

# EAST OF BYZANTIUM: SYRIA AND ARMENIA IN THE FORMATIVE PERIOD

NINA G. GARSOÏAN, THOMAS F. MATHEWS  
and ROBERT W. THOMSON  
Editors

Published with the Assistance of  
a Grant from  
The Suren D. Fesjian Academic Publications Fund  
Columbia University

Dumbarton Oaks  
Center for Byzantine Studies  
Trustees for Harvard University  
Washington, District of Columbia  
1982

© 1982 DUMBARTON OAKS  
TRUSTEES FOR HARVARD UNIVERSITY  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Composition by Cambridge Typesetters, Ltd.

Printed by Braun-Brumfield, Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data  
Main entry under title:

East of Byzantium.

“Dumbarton Oaks symposium, 1980”—Half-  
title p.

1. Near East—Civilization—Congresses.  
2. Syria—Civilization—Congresses. 3. Armenia—  
Civilization—Congresses. 4. Syrian Church—  
Congresses. 5. Nestorian Church—Congresses.  
6. Armenian Church—Congresses. I. Garsoïan,  
Nina G., 1923- . II. Mathews, Thomas F.  
III. Thomson, Robert W., 1934-

DS57.E18 1982 956

82-9665

ISBN 0-88402-104-1

# THE HELLENIZING SCHOOL

## Its Time, Place, and Scope of Activities Reconsidered

ABRAHAM TERIAN

THE Armenian literary heritage of the sixth to eighth centuries is comprised for the most part of a vast corpus of translations from Greek, which, unlike biblical and theological translations of the Golden Age (fifth century), maintains the Greek word order or syntax. These predominantly philosophical translations generally have been called the work of the Hellenizing School, or *l'école hellénistique*, sometimes called the Philhellene School or *l'école grécophile*. Perhaps the designation “Grecizing School” explains the characteristics of these translations more accurately. The word “School” stands for a school of translators: founders and successors devoted to the same translational tendencies, just as one would speak of the School of Sahak, Mesrop, and their circle.

Partial and inconclusive studies on the subject warrant the quest indicated in the subtitle. The subject itself is inherently problematic, especially in the absence of conclusive evidence for the time and place of the earlier translations by the School. There are but few colophons and proemia revealing certain dates and personal and place names in conjunction with later translations. Consequently, and in due consideration of the School’s translational activities, reference will be made to sources outside the corpus, especially to works that show immediate dependence on the earlier translations. The question of the purpose for the syntactically strange renderings is addressed at the end of the study, which necessarily abounds with references to Manandean’s *magnum opus* on the development of the School.<sup>1</sup>

The translations under consideration have been variously arranged into four groups, representing, *prima facie*, four successive periods of active translating.<sup>2</sup> To the first group belong the *Tέχνη γραμματική* of Dionysius Thrax, a handbook of rhetoric belonging to Aphthonius,<sup>3</sup> certain Philonic and pseudo-Philonic works—several of which survive only in Armenian,<sup>4</sup> Books IV and V of Irenaeus’ *Adversus haereses* and his *Demonstratio praedicationis evangelicae* (*Εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος*)—now extant only in Armenian, and the so-called Alexander Romance wrongly ascribed in antiquity to Callisthenes. To the second group belong the refutation of Chalcedon by the Monophysite Timothy of Alexandria (nicknamed “the cat”), the *Progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon, *Hermetica* (“To Asclepius”), Porphyry’s *Isagoge* on Aristotle’s *Categoriae*, the latter’s *Categoriae* and *De interpretatione*, and Iamblichus’ commentaries on Aristotle.<sup>5</sup> To the third group belong the works of Dawit<sup>c</sup> Anañt<sup>c</sup> (the Neoplatonist David the Invincible)—excluding the liturgical works attributed to him,

the pseudo-Aristotelian *De mundo* and *De virtutibus et vitiis*, Plato's *Apologia*, *Euthyphro*, *Leges*, *Minos*, and *Timaeus*, the collection and exposition of the stories ascribed to Nonnus of Panopolis, Euthyches' denunciation of the Nestorian doctrine of two persons or substances in Christ—available only in Armenian,<sup>6</sup> two works *On Nature*, one ascribed to a certain Zeno and the other anonymous, and a few other anonymous works possibly of late Stoic origin—all of which survive only in Armenian. To the fourth group belong the *Hexaemeron* of George of Pisidia, the *Phainomena* of Aratus,<sup>7</sup> the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Socrates, the mystic works attributed to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, selections from Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>8</sup> Nemesius' *De natura hominis*, and Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio*.<sup>9</sup>

This grouping is based primarily on the way Greek compounds are rendered into Armenian. As Manandean observes in his study (limited to the first three groups excluding the Platonic and possibly Stoic works), there seems to be no serious effort in the earliest translations consistently to render Greek compounds with Armenian compounds, but in the later translations a mechanical imitation of Greek compounds becomes increasingly common, to the extent that many of the newly compounded words stand out as *hapax legomena* in the latest translations.<sup>10</sup> However meritorious these observations may be, the methodology remains questionable because of omissions even within the limits of the study, such as failure to include a third of the voluminous translation on Philo's works.<sup>11</sup> Also, instead of dwelling more on the relative frequency of similarly constructed compounds in the various translations or groups, Manandean places undue emphasis on the importance of unique compounds, which he limits to certain groups as determining factors in his categorization.<sup>12</sup> It is not surprising that many of the words he claims to be peculiar to the second or even third group are found also in the first. For example, in the translation of Philo's works (first group) one finds such third-group words as "nerhakan" (ἐνάντιος, *Legum allegoriarum* i. 18), "makac<sup>o</sup>wt<sup>i</sup>wn" (ἐπιστημή, *ibid.*, 6, 68, 70; *De Abrahamo* 71, 73), and "əndhanrakan" (καθολικός, *ibid.*, 3).<sup>13</sup> A more accurate picture emerging from Manandean's word-study is that of certain compounds abounding in one or another of the respective groups rather than being limited to them, and that of one group of translations overlapping the other—apparently in the sequence outlined above—with no boldly drawn demarcation lines between them and no precise order of works within the respective groups. The evidence, rightly perceived, suggests that the translations of the first three groups were accomplished within a single period—perhaps by one generation.<sup>14</sup> The similarities and differences obtaining between the various translations of the first three groups may be explained not so much by the lapse of time between them as by the translators' possible use of a Greek-Armenian lexicon and their habitual selection and combination of Armenian equivalents.<sup>15</sup> The compounds and technical terms of the fourth group, omitted in its entirety by Manandean, likewise manifest well-established lexical forms found in the earlier translations. Moreover, since the translations of this last group do not follow the Greek syntax as strictly as the earlier translations, there appears to be some lapse of time between it and the rest. Consequently, it would be more accurate to speak of two major groups: the first three and the fourth.

The end of the School's translational activities, as we shall see, can be established easily by ascribing most—if not all—of the translations of the fourth group to Step<sup>c</sup>anos Siwnec<sup>i</sup> and his early eighth-century Constantinopolitan associates. Determining the time and place of the School's beginnings, however, is difficult. Aucher was the first to observe the dependence of Movsēs Xorenac<sup>i</sup>, Mambrē Vercanoł (whom tradition presents as a younger brother of Xorenac<sup>i</sup>), and Ełışē Vardapet on the Armenian translation of Philo.<sup>16</sup> Thinking of the traditional dates given to these celebrated writers, Aucher was quick to place the founding of the School in the fifth century.<sup>17</sup> The traditional dates given to Ełışē and Xorenac<sup>i</sup> need not be challenged anew;<sup>18</sup> but should they be insisted upon, then it must be said that for a century thence no other dependence on any of the translations of the Hellenizing School is to be found in the existing literature. As for Mambrē, his name, among others, appears in conjunction with the *Girk<sup>c</sup> ēakac<sup>c</sup>*,<sup>19</sup> and the traditional date given to him derives from the erroneous date given to this book, which, as we shall see later, was translated in 576/7 and not a century earlier. It may not be superfluous to add that none of these writers has an exact quotation from Philo. The first Armenian writer to quote Philo by name is the seventh-century sage Anania Širakac<sup>i</sup>,<sup>20</sup> about whom more shall be said later. In view of the questionable traditional dates given to Ełışē (who still remains the earliest witness to the Armenian version of Philo), Xorenac<sup>i</sup>, and Mambrē, we are compelled to look into the evidence emerging from the use made by other writers of the remaining translations of the first group.

It has been observed that Philo and Irenaeus were translated at about the same time; they both belong to the earliest translations of the School.<sup>21</sup> Yet the earliest witness to the translation of Irenaeus are a certain Yohan of Karin, an insignificant writer of the late sixth century, and Vrt<sup>c</sup>anēs K<sup>c</sup>ert<sup>c</sup>oł in a letter addressed to Sowrmēn Stratelat and dated 604/5.<sup>22</sup> Likewise, the translation of Aphthonius' handbook on rhetoric (the *Girk<sup>c</sup> pitoyic<sup>c</sup>*) was known to Sebēos Episkopos and Dawit<sup>c</sup> Hark<sup>c</sup>ac<sup>c</sup>i, both of whom flourished about the middle of the seventh century.<sup>23</sup>

The founding of the School must have been marked by the translation of the Τέχνη γραμματική of Dionysius Thrax, which, as a primer, was basic for the rest of the translational activities of the School.<sup>24</sup> Of special interest in this particular version are the Armenian substitutions for the Greek examples. Where the original text has illustrations from the Greek country, the translator provides examples suggestive of the Armenian countryside. He even names cities of West Armenia, including, Tarōn and C<sup>c</sup>ronk<sup>c</sup>. Ałbalyan suggests that these names betray the homeland of the translator and perhaps that of his associates, the country around Tarōn.<sup>25</sup> Manandean goes so far as to observe linguistic affinities between the translator and the dialect of the region of Bagrewand, Tarōn, and Karin.<sup>26</sup> But he errs in denying any literary dependence on Thrax that would help establish the time of the translation.<sup>27</sup> To a certain degree, however, the early scholia on Thrax by Armenian grammarians (k<sup>c</sup>ert<sup>c</sup>ołk<sup>c</sup>) of the late sixth century provide helpful evidence to establish the approximate time of the translation and thereby the founding of the School. From among a number of such works, Adonc<sup>c</sup> gives the primacy to the scholion of Dawit<sup>c</sup> Anałyt<sup>c</sup>,<sup>28</sup> who, as we shall notice, flourished in the late sixth and early seventh centuries. Another noteworthy scholion

on Thrax is by Movsēs K<sup>c</sup>ert<sup>c</sup>oľahayr,<sup>29</sup> who excelled as a teacher at about the same time.<sup>30</sup>

Thus far, the evidence from the literary sources seems to indicate a 570 date for the founding of the School. As for Manandean, he seems to be puzzled about the date for the School's beginning, even though he too rejects the traditional fifth-century date for Eľišē,<sup>31</sup> the earliest witness to the translation of Philo. Basing his evidence on the use made of these early translations by later writers in chronologically descending order, he draws successive conclusions before setting a date at "about the middle of the sixth century," specifically, between 552 and 564 (later 560 and 564), his date for the translation of the refutation of Chalcedon by Timothy of Alexandria, which he takes as the *terminus ad quem* for the translations of the first group and the *terminus post quem* for those of the second group.<sup>32</sup> But he arrives at this date first through an erroneous emendation of a corrupt reading in the text of the refutation, where reference is made to the month and day of the death of Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria (d. 454), and second by applying the supposed *terminus post quem* of authorship for the translation.<sup>33</sup> His error becomes more elusive when testimony alluding to a mid-sixth-century translation of the refutation is brought to bear on the argument.<sup>34</sup> Earlier, and on better grounds, he places the translations of the first group "before the seventh century."<sup>35</sup> Later in his study, and with hardly any evidence, he places the founding of the School "either at the beginning of the sixth or at the end of the fifth century," and elsewhere, "at the end of the fifth century,"<sup>36</sup> yet always maintains that the translations of the first group belong to the "first half of the sixth century."<sup>37</sup> Akinean closely follows Manandean's analysis of the literary sources, but in due consideration of his studies on Eľišē, he places the founding of the School between 572 and 575 and most of its translations between 572 and 603.<sup>38</sup> In a much later study, however, he has 590-610 for the translations.<sup>39</sup>

The time and place of the Aristotelian translations (second group) may be established through the colophon of the *Girk<sup>c</sup> ēakac<sup>c</sup>*, a textbook of the "Όρϑανον, written in the form of *quaestiones et solutiones*. Like much of the rest of the Aristotelian corpus, its translation is attributed to Dawit<sup>c</sup> Anaľyt<sup>c</sup>, though at times the names of Xorenac<sup>c</sup>i and Mambrē are also given.<sup>40</sup> The colophon, reproduced in a number of manuscripts,<sup>41</sup> reads:

This book was completed [lit., written or penned; greac<sup>c</sup> zgirs zays] after a long lapse of time. Thus God brought us to such a time, when is the 76th year of the Armenian era [627/8]. I. Gowrgēn, a scribe to Armenian leaders and first regent to holy kings, am the recipient of this book [Groc<sup>c</sup>s aysm]. The previous colophon of this book [groc<sup>c</sup>s aysmik] is amazing, since this book on beings was written [grec<sup>c</sup>aw girk<sup>c</sup>s ays eagk<sup>c</sup>s] as a translation ordered by the sovereign Yovhannēs Gabelīnac<sup>c</sup>i, Catholicos of the Armenians, in the 25th year of the Armenian era [576/7]. Bishop Sargis Arabac<sup>c</sup>i attests to this in a faithful testimony.

The text of the colophon calls for a form-critical analysis, for we seem to have two colophons in one: the one comprising the first half and logically ending at the middle

of the text with reference to ownership, the other comprising the second half and alluding to another, earlier colophon. In the first half we have the words *greac<sup>c</sup> zgirs zays* and in the second half *grec<sup>c</sup>aw girk<sup>c</sup>s ays* (the former is more in keeping with the syntax of the Hellenizing School). At the end of the first half we have *groc<sup>c</sup>s aysm* and at the beginning of the second half *groc<sup>c</sup>s aysmik*. Also, the words *girk<sup>c</sup>s ays ēagk<sup>c</sup>s* do not necessarily refer to the title of the epitome, which is *Girk<sup>c</sup> ēakac<sup>c</sup>* and probably a derivative title. Finally, *girk<sup>c</sup>* may refer to a codex containing several books, just as the identical singular and plural forms of this word allow us to think in terms of more than one book. Even at the outset, the first of the two colophons seems to imply a great undertaking. It was probably appended to the Aristotelian corpus of translations, at the end of which appeared the *quaestiones* on the "Ὀργάνον."<sup>42</sup> Prior to the thirteenth century (judging from the oldest extant manuscript), a copyist of this textbook was quick to add the "amazing" information obtained from "the previous colophon of this book" (*bayc<sup>c</sup> zarmanali ē i naxki yišataki groc<sup>c</sup>s aysmik*), which he found probably within the covers of his exemplar (construing "previous" as referring to sequence rather than time). With the early severance of the *quaestiones* from the rest of the corpus, the conflate colophon came to be invariably associated with the end part.

What interests us most, however, is the date for the translation, which is significant in light of the close affinities—even the proximity in time—between the Aristotelian translations and those of the first group. The names of the Katholikos and of the Bishop are equally significant for enabling a historical correlation. For according to the Syriac historian John of Ephesus (d. 586), the Katholikos arrived in Constantinople in 572, where he died a few years later, and was followed at the Byzantine capital by the Armenian *stratēlatēs* or *magister militum* Vardan and many nobles who were received with great honor by Emperor Justin II (565-578) and were admitted to the court circle.<sup>43</sup> By way of synchronism, the above colophon and the chronicle of John of Ephesus reveal the provenance of the School's translational activities and perhaps even the literary and educational interests of this elite party. We may note in passing that the date for the translation shows that the Katholikos was still living in 576/7; consequently, the traditional date given for his death (574)<sup>44</sup> must be revised in light of the colophon. As for the bishop bearing witness to the ordering of the translation, he must be Sargīs bar Karjā, the Syriac Bishop to the Arabs, who was noted for his literary pursuits in the second half of the sixth century.<sup>45</sup>

Along with the proemia which ascribe the translation of the *Girk<sup>c</sup> ēakac<sup>c</sup>* to Dawit<sup>c</sup> Anyaŋt, we must consider those that ascribe to him the translation of Aristotle's *De interpretatione* as well.<sup>46</sup> Such proemia compel us to associate Dawit<sup>c</sup> with the Hellenizing School at Constantinople, where the Aristotelian works, among others, were translated. Moreover, the 576/7 date for the translation of the *Girk<sup>c</sup> ēakac<sup>c</sup>* agrees with internal evidence in two of his own writings which were also translated by the same School: the *Prolegomena philosophiae* and *In Porphyry isagogen commentarium*.<sup>47</sup> On three occasions in the *Prolegomena* Dawit<sup>c</sup> quotes Olympiodorus the younger,<sup>48</sup> who flourished in Alexandria as head of the Neoplatonic school and died after 564/5.<sup>49</sup> Dawit<sup>c</sup> refers to him as "the philosopher" in the first two instances and seems to appeal to him as a final authority in all three instances. The contextual overtones of the

remarks on Olympiodorus seem to indicate a teacher-pupil relationship. Further support strengthening the links established between Dawit<sup>c</sup> and Olympiodorus may be derived from the Neoplatonist Elias, whose scholion on Porphyry's *Isagoge* has much in common with the scholion of Dawit<sup>c</sup> on the same work, not only in form and content but also in reliance on Olympiodorus.<sup>50</sup> The works of Elias and Dawit<sup>c</sup> abound with such overwhelming similarities that in many instances they are comparable to classroom notes taken by successive students if not classmates.

We may safely conclude that Dawit<sup>c</sup> is a late contemporary of Olympiodorus and flourished at the end of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh. Because of his Neoplatonic orientation and dependence on—if not direct association with—Olympiodorus, we must place Dawit<sup>c</sup> at Alexandria, where he would be an early contemporary of John Philopone and Stephanos, who moved to Constantinople early in the reign of Heraclius (610) as head of the Imperial Academy.<sup>51</sup> It is very likely that Dawit<sup>c</sup> preceded these men to Constantinople and there continued a fellowship with them that had its beginnings in Alexandria.<sup>52</sup> We will also have to conclude, on the basis of the date we have ascribed to Dawit<sup>c</sup>, that his works were translated into Armenian apparently during his lifetime. That is to say, he translated not only Aristotle but probably his own works as well. Since his time coincides with the early period of the School and the height of its translational activities, we are inclined to think that he must have played a significant role in the School. His Greek writings probably date to his Alexandrian days and his translations and later works to his Constantinopolitan period.<sup>53</sup>

The early influence of the Aristotelian translations on native writers is most clearly seen in the writings of Anania Širakac'i, especially the influence on the pseudo-Aristotelian *De mundo* on Anania's *Yatags šrjagayowt'ean erknic'*.<sup>54</sup> Several other translations hitherto considered have likewise left their strongest influence on Anania, in whose writings we also find the first exact quotations from the Armenian version of Philo.<sup>55</sup>

Fortunately, "the father of the exact sciences in Armenia," as Anania is often called, has left a personal account of his *curriculum vitae*, which gives some information about certain academic circles of the time and yields some pertinent data for our thesis. This seventh-century account survives in two recensions, one shorter than the other.<sup>56</sup> While further text-critical study is needed to establish better the relationship obtaining between the two recensions, we shall draw upon the generally preferred longer version without disregarding the peculiar readings of the less reliable shorter version. The following is a partial summary of Anania's testimony.

After having studied the Scriptures and all the literature available to him in his native country, Anania wished to study philosophy and arithmology—whether mathematics or chronology—which he considered the mother of all knowledge. But he found no one in Armenia who knew philosophy, and he could not even find books on the sciences. He therefore went "to the country of the Greeks," and on the advice given him at Theodosiopolis by a certain Eleazar, he came to the Byzantine province of Fourth Armenia.<sup>57</sup> There he studied for six months with a certain mathematician named K<sup>c</sup>ristosatowr (Gk. Χριστόδοτος).<sup>58</sup> Perceiving that his master's science was not



sufficient, he thought of going to Constantinople. He then met some of his countrymen who were coming from Constantinople. They dissuaded him from taking such a long trip and counseled him to go instead to Trebizond, where there was a very knowledgeable and famous "Byzantine doctor," named Tychikos, who also knew Armenian, having lived in Armenia in his youth. Students were rapidly leaving Constantinople to attend his school, and recently, a group of youths from the capital, led by a deacon from the patriarchate named Philagrios, had done this, traveling by sea to Trebizond. The compatriots of Anania had taken the same boat with the group as far as Sinope, whence they were continuing overland. Anania followed their advice, went to Trebizond, found Tychikos, and remained there as his favorite disciple for eight years. He read extensively in the rich library of his master, where he found all kinds of books on every subject: "secret books and open, ecclesiastical and profane, scientific and historical, medical and chronological."

Throughout the rest of his account, Anania goes on to tell enthusiastically how his master had learned Armenian, how he acquired such great knowledge, and how he came to settle at Trebizond.<sup>59</sup> It is not within the scope of this study to explicate the significance of these passages. Suffice it to say that the testimony should prove to be of great importance to the historian of Byzantine education, especially as it pertains to a period about which very little is known from Greek sources.<sup>60</sup> We must note that Anania concludes with reference to his return to Armenia, where he in turn became a teacher. There he knew nothing but repugnance, for the Armenians "love neither learning nor knowledge."<sup>61</sup>

We now turn to draw from Anania's testimony the elements pertinent to our thesis. First, if we are to believe him, at the beginning of the seventh century there was no one in Armenia who knew philosophy and there were no scientific books there either.<sup>62</sup> This implies that the philosophical and scientific works translated by the Hellenizing School belong to a provenance outside of Armenia and that they could not have been translated long before his time. Had any of them been translated a century or so before his time, it would have been known in the ensuing period. To be sure, his account agrees with the literary evidence presented thus far. Moreover, he alludes to the presence of Armenian students at Constantinople at a time when the Hellenizing School seems to have been still active in the metropolis. That would be the time when the works constituting the third group were being translated, including, among others, the pseudo-Aristotelian *De mundo*, which had a considerable impact on Anania's thought. Students such as those mentioned by Anania were perhaps instrumental in spreading such translations.

At this juncture we may consider another external evidence derived from the sixth to seventh-century Syriac translations of Aristotle and related commentaries, which also maintain the Greek syntax. Nöldeke in his Syriac grammar invites attention to such translations, but he does not enumerate them.<sup>63</sup> Baumstark touches on these works in his introduction to Syriac literature,<sup>64</sup> but in a chronological treatment of what may be termed a genre of translations. In a most comprehensive study included in this publication, Brock brings into focus the Syriac corpus of Aristotelian translations and their academic environment.<sup>65</sup> We may discern further similarities—if not a relationship—

between these syntactically awkward Armenian and Syriac translations. Suffice to say that the syntactical similarities of these corpora, their partially identical contents, and their emergence at about the same time cannot be incidental. They deserve further study with reference to the nonmonastic schools of the period.

As for most of the translations constituting the third group, they do not follow the Greek syntax as strictly as the earlier translations. There is a marked syntactical distinction, for example, between the Aristotelian (second group) and the pseudo-Aristotelian (third group) translations. To be sure, however, there are syntactical distinctions even within the group, to the extent that some translations, such as those of the works of Dawit<sup>c</sup> and Nonnus of Panopolis, are syntactically closer to the translations of the second group than to others within their group. Thus at certain points the distinction between the two groups is marginal and arbitrary, and at other points it is clearly justifiable. The gradual loosening of the syntax in this group may be due to short intervals of time between the various translations. As for the later translations of this group—those of the Platonic and possibly Stoic works excluded by Manandean and Akinean—they are well accounted for by Arevšatyan, who rightly places them in this group.<sup>66</sup> Their grouping can be ascertained not only on the basis of rare compounds but also on the basis of syntax. Moreover, there is no attestation to any of these translations prior to the seventh century. In addition to the witness of Anania Širakac<sup>i</sup> to the earlier translations of this group, there are two late seventh-century citations of the translation of Eutychus' denunciation of the Nestorian doctrine in the letters of Yovhannēs Mayragomec<sup>i</sup> and Xosrovik T<sup>c</sup>argmanič<sup>c</sup>.<sup>67</sup>

The last name to be associated with the School is that of Step<sup>c</sup>anos Siwnec<sup>i</sup>, to whom is attributed most of the translations constituting the fourth group. The Pseudo-Dionysian translations conclude with a colophon by the translator, dated in the second year of Emperor Philippicus (712),<sup>68</sup> and those of Nemesis' *De natura hominis* and Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio* conclude with similar colophons dated in the first year of Emperor Leo III (717).<sup>69</sup> While Step<sup>c</sup>anos is also the acknowledged translator of considerable selections from Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>70</sup> he is not to be regarded as the sole translator of the works belonging to the fourth group. He was assisted by his intimate friend and classmate Grigor K<sup>c</sup>ahanay Ayrivanec<sup>i</sup> and a certain Dawit<sup>c</sup> Hiwpatos, with whom he returned to Armenia in 728, after having spent nearly two decades studying and translating at Constantinople (712-28).<sup>71</sup>

The strange syntax of the translations of the Hellenizing School has left a marked influence on contemporary writings.<sup>72</sup> In addition to the commentaries on Thrax, the later works of Dawit<sup>c</sup> Anałyt<sup>c</sup>, and the compositions of Step<sup>c</sup>anos Siwnec<sup>i</sup>, some influence may be detected in the early seventh-century letters of Vrt<sup>c</sup>anēs K<sup>c</sup>ert<sup>c</sup>oł and Grigor K<sup>c</sup>ert<sup>c</sup>oł.<sup>73</sup> Further influence may be seen in the works of other seventh-century writers including Anania Širakac<sup>i</sup>, Dawit<sup>c</sup> Harkac<sup>i</sup>, and Tēodoros K<sup>c</sup>rt<sup>c</sup>enawor—a propagator of the Chalcedonian faith among Armenians—and his disciples, Sahak Jorp<sup>c</sup>orec<sup>i</sup> (d. 703) and Yovhan Ojnec<sup>i</sup> (d. 728), both of whom became renowned heads of the Armenian Church.<sup>74</sup> Clearer still is the influence on the writings of Xorenac<sup>i</sup><sup>75</sup> and Xosrovik T<sup>c</sup>argamič<sup>c</sup>, a contemporary of Ojnec<sup>i</sup>.<sup>76</sup> The influence of the Greek language, rather than that of the Greek syntax of translations, may be

discerned in writers as early as Eznik Kołbac<sup>ı</sup> (fifth century) and as late as Grigor Magistros (eleventh century).

Akinean observes that the interlinear translations of the Hellenizing School were to help Armenian students enrolled in the Byzantine schools of the day.<sup>77</sup> His meritorious observation deserves serious consideration, especially in light of our remarks on the various colophons cited above, the account of Anania, and the Syriac translations of Aristotelian works. Accordingly, we must note that no attempt was made by the School to translate the complete works of voluminous writers like Plato, Aristotle, and Philo, but only select works apparently intended for tutorial purposes. Of Plato's works only the *Apologia*, *Euthyphro*, *Leges*, *Minos*, and *Timaeus* were translated. All five works occupy a most significant place in the history of Platonic interpretation. Of Aristotle's works only the *Categoriae* and *De interpretatione* were translated, and their importance in Neoplatonism need not be restated. Likewise, about a third of Philo's works was translated, including the *Quaestiones*, or his first commentary on the Pentateuch, select works from the subsequent commentaries, *De vita contemplativa*, and the dialogues with Alexander (*De providentia* I-II and *De animalibus*). Along with the grammar of Dionysius Thrax, these works, even in part, cover all that was essential for the *Trivium* in this late classical period: grammar (which, as the Art of Letters, included literature), rhetoric, and dialectic (the last ranging from bare logic to the combination of pagan philosophy and Christian theology, the works of Philo being the most appropriate models for the combination of philosophy and theology). The remaining works also seem to belong to academic circles, including the three works dealing with Christological controversies, the strange translation of which would otherwise be of little value for a monastic school.<sup>78</sup> We may also note that the works of Dawit<sup>ı</sup> Anyałt<sup>ı</sup>, like many of the Neoplatonic scholia on Aristotle, are composed as πράξεις or "lessons" and seem to have been intended for delivery as classroom lectures. Similarly, the question and answer form of the Aristotelian epitome, which now bears the title *Girk<sup>ı</sup> ēakac<sup>ı</sup>*, is most appropriately written for teaching purposes.

If placing the translational activities of the Hellenizing School at Constantinople is correct, and if indeed these activities were somewhat connected with the schools of the day, as they seem to be, then the translations of the School would represent the kind of texts used for certain structured courses of learning during the period of the School's activity (570-730). In the absence of direct evidence for texts and curricula in Byzantine sources of the same period,<sup>79</sup> the indirect evidence of the Armenian translations of the School may be deemed important for the history of Byzantine education.

The cumulative evidence suggests that the Hellenizing School was active 570 to 730 at Constantinople and that the scope of its activities was within the realm of the Byzantine schools.<sup>80</sup> The influence of the School, however, was not limited to its time and place. Although the translations had minimal influence on the language, affecting but a few contemporaries, their influence on Armenian thought was far reaching. Obviously, contemporary writers and scholiasts—some of whom were also translators—were familiar with the thought of these philosophical treatises, and it is through their writings that the influence of the School continued into subsequent centuries. As for later would-be commentators on these translations, because of the Greek syntax,

they had little or no understanding of these works. What most impressed the Armenian scholiasts of the late Middle Ages was the obscurity of the language and the challenge to convey its meaning. They accepted this as being the fault of the readers, not of the authors or the translators. For the scholiasts these philosophical writings were to be tackled only by men of profound ability. It is not surprising that they were more likely to quote these works than to interpret them.

Andrews University

1. Y. Manandean, *Yownaban dproc'ə ew nra zargac'man šrjannerə*, Azgayin matenadaran, CXIX (Vienna, 1928). For an excellent survey of the literature, both ancient and modern, see N. Akinean and P. Tēr-Pōtosean, "Matenagrakan hetazōtowt'iwnner: Yownaban dproc'ə," *Handes amsorya*, 91 (1977), 1-72.

2. Manandean, *Yownaban*, 86-255, accounts for the works in the first three groups, excluding the Platonic and possibly Stoic works in the third group; so also N. Akinean, "Yownaban dproc'ə," *Handes amsorya*, 46 (1932), 273-77, who synthesizes Manandean's classifications and sets off the stories ascribed to Nonnus of Panopolis and the pseudo-Aristotelian *De mundo* as a fourth group; cf. Akinean and Tēr-Pōtosean, "Matenagrakan," 15-18. The Platonic and possibly Stoic works have been rightly added by S. Arevšatyan, "Platoni erkeri Hayerēn t'argmanowt'yan zamanakə," *Banber matenadaran*, 10 (1971), 16-18, whose list we have followed with some reservations, contenting ourselves with few modifications in the order of works within the groups and with additions indicated in the notes.

3. This is the *Girk' pitoyic'*, wrongly attributed to Movsēs Xorenac'i.

4. For a complete list of these works, see the author's *Philonis Alexandrini De animalibus: The Armenian Text with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Supplements to *Studia Philonica*, I (Chico, Calif., 1980), 3-6.

5. To this we may add the *Girk' žakac'*, an Aristotelian textbook on the "Օրγανον," written in the form of questions and answers.

6. Here we may add the letter of Peter of Antioch, wrongly attributed to Petros K'ert'ol or Petros Episkopos Siwneac', the translation of which maintains the Greek syntax; see *Girk't t'it'oc'* (Tiflis, 1901), 99-107.

7. This work, *Yatags ampoc' ew nšanac'*, was, until recently, attributed to Anania Širakac'i.

8. Five short selections from Athanasius may be added to this collection; see *Srboyn At'anasi Atełk'sandrioy Hayrapeti žark', t'owlt'k' ew anddimasac'owtiwnk'* (Venice, 1899), 56-88, 281-83, 344; cf. Jerusalem MS 534.

9. For various editions of certain of these works, see H. Ačaṙean, *Armatakan baṭaran*, I (Erevan, 1926), 30-58; for a few more recent editions, see S. Arevšatyan, "Platon," 16-18.

10. *Yownaban*, 86-255.

11. *Ibid.*, 108 note, 124 note.

12. *Ibid.*, 107-15, 127-34, 153-55, 159-61.

13. *Ibid.*, esp. 115, 133-34, 160; cf. 144-45, 184-87, 194-96. Arevšatyan demonstrates the presence of such words in the translation of Plato's works, "Platon," 13-14.

14. So thinks Akinean, "Yowaban," 271-92.

15. H. Lewy, *The Pseudo-Philonic De Jona*, Studies and

Documents, VII (London, 1936), 20-21, and the author's "Syntactical Peculiarities in the Translations of the Hellenizing School," *First International Conference on Armenian Linguistics; Proceedings*, ed. J. A. C. Greppin (Delmar, N.Y., 1980), 197-207.

16. J. B. Aucher, ed. and trans., *Philoni Judaei sermones tres hactenus inediti: I et II de providentia et III de animalibus* (Venice, 1822), iii-v.

17. *Ibid.*, iii. After suggesting that Xorenac'i is the translator of Philo's works, p. ii, Aucher goes on to identify the translator with a certain Leontius, who is mentioned by Lazar P'arpec'i (ed. Tiflis, 1904, 202) as the friend of a philosopher named Movsēs; moreover, he identifies this philosopher with the historian Xorenac'i, p. iv; cf. N. Połarean, *Hay groṭner* (Jerusalem, 1970), 14-15, 40, who attributes the translation of several of Philo's works to Xorenac'i, and the rest to Movsēs K'ert'olaṭayr.

18. For a detailed study, see N. Akinean, *Etišē Vardapet*, I-III (Vienna, 1932-60); for a survey of the arguments on the date of Xorenac'i, see C. Toumanoff, "On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene," *Handes amsorya*, 75 (1961), 467-76; *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington, D.C., 1963), 330-34; on the sources of Xorenac'i, see R. W. Thomson, *Moses Khorenats'i: History of the Armenians*, Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies, IV (Cambridge, Mass., 1978).

19. Połarean, *Hay groṭner*, 21.

20. Aucher, *Philon*, v-vi.

21. F. C. Conybeare, "The Age of the Old Armenian Version of Irenaeus," in Mechitharisten-kongregation, *Huschardzan, Festschrift aus anlaß des 100jährigen bestandes der Mechitharisten-kongregation in Wien* (Vienna, 1911), 193-202 (Conybeare, however, was misled by the traditional date given to Elišē, who utilizes the Armenian Philo); A. Vardanean, "Lezowagan nmanowt'iwnner P'iloni ew Irenēosi Hay t'argmanowt'iwnnerow mēj," *Handes amsorya*, 35 (1921), 450-58; Manandean, *Yownaban*, 228-36; see also the introductions to the various editions of the *Demonstratio*, all of which have a 7th-century date for the translation.

22. N. Akinean, "S. Irenēos Hay matenagrowth'ean mēj," *Handes amsorya*, 24 (1910), 200-8; hastily and perhaps erroneously, he ascribes the translation of Irenaeus to Vrt'anēs; see also Manandean, *Yownaban*, 230-31.

23. A. Baumgartner, *Über das Buch "Die Chrie"* (Leipzig, 1886); G. V. Yovsēp'ean, "Dawit' Hark'ac'in ew Pitoyic' girk'ə," *Ararat* (February 1908), 203-16.

24. Manandean, *Yownaban*, 115-24; Akinean, "Yownaban," 275; for the text of Thrax, see N. Adonc', ed., *Дионисий Фракийский и армянские толкователи* (Petrograd, 1915), 1-56 and his enlightening introduction (cited hereafter as *Thrax*).

25. N. Aḡbalean, "Ditołowt'iwnner N. Adonc'i nor grk'ci vray," *Ararat* (January-December 1919), 70-71, concluding that the translation of Thrax was accomplished at Taron; cf. A. Vardanean, "Artawazdahaw, Hayk, Haykač'apč, Vahagn," *Hands amšorya*, 34 (1920), 281-83. Both authors seem to rely on A. Meillet, *Allarmenisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg, 1913), 4.

26. *Yownaban*, 227-28, where he does not rule out a west Armenian provenance; cf. H. Ačatean, *Hayoc' lezowi patmowtiwn*, II (Erevan, 1951), 142-68, who discerns a more western dialect.

27. *Yownaban*, 107; cf. 95, where he denies any clear evidence to help date any of the translations considered by him.

28. *Thrax*, 79-124; Adonc', however, concludes that this scholion was written on the Greek version rather than on the Armenian translation and questions the scholiast's identity with Dawit' Ayałt', p. clxxiii; he also places the translation in the 7th century, p. cxciii. Manandean clearly demonstrates the scholiast's dependence on the Armenian translation and his identity with Dawit', *Yownaban*, 210-11, 218-22. The antiquity of this scholion is attested by a 7th century anonymous scholion which mentions it repeatedly, *Thrax*, 128-29; cf. 127, 137, 145, and by the scholion of Step'anos Siwnec'i, 181-219. Adonc' attributes the anonymous work to Mambrē Vercanoł, *ibid.*, cxiii-cxiv (but cf. Jerusalem MS 1311, 642-45), Manandean attributes it to Pōłos K'ert'ol, *Yownaban*, 212-13.

29. Adonc', *Thrax*, 159-79; Polarean, *Hay grołner*, 39-40, ascribes to K'ert'olāhayr the translation of Thrax, several of Philo's works, and the handbook of Aphthonius.

30. Judging from the dates given to his students: T'ēodoros K'ert'ol, Petros K'ert'ō, and Ezras Angełac'i; see Manandean, *Yownaban*, 246-55 and his references to Asołik on p. 224; cf. Polarean, *Hay grołner*, 39, 44.

31. *Yownaban*, 88, 106, 124.

32. *Ibid.*, 107, 115; for earlier conclusions beginning with "before the second half of the seventh century," see pp. 93, 95.

33. *Ibid.*, 95-107; he seems to have been misled by Tēr-Mkrtč'ean (cited on p. 97), who, emending the date, places it between 480 and 484, as the dae for the translation; so also Akinean, "Yownaban," 279-84, who, emending the date differently, places the translation between 601 and 603 and finds its first mention in a letter by Vrt'anēs K'ert'ol (dated 606), in which Vrt'anēs boasts of having collected a number of anti-Chalcedonian works, among them that of Timothy of Alexandria (*Girk' t'it'oc'*, 126; cf. 91, 140). To this letter Akinean appends another letter by Abraham Kar'olikos (dated 607), in which mention is made of absurd transliteration of names of bishops and bishoprics in translations from Greek (and not absurd translations from Greek as Akinean thinks, col. 282, quoting *Girk' t'it'oc'*, 183), done at Owīha (Edessa), where Vrt'anēs lived and where Akinean is wrongly inclined to place the translations of the second group. The latter seem to derive from a Chalcedonian circle; see Manandean, *Yownaban*, 136, 225.

34. *Ibid.*, 96-97, citing Photius and the anonymous of the *De rebus armeniae*; see also N. Akinean, "Timot'ēos Kowz Hay matenagrowt'ean mej," *Handes amšorya*, 22 (1908), 261-65, 294-302. For two other interdependent testimonies that have come to light since, see Akinean-Pōłosean, "Matenagragan," 65-68, where all four testimonies are excerpted in the notes, and where sufficient reasons are given to conclude that the mid-6th-century translation of Timothy's refutation alluded to in these testimonia cannot be the translation by the Hellenizing School. The strongest evidence is that the Armenian version of Philoxenus, mentioned with Timothy's refutation, does not belong to the Hellenizing School (see also Akinean, "Yownaban," 283-84). We may likewise add

that neither of the two other writings pertaining to Christological controversies and translated by the School (those of Eutychus of Constantinople and Peter of Antioch) is alluded to in the testimonia. More on these "barbaric" translations, which cannot be of much use in dynamic controversies, shall be said later (see note 78 below).

35. *Yownaban*, 95.

36. *Ibid.*, 223, 226; Arevšatyan, "Platon," 16, follows uncritically Manandean's late-5th-century date, which accommodates the traditional view on very poor grounds.

37. *Yownaban*, 106, 216, 229-32.

38. "Yownaban," 208.

39. N. Akinean, "Dawit' Anyalt' ew Dawit' Hark'ac'i, Yownaban dproc'i t'argamanič'nern əst Hay awandowt'ean," *Handes amšorya*, 70 (1956), 123-63.

40. Among manuscripts attributing the translation to Dawit', see Jerusalem MSS 401, 1288, 1291, etc.; among those attributing it to others as well, see 68, 1303, etc.; see also Polarean, *Hay grołner*, 21.

41. Erevan MSS 270, 580, 589, 1754, 2018, 2607; all but the last date from the 17th century, the last is dated 1300 (old numbers cited by Akinean, "Yownaban," 290, where the colophon appears).

42. Manandean, *Yownaban*, 136-42, thinks the colophon alludes to the works of Aristotle, perhaps the *Categoriae*, and underlines its importance in dating the translations of the second group, p. 216. Akinean, "Yownaban," 290-91, sees a reference to the scholia on Aristotle. The reference could well be to the entire Aristotelian corpus translated by the School.

43. *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 18-19; vi. 11; the surviving third of the chronicle covers the period 571-85; cf. Y. G. Melk'onyan, *Asorakan albiurner Hayastani ew Hayeri masin* (Erevan, 1976), 431; on various migrations of Armenians to Byzantium, see J. Laurent, *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam* (Paris, 1919), 190-91. The favorable situation of Armenians in Byzantium changed during the reigns of Tiberius (578-82) and Maurice (582-602).

44. M. Örmanean, *Hayoc' ekelec'in*, 5th ed. (Antilias, Lebanon, 1952), 200.

45. A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922), 184-85.

46. Arm. *Bēriarmēnias*, a corruption of the Gk. Περὶ ἐρμηνείας; see, e.g., Jerusalem MSS 401, 407, 791, 833, 948, 974, 1411, 1501, etc. This credit to Dawit' appears in every proem or subtitle to Aristotle's works.

47. A. Busse, ed., *Davidis Prolegomena et in Porphyrii Isagogen commentarium*, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca XVIII, 2 (Berlin, 1904); S. Arevšatyan, ed., *Давид Непобедимый, Определения философии* (Erevan, 1960), and *Давид Непобедимый, Толкование Аналитики Аристотеля* (Erevan, 1967).

48. 14.18-19, 24-26, 28-65.9 (ed. Busse); but twice in the Armenian text, where the third is missing: 134.5, 11 (ed. Arevšatyan).

49. In his commentary on Aristotle's *Meteorologica* he mentions the comet which appeared in the 281st year of the Diocletian era (564/5).

50. A. Busse, ed., *Eliae in Porphyrii Isagogen et Aristotelis Categoriae commentaria*, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca XVIII, 1 (Berlin, 1882), v-ix; but in *Davidis Prolegomena*, v-vi, Busse insists that Dawit' was a pupil of Elias; cf. M. Khostikian, *David der Philosoph* (Diss. Leipzig, 1907), who argues against Busse's later views; see also Manandean, *Yownaban*, 49-52, who goes on to identify Elias with Olympiodorus the Younger.

51. H. D. Saffrey, "Le Chrétien Jean Philopon et la survivance de l'école d'Alexandrie au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle," *REG*, 72

(1954), 396-400; H. Usener, *De Stephano Alexandrino* (Bonn, 1880), 3-6.

52. For a concise treatment of the Christian takeover at Alexandria and the move to Constantinople, see R. T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism* (New York, 1972), 139-40.

53. Polarean's differentiation between the Greek author and the Armenian translator as two distinct personalities (*Hay grofner*, 73) cannot be maintained for the simple reason that the dates of authorship and translation are about the same. A detailed study of the questions surrounding Dawit' must be left to another publication.

54. This observation was first made by G. Tēr-Mkrťēan, *Anania Širakač'i* (Vałaršapat, Armenia, 1896), 35.

55. Aucher, *Philon*, v-vi.

56. The shorter recension was first published by K<sup>c</sup>. Patkanean, *Ananiayi: Širakownwoy mnač'ordk' banic'* (St. Petersburg, 1877), 1-4, then by L. Ališan, *Hayapatowm* (Venice, 1901), 232-33, and is available in an English translation by F. C. Conybeare, "Ananias of Shirak (A.D. 600-650 c.)," *BZ*, 6 (1897), 572-74. The longer recension was first published by J. Dashian, *Katalog der Armenischen Handschriften in der Mechitaristen-Bibliothek zu Wien* (Vienna, 1895), 174-76, then by A. G. Abrahamyan, *Anania Širakač'ow matenagrowt'iwna* (Erevan, 1944), 206-9, and is available in a French translation by H. Berbérian, "Autobiographie d'Ananias Širakač'i," *REArm*, n.s. 1 (1964), 189-94.

57. He gives no further indication of the place.

58. Most likely, the mathematician was a Greek whose name Anania renders in Armenian.

59. Tychikos had served in Armenia during the reign of Tiberius (578-82) and was wounded during a warfare with the Persians early in the reign of Maurice (582-602). He then fled to Antioch and vowed to devote the rest of his life to study and teaching. Upon being healed, he went to Jerusalem for a month, then to Alexandria for three years, off to Rome for "not a few years," and eventually to Constantinople. At the latter place he spent "not a few years" studying with "a distinguished man, a doctor of the city of philosophers" (the short recension adds "Athens"; however, the long version implies Constantinople, which merits such a designation during the reign of Heraclius, 610-641). Upon the death of his famed teacher, Tychikos was asked to occupy his chair, but he declined the imperial invitation insisting that he had vowed not to leave Trebizond.

60. See the perceptive study by P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Bibliothèque Byzantine, VI (Paris, 1971), 43-108, esp. 81-85, and his "Note sur les données historiques de l'Autobiographie d'Anania de Shirak," *REArm*, n.s. 1 (1964), 195-202.

61. He had earlier attributed to his master a statement about the prevailing illiteracy in Armenia.

62. Certainly the fundamental texts in the Armenian monastic schools were biblical, liturgical, and the more theological books among patristic writings; see R. W. Thomson, *Agathangelos: History of the Armenians* (Albany, 1976), lxxx.

63. T. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasse syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1898), ix-x.

64. *Geschichte*, 184-85.

65. S. Brock, "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning."

66. "Platon," 8-20; for the various editions of the possibly Stoic works, see p. 17.

67. Cited by Akinean, "Yownaban," 289, who also finds

allusion to Eutychus in a letter of Vrt'anēs K'ert'ol, *Girk' t't'oc'*, 116.

68. Jerusalem MSS 451, 1120, 1328, 1386, etc. Likewise, an anonymous scholion on Pseudo-Dionysius states that "it was translated by Step'anos, Bishop of Siwnik', at Constantinople," see e.g., Jerusalem MS 270B, p. 3.

69. Jerusalem MSS 1862 (Nemesius), 390 (Gregory of Nyssa).

70. In addition, some manuscripts also attribute to him few selections from Athanasius; see, e.g., Jerusalem MS 534.

71. Polarean, *Hay grofner*, 112-15; see also the authorities cited by him; cf. S. Orbélian, *Histoire de la Siounie*, II, trans. M. Brosset (St. Petersburg, 1864), 49-51. Arevšatyan, "Platon," 18, limits the years of the translator's activity to 712-18.

72. Ačarean, *Hayoc' lezowi patmowt'iwn*, II, 142-68; G. Jahowkyan, *K'erakanakan ašxatowt'yownnera mišnadarayan Hayastanowm* (Erevan, 1954), 41-114; A. N. Mowradyan, *Yownaban dproc'a ew nra derə Hayereni k'erakanakan terminabanowt'yan stelcman gorcowm* (Erevan, 1971), *passim*; et al.

73. *Girk' t't'oc'*, 93-98, 112-45, 196-211 (Vrt'anēs), 153-60 (Grigor). The letter wrongly ascribed to Petros K'ert'ol or Petros Episkopos Siwneac' (*ibid.*, 99-107) is a translation from Greek; see N. Biwandac'i, "T'it'akc'owt'iwn," *Handes amšorya*, 22 (1908), 155-56; N. Akinean, "Kiwriion kat'owlikos Vrac'," *Handes amšorya*, 23 (1909), 332; Manandean, *Yownaban*, 93-95.

74. Polarean, *Hay grofner*, 83-102.

75. Aucher, *Philon*, iii-v.

76. Polarean, *Hay grofner*, 106-8; Manandean, *Yownaban*, 89-91.

77. "Yownaban," 285; Akinean-Pōtosean, "Matenagra-kan," 55; Lewy, *De Jona*, 15.

78. These are: the refutation of Chalcedon by Timothy of Alexandria, Eutyches' denunciation of the Nestorian doctrine of two persons or substances in Christ, and the letter of Peter of Antioch. All three may have been translated at the same time and may rightly belong to the third group. This does not preclude the existence of other translations of the same polemical writings at the height of Christological disputes in the 6th and 7th centuries. Vrt'anēs K'ert'ol cites a number of anti-Chalcedonian works which he had collected and at times translated (see note 33 above). He also seems to have been familiar with the translation of the Hellenizing School, judging from a derogatory allusion to new ways of translating (*Girk' t't'oc'*, 116).

79. In particular, see H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Münich, 1959); "Bildung und Theologie im frühmittelalterlichen Byzanz," *Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Wirth, Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit I (Heidelberg, 1966), 69-81; Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*; P. Speck, *Die Kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel: Präzisierungen zur Frage des höheren Schulwesens in Byzanz im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, *ByzArch*, 14 (Munich, 1974).

80. As S. Der Nersessian summarily observes (following Akinean): "The Philhellene school, the activity of which extends over the seventh century, may have started in Constantinople approximately in 572 when the catholicos John and a number of nobles came to the capital and remained there in exile for almost twenty years." *Armenia and the Byzantine Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1945), 26.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AA* *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, Supplement to *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*
- AArchArSyr* *Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes. Revue d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*
- AbhPreussAkad* *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Kl.*
- AJA* *American Journal of Archaeology*
- AnalBoll* *Analecta Bollandiana*
- AnatSt* *Anatolian Studies. Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara*
- ArtB* *Art Bulletin*
- AttiVen* *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti. Classe di Scienze morali e Lettere*
- BEFAR* *Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*
- BJb* *Bonner Jahrbücher*
- BO* *Bibliotheca Orientalis*
- BSOAS* *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
- BSR* *Papers of the British School at Rome*
- ByzArch* *Byzantinisches Archiv*
- BZ* *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
- CahArch* *Cahiers Archéologiques*
- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
- ClMed* *Classica et Mediaevalia*
- CSCO* *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*
- DACL* *F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*
- DOP* *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*
- DOS* *Dumbarton Oaks Studies*
- DTC* *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*
- FRLANT* *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*
- GBA* *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*
- GCS* *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte (1897– )*
- GRBS* *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
- HAW* *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, ed. I. Müller; new ed. by W. Otto et al*
- HO* *Handbuch der Orientalistik*
- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae (Berlin, 1873– )*
- ILS* *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae, ed. H. Dessau, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1892–1916)*
- JA* *Journal Asiatique*
- JBL* *Journal of Biblical Literature*
- JBLW* *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*
- JEH* *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
- JNES* *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
- JÖB* *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*
- JRAS* *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
- JRS* *Journal of Roman Studies*
- JThS* *Journal of Theological Studies*
- JWarb* *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*
- LThK* *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche, ed. J. Jöfer and K. Rahner, 2nd ed. (Freiburg i/B, 1957-65)*
- MélUSJ* *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth*
- MemLinc* *Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Memorie*
- NachrGött* *Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl.*
- NTS* *New Testament Studies*
- OCA* *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*
- OCP* *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
- OKS* *Ostkirchliche Studien*
- OrChr* *Oriens Christianus*

OrSyr *L'Orient Syrien*

PG *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne

PO *Patrologia Orientalis* (Paris, 1903– )

ProcBrAc *Proceedings of the British Academy*

PS *Patrologia Syriaca*, ed. R. Graffin, 3 vols. (Paris, 1894–1926)

RAC *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*

RBibl *Revue Biblique*

REArm *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes*

REG *Revue des Etudes Grecques*

RendLinc *Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Rendiconti*

RHE *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*

RhM *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*

RHR *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions. Annales du Musée Guimet*

ROChr *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*

RSR *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*

RStO *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*

SBE *The Sacred Books of the East*, ed. T. M. Müller (Oxford, 1879–1910)

SC *Sources Chrétiennes. Collection dirigée par H. de Lubac et J. Daniélou*

SemKond *Seminarium Kondakovianum*

ST *Studi e Testi*

StPB *Studia Patristica et Byzantina*

TU *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1882– )

VChr *Vigilae Christianae*

VizVrem *Vizantijskij Vremennik*

ZAW *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

ZDMG *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

ZDPV *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*

ZKircheng *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*

ZNW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

ZWTh *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*