eau au vin eucharistique", Le Muséon 73 (1960), pp. 297-310.

¹¹⁵ Hakobyan, Kanonagirk' Hayoc', vol. 1, p. 519. The rationale for taking this position is developed in a tract which is sometimes attributed to the same catholicos. See Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 235. That even in the middle ages there could be ambiguity as to the order of magnitude of the issue, whether purely one of Armenian ecclesiastical tradition or one dogmatically binding on all Christian churches is well brought out by the experience of Mxit'ar Sasnec'i (c. 1260-1337). In his youth he had favoured the former attitude until constrained by a vision to adopt the rigorist stance (Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem MS no. 414 (A.D. 1334), ff. 113v-123r). An edition of Mxit'ar's discourses is currently under preparation. For a recent discussion of Byzantine practice, for which Catholicos Movsēs' remark is the oldest attested witness, see R. Taft, S.J., "Water into Wine. The Twice-Mixed Chalice in the Byzantine Eucharist", Le Muséon 100 (1987), pp. 323-342.

Naturally, as the Narratio informs us, most of the contention between the two sides in the Armenian dispute was directly focused «περὶ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ δύο φύσεων... καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον» 117. Even after Catholicos Movsēs' death in 604 when, under imperial orders, Sormēn, the commander of Byzantine Armenia intensified contacts with Vardapet, šalasar of Persarmenia on effecting a union, their correspondence is redolent with recrimination and inuendo. In response to a proposal for a delegation to observe how the faith of the Fathers is preserved intact in the Persian sphere of influence, Sormēn retorts sharply «եβէ դԴէոսկորոսին ասէթ, դՏինոβէոսին դԱղեքսանդրացւոյ որ ընդդէմ բարեպաշտուβեան Հոգեկիր Հարցն յանդգնեցան ասել, ուստի և մերժեցան ի սրբոյ եկեղեցւոյ, և անջինջ վիճակեցան յիշատակի նղովից զայդ և մեք բաջ դիտեմջ» 118. Moreover, as defections occur from Chalcedonian adherents, influenced by Khusrau's major offensive against the Emperor Phocas, Sormēn complains that they are obliged perforce to anathematize the council 119.

At the same time, he outlines the Fathers he regards as orthodox, among whom pride of place is given to Athanasius, followed by Basil, the four Gregories 120 and John Chrysostom 121. It is therefore unlikely to be incidental that the final tract in the collection from Sinai MS no. 1699, a dyophysite florilegium 122, is almost entirely culled from these authors. Out of thirteen citations nine derive from Athanasius 123, two from Gregory the Illuminator and one from Gregory of Nazianzus¹²⁴. As one might expect, the passages from St. Gregory the Illuminator are of particular interest. The first, which speaks of Christ's uniting Godhead and manhood, is an almost literal rendering of one of the sections of the "teaching" of St. Gregory, as represented by Agathangelos 124. The second, in contrast, varies in important respects from the received Armenian text e.g. դմեր Հողեղէն բնութիւնս դդեդաւ և μωπιδεως ιωθρωπο ωυσητωδητιθητο ητη α ιωθωμωθητιθητού την ήμετέραν φύσιν την χοϊκην ἐνεδύσατο καὶ ἔμιξε τῆ θεότητι αὐτοῦ τῆ ἀφύρτφ ἵνα ἡμῖν δώση τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀθανασίαν καὶ εὐφροσύνην καὶ ἀπάθειαν αὐτοῦ· τὸ δὲ φθαρτὸν ἡμῖν (leg. ἡμῶν) ἔμιξεν ἵνα ἀθάνατον ποιήση.

¹¹⁷ Garitte, Narratio, § 108, p. 41.

¹¹⁸ Girk' T'It'oc', p. 91.

¹¹⁹ In his reply, Vardapet denies the charge, p. 94.

¹²⁰ Sc. Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory the Illuminator and Gregory Thaumaturgus.

¹²¹ Girk' T'It'oc', p. 91.

¹²² G. Garitte, "Un petit florilège diophysite grec traduit de l'arménien", Studia Biblica et Orientalia 111 (1959), pp. 102-112.

¹²³ Such is the ascription, but three of the citations come from a spurious work and four others have not yet been identified. For the tendentious transmission of Athanasian texts in Armenian see R. W. Thomson, "The Transformation of Athanasius in Armenian Theology", *Le Muséon* 78 (1965), pp. 47-69.

¹²⁴ See Garitte, "Un petit florilège", p. 109.

That the era under discussion might have been the matrix for the tracts just mentioned and the gestation period for Armenian Chalcedonian thought as a whole may partly be inferred from the activities of monophysite apologists which are far more amply documented. To reinforce his condemnation of Chalcedon and Severus, Abdišo introduced to Armenia Timothy Aelurus' refutation 127 and unspecified writings of Philoxenus of Mabbug, as has been seen. Although we hear little of the latter, the former was obviously in brisk circulation by the end of the sixth century. A cleric named Petros, writing to a fellow churchman, remarks the addressee also possesses a copy of the refutation, the utility of which in debate he esteems above the other authorities for the range of topics broached and the comprehensivity of patristic opinion represented. He therefore urges his colleague to apply himself to it to direct the simple-minded from being led astray. Later, when Movses, bishop of C'urt'aw is forced to abandon his see, the locum tenens at Duin, Vrt'anes K'erdol sends him various documents to assist him compile a dossier of antidyophisite thought. This he then distills into a pastoral letter to his flock. Subsequently, perhaps partly on the basis of their reaction, he pursues his inquiry on how Chalcedon has fared in the Empire during the last century after its negative assessment under Zeno and Anastasius 128. In this connection it is also worth mentioning his superior's abstract of the circumstances and decisions of that council 129. Soon afterwards a riposte was forthcoming

¹²⁵ Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 56. The confession parallels verbatim that of Abdišo in the previous letter.

¹²⁶ Ibid., p. 90.

¹²⁷ The Armenian translation of the work is extant in a single codex of the 10th century (Erevan, Matenadaran Ms. no. 1958). See K. Tēr-Mekerttschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz (eds.), Timotheus Älurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzten Lehre, Leipzig:1908.

¹²⁸ Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 140.

¹²⁹ N. Akinian, "Vrt'anēs vardapet K'erdoł ew iwr erkasirut'iwnnere, Handēs Amsoreay 24 (1910), pp. 39-45.

148 Cowe

from the Georgian Catholicos Kiwrion set in the context of the first three ecumenical councils which, we are told, represented the synopsis of their *acta*¹³⁰. This whole phase of assiduous textual investigation and compilation then culminates in a rich aphthartodocetic tome, known as the "Seal of Faith", similar in arrangement and magnitude to Timothy's work. Its first edition is usually ascribed to the catholicate of Abraham's successor Komitas (c. 610-628)¹³¹.

In light of St. Gregory's significance, like that of Nicaea, as a legitimizing symbol, it is hardly surprising that among the citations attributed to him in the Seal of Faith is a longer extract incorporating exactly the same passage as the first quotation of the dyophysite florilegium. Needless to say, whereas there it served to confirm the doctrine of a duality of natures, here it witnesses to Christ's single nature, to which both human and divine activities are to be predicated ¹³². As the communities' image of the saint developed, the sacred tradition which mediated his life and teaching to the faithful underwent an ongoing process of transformation. Hence, with the geographical, political and religious divisions of the late sixth century cleaving the Armenian people in two, it is logical to expect the saint's hagiographic transmission to have been subject to a similar bifurcation, conditioned to a certain degree by ideological considerations. At the same time, Byzantine attempts to negociate a settlement to heal the schism might plausibly have resulted in compromise collages synthesizing material from both previous constructs.

The recovery of the Syriac abridgement of St. Gregory's life (Vs)¹³³ has greatly advanced the study of this highly complex, but fascinating problem. Although some of its data may be early, certain features are best accounted for by positing the situation of catholicos Yovhannēs having been driven back by Khusrau II to an enclave round Theodosiopolis, during the years 607-610. Moreover, the memorial of the saint's burial at Thordan gains

131 K. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean (ed.), *Knik' hawatoy*, Ejmiacin:1914; anastatic reimpression, Louvain:1974. A second, enlarged edition is attributed to the translator Step'anos Siwnec'i (c. 680 - c. 735).

133 See note 104.

¹³⁰ Girk' T'lt'oc', p. 188. For the view that Kiwrion deliberately modified certain details (such as substituting "out of two natures" for the Chalcedonian formula) in order to render his confession more palatable to Catholicos Abraham and thereby minimize the extent of Armenian repercussions see G. Kojababian, "The Relations between the Armenian and Georgian Churches according to the Armenian Sources, 300-610", (D.Phil. thesis submitted to the University of Oxford, 1977), pp. 204-217. As the author concedes, if this were his line of reasoning, he badly miscalculated. Moreover, despite the absence of that formula, Kiwrion reiterates at different points his conviction concerning the existence of two natures after the union, highlighting it further by condemning those who do not so affirm. As this can hardly be a lapse, it is hard to reconcile with Kiwrion's supposed intentions.

¹³² With this we may compare the parallel phraseology Komitas employs in his credal statement at the Persian court: ոչ սոսկ մարդոյն ասեծ զչարչարանս, գիսաչն և զմաՀն, և ոչ գնչանագործութիւնսն միայնում Բանին Աստուծոյ, այլ միաւորութեամբ տնաւրէնութեանն (Girk Titoc, p. 213).

special impact from the later reference to Heraclius' erecting a church on the site c. 623134. Hence, it seems likely that the main redaction took place in the early seventh century and this has left its imprint on the selection of materials for inclusion (or omission) and their function within the composition (which need not have been the same as the one they fulfilled in earlier crystalizations of the legend). Its limited circulation, in contrast to the many renditions, abbreviations and reeditions enjoyed by Agathangelos' text (Aa)135, is probably to be accounted for by its compromisory character. Of significance in the attempt to unite the two Armenian communities on the basis of one of the most powerful symbols they shared, it would have been discarded when talks broke down and each side reverted to its own "authoritative" version of events. This bold initiative may have peaked c. 610/611 with the removal from the scene of the leaders of both factions. In that year Yovhannes' deportation by the Iranian forces to Ahmatan along with the inhabitants of Theodosiopolis, coincided with Catholicos Abraham's death. Thus before Komitas' election and ratification there would have been an opportunity to pursue negociation.

As a compromise document, one of Vs' characteristics is inclusivity, harmonizing the confrontational configurations of the two sides. For example, the redactor divides the virgins accompanying St. Hripsimē, assigning forty to Duin and another thirty-seven to Awan (as well as noting that St. Gregory latterly became cell-mate of one of them, named Mani, in the western region of Daranali). In this way the sanctity of both sees is assured, as Aa had earlier established the primacy of Valaršapat. Similarly, there are three baptisms: the principal event is staged at Arcn in the area of Theodosiopolis, but the rite is then repeated at Valaršapat and Artašat. Although Vs lacks a separate vision scene, it borrows from that episode the descent of light in language reminiscent of the Greek variant tradition (Vg). It must be supposed that the two capitals are chosen for inclusion because they are the locus for the vision in Aa and Vg respectively. The number of those baptised in Vs parallels that of Aa (190,000) rather than Vg's higher figure, because the latter also comprised delegations from other Caucasian peoples. Since the reunification was primarily concerned with the two Armenian polities, those would have distorted the focus. Even-handed treatment is also meted out to the two journeys St. Gregory undertakes, the one to Rome largely founded on Vg, the other to Constantinople following Aa. Rome's supplanting Caesarea as the site of the saint's consecration clearly coheres with Vs's incorporation of the Thaddeus legend we have already discussed, to safeguard the autocephaly

¹³⁴ van Esbroeck, "Le résumé syriaque", § 300, p. 357.

¹³⁵ Critical edition G. Ter-Mkrte'ean and St. Kanayeanc' (eds.), Agat'angelay Patmut'iwn Hayoc', Tiflis:1909.

of the Armenian church from Byzantine dependence. The visit to Constantinople then balances this by fostering co-operation between the co-religious states.

Naturally, achieving credal conformity would have been a delicate matter, and presenting it posed particular difficulty, as some of the episodes in the life had been consciously developed as partisan theological statements. These are therefore mostly handled with discrete silence. Thus the narrative of St. Gregory's martyrdom is plain, unencumbered with divisive Christological baggage, as is the teaching. Moreover, granted the tensions generated by Chalcedon and the veneration both communities accorded Nicaea (though form different perspectives), it is perfectly comprehensible why the latter is offered as the arbiter of communion 136. For similar reasons the vision would also have been omitted to preclude the inevitable dissent over interpreting the famous passage of the one herd of goats which mutates into wolves and lambs 137. The redactor, as a successor of Sormēn in negociations, would therefore have approved of his evangelical watchword «If Lulin II III)

The inescapable conclusion from the dating of Vs' Armenian Vorlage is that the two primary traditions on which it relies (Aa and Vg) were also available in Armenian by the end of the sixth century at the latest. It is generally agreed that the core of the former, attributed to Agathangelos, came into existence in the second half of the fifth century 139 and was utilized by Łazar at the turn of the sixth 140. Koriwn canonized the missionary zeal and educational accomplishments of Sahak and Maštoc' at the request of their protégé, Catholicos Yovsēp', after the Syro-Persian interlude in the second quarter of the fifth century. So Agathangelos projects this situation back into the previous century, depicting the supremacy of the Hellenic orientation represented by the northern Gregorid tradition throughout the country 141. Hence, even at this stage, the saint's ideological significance is paramount. Thereafter, particularly in the area of the teaching, a line of development may be traced, which enhances the work's monophysite colouring 142. Also, by altering the dates of Gregory's confinement in the pit, the redactor advanced

¹³⁶ van Esbroeck, "Un nouveau témoin", § 286, p. 91.

¹³⁷ Agat'angelay Patmut'iwn Hayoc', § 753-754, pp. 390-391.

¹³⁸ Girk' T'It'oc', p. 92.

¹³⁹ R. W. Thomson (trans.), Agathangelos History of the Armenians, Albany:1976, p. xci.

¹⁴⁰ M. van Esbroeck, "Le résumé syriaque de l'Agathange et sa portée pour l'histoire du developpement de la légende", *Handēs Amsōreay* 90 (1976), col. 509.

¹⁴¹ Paradoxically the baptismal rite by which Gregory illuminated the Armenians is apparently Syrian in form. See G. Winkler, "Our Present Knowledge of the History of Agat'angelos and its Oriental Versions", *REA* N.S. 14 (1980), pp. 136-137.

¹⁴² van Esbroeck, "Le résumé syriaque de l'Agathange", cols. 507-508.

the claim that Armenia preceded the Roman Empire in embracing Christianity 143, yet another ground for autocephaly.

By process of elimination, we must consider the proposal that Vg, whatever its ultimate origins ¹⁴⁴, was adopted by Armenian Chalcedonians as a vehicle from their perception of the saint. There is, in fact, much mention of Byzantine territory in this recension and the journeys to Caesarea and Rome are described with lively, circumstantial elaboration. As has already been observed, the baptism scene, among others, focuses on the unity in faith enjoyed by the Caucasian peoples. Adherence to the Catholic Church, as opposed to a break-away sect, recurs in the argumentation of Kiwrion and others, while anti-monophysite solidarity is a hallmark of the sixth century in the *Narratio* ¹⁴⁵.

Moreover, when viewed within this context, the substitution of Artašat for Vałaršapat as the locus of Gregory's vision, far from being a ridiculous blunder 146, is a profound denial of the latter's prestige as foremost shrine of

¹⁴³ Ibid., col. 501.

¹⁴⁴ As usage rather than etymology determines semantics, so it is quite possible that early elements of the tradition are given a new significance when juxtaposed to later data. As none of the three strands of transmission has preserved its pristine form intact, it is necessary to attempt to stratify the material to try to reconstitute the process by which it developed. Since redaction usually entails not only accretion but excision, it is important not to lose sight of the intentions of later tradents in selecting these specific data to perpetuate.

Van Esbroeck would connect the Armenian Vorlage of Vg and Aa with the Councils of Duin in 506 and 555 respectively. In support of the former identification he adduces the inclusion of the other Caucasian nations in the baptismal account, as a parallel to their political cooperation at that period and hierarchical representation at the council itself. He also posits the institution of the feast of šolakat' in celebration of St. Gregory's vision at around this time, arguing that it was still unknown to the historian Łazar. Yet it is generally held the latter was writing precisely at this juncture and, if the first book is authentic, was also familiar with Agathangelos in some form. Moreover, the reference to Nerses Kamsarakan's prayer to Gregory ("Témoignages littéraires sur les sépultures de saint Grégoire l'illuminateur", AnBoll 89 (1971), p. 413) as an indication of the saint's martyrdom alone is surely inconclusive. His act of dispelling the mist of Armenians' sinful impiety (quuumph olt q ամբարչտութեանն մեղագ մերոգ մերժեալ) could well be construed as an allusion to the purification of sin through baptism and the nation's transformation from idolatry to Christianity, Similarly, Caucasian solidarity was already a theme of Koriwn's in the 440s in describing Maštoc''s missionary journeys to Georgia and Albania. In addition, the association of the two contrasting traditions with those councils creates further problems of interpretation. Although Duin II largely reinforced the decisions of the earlier council in anathematising Nestorianism, the hypothesis would have to explain major changes in key elements of the life. For example, why would the site of the vision be relocated from Artašat to Valarsapat in the mid sixth century when the latter was of secondary importance, in contrast to its pre-eminence in the preceding century?

¹⁴⁵ G. Garitte, Narratio, § 85-89, p. 38.

¹⁴⁶ G. Garitte, *Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange* (Studi e Testi 127) Vatican City:1946, p. 300: "il faut que le rédacteur responsable de cette bévue ait été ou très distrait ou très ignorant de la vie religieuse de l'Arménie".

the land. Agathangelos envisages the future internecine struggle in terms reminiscent of the Vardananc' war in which a section of the population collaborated with the Iranian attempt to reimpose Zoroastrianism, despite protest by the Armenian Church 147. Consequently, apart from the metaphorical violence inherent in the image of wolf and lamb, the distinct impression is given that the two groups are inexorably opposed and that the physical survival of the community of faith is in jeopardy. In the corresponding portion of Vg the relation between image and interpretation is less convincing. The wolves become even more of a cipher for the human body they represent; for the nature of the confrontation is spiritual and it is the integrity of their antagonists' principles which is at stake. Furthermore, the presence of the verb κοινωνείν in the final sentence seems too pointed to be coincidence: εἰς λύκους μεταβαλλόμενοι ήρπαζον οὐκ ὀλίγα πρόβατα τῆς οἰκείας αὐτῆς χρόας καὶ γνώμης κοινωνεῖν παρασκευάζοντες 148. Hence I believe Marr's intuition that the Arabic translation of this passage referred to the anti-Chalcedonian schism is well-founded 149.

One of the most noticeable disjunctions between Aa and Vg concerns the order of the episodes leading up to the end of the life. The former presents a rather chiastic progression whereby Aristakēs' succession to the primacy precedes Gregory's visit to Constantine. Next follows Aristakēs' attendance at the Council of Nicaea and then Gregory's final years. In Vg not only is the sequence reversed, it is much shorter: the work closes with Aristakēs' succession after his father returns from Rome. There is thus no treatment of Nicaea 150.

Earlier, we considered the plausible effect of St. Sahak's vision on the Armenian Chalcedonian understanding of events up to the catholicate of Yovhannēs Bagaranc'i. Now we have seen how St. Gregory's vision (in Vg's version) might be applied to the same period. It is also interesting to remark that another Chalcedonian writer, Arsen, catholicos of Iberia, refers both visions to the heyday of the arch-Julianist, Yovhannēs Mayragomec'i, later in the seventh century¹⁵¹. In view of the above and the Gregorid legitimacy bestowed on Catholicos Yovhannēs' foundations by Vs, it is highly tempting to suggest that the contemporary community perceived Gregory's final act of investing his physical son Aristakēs with the trappings of office as symbolic of the spiritual continuity their leader possessed with the saint's faith and order.

¹⁴⁷ Agat'angelay Patmut'iwn Hayoc', § 754, p. 391.

¹⁴⁸ Garitte, Documents, Vg § 81, p. 60.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Garitte, ibid., p. 343.

¹⁵⁰ See ibid., p. 332 for a schema of events and Garitte's conclusion.

¹⁵¹ Zaza Alek'sidze (ed.), Ganqop'isat'ws K'art'velt'a da Somext'a: Arseni Sap'areli, Tbilisi:1980. For a modern Armenian translation see L. Melik'set'-Bek (trans.), Vrac' albyurnerĕ Hayastani yev hayeri masin, vol. 1, Erevan:1934, pp. 38-39.

Compelled by circumstances to realign their approach, they forged the compromise document Vs. When that too proved ineffectual, they reverted to the earlier tradition, awaiting a more complete realization of the prophecy.

It is striking that though St. Gregory appears boldly in the opening clause of the Narratio's title 152 and is further specified as the one who steered Armenia to orthodoxy, no attempt is made to define what is meant by that term or to explain how the saint attained it. One can only assume the author felt his readers were sufficiently conversant with those matters that he could pass over them to concentrate on the major part of his task, that of documenting how far his successors remained faithful to his precepts. Slightly anomalously, one might argue, although the Council of Nicaea is cited in the superscription as a source of orthodoxy parallel to St. Gregory, it is not subject to the same summary treatment in the body of the text. On the contrary, care is taken to inform us of its date and purpose, as well as the Armenians' role in the proceedings. Hence, one might conclude that the compiler of the Narratio intended his work as a continuation and supplement of a pre-existing life of Gregory. If that is so, then there is a certain probability that the form of life utilized bore typological affinity to the Armenian Vorlage of Vg, since the latter provides the smoothest transition between the two compositions. In surveying the period spanning the production of their Armenian originals (end 6th-end 7th cents.) and encompassing the other writings directed against the 'national' church found at Sinai, we encounter over a century of fairly intense literary propaganda.

It was proposed earlier that Armenian Chalcedonian monks at Mar Saba were instrumental in preserving copies of this dossier. So far there is no indication of the circumstances of their rendering into Greek. Perhaps the same community was also responsible for that ¹⁵³. St. Catherine's also possesses the Arabic version of the life of St. Gregory already alluded to, much of which derives from a Vg type of Greek text ¹⁵⁴ which may have had a similar origin. In addition, the monastery contains an abbreviated redaction of Ag in a manuscript (10th-11th cents.), the prototype of which may likely have hailed from Mar Saba, the two other lives it witnesses being that of St.

¹⁵² Viz. ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἀγίου Γρηγορίου μέχρι τοῦ νῦν (Garitte, Narratio, p. 26).

¹⁵³ Cf. van Esbroeck, "La naissance du culte de saint Barthélémy", p. 174. There the author proposes the Greek translation of the *Narratio* was executed in Cyprus. Transliterations of Armenian terms indicate the translator hailed from the western Armenian provinces where a sound shift occurred at some period prior to the eleventh century (Garitte, *Narratio*, pp. 399-400).

¹⁵⁴ The text is contained in Sinai Arabic MS no. 460 (9th cent.). For details of its *Vorlage* see G. Garitte, "La vie grecque inédite de saint Grégoire d'Arménie (MS 5 D'Ochrida)", *AnBoll* 83 (1965), pp. 233-290. Two further Arabic manuscripts adduce versions of the Greek translation of Agathangelos (MS no. 395; c. 9th-10th cents.) and of Vo (MS no. 455; 12th-13th cents.).

Sabas himself and St. John of Damascus, who spent most of his life there ¹⁵⁵. It may be objected that this recension represents the monophysite viewpoint and is therefore less plausibly to be associated with a Chalcedonian brotherhood, and yet one must recall the use made in the dyophysite florilegium of citations emanating from the teaching in Aa.

Armenian translation in the environs of Jerusalem began early with the rendering of the lectionary and included works of Cyril's successor Patriarch John 156 and the exegete Hesychius 157. More important for our purposes is the reference in a colophon to the translation of Ps. Dionysius' autobiography at Jerusalem in 880 by a physician Yovhannes. Moreover, it was translated from Georgian 158. Literary contacts between the two peoples in the reverse direction can also be associated with the Holy City. The account of a theological debate before Bagrat IV in 1046 between the Armenian Sost'enes Marmašēnc'i and Ep'time Grjeli provides valuable data on the subject 159. Announcing that he has come from Jerusalem, the latter proceeds to assail various Armenian dogmas and usages on the basis of their own writings. Inter alia he betrays knowledge of the Narratio and the visions of St. Gregory and St. Sahak. this might then imply that Georgian renderings of the anti-'Armenian' dossier of Sinai were circulating at Jerusalem and Mar Saba and may possibly have been produced there. Later copies of such collections are extant in Thilisi 160.

Whether or not Mar Saba is the provenance of particularly the Greek versions of those works, it is understandable why they would be valuable to the Armenian colony there, both to provide ideological ammunition for their co-religionists (e.g. the above debate) as well as proof of their own orthodoxy, a growing necessity in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. That the latter was under scrutiny is evident already from the Life of St. Sabas. Having permitted the Armenian brethren to pray the office separately in their own language, the saint insisted they revert to singing the *trisagion* in Greek, presumably so that it would be manifest to all they had obeyed his injunction

¹⁵⁵ See G. Lafontaine, "Une vie grecque abrégée de S. Grégoire l'illuminateur (Cod. Sin. Gr. 376)", Le Muséon 86 (1973), pp. 125-145.

¹⁵⁶ Ch. Renoux, "Une homélie sur Luc. 2,21 attribuée a Jean de Jérusalem", Le Muséon 101 (1988), pp. 77-95 and the literature cited there.

¹⁵⁷ Id., Hesychius de Jérusalem. Homélies sur Job, PO 42, fasc. 1, Turnhout, Brepols:1983.

¹⁵⁸ P. Peeters, "La version ibéro-arménienne de l'autobiographie de Denys l'aréopagite", AnBoll 39 (1921), pp. 277-313.

¹⁵⁹ L. Melik'set'-Bek, Vrac' albyurnerĕ, pp. 105-110.

¹⁶⁰ MS no. 735 of the former collection of the Ecclesiastical Museum (17th cent.) contains inter alia an history of early Armenia, St. Sahak's vision and Theodore Abū Qurrah's refutation (also connected with Jerusalem). MSS no. 312 (16th cent.) and 248 (18th cent.) of the former Society for the Propagation of Literacy among the Georgians adduce a compilation derived from the Narratio and list of catholicoi.

to refrain from the patripassionism of Peter the Fuller's insertion ¹⁶¹. Under Justinian, according to a later source, the patriarchate took measures against Armenian monasteries in its jurisdiction so that their princes were constrained to approach the monarch directly for redress ¹⁶². A few years later, a similar petition was addressed by Armenian monastics to Catholicos Yovhannēs Gabelean to the effect that they were being faced with the ultimatum either to conform to the faith of the Emperor or relinquish their property to the patriarchate ¹⁶³. In his missive to Catholicos Abas Patriarch John (574-594) also remarks that since his assumption of office a local faction had set one of the Armenian monasteries on fire. However, when the matter was brought before the Emperor, the ruling was that the monastery be entrusted to an 'orthodox' community. In this case, the monks entered into communion with the patriarch and retained their property ¹⁶⁴.

These events are the clear result of Jerusalem's consistent championing of the dyophysite position and the close surveillance of theological trends in the monasteries dependent on it which prevented the factional excesses which plagued Alexandria and Antioch. Moreover, as we probe more deeply, we observe the close network of Caucasian ties that were forged with the patriarchate to promote the Chalcedonian cause in the region. From Patriarch John's letter we learn that the monk Towmas (whose expulsion from Albania we have already noted) has been a regular go-between for some time. He had carried doctrinal correspondence from John's predecessors Eustochius and Macarius and was now engaged on translating into Armenian a series of materials meant to confute the positions adopted at the second Council of Duin, details of which had also been communicated to him by Towmas.

¹⁶¹ See Festugière, Les moines d'orient, vol. 111/2, p. 44.

¹⁶² Sanjian, "Anastas Vardapet's List of Armenian Monasteries", pp. 265-292. In connection with the fragment under review it is interesting to note the writer purports to have visited the sites he records in and around the Holy City and speaks hyperbolically of the Armenian Bibles he saw there: Աստուածաչունչք անքիւ դտանքին ի Հայկական լեզու յամենայն մենաստանս Երուսադէմի ... ուր էին վանորայք Հայոց (p. 273).

¹⁶³ Since the catholicos urged them to leave rather than capitulate doctrinally, the incident must have predated his residence at Constantinople in 572-574. Perhaps the renewed patriarchal activity is to be associated with the accession of Macarius II (564-574).

¹⁶⁴ See note 83.

¹⁶⁵ See note 81.

156 Cowe Cowe Cowe The Cowe of the Cowe of

պատասխանի նա առնէ» 166. Moreover, distinctive features of the Jerusalem creed have been detected in his confessional statements 167, suggesting he too had been the beneficiary of the patriarchate's 'trouble-shooting' measures.

Extrapolating from the above, one can probably conclude Armenian Chalcedonians played a similar intermediary role between Palestine and the Caucasus. Later evidence seems to reflect the perception that the Armenian community in Jerusalem was of that complexion. In an entry for the year 709 Samuēl Anec'i records the pilgrimage of the celebrated mathematician Anania Širakac'i to the Holy Land, where he disowned five of his erstwhile students for abandoning their ancestral faith ¹⁶⁸. The following century once more finds the patriarchate actively seeking to influence Armenian policy. Theodore Abū Qurrah (c. 740-c. 820), a monk at Mar Saba who later became bishop of Harran, had authored a tract in Arabic defending the dyophysite, dyothelite position and refuting that of Julianism ¹⁶⁹. Subsequently, Patriarch Thomas (c. 807-821) had the work translated into Greek ¹⁷⁰ and then arranged for it to be sent to Armenia. Following this, Theodore undertook a visit there himself c. 815 to engage in a debate with the Syrian Nanā (Nonnus) at the court of Ašot *msaker* (806-826) ¹⁷¹.

Accordingly, a clearer image emerges of the factors affording the most plausible explanation of how an early Armenian folio of Job ended up in Sinai. An analysis of the remains of an Armenian Chalcedonian literature also preserved there would seem to offer a context for the fragment and help define the community within which it functioned. This in turn sheds further light on the tenor of the Christological controversy in the Caucasus, while underscoring the particular importance of groups centred at Jerusalem in

167 Kojababian, "The Relations between the Armenian and Georgian Churches", p. 86.

169 For the unsuccessful attempt in Harran at union between the Syrian Julianists and Severan Jacobites in 797/798 see W. Hage, Die syrisch-jakobitische Kirche in frühislamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden:1966, p. 80. It may be that this effort stimulated the following Chalcedonian

attempt at re-union.

170 PG vol. 97, coll. 1504-1522.

¹⁶⁶ Uxtanēs, Patmut'iwn Hayoc', 2,24, p. 47. The patriarch in question would have been Isaakios (601-609).

¹⁶⁸ See A. Maius and I. Zohrabus (eds.), Samuelis Praesbyteri Aniensis Temporum usque ad suam Aetatem Ratio, Mediolani:1818, p. 58. The authenticity of the confrontation is debatable as in general this writer is one of the first to record a series of apocryphal traditions which had accrued around famous figures of the Armenian literary past. However, precisely because of this, its symbolic significance is reinforced as, for example, that of Trebizond at a later period cf. Movsēs Erznkac'i's βπιηθ шη Գρիգոր երէη ζηπηδωηλωή h Σρωμβηηδ.

¹⁷¹ For further details of the ensuing debate there with the monophysite apologist Nonnus see A. van Roey (ed.), *Nonnus de Nisibe traité apologique*, Bibliothèque du Muséon 21, Louvain:1948, pp. 17-21. I am grateful to Prof. S. H. Griffith for supplying me with this reference and discussion of the incident.

furthering the Chalcedonian cause. The extent to which this reflects a policy objective of the patriarchate is worthy of further investigation. The data presently available appear to warrant more detailed attention to the Armenian contribution to life and letters of the Holy Land than it has hitherto been accorded.