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Foreword
On the Retirement of Prof. Abraham Terian

It is with great joy that St. Nersess Armenian Seminary dedicates this issue of the St. Nersess Theological Review to Professor Abraham Terian on the occasion of his retirement from full-time teaching.

With the arrival of Dr. Terian at St. Nersess in the Fall of 1997, the academic caliber of the Seminary surged to an unprecedented level thanks to his preeminent scholarship, his unrivaled expertise in Armenian theological thought with its sources and historical pathways, and his reputation as an excellent teacher and highly-esteemed colleague.

In gratitude for Professor Terian’s manifold contributions to this journal, to the Seminary, to the Armenian Church, and to his countless students — թեոպարտություններ — the Editorial Board of the Theological Review is republishing herein a selection of his many noteworthy studies. Some, like those on the so-called Hellenizing School of Armenian translational literature, were pioneering works that continue to be cited as the most authoritative word on the subject to date. Other valuable essays, cached in the Acta of various scholarly congresses long-since forgotten, are returned to light as an enticement both to seasoned scholars and to their disciples of a new generation. Included as well is an anthology of Terian’s Philonic studies. Philo of Alexandria’s importance for the nascent Christian exegetical and theological tradition occupied Terian’s early career and continues to captivate him.

As transparently as these essays may reflect Abraham Terian’s erudition, they could never portray the exceptional human qualities of the gentleman that my colleagues and I have had the distinction of working with — and learning from — for the past twelve years.

I wish to thank Edward G. Mathews for compiling Professor Terian's bibliography and Roberta R. Ervine, who now takes over as editor of the Review, for overseeing the production of this volume.

Very Rev. Fr. Michael Daniel Findikyan
Dean, St. Nersess Armenian Seminary
Record of an ...
Editor’s Preface

Editing this volume has been a profoundly gratifying experience on several levels. First, it could hardly be anything but edifying to reprise the writing career of a ranking scholar in the field of Armenian studies — especially one whose works have influenced the development of scholarly research in such diverse fields. To reread the articles presented here has been to benefit from their contents anew, and to be struck yet again by the erudition and intellectual generosity of their author.

Second, to make a body of Abraham Terian’s works available to a new audience is to do a meritorious service to the Armenian community at large. Generations of St. Nersess students have sat at his feet (as, in fact, did his colleagues) and as a result, Armenian communities around the country now benefit at second hand from his learning. For those future generations who will not have the opportunity to proudly call themselves his students, this volume offers a taste of what they will have missed.

Last but not least, it has given me and everyone on the St. Nersess faculty great pleasure to honor a revered and beloved pillar of the Seminary — albeit in a way of which, had he realized our intentions, he would quite likely not have approved. Professor Terian’s perfectionism was a quality from which we all benefited on countless occasions during his tenure at St. Nersess; we hereby ask his pardon for not having allowed him to satisfy that side of his character by updating any of the articles in this volume, prior to their republication.

The merits of having withheld that opportunity from the author will be immediately apparent to the reading audience. There is nothing that enhances our appreciation of Abraham Terian’s mature writings more than to see evidences of how his scholarly passions have come to bud, bloom and fruition over the course of thirty years. To enhance that appreciation, the arrangement of articles in this retrospective collection is chronological. The organic growth of his scholarship may be clearly seen in these pages, where we find on display the deepening of Terian’s insights into the mindset of Armenian historiography, the intentions and techniques of the Hellenizing School, the underpinnings of early Armenian theology, and the vital role of Armenian texts in filling out the picture of Hellenistic Judaism, among other topics both deep and broad. By painstakingly weaving together these threads of Armenian thought, Professor
Terian’s articles, as a body of work, set before the reader the very fabric of Armenian religious experience.

Also clearly evident in these articles are Professor Terian’s twin gifts for presenting complex material simply, and for treating apparently simple material with analytical complexity. His ability to move freely and easily between erudite discussion and elementary exposition, communicating equally well with people at any level of expertise and in any setting, has made him both a scholar’s scholar and a teacher’s teacher.

A decision was made early on in the editorial process to limit the contents of this volume to Professor Terian’s articles in Armenology and Philonic Studies. In a way, the latter are part and parcel of the former, as he has focused his inquiries in that field primarily on the texts of the Philonic corpus extant in Armenian. The choice to offer the broader scholarly world a unique and otherwise inaccessible Armenian platform from which to review their findings, is characteristic of Professor Terian’s entire body of work. His activities within the Society of Philo Studies, the Society for Biblical Literature, the North American Patristics Society and other scholarly groups have all been designed to open doors into the Armenian tradition — historical, intellectual, and spiritual — for thinkers who might otherwise remain regrettably unaware of the treasures lying within this relative terra incognita.

Preference has been given in these pages to writings not readily available to an average reader. On this principle, articles that appeared in the pages of the St. Nersess Theological Review, still readily available through the Seminary and soon to be available on-line as well, have been excluded. The reader should be aware that a number of the articles chosen for inclusion here were groundbreaking from the point of view of Armenian Studies. For example, Terian’s 1992 article on Armenian grammarians is one of the earliest explorations of that topic in English. Similarly, his article on Biblical Interpretation in the Writings of Grigor Magistros is the first to deal with that work, and represents an early step in Terian’s ongoing fascination with the writings of the famously savant Magister (including his notoriously difficult Letters).

It should be noted that editorial interventions have been kept to the minimum necessary to bring the articles into a harmonious format as a single volume: footnote formatting has been rendered uniform (or nearly so), and transliteration has been regularized. Bibliographical references have sometimes been expanded in hopes of making the tracing of information easier for the majority of our non-specialist readership. Philonic abbreviations have been regularized following the list given in his article, “A Critical Introduction to Philo’s Dialogues”, even though this system does not follow the latest scholarly usage, be-
cause of its convenience for the reader. For any errors that may have been introduced inadvertently into his articles in the editorial process, we ask the author’s pardon.

Finally, let me say that the Editorial Board is especially happy to greet the appearance of this retrospective as the first volume in the new phase of the St. Nersess Theological Review’s ongoing development. We are all cognizant of the fact that this publication is our way of making Abraham Terian’s gracious and learned presence among us linger just a little longer.
Acknowledgements
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REVIEWS


Syntactical Peculiarities in the Translations of the Hellenizing School

The predominantly philosophical translations of the Hellenizing School are characterized by syntactical awkwardness that makes them somewhat incomprehensible. The ambiguities are basically due to the fact that these translations maintain not only the word order of the Greek but also the form of Greek compounds and other grammatical structures.

Unlike biblical and other religious translations of the Golden Age (5th century), the predominantly philosophical translations of the Hellenizing School (flourished ca 570-ca 730)\(^1\) maintain the Greek word order or syntax.\(^2\) The inter-linear character of these translations is well explained by Lewy, who observes that these translations were intended primarily for the trivium — the three subjects taught in the schools of the late classical period as preliminary to biblical and theological studies: grammar in accordance with Dionysius Thrax, rhetoric, and introduction to dialectic. Lewy goes on to follow Akinian in suggesting that these translations were to facilitate the education of Armenian students seeking admission into the Byzantine schools in the imperial metropolis, where also the Hellenizing School must have been located. Such a thesis can be further substantiated not just by appealing to the historical situation during the last quarter of the 6th century — as both of the cited authorities do — but also by the fact that

---

1 For a complete list of these translations, see S. Arevshatyan, “The Time of the Armenian Translation of Plato’s Works” [ձըտրայի բթի հաղորդածությունը], Banber Matenadaran: X (1971) 7-20; here, 16-18. On the date of the founding of the School, see the excellent discussion by H. Lewy, *The Pseudo-Philonic De Jona* (Studies and Documents 7), London: Christophers, 1936, 9-16, who, for the most part, follows N. Akinian, “The Hellenizing School” [Գիտական գրքությունը], Handès Ansönya XLVI (1932), 271-292; here, 271-277.

2 This was readily observed by J.B. Aucher, *Philonis Judaei semones tres hactenus inediti: I et II de providentia et III de animalibus*, Venice: San Lazzaro, 1822, ii. It was due to his collaboration that the translations of the Hellenizing School were drawn upon in the monumental dictionary edited by G. Awetik’ian, Kh. Siwrmélian and Aucher (M. Awgerian) himself (*New Lexicon of the Armenian Language* [երեք բառարան Հայերեն լեզուները], vols. I-II, Venice: San Lazzaro, 1836-1837.)
the Armenian translations of voluminous writers like Plato, Aristotle, and Philo are incomplete. No attempt was made by the Hellenizing School to translate the complete works of such celebrities but only select works which seem to have been used for tutorial purposes.

Following Manandyan’s pioneering work, the achievements of this School are arranged into four groups representing four successive periods of active translating. The grouping is based primarily on the rendering of Greek compounds in the Armenian. Whereas in the earliest translations many Greek compounds are rendered by a number of words, in the later translations a more mechanical imitation of Greek compounds becomes commonplace. In the latest translations of the School a considerable number of the new compounds stand out as *hapax legomena*. The line of demarcation between the groups, however, is not as clear as Manandyan indicates. For instance, much of what he says about the second group of translations applies equally to the translation of Philo’s works, which he places in the first group. The distinction between the groups seems to rest more on the relative frequency of the compounds rendered in more than one word than on the rarity or uniqueness of some compounds rendered in a word.

In view of the significance of compounds in the translations of the School, we shall look at their formation. Indeed, there can be no thorough treatment of syntax without considering the employment of stems and words in the composition of compounds; one may even begin with the various inflectional forms of simple words. For practical purposes, we shall limit our consideration to renderings of Greek compounds beginning with prepositional prefixes. Some examples of such renderings, taken from every *categorema* of prepositionally prefixed words, will suffice.

---


4 Preferences by various yet few translators, and their obvious use of a lexicon, may account for many of the similarities and dissimilarities between the groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Æπο - ρωγ</th>
<th>Από - ρωγ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ἀνά - ἢμρ</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀντί - ἢμρ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάλογα</td>
<td>ἀντιφάσις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγγέλλω</td>
<td>ἀντιμεθύτημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνατίθημι</td>
<td>ἀντωνομα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έπι - σωλ / σφρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιδακρῶν</td>
<td>ὑποστήμε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιδιάτρεσ</td>
<td>σωματικικῆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπινοια</td>
<td>σωματικικῆ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>κατά - ὑμ / ὑμη</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καταγγέλλω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταγγέλλω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθηγορούμαι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>μετά - τάφρ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μεταμορφώ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετατομή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεταστομία</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>περί - λμή / λμή / λμω</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>περιστοτέμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περικάθημα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιτόμημα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>παρά - λμή / λμή</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>παραβάλλω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραλαμβάνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρομοιά</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>πρό - λμή</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πρόθεμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρόσθιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσεπτικ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The formation of Armenian compounds in the above examples requires little or no explanation: the imitation of Greek compounds is only too obvious. Of course a word in one language is seldom the exact equivalent of a word in a different language. Each word is the center of a whole cluster of meanings and associations, and in different languages these clusters often overlap but do not always coincide. However, some of these artificial compounds are meaningless — despite the inherent meanings of the parts of which they are composed. The same is true of the broader syntax of these translations in spite of the inherent meanings of words which, to the Armenian reader, seem in disarray. Even when the meanings of the individual words are known, the overall meaning remains elusive.

In his study of the Philonic works extant in both Greek and Armenian, Marcus observes three classes of word renderings by the Armenian translator: 1) one to one correspondences 2) exact reproductions of compounds and 3) one word translating a number of Greek synonyms or words of related but by no
means identical meaning. Marcus, however, disregards three other classes of word renderings that emerge from the lack of exact equivalency or import of meaning in the Armenian. In such instances the translator was compelled to render a Greek word with a number of words. Moreover, there are many instances where after once rendering a Greek word by its Armenian equivalent, the translator elsewhere renders the same word by a number of words, often using *hendiadys* and sometimes *polyndeton*. Furthermore, one finds not only exact reproductions of compounds but also renditions of the same compounds in separate words. One may even go beyond these major classes of word renderings to show a fair number of other, still common tendencies of rendering. The following randomly taken examples from Philo, scores of which abound in any Philonic work extant in both languages, will suffice to show a number of these additional classes of word renderings and the translator’s treatment of words in general.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἀλεξάρτος</th>
<th>Leg All I</th>
<th>ὀἰκονομία (61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leg All II</td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (32, 66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (68, 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abr</td>
<td>ᾠδὴ Ὁμοιομόρφη (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (93, 115, 123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec Leg III</td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἄκρισθω</th>
<th>Leg All I</th>
<th>ὀἰκονομία ὑπὲρ ἔργον (91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abr</td>
<td>ἐργασία (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία ἀγαθον (240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>ἀγάθος (1, 18, 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀἰκονομία (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec Leg I</td>
<td>ἀγάθος (105)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vita Cont</th>
<th>Xρήσεις τού ἄρχοντος εἰς τὸ μέτωπον (110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀπαντήσεις (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Χρηστὴν ἀποκαλεῖσθαι λαῖτον ἐκπαιδευτήρ (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>λακατί (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apόdoσις</td>
<td>Leg All I</td>
<td>παραπαράγεται (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>συνεκτικός (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leg All II</td>
<td>παράκειμεν (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abr</td>
<td>παραπαράγεται συνεκτικός (88, 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παραπαράγεται συνεκτικός (119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παράκειμεν (200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αφθονία</td>
<td>Leg All I</td>
<td>ἀπαντηθήσεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀπώσπασθήσεται (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abr</td>
<td>ἀπαντηθήσεται ἐκρήγα (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>ἀπαντηθήσεται εἰς ἀπαντηθήσεις (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀπαντηθήσεται (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec Leg I</td>
<td>ἀπωθήτωσθαι ἀπαντηθήσεις (117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παραπαράγεται (141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κιβδηλεύω</td>
<td>Leg All II</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ὑπηρεσίαν (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἑρμηνεύσεις ὑπηρεσίας (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec Leg I</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ὑπηρεσίας (326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec Leg III</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ὑπηρεσίας (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vita Cont</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ὑπηρεσίας ἐς ὑπηρεσίας ὑπηρεσίας (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρατέω</td>
<td>Leg All I</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας ἐς ὑπηρεσία (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας ἐς ὑπηρεσία (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας ἐς ὑπηρεσία (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leg All II</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας ἐς ὑπηρεσία (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας ἐς ὑπηρεσία (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας ἐς ὑπηρεσία (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abr</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας (151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας (220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παράκειμεν ἐς ὑπηρεσία ὑπηρεσίας (243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec Leg I</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ὑπηρεσίας (312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ὑπηρεσίας (343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vit Cont</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ὑπηρεσίας (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνέχω</td>
<td>Abr</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας ἐς ὑπηρεσία ὑπηρεσία (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec Leg I</td>
<td>ἡμῶν ἐς ἱστορίας (289)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No doubt the Armenian translator of Philo made inconsistent use of a lexicon, for seldom does his choice of words fall outside a lexical pattern or appear to have been based on recall. Certainly his choice of words was not always governed by context. He randomly chose words from among the alternate meanings provided in his manual. Sometimes he picked two or three synonyms which he used either conjunctively or paraphrastically. When picking two verbs, he often changed the first into a participle (but no methodical rendering of participles is to be found in his translation — even if one were to allow for the confusion resulting from the scribal tendency in the Middle Ages toward abbreviating the participial ending - kuk to -ki, the infinitival ending). His frequent use of auxiliary verbs is all too obvious. But seldom does his “paraphrasing” — even of compounds — obliterate the lexical terms, which can be identified. Identifying the Greek lexical terms, however, can be difficult, since one Armenian word sometimes translates a number of Greek synonyms or words of related but by no means identical meaning; e.g., .resolution, an equivalent of αισχρός, the first word listed above, could also be a rendering of aiddin (Spec Leg I 83), and ἄρωμα, an equivalent of συνέλως, the last word listed above, could also be a rendering of ἄθρος (Abr 42, 138), ἄμα (176), καθάπαξ (36, 50), ὁμοῦ (45, 50, 136, 161, 246, 267), συλληβδην (49), and ὅλος (Leg All I 31).

Other syntactical peculiarities are easily discernible in these translations; e.g., the placing of the verb after the subject instead of before — as is customarily done in Classical Armenian: thus, one reads

---

Another clear evidence for the use of a lexicon by the translator(s) is found in the parallel passages from Plato’s *Timaeus* and David’s *Prolegomena* cited by Arevshatyan, 15. It is not that the translator of David used the Armenian version of the *Timaeus*, as Arevshatyan thinks, but that the translator(s) of these works used the same lexicon. This accounts for the minor variations in the translations.
instead of the more familiar

ρωσία ρωσίαν ιερών ρωσίαν

The former is a literal rendering of

tά ἄλογα Ἰσραήλ λόγου μετέχοισι

Another peculiarity is seen in the placing of the attributive before the substantive instead of after: thus, one reads

οἶδαίσαν ρωσίαν instead of οἴδαισαν ἐρήμων

The former is a literal rendering of

tοὺς ἔχθες λόγους

Note the attachment of the accusative prefix to a word with a genitive suffix, an awkwardness resulting from the reversed position of the attributive. Other examples:

οἴδαισαν ἔρημων ρωσίαν ιερών instead of οἴδαισαν ἔρημων ρωσίαν ιερών
οἴδαισαν ἔρημων ρωσίαν ιερών instead of οἴδαισαν ἔρημων ρωσίαν ιερών
οἴδαισαν ἔρημων ρωσίαν ιερών instead of οἴδαισαν ἔρημων ρωσίαν ιερών

The foregoing syntactical peculiarities may be seen in the following example:

πρωτόμαιᾳ πρωτομίῳ πρωτομίῳ (Hellenizing School)
πρωτομίῳ πρωτομίῳ (Golden Age)

Awareness of the Greek syntax underlying the translations of the Hellenizing School faded away in subsequent centuries. What most impressed

7 Grigor Magistros (11th century) may belong to the last generation of those who were aware of the underlying Greek syntax.
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 Plato, Aristotle, Philo, Irenaeus, David the Invincible, and others should be tackled only by men of profound ability. While the would-be interpreters were apt to quote these authors more than interpret them, some were eager to express their personal views rather than those of the authors; others, however, were content with short catenae of quotations. As for medieval and later scribes, they must have copied the seemingly obscure translations of the Hellenizing School with little or no understanding.
The Hellenizing School: Its Time, Place, and Scope of Activities Reconsidered

The Armenian literary heritage of the 6th to 8th 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 (5th 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 grécoophile. 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 proemias 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 this study, which necessarily abounds with references to Manandyan’s magnum opus on the development of the School.¹

The translations under consideration have been variously arranged into four

groups, representing, *prima facie*, four successive periods of active translating. To the first group belong the Ἡχη γραμματική of Dionysius Thrax, a handbook of rhetoric belonging to Aphthonius, certain Philonic and pseudo-Philonic works — several of which survive only in Armenian, Books IV and V of Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* and his *Demonstratio praedicationis evangelicae* (Ec επιθεξην του ἀποστολικου 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 Adiab Theon, *Hermetica* ("To Asclepius"), Porphry's *Isagoge* on Aristotle's *Categoricae*, the latter's *Categoricae* and *De interpretatione*, and Iamblichus' commentaries on Aristotle.

To the third group belong the works of Dawit' Anhaght' (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, Eutyches' denunciation of the Nestorian doctrine of two persons or substances in Christ — available only in Armenian, two

---

2 Manandyan, *Hellenizing School*, 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. Akinian, "The Hellenizing School" [Ἑλληνιζόμενη Βιβλιοθήκη], *Handels Annales* XLVI (1932) 273-77, who synthesizes Manandyan's classifications and sets off the stories ascribed to Nonnus of Panopolis and the pseudo-Aristotelian *De mundo* as a fourth group; cf. Akinian and Tēr-Pōghosian, "Literary Studies," 15-18. The Platonic and possibly Stoic works have been rightly added by S. Arevshatyan, "The Dating of the Armenian Translation of Plato's Works" [Թուրքական եզրակացության մասին, *Armenian Studies* X (1971) 141-158, whose list we have followed with some reservations, contenting ourselves with a few modifications in the order of works within the groups and with additions indicated in the notes.

3 This is the *Girk* pitoyis', wrongly attributed to Movsēs Khorenats'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* 1), Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980, 3-6.

5 To this we may add the *Girk* tkats', an Aristotelian textbook on the Ὀργανος, 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'ogh or Petros Episkopos Siwneats', the translation of which maintains the Greek syntax; see Book of *Correspondence* [Թագուհի նախագիծ], Tiflis: 1901, 99-107.
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, the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Socrates, the mystic works attributed to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, selections from Cyril of Alexandria, Nemesius' *De natura hominis*, and Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio*.

This grouping is based primarily on the way Greek compounds are rendered into Armenian. As Manandyan 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. 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 of Philo’s works. Also, instead of dwelling more on the relative frequency of similarly constructed compounds in the various translations or groups, Manandyan places undue emphasis on the importance of unique compounds, which he limits to certain groups as determining factors in his categorization. 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 allegoriae I* 18), “makats’ut’iwn” (*ἐπιστημή*, *ibid.*, 6, 68, 70; *De Abrahamo* 71, 73), and

---

7 This work, *On Clouds and Signs* ([Ὑφηγητὰ ὅραμα καὶ ἀντίγραφα]), was until recently attributed to Anania Shirakats'i.

8 Five short selections from Athanasius may be added to this collection; see *Discourses, Letters and Refutations of St. Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria* ([Ἡρονίμου Βασιλείας Πατριάρχου Αθανασίου Λογοτεχνία, Κολοσσαί, καὶ προβλήματα τε καὶ διαπραγματεύσεις], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1899, 56-88, 281-83, 344; cf. Jerusalem ms 534.

9 For various editions of certain of these works, see H. Ajaiyan, *Etymological Dictionary* ([Ἡρονίμου Ερμηνευτικόν], I, Erevan: 1926, 30-58; for a few more recent editions, see S. Arevshatyan, “Plato,” 16-18.

10 *Hellenizing School*, 86-255.


"endhanrakan" (καθολικός, ibid., 3). A more accurate picture emerging from Manandyan’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. 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. The compounds and technical terms of the fourth group, omitted in its entirety by Manandyan, 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'anos Siwnets’i and his early 8th-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 Movšes Khorenats’i, Mambṛē Vertsanogh (whom tradition presents as a younger brother of Khorenats’i), and Eghishē Vardapet on the Armenian translation of Philo. Thinking of the traditional dates given to these celebrated writers, Aucher was quick to

---

13 Ibid., esp. 115, 133-34, 160; cf. 144-45, 184-87, 194-96. Arévshat'yan demonstrates the presence of such words in the translation of Plato’s works (“Plato,” 13-14).


place the founding of the School in the 5th century. The traditional dates
given to Eghishē and Khorenatsʿi need not be challenged anew; 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 Girkʿ ēakatsʿ; the traditional date given to him de-

17 Ibid., iii. After suggesting that Khorenatsʿi is the translator of Philo's works (p. ii), Aucher
goes on to identify the translator with a certain Leontius, who is mentioned by Ghazar
Pʿarpetsʿi, Historiography [Pʿarq pʿarpetsʿi, Tišfī: 1904, 202] as the friend of a philoso-
pher named Mowsēs; moreover, he identifies this philosopher with the historian Khorenatsʿi
(p. iv); cf. N. Bogharian (=Pogharian), Armenian Writers [Luy qaŋqub'], Jerusalem: St.
James Press, 1970, 14-15, 40, who attributes the translation of several of Philo’s works to
Khorenatsʿi, and the rest to Mowsēs Kʿertʿoghahây.

18 For a detailed study, see N. Akinian, Eghishē Vardapet, I-III, Vienna: Mekhitarist Press,
1932-60; for a survey of the arguments on the date of Khorenatsʿi, see C. Toumanoff, “On
the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene,” Handes Amsōra LXXV (1961) 467-76; idem, Studi-
330-34; on the sources of Khorenatsʿi, see R.W. Thomson, Moses Khorenatsʿi: History of the
Armenians (Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies 4), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University

19 Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 21.

20 Aucher, Philon, v-vi.

21 F.C. Conybeare, “The Age of the Old Armenian Version of Irenaeus,” in Meckitharisten-
kongregation, Huschardan, Festschrift aus anlass des 100-jährigen bestandes der Meckitharis-
ten-kongregation in Wien, Vienna: Mekhitarist Press, 1911, 193-202 (Conybeare, however,
was misled by the traditional date given to Eghishē, who utilizes the Armenian Philo); A.
Vardanian, “Linguistic Similarities in the Armenian Translations of Philo and Irenaeus”
earliest witnesses to the translation of Irenaeus are a certain Yohan of Karin, an insignificant writer of the late 6th century, and Vrt’anës K’ert’ogh in a letter addressed to Surmën Stratelat and dated 604/5.\textsuperscript{22} Likewise, the translation of Aphthonius’ handbook on rhetoric (the \textit{Girk’ pitoyits’}) was known to Sebëos Episkopos and Davit’ Hark’ats’i, both of whom flourished about the middle of the 7th century.\textsuperscript{23}

The founding of the School must have been marked by the translation of the Τἐχνη γραμματικη of Dionysius Thrax, which, as a primer, was basic for the rest of the translational activities of the School.\textsuperscript{24} Of special interest in this particular version are the Armenian substitutions for the Greek examples. Where the original text has illustrations from the Greek countryside, the translator provides examples suggestive of the Armenian countryside. He even names cities of West Armenia, including, Tarôn and Ts’ronk’. Aghbalyan suggests that these names betray the homeland of the translator and perhaps that of his associates, the country around Tarôn.\textsuperscript{25} Manandyan goes so far as to observe linguistic affinities between the translator and the dialect of the region of Bagrewand,

\textit{Handes ansor}a XXXV (1921) 450-58; Manandyan, \textit{Hellenizing School}, 228-36; see also the introductions to the various editions of the \textit{Demonstratio}, all of which have a 7th-century date for the translation.

\textsuperscript{22} N. Akinian, “St. Irenaeus in Armenian Literature,” [\textit{U. Ուրբիք փգտնաբանություն-րգման գրք}], \textit{Handes ansor}a 24 (1910) 200-8; hastily and perhaps erroneously, he ascribes the translation of Irenaeus to Vrt’anës; see also Manandyan \textit{Hellenizing School}, 230-31.

\textsuperscript{23} A. Baumgartner, “Über das Buch \textit{Die Chrise},” \textit{Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft} XL (1866) 457-515; G.V. Yovsep’ian, “Davit’ of Hark’ and the \textit{Girk’ Pitoyits’};” [Վաճառք կարչի Գիրք], \textit{Ararat} (February 1908) 203-16.

\textsuperscript{24} Manandyan, \textit{Hellenizing School}, 115-24; Akinian, “Hellenizing School,” 275; for the text of Thrax, see N. Adonts’, ed., \cyrillic{Дионисий Фракийский и армянские толкователи} (\textit{Bibliotheca Armeno-Georgia} 4), St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1915, 156 (Fr. trans. \textit{Denys de Thrace et les commentateurs Arméniens} [Bibliothèque arménienne de la Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian], Louvain: Imprimerie orientaliste, 1970) and his enlightening introduction (cited hereafter as \textit{Thrax}).

Tarōn, and Karin. But he errs in denying any literary dependence on Thrax that would help establish the time of the translation. To a certain degree, however, the early scholia on Thrax by Armenian grammarians (k’ert’oghk’) of the late 6th century provide helpful evidence for establishing the approximate time of the translation and thereby the founding of the School. From among a number of such works, Adonts’ gives the primacy to the scholion of Dawit’ Anhaght’; who, as we shall note, flourished in the late 6th and early 7th centuries. Another noteworthy scholion on Thrax is by Movses K’ert’oghahayr’, who excelled as a teacher at about the same time.

Thus far, the evidence from the literary sources seems to indicate a 570 date for the founding of the School. As for Manandyan, he seems to be puzzled about the date for the School’s beginning, even though he too rejects the traditional 5th-century date for Eghishē, 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 6th 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

26 *Hellenizing School*, 227-28, where he does not rule out a west Armenian provenance; cf. H. Ajaiyan, History of the Armenian Language [Այստեղ իբնե աշակերտի], II, Erevan: 1951, 142-68, who discerns a more western dialect.

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

28 *Thrax*, 79-124; Adonts’, 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’ Anhaght’ (p. clxxxiii); he also places the translation in the 7th century (p. cxiii). Manandyan clearly demonstrates the scholiast’s dependence on the Armenian translation and his identity with Dawit’, *Hellenizing School*, 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 Siwnetti’s, 181-219. Adonts’ attributes the anonymous work to Mambrē Vertzanogh, *ibid.*, cxiii-cxiv (but cf. Jerusalem ms 1311, 642-645); Manandyan attributes it to Pōghos K’ert’ogh (*Hellenizing School*, 212-13).

29 Adonts’, *Thrax*, 159-79; Bogharian, *Armenian Writers*, 39-40, ascribes to K’ert’oghahayr 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’ogh, Petros K’ert’ogh, and Ezras Angeghats’i; see Manandyan, *Hellenizing School*, 246-55 and his references to Asoghik on p. 224; cf. Bogharian, *Armenian Writers*, 39, 44.

31 *Hellenizing School*, 88, 106, 124.
translations of the first group and the *terminus post quem* for those of the second group.\textsuperscript{32} 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.\textsuperscript{33} His error becomes more elusive when testimony alluding to a mid-6th-century translation of the *Refutation* is brought to bear on the argument.\textsuperscript{34} Earlier, and on better grounds, he places the translations of the first group "before the 7th century."\textsuperscript{35} Later in his study, and with hardly any evidence, he places the founding of the School "either at the beginning of the 6th or at the end of

\textsuperscript{32} *Ibid.*, 107, 115; for earlier conclusions beginning with "before the second half of the 7th century", see 93, 95.

\textsuperscript{33} *Ibid.*, 95-107; he seems to have been misled by Ter-Mkrtch’ian (cited on p. 97), who, emending the date, places it between 480 and 484 as the date for the translation; so also Akinian, "Hellenizing School," 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’ogh (dated 606), in which Vrt’anēs boasts of having collected a number of anti-Chalcedonian works, among them that of Timothy of Alexandria (*Book of Correspondence*, 126; cf. 91, 140). To this letter Akinian appends another letter by Abraham Catholicos (dated 607), in which mention is made of the absurd transliteration of names of bishops and bishoprics in translations from Greek (and not absurd translations from Greek, as Akinian thinks, col. 282, quoting *Book of Correspondence*, 183), done at Urha (Edessa), where Vrt’anēs lived and where Akinian is wrongly inclined to place the translations of the second group. The latter seem to derive from a Chalcedonian circle; see Manandyan, *Hellenizing School*, 136, 225.

\textsuperscript{34} *Ibid.*, 96-97, citing Photius and the anonymous writer of the *De rebus armeniis*; see also N. Akinian, "Timothy Aclurus in Armenian Literature" [\textit{Shenotqēn Յուկղ Հայ Հայոցային-գրչությունը} XXII (1908) 261-265, 294-302. For two other interdependent testimonies that have come to light since, see Akinian-Poghosian, "Literary Studies," 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 Akinian, "Hellenizing School," 283-84). We may likewise add that neither of the two other writings pertaining to Christological controversies and translated by the School (those of Eutychius 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, will be said later (see note 78 below).

\textsuperscript{35} *Hellenizing School*, 95.
the 5th century”, and elsewhere, “at the end of the 5th century”, 36 yet always maintains that the translations of the first group belong to the “first half of the 6th century”. 37 Akinian closely follows Manandyan’s analysis of the literary sources, but in due consideration of his studies on Eghishē he places the founding of the School between 572 and 575 and most of its translations between 572 and 603. 38 In a much later study, however, he has 590-610 for the translations. 39

The time and place of the Aristotelian translations (second group) may be established through the colophon of the Girk‘ ēakats’, a textbook of the ‘Opyavov, written in the form of quaestiones et solutiones. Like much of the rest of the Aristotelian corpus, its translation is attributed to Dawit’ Anhaght’, though at times the names of Khorenats’i and Mambrē are also given. 40 The colophon, reproduced in a number of manuscripts, 41 reads:

This book was completed [lit., written or penned; great’s 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, Gurgēn, a scribe to Armenian leaders and first regent to holy kings, am the recipient of this book [grots’s aysmik]. The previous colophon of this book [grots’s aysmik] is amazing, since this book on beings was written [grots’s aw girk’s ays ēakk’s] as a translation ordered by the sovereign Hovhannēs Gabeghinats’i, Catholicos of the Armenians, in the 25th year of the Armenian era [576/7]. Bishop Sargs Arabats’i attests to this in a faithful testimony.

36 Ibid., 223, 226; Arevshatyan, “Plato,” 16, follows uncritically Manandyan’s late-5th-century date, which accommodates the traditional view on very poor grounds.

37 “Hellenizing School,” 208.

38 Hellenizing School, 106, 216, 229-32.


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 Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 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 Akinian, “Hellenizing School,” 290, where the colophon appears).
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 *grets' zgirs zays* and in the second half *grets'aw girk's ays* (the former is more in keeping with the syntax of the Hellenizing School). At the end of the first half we have *grots's aysm* and at the beginning of the second half *grots's aysmik*. Also, the words *girk's ays ūakk's* do not necessarily refer to the title of the epitome, which is *Girk' ēakats'* and probably a derivative title. Finally, *girk* 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 *Ὀργανικἠ*. Prior to the 13th 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” (*bayts' zarmanali ē i nakhti bishatki grots'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 Catholicos and of the bishop are equally significant for enabling a historical correlation. For according to the Syriac historian John of Ephesus (d. 586), the Catholicos arrived in Constantinople in 572, where he died a few years later, and was followed at the Byzantine capital by the Armenian *stratelates* 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. By way of syn-

---

42 Manandyan, *Hellenizing School*, 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. Akinian, “Hellenizing School,” 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. II; the surviving third of the chronicle covers the period 571-85; cf. Y.G. Melk'onyan, *Syriac Sources on Armenia and the Armenians [Արմենիայի տուրքական մշակութային գրականության գրականագրերը]*, Erevan: 1976, 431; on various migrations of Armeni-
chronism, 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 Catholicos was still living in 576/7; consequently, the traditional date given for his death (574) must be revised in light of the colophon. As for the bishop bearing witness to the ordering of the translation, he must be Sargis bar Karjä the Syriac Bishop to the Arabs, who was noted for his literary pursuits in the second half of the 6th century.45

Along with the proemia which ascribe the translation of the Girk 'ēakats 'to Dawit' Anhaght', we must consider those that ascribe to him the translation of Aristotle's *De interpretatione* as well.46 Such proemia compel us to associate Dawit' 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 'ēakats' 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*.47 On three occasions in the *Prolegomena* Dawit' quotes Olympiodorus the Younger,48 who flourished in Alexandria as 


46 Arm. *Beriarminias*, a corruption of the Gk. περί 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.


48 64.18-19, 24-26, 28-65.9 (ed. Busse); but twice in the Armenian text, where the third is missing: 134.5, II (ed. Arevshatyan).
head of the Neoplatonic school and died after 564/5.\textsuperscript{49} Dawit' 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' and Olympiodorus may be derived from the Neoplatonist Elias, whose scholion on Porphyry's \textit{Isagoge} has much in common with the scholion of Dawit' on the same work, not only in form and content but also in reliance on Olympiodorus.\textsuperscript{50} The works of Elias and Dawit' 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' is a late contemporary of Olympiodorus and flourished at the end of the 6th century and the beginning of the 7th. Because of his Neoplatonic orientation and dependence on — if not direct association with — Olympiodorus, we must place Dawit' at Alexandria, where he would be an early contemporary of John Philoponus and Stephanos, who moved to Constantinople early in the reign of Heraclius (610) as head of the Imperial Academy.\textsuperscript{51} It is very likely that Dawit' preceded these men to Constantinople and there continued a fellowship with them that had had its beginnings in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{52} We will also have to conclude, on the basis of the date we have ascribed to Dawit', 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

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

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


\textsuperscript{52} For a concise treatment of the Christian takeover at Alexandria and the move to Constantinople, see R.T. Wallis, \textit{Neoplatonism}, London: Duckworth, 1972, 139-40.
date to his Alexandrian days and his translations and later works to his Constantinopolitan period.  

The early influence of the Aristotelian translations on native writers is most clearly seen in the writings of Anania Shirakats'i, especially the influence of the pseudo-Aristotelian De mundo on Anania's On the Rotation of the Heavens (Σωφρονέων Ώμώνομας θύραις ἄρθρα).  

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.

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 7th-century account survives in two recensions, one shorter than the other.  

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

---

53 Bogharian's differentiation between the Greek author and the Armenian translator as two distinct personalities (Armenian Writers, 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. Tër-Mkrtch'ian, Anania Shirakats'i, Vagharshapat: 1896, 35.

55 Aucher, Philon, v-vi.

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.57 There he studied for six months with a certain mathematician named K'ristosatur (Gk. Χριστόσατος).58 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.59 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

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 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.
sources. We must note that Anania concludes with a 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."  

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 7th century there was no one in Armenia who knew philosophy and there were no scientific books there either. 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. Certainly 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 like those mentioned by Anania were perhaps instrumental in spreading such translations.

At this juncture we may consider another external evidence derived from the 6th- to 7th-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. Baumstark touches on these works in his introduction to Syriac literature, 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

---


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


64 *Geschichte*, 184-85.
the Syriac corpus of Aristotelian translations and their academic environment.\textsuperscript{65} We may discern further similarities — if not a relationship — between these syntactically awkward Armenian and Syriac translations. Suffice it to say that the syntactical similarities of these corpora, their partially identical contents, and their emergence at about the same time cannot be accidental. They deserve further study with reference to the non-monastic 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' and Nonnus of Panopolis, are syntactically closer to the translations of the second group than to others within their own group. Thus at certain points the distinction between the two groups is marginal and arbitrary, while 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 Manandyan and Akinian — they are well accounted for by Arvshatyan, who rightly places them in this group.\textsuperscript{66} 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 7th century. In addition to the witness of Anania Shirakats'i to the earlier translations of this group, there are two late 7th-century citations of the translation of Eutychus' denunciation of the Nestorian doctrine in the letters of Hovhannès Mayragomets'i and Khosrovik T'argmanich.\textsuperscript{67}

The last name to be associated with the School is that of Step'anos Siwnets'i, to whom are attributed most of the translations constituting the fourth group. The Pseudo-Dionysian translations conclude with a colophon by the translator.


\textsuperscript{66} “Platon,” 8-20; for the various editions of the possibly Stoic works, see p. 17.

\textsuperscript{67} Cited by Akinian, “Hellenizing School,” 289, who also finds allusion to Eutyches in a letter of Vrt'anes K'ert'oogh, \textit{Girk'T'g'hot's'}, 116.
dated in the second year of Emperor Philippicus (712),68 and those of Nemesius’ *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).69 While Step’anos is also the acknowledged translator of considerable selections from Cyril of Alexandria,70 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’ahanay Ayrivanets’i and a certain Dawit’ Hiwpatos, with whom he returned to Armenia in 728 after having spent nearly two decades studying and translating at Constantinople (712-728).71 The strange syntax of the translations of the Hellenizing School has left a marked influence on contemporary writings.72 In addition to the commentaries on Thrax, the later works of Dawit’ Anhaght’, and the compositions of Step’anos Siwnets’i, some influence may be detected in the early 7th-century letters of Vrt’anës K’ert’ogh and Grigor K’ert’ogh.73 Further influence may be seen in the works of other 7th-century writers including Anania Shirakats’i, Dawit’ Hark’ats’i, and Tèodoros K’rt’enawor — a propagator of the Chalcedonian faith among Armenians — and his disciples, Sahak Dzorop’oret’s (d. 703) and Hovhan Ödznets’i (d. 728), both

----

68 Jerusalen mss 451, 1120, 1328, 1386, etc. Likewise, an anonymous scholion on Ps.-Dionysius states that “it was translated by Step’anos, Bishop of Siwnik’ at Constantinople,” see e.g., Jerusalen ms 270B, p. 3.

69 Jerusalen mss 1862 (Nemesius), 390 (Gregory of Nyssa).

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


73 Girk’ T’gh’ots’, 93-98, 112-45, 196-211 (Vrt’anës), 153-60 (Grigor). The letter wrongly ascribed to Petros K’ert’ogh or Petros Episkopos Siwnets’ (ibid., 99-107) is a translation from Greek; see N. Biwzandats’i, “Correspondence” [Քնարություններ], *Handës amgöya* XXII (1908) 155-56; N. Akinan, “Catholicos Kiwrion of Georgia” [Կիվրիոնի Հայոց երեք], *Handës amgöya* XXIII (1909) 332; Manandyan *Hellenizing School*, 93-95.
of whom became renowned heads of the Armenian Church. Clearer still is the influence on the writings of Khorenats'i and Khosrovik T'argamich', a contemporary of Ödznets'i. The influence of the Greek language, rather than that of the Greek syntax of translations, may be discerned in writers as early as Eznik Koghbat's'i (5th century) and as late as Grigor Magistros (11th century).

Akinian observes that the interlinear translations of the Hellenizing School were to help Armenian students enrolled in the Byzantine schools of the day. 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. We may also note that the works of Dawit Anhaght', like

74 Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 83-102.
75 Aucher, Philon, iii-v.
76 Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 106-8; Manandyan Hellenizing School, 89-91.
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
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' ęakats', 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,\textsuperscript{79} 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.\textsuperscript{80} 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


\textsuperscript{80} As S. Der Nersessian summarily observes (following Akinian): "The Philhellene school, the activity of which extends over the 7th 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: A Brief Study of Armenian Art and Civilization, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1945, 26.
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.
A Medieval Armenian Glossary of Philosophical Terms and Concepts

The 13th-century glossary considered in this preliminary study is entitled Definitions by David the Philosopher: Philosophical Definitions by Way of Questions, represented by the Jerusalem Armenian Patriarchate ms 1213 (dated 1633-1636), pp. 155-181. The first part of the study is devoted to introductory issues, followed by text and translation. After a discussion of the place of the document in Armenian lexicography, attention is given to its immediate and original sources. Some semantic observations are made at the end. The peculiarity of the document is seen in its intermediate state of development: it marks a transition from thematically arranged glossaries to those arranged alphabetically. For practical purposes, the study is limited to a sample consisting of the fifty-two terms beginning with the first letter of the alphabet.

Interest in classical philosophy among Armenians is well attested by the overwhelming number of manuscripts devoted to such study. Moreover, Amalyan in his two volumes on medieval Armenian lexicography has demonstrated the broad lexicographical interest among Armenians during the 5th-7th centuries.

In his first volume Amalyan devotes an entire section to the very subject of this study, the Philosophical Definitions [Սարում փիֆինհայագախ], and I am indebted to many of his keen observations, such as: the time and place of its compilation, namely, Gladzor and Tat’ew in the late 13th century; its immediate sources, especially the Philosophical Definitions [Սարում փիփոյագախար].

---

1 See the anonymously compiled list in Banber Matenadarani III [1956] 387-457.


and the compilations of Grigor Yerushaghe'ats'í; and his statement that this work is the earliest Armenian glossary of its kind. The last statement is enough to create interest in this document, to which I was already attracted in my quest for the extent to which the translations by the Hellenizing School were used in subsequent centuries.

There are two recensions of the Philosophical Definitions which I shall discuss prior to providing a sample of the text with translation; the sample will be limited to the fifty-two terms beginning with the letter w, the largest category in the alphabetical classification. In the part that follows, I shall relate the lexicographical tradition behind the document and, subsequently, the immediate sources used by the compiler. Then I shall survey the philosophical tradition behind the terms and definitions found in the sample, paying due attention to the original sources. Finally, I shall remark briefly on some of the semantic peculiarities of certain terms.

In passing, I may note that the ascription of this glossary to Dawit' An-haght' in the later manuscripts must have resulted from wrongly relating the title Philosophical Definitions [ւծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծծաę ադեր է]

Text and Translation

The text used, recension B, is that of Jerusalem Armenian Patriarchate ms 1213 (dated 1635-1636, pp. 155-181), which differs somewhat from that of recension A, represented by the oldest, Erevan Matenadaran ms 6897 (dated 1317, ff. 379v-410r). In the latter manuscript, which preserves an earlier textual tradition, the entries are more haphazard in that there is no alphabetical arrangement beyond the initial letter. Moreover, certain of its terms are repeated after being interrupted by other terms. For reasons of practicality in translating, and for system

---

4 Amalayan, 170.

atically researching the subsequent parts of this study, the somewhat better-arranged text of the Jerusalem manuscript is preferred. In fact, its text is superior to that of the oldest manuscript in most of the instances where the immediate sources are established (see the variously underlined parts of the text). The Jerusalem manuscript, however, is insufficient for establishing a basis for a full-length, critical text. Should the latter be deemed necessary, the remaining manuscripts at the Matenadaran would be indispensable. These are: 1681, 7151, 1980 (14th century), 2335 (15th century), 3448 (16th century), and several others form the 17th-18th centuries.6

The basic difference between the two recensions is in the sequence of terms. Those of recension A, the work of the compiler, differ in their sequence from those of recension B, the work of the redactor, in the following order (as compared with the enumerated terms in the text below): 1, 3, 15, 16, 26, 2, 4, 29a, 27a, 29b, 31, 17a, 18a, 17b, 32, 37, 4, 5, 6, 7, 18b, 33, 17c, 40, 34, 42a, 44, 19, 9, 38a, 41a, 45, 35, 36, 49, 48, 10, 47, 20, 21, 46, 42b, 38b, 50a, 11, 12, 22, 30, 27b, 51, 38c, 42c, 13, 42d, (note the omission of nos. 14, 23, 24, 25, 28, 39, 41b, 43, 50b, 52).

The redactor’s rearrangement in recension B reveals a certain pattern. Although the reworking falls short of thorough alphabetical arrangement, it is nonetheless noteworthy. The emerging pattern is as follows: as (1-2), an (3-14), agh (15), ar (16-25), at (26-28), ap (29-30), aj (31), am (32-36), ak (37-39), aw (40-41), akh (42-43), ah (44), ay (45-47), ash (48-49), at (50), ag (51), ar (52). Obviously, the second letters are not alphabetical, but the grouping is developmentally significant. Only the last term falls out of the pattern; it should belong to nos. 26-28.

Apparently the question preceding the first entry is intended to be repeated with every entry regardless of the resulting awkwardness. The question and answer format suggests that the handbook in either recension was perhaps intended for tutorial purposes.

Sometimes the entry is a noun, but the definition or citation is that of an adjective; e.g., no. 29. Or, the entry is an adjective and the definition or citation is that of a noun; e.g., no. 13. In such cases the entry is contextually part of the statement that follows as definition, and the sense is better obtained by elimination of the question mark to be supplied and the punctuation between the entry and its supposed definition.

Most terms have multiple definitions; some have as many as seven (17), eight (27) or nine definitions (42), connected by the conjunction kam (“or”).

---
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Terms with such multiple definitions are sometimes repeated before certain of their definitions.

I have used parentheses ( ) to indicate editorial deletions, brackets [ ] to indicate editorial additions, pointed brackets < > to indicate emendations of corrupt words, and parallels / / to indicate a possible transposition in no. 38. Moreover, I have modified  מבוסס to ubble in a few places to be consistent with the more predominant usage of ubble, which is required for the inclusion of ubble and ubble (40-41) under the letter ubble. Elsewhere, I have changed ubble to ubble in spellings of the agent-denoting suffix -ubble. The spelling of ubble (no. 43) was retained because of the prevailing alphabetical rearrangement by the reductor, even though in the definition it is spelled ubble.

The various underlinings in the text indicate certain of the immediate sources. The straight lines represent the use of Philosophical Definitions [Usvdirm ubblem ubblem], followed by page and line reference to Arevshatyan’s edition. The lines of short strokes represent the use of the glossaries of Grigor Yerushaghêmats‘i, followed by reference to the Jerusalem Armenian Patriarchate ms 656 (early 18th century; pp. 762a-777a, 787a-794a). The dotted lines represent the use of the Armenian version of Nemesis’ De natura hominis8 as identified by Amalyan.9

Translating such short definitions detached from their original and mostly unknown context is problematic — to say the least. As far as possible, the translation is literal. Except for four conventional terms (6, 11, 23 and 49), all Greek equivalents are derived from my unpublished, comparative word-index to the works of Philo extant in both Greek and Armenian.

---

7 Arevshatyan, “Two Philosophical Texts,” 376-391.
8 Nemesis of Emesa, On Human Nature [EEVEH ubblem ubblem ubblem], Venice: San Lazaro, 1889 (earlier published as a series of articles in Bazmavê XLV-XLVII [1887-1888].)
9 Amalyan, 172, 176.
/Ավելի համարկապություն տվյալների/ Ավելի համարկապություն տեղեկություն է ամբողջությամբ

1 ԱՍԲԱ, կանխատես է բարձր գրավոր: Ալիալդակ, ձայնագրություն է երկրորդ բաշխության հետ, հարկանքի շարք։ Անհայտ գործակալություն, ընդհանուր համակարգ է։ Բազմաֆոսթեր ցուցանկացված է բազմախմբային և բազմակուլտուր բազմազանության շրջաններում, քանի ոչ պակաս /726w/: 2 ԱՍԲԱ, ԱՍԲԱ, ապահով անցքով ներկայացման, ձգտում է համագործակցության, զարգացման, իշխանության, վարչության, այլ որոշակի անմիջական /388.46/: 3 ԱՍՏԱ, ձև արտացոլում է հեռացուցակ։ Այն բազմազանության շրջան /զարգացման առավել ամբողջական` որի տեխնիկա և տեսաները /376.22-24/: 4 ԱՍՏԱ է բարձրակարգ բազմազանություն` որոշ սահմանի է պարու այն ելույթ: 5 ԱԼՅՈՒՐ, այսինքն քրիստոնեական պարական երկիր /390. 32-33/: 6 ԱԼՅՈՒՐ, սովետական աշխատակիցներ` պարական է արտազորագրել աշխատակից /390.32-33/: 7 ԱՆԴԱՆ, ազատագրվել է ազատագրման հարցում։ Համարել են ազատագրվել հարցերը են: 8 ԱՆԴԱՆ, ազատագրվել է ազատագրման հարցում։ Սա միակ ազատագրվել հարցում։ Համարել էն /788w/: 9 ԱՆԴԱՆ, ձևակերպված, և զինված թերազինքի անց գրիչ: 10 ԱՆԴԱՆ, ձևակերպված, և զինված թերազինքի անց գրիչ: /793p/: 11 ԱՆԴԱՆ, ձևակերպված, և զինված թերազինքի անց գրիչ: զարգացված` որը ուղղված է /384. 10-11/: 12 ԱՆԴԱՆ, ձևակերպված, և զինված թերազինքի անց գրիչ: /384.12/: 13 ԱՆԴԱՆ, ձևակերպված, և զինված թերազինքի անց գրիչ:
14 Մ.Հ. Հիվանդ, ուր գիտեց իսկում ծառայող անձներ զատել, որ են
ինք աշխատեց զգան բուժական աշխատ, որեքեւս պաշտպան
գրավելու համար կարողանան;

15 Մ.Հ. մեք, այցելու պարբերով ու ջարդարով /384.35/;

16 Մ.Հ., հաղթող ճնշման գրքում ու հագեցնել և պարբեր
գրավելու համար կարողանան;

17 Մ.Հ. Հիվանդ, ծառայող անձներ, ուր պարբերով գրավել
անձներ ծառայություն և համար չի գրավել /388.32-32/;

18 Մ.Հ. Հիվանդ, ինքըել փոխարեն նաև պարբերով գրավել
անձներ ծառայություն և համար չի գրավել /390.14/;

19 Մ.Հ. մեք, այցելու պարբերով այբուբեն ինքըել ու ռեմ,
եթե զգացել իր պարբերով /791/;

20 Մ.Հ. հաղթող ճնշման գրքում /793/;

21 Մ.Հ., այցելու պարբերով /793/;

22 Մ.Հ. հաղթող ճնշման գրքում ու հագեցնել և պարբեր
գրավելու համար կարողանան /384.13-14/;

23 Մ.Հ. հաղթող ճնշման գրքում ու հագեցնել և պարբեր
գրավելու համար կարողանան;

24 Մ.Հ. մեք պարբերով գրավելու համար այբուբեն;

25 Մ.Հ., մեք պարբերով գրավելու համար այբուբեն;

26 Մ.Հ., մեք պարբերով գրավելու համար այբուբեն;

27 Մ.Հ., մեք պարբերով գրավելու համար այբուբեն.
ԱՄԵՆԵՐ ԵՊՀ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՐՍԱՄԱԳՆԻՐԻ ՑԱՆԿԱՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:
ԱՄԱՆԻՐԱԾ, ԱՄԵՆԵՐ ԵՊՀ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՐՍԱՄԱԳՆԻՐԻ ՑԱՆԿԱՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

28 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՐՍԱՄԱԳՆԻՐԻ ՑԱՆԿԱՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

29 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՐՍԱՄԱԳՆԻՐԻ ՑԱՆԿԱՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

30 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՐՍԱՄԱԳՆԻՐԻ ՑԱՆԿԱՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

31 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՐՍԱՄԱԳՆԻՐԻ ՑԱՆԿԱՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

32 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՐՍԱՄԱԳՆԻՐԻ ՑԱՆԿԱՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

33 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

34 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

35 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

36 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

37 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

38 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:

39 ԱՆԱՊԱՏՏԵՍՏ ՏԱՐԱՆՑՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԱՐՏԻՍՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՇՎԱՐՏԱՅԻՆ /786/:
40 ՄԻՐ, կան միկարան, հարմարական, գործական: ընդհանուր, որոնք զանգակատուներ, ինչպես կարելի է հասել. առանց այս գրականության /789/.

41 ԱՄՆ, այսպիսով հատակացված է թե, որ առաջադիմության մեջ է մտնում ունենա ուղիկ。

42 ԱՄՆ, հապատրոս, համար, հատկություն, որ պահպանվում է /790/։ Այս համարում է, որ սուրբ է արած։ Գործականություն էկոնոմիկ, գաղութային, զարգացման մեջ, այսպինք՝ զարգացման կրկնօրինակ 

43 ԱՄՆ, իրավասության արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այն է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

44 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

45 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

46 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

47 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

48 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

49 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

50 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

51 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.

52 ԱՄՆ, զարգացման արդյունքները /89-90/։ Այս է, ինչպես է ազատագրվել հատկությունը։ Կարող է, որ այն կարող է ազատագրվել, որպես արդյունքներ։ Այս արդյունքը էկոնոմիկ, զարգացման մեջ է 89-90/.
Philosophical Definitions by Way of Questions

What is ...?

1. GOD (Arm. astuatz; Gk. theos), sublime self-existence. God, ultimate and blessed good. God, maker of all and sustainer of those created from nothing. Himself the triad worshipped singularly and the monad venerated triune by all creatures, both intelligible and sense perceptible. The truly existent and eternal.

2. ASTRONOMY (Arm. astegagitut' 운; Gk. astronomia), knowledge of the circular wanderings, magnitudes, shapes, constitution, distances, motions and positions of stars, individually and in relation to one another.

3. A NOUN (Arm. anun; Gk. onoma) is a sound to indicate a subject or a predicate; or a sound significant by compounding, which has no reference to time, and of which no part is significant apart from the rest.

4. AN INDIVIDUAL (Arm. anhat; Gk. atomos) is one who is uniquely constituted, one whose assemblage cannot be seen in another.

5. FREEDOM FROM AVARICE (Arm. anartzat'sirut'운; Gk. aphilar-guria), to so wish non-possession as one wishes possession.

6. THE ONE WITHOUT BEGINNING (Arm. anéskizbn; Gk. ho anarchos), first by nature, as the creator of the primary things.

7. FOLLY (Arm. anzgamut'운; Gk. aphrosunë), men's wicked thoughts about things; or active irrational tendency; or ignorance of causative factors and whatnot.

8. INJUSTICE (Arm anirawut'운; Gk. adikia), derangement of the parts of the soul; or disrupting tendency; or tendency that disrupts equality; or ignorance of consequences and whatnot.

9. INEQUALITY (Arm. anhawasarut'운; Gk. anisotês) is the fate allotted to each as one's own.

10. A FIXED STAR (Arm. anmolar gund; Gk. aplanês sphaira) is (a heavenly body) which is changelessly borne from east to west.

11. IMPOSSIBLE (Arm. anmarr; Gk. adunatos) is the eternally untrue, for example: three is four; or, with respect to periods of time — deceitfully, such as: now is night.

12. INVISIBLE (Arm. anhayt; Gk. adêlos) is that in which faith is latent.

13. THE UNSPIRITUAL (Arm. andznakann; Gk. ho psuchikos), sensuality and heartache.
14. SELFISH (Arm. andznasër; Gk. philautos) is he who loves to consider himself constantly; whatever he does, he does it for himself — even though the thing done is in accordance with the commandments.

15. PRAYER (Arm. aghawt'k; Gk. proseuchê), the asking of good things from God.

16. CRAFTSMANSHIP (Arm. arhest; Gk. technê), customary adherence to something useful after leaving the primary instructions.

17. JUSTICE (Arm. ardarut'iwn; Gk. dikaiosune), harmony of the soul; or orderliness of the parts of the soul among and within themselves. Justice, ability to distribute what is equal; or the natural inner working of the parts of the soul; or distribution of wealth for the common good — befittingly; or apprehension of things encountered and whatnot. Justice, the essence of the power of apportioning to each according to merit.

18. COURAGE (Arm. arut'iwn; Gk. andreia), the nature of a soul unaffected by fear. Courage, redemption of one's honor and rights, as well as the oppressed and whatnot; or the mean between rashness and ignorance; or apprehension of trouble and whatnot.

19. (THE) CREATIVE CAUSE (Arm. ararch'akan patchar[n]; Gk. bê poiêtikê aitia) is independent of created beings — like God; or of whom is derived that which exists — such as goodness.

20. MALE (Arm. aru; Gk. arrên), an animal that generates in another.

21. BLOOD (Arm. ariwn; Gk. haima), nutriment of the body.

22. PIETY (Arm. arzhanaworut'iwn; Gk. hosiotes) is advancement in the pursuit of revealed religion — wherefore man is such an animal.

23. PRONUNCIATION (Arm. artasanut'iwn; Gk. prophora) a spoken word; what is openly and publicly disclosed.

24. ART (Arm. aruest; Gk. technê) is universal knowledge — without the causes. Art is ability to take off with imagination. Art is composition resulting from the exercise of an acquired skill and wrought for something useful in life.

25. THE SUN (Arm. aregakn; Gk. ho helios) is divine fire by which alone we can see from daybreak till night; the day-star that appears perpetually.

26. PROPOSITION (Arm. aracharkut'iwn; Gk. prothesis), predestination, necessity.

27. VIRTUE (Arm. arik'inut'iwn; Gk. arete), steadfastness; or the best of mortal nature, in itself praiseworthy in life; or utmost capability of goodness for a rational soul, producer of good things; or agreeable disposition in every deed, even in times of war; or willing inclination toward the practical good
or the beautiful. Virtue, a quality perceived and measured in relation to the mean; or the highest ascent. Virtue is irrevocable happiness.

28. MORNING (Arm. առավոտ; Gk. πρωία) is the beginning of daytime; the first light.

29. DETERIORATION (Arm. ապականութիւն; Gk. diaphthora or phthora), the opposite of being, as man is deteriorative after death, he in whom are found the lifeless, the senseless, and the spiritless. Deterioration, movement from existence to nonexistence.

30. PROOF (Arm. ապացիություն; Gk. apodeixis) is demonstration, a verifying word gathered from the ancients, the intermediates, and the facts; or a word divulged by those who have the information at hand to those who do not have the information at hand.

31. GROWTH (Arm. աճում; Gk. αὐξήσις) is an innate movement in accordance with development.

32. OSTENTATION (Arm. ամբարհավաչութիւն; Gk. alazoneia) a good pretense for nothingness; or evil of deception.

33. SHAME (Arm. ամութ; Gk. aischunē), fear of direct blame; or shame is letting humiliation last — and humiliation is prolonged shame. Shame is humiliation with reproach — and humiliation revives shame without reproach. Shame, fear of disgrace.

34. MARRIAGE (Arm. ամունութիւն; Gk. gamos), the joining of man and woman to beget children; union for life.

35. MONTH (Arm. ամիս; Gk. μήν), from the moon's travel toward the sun until its next travel.

36. SUMMER (Arm. ամառհ; Gk. theros), the time when temperature rises.

37. ANTICIPATION (Arm. ահնկալութիւն; Gk. prosdokia), a way of protection.

38. INVOLUNTARY (Arm. ակամայ; Gk. akousios), the origin of which is internal but the offence of which is not of the free will; not of the will. Involuntary, the origin of which is external yet none of the affecting power is under one's control. Involuntary is pursuit of unpleasant deeds and never of the pleasant: mercy and forgiveness. Involuntary, that which is not unpleasant and regrettable to the willing person, to the end that it is done without knowledge. Involuntary, at the accomplishment of which we laugh, as when unbeknown we kill an enemy or find a treasure. Some call these voluntary and whatnot.

39. THE EYE (Arm. ան; Gk. ho ophthalmos) is the decisive among the sense-organs.
40. LAW (Arm. ὄρεν; Gk. nomos), a directive, ordering, and functional work; but that which is to be shunned, which is not functional, is the city ordinance and that which pertains to science.

41. AIR (Arm. ὀῖδ; Gk. ἀέρ), a moist and loose substance. Air is an environing element; the movement of nature.

42. EMOTION/DISEASE (Arm. akhr; Gk. pathos). (Emotion), movement of the irrational part of the soul due to its ascent and contraction. Emotion, violent movement of the impulsive sensation; an admixture of good and evil.

Again, emotion is movement of the irrational soul by reason of good and evil fantasies. Emotion is movement from one mental state to another. Emotion is synonymous with physical illness and wounds. Emotion is that which is attended by pleasure and pain. But disease (pathos) is not the same as pain, since insensitive parts do become afflicted but do not suffer pain since disease is one thing and pain another, and since pain is the feeling of disease. Disease is intrusion of an external substance.

43. POOR (Arm. akhk'at; Gk. penēs), he is poor in spirit who has become poor for no reason other than the righteousness of the Lord.

44. FEAR (Arm. ah; Gk. phobos), dread of hardship.

45. ALTERATION (Arm. aylaylunn; Gk. alloiōsis), change (lit., motion) of place or of quality.

46. VINE (Arm. aygi; Gk. ampelos), a plant which produces wine.

47. MAN (Arm. ayr; Gk. anēr), adult male human; the first retainer of the seed.

48. UNIVERSE (Arm. ashkarb; Gk. kosmos), the structure of heaven and earth and natures therein; or from the largest living creatures to those (hardly perceptible by sense — all living creatures embodied therein; or any part of all existence separately considered.

49. AUTUMN (Arm. ashsan; Gk. phthinopōron), the time when dryness increases.

50. HATE (Arm. atelut'ium; Gk. misos), alienation from the displeasing aversion from the painful. Hate, disgusting look by the envious of the happy.

51. GREED (Arm. agabut'iwn; Gk. pleonexia), a swift snare.

52. HEALTH (Arm. aroghjut'iwn; Gk. bugieia) is stability that has a consistent nature.

The Lexicographical Tradition and the Immediate Sources

The beginnings of the Armenian lexicographical tradition in the area of philosophy are found in the scholia on works translated by the Hellenizing Schol...
The syntactical difficulties of these translations compelled prospective interpreters to move in the direction of word-studies. Consequently there emerged a large number of lutzmunk', meknut'iumk', or patchark', which hardly differ from those entitled bark'. The latter word is a more accurate designation for these brief commentaries which seldom go beyond the study of words. The further realization that these Armenian words abound with Greek meanings must have hastened the compilation of thematically arranged glossaries. Ironically, the definitions in these glossaries were gathered from the very translations of the Hellenizing School, from the very sources, contexts and usages of terms the meanings of which were being sought. Also, one must not overlook the educational needs of the times that contributed to the formation of thematically as well as alphabetically arranged glossaries for tutorial purposes.

The distinction of the Philosophical Definitions [Եղբայր հավաչեռույթ] lies in the fact that it marks the first attempt at alphabetization. Due to its crudeness, however, it lies at the crossroad of transition from the earlier, thematically arranged glossaries to the later, alphabetically arranged collections that take the form of dictionaries. To the earlier glossaries belong such works as those of Grigor Yerushaghêmats'i\(^{10}\) and Vanakan Vardapet\(^{11}\) among others who endeavor to follow a trend set by the Definitions of Philosophy of Dawit' Anhtag'. Of the later, alphabetically arranged glossaries, one may note that of Step'anos Lehats'i, Philosophical and Theological Terms Briefly Presented as if by Definitions, Alphabetically Arranged [Բառեր հավաչեռույթներ Եղբայր հավաչեռույթների երկրաչափության ճշտականության բրնություն]\(^{12}\); the anonymous collection entitled Compilation of Definitions and Quasi-definitions, That Are Found in This Book and Samples from Certain Lists, Composed List-wise in the Order of the Letters of Our Alphabet [Հավաչեռույթների անվանումները Եղբայր հավաչեռույթներից, որն են ընթացել ճարտարապետության շարքով, գրանցվում Հավաչեռույթների անվանումներից անց]\(^{13}\); and the collection called Dictionary of Philosophical Terms [Բառեր Եղբայր հավաչեռույթներ]\(^{14}\).

---

10 Banber Matenadarani III (1956), 406.
11 Ibid., 404.
12 Ibid., 449.
13 Ibid., 456.
14 Ibid.
Most of the immediate sources of the compiler are readily identifiable. As Amalyan rightly observes, the compiler makes use of the *Philosophical Definitions* [Անվանական գործերի բանամատիկ], the glossaries of Grigor Yerusaghêmats’i, as well as the Armenian translation of Nemesius’ *De natura hominis* among others. Other authorities cited by Amalyan remain to be verified as sources used by Grigor Yerusaghêmats’i. Whatever the latter’s sources, the syntactical peculiarities of the definitions suggest that they were predominantly of Greek authorship and were translated into Armenian by the Hellenizing School, where also the other immediate sources of the compiler were translated. The order in which certain of these sources were used and to what extent may also be demonstrated.

Foremost is the use made of the *Philosophical Definitions* [Անվանական գործերի բանամատիկ], from which are derived definitions found in nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 22, 27, 29, 30, 32 and 37. Then were used the glossaries of Grigor Yerusaghêmats’i, as one may observe through the terms followed by definitions taken from several identifiable sources (see 18, 27, 38, 42). In these the definitions from *Philosophical Definitions* [Անվանական գործերի բանամատիկ] appear first, followed by those from Grigor Yerusaghêmats’i, who in turn is followed by Nemesius and others. But the extent to which the glossaries of Grigor were used is far more overwhelming. From the work entitled *Various Selected Definitions According to Holy and Advanced Vardapets* [Փառած ծառայող տարբերակներ ուղղեր հայրենիքի քրոնական], which begins with “What is God?” are derived nos. 1 and 24 (the latter appears as arhest, but with identical words for the last definition). Many more definitions, however, are drawn from the brief and more technical collections of philosophical terms, the compilations of which may be attributed with fair certainty to Grigor. Thus, from the *Moral Definition* [Բարեկարգի տարբերակ աշխատ] (Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate ms 656, pp. 787a-789b) are derived definitions found in 8, 18, 27, 32, 33 and 40. From *Definitions on Rationality* [Բարեկարգի տարբերակ աշխատ] (Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate ms 656, pp. 789b-791a) are taken those of 10, 19, 20, 35, 36, 38, 47, and 48. From *Parts of the*

---

15 Amalyan, 174-179.

Body [Ուրուցը Ֆիլիպը] (Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate ms 656, pp. 789b-794a) are derived the anatomical terms; e.g., no. 21.

Not all defined words beginning with ayr in the Philosophical Definitions [Ուռուցուռչը Ֆիլիպուռչուռք] appear in our sample of the glossary. Those omitted are: asumnn (378.2), asoghut’iwn (380.30), arinch’ (382.36), apakanut’iwn (384.4), arhest (396.5), astuatz (383.15), and anp’ordzut’iwn (388.22). Of these, the fourth, fifth and sixth appear in the sample (nos. 29, 16, and 1, respectively) but with different meanings, suggesting that the compiler opted for other definitions either from the same source (as with no. 16) or from another (as with no. 1). Likewise, he dismissed numerous other terms in Grigor Yerusaghêmans’i that begin with ayr in favor of other definitions; e.g., the definition of astuatz on p. 791b in favor of the earlier one on p. 762a (there seems to have been a tendency to begin lexisca with this word “God”); the better definition of ardarut’iwn (“Justice is that which maintains equality among those of like species”) on p. 764a in favor of the earlier selections from Philosophical Definitions [Ուռուցուռչը Ֆիլիպուռչուռք], 388.31-32, 390.14. Moreover, he selected from among the several definitions readily available with the given term; e.g., he took only the Aristotelian definition of anm from Philosophical Definitions [Ուռուցուռչը Ֆիլիպուռչուռք] and dismissed the rest (376.22-25).

The Philosophical Tradition and the Original Sources

It is easier to comment on the origin of these concepts as found in Greek philosophy than to identify the exact sources in Greek literature. It is not within the scope of this presentation however, to try to identify the source of every definition Even if it were to be allowed, the attempt would be futile. Suffice it to survey briefly the philosophical background of these meanings and to identify in the meantime as many sources as possible. I shall then consider the implications of these identifications for the rest of the sample and, of course, the implications of the sample for the entire glossary.

Several of these definitions derive from classical philosophy, especially those of words related to the cardinal virtues and their opposite vices (7, 8, 9, 17, 18, 27, 33, 37, 42, 44, and 50). While much could be said about each of these terms, I shall limit my remarks to the definitions in the glossary.

All three definitions of FOLLY (7) are contemplated in Aristotle VV 1250b44-1251a3. The definitions of INJUSTICE (8) and JUSTICE (17) may be

---

17 Anasyan (1976), cols. 1177-1242, esp. nos. 6, 7a, 12, 14, etc.
divided into three categories: those pertaining to the soul, to knowledge or understanding, and to distribution. Regarding the first two categories, justice, like the rest of the virtues in Platonic thought, is anchored in the soul and is seen in their harmony — with injustice as the disruption of that harmony; moreover, like the rest of the virtues, justice is related to knowledge, and injustice, understandably, to ignorance (Plato, *R 419A-445E*). The distributive category, however, is best explained by referring to Aristotle, the source of at least one of the definitions: "Ability to distribute what is equal" (*Top 145b35*; although he hastens to add that this is an incorrect definition). The statement on distribution of wealth owes to *EN 1131a15-30* (see his reference to it in *Pol 1280a16*; cf. *IV 1250b15*), and that of justice as equality on the basis of merit to *EN 1131a25, 1158b31*, etc. *INEQUALITY (9)*, an attendant of injustice, is defined in the Stoic sense of determinism or fatalism, in that not all are created equal.  

COURAGE (18), according to Aristotle, is not to be defined as control of fears (*Top 125b22-27*; see also his treatise on "Problems Connected with Fear and Courage," *Pr 947b10-949a20*). The third definition, "[Courage], the mean between rashness and ignorance," is a distortion of Aristotle's dictum that courage is the mean between rashness and cowardice or fear and confidence (*EN 1107b1-3; cf. 1114a6-35*). As for the intervening definitions of courage as "redemption" or "preservation" (*soteria*), there seems to be a mixture of Platonic (*R 425E*) and Christian meanings (q.v. 2.a.d. in Lampe, 129-130). With regard to VIRTUE (27), the given definitions likewise have analogies in Aristotle — notwithstanding their Platonic reminiscences; its place in life in terms of virtuous deeds (*EN 1098a16, 1103a14-b26, 11014a18, 1177a11a8; EE 1220a38b6*); the good things it encompasses (*Pol 1323a24-26*); as an agreeable disposition (*Top 121b38*); the mean (*EN 1220a38-b6; MM 1186a20-23, b33; EE 1220b21-1221b3, 1222a6-22; *Pol 1295a37*); and happiness, of which he gives a catalogue of different views (*EN 1098b23-30*).

As for shame, emotion, and fear, these are related in that they belong to *pathē*, the Stoic doctrine of the motions,19 and must be understood accordingly. Plato uses SHAME (33) with *aidos and aischunē* interchangeably, in the sense of fear (see his dialogue on fear, *Lg 646E-650B*), and Aristotle relates it to *pathē* and

---


lupê ("grief"; see De an 403a16; pr 948b20). But it was due to Stoic elaborations that shame was to be defined exactly as in the first and last definitions: "fear of direct blame (eulabeia orthou psogou; SVF III, 105.40) and "fear of disgrace" (from the subjective sense of aischunê as fear of the aischos or aischros, "disgrace" or "reproach"; ibid., 101.34-35). Likewise in Stoicism, EMOTION (42) "is movement of the irrational part of the soul" (ibid., 114.36; cf. 92.11, 93.14, 113.14; attributed to Zeno, ibid., I, 50.21 — just as in the glossary of Grigor Yerushaghêmat'si, 790b). To the Stoic every emotion is lack of reason and is viewed as sickness (ibid.). Nonetheless, the term is common in the Greek and Hellenistic world, especially in descriptions of the passions or in discussions of the problem of pain and suffering. For a diversity of meanings in Aristotle, expressing the feelings of pleasure and pain, see EN 1105b21-23. On pathos as an external element, cf. ektos tou pathos einai (Teles 56), or exò tôn pathón ginestai (D Chr 60.3), and the Cynic-Stoic ideal of apatheia or ataraxia as means of freeing oneself from this. The equally Stoic definition, "emotion is movement of the irrational soul by reason of good and evil fantasies," as Amalyan observes,20 is taken from Nemesius' De natura hominis.21 As for FEAR (44), treated by the Stoics with the rest of the emotional impulses and their positive equivalents, its definition owes to Plato (Lg 646E-650B) and Aristotle (Rh 1382a21, b26-27) in that fear is caused by the threat to existence. To the Stoic elaborations on the latter belongs the definition of ANTICIPATION (37) as a way of protection; i.e., fear generates caution, and that the primary impulse of every creature is to long for self-preservation (cf. the Stoic doctrine of hormê).22 Also to this understanding belongs the first definition of HATE (50) as aversion (cf. the Stoic doctrine of allotriosis as it relates to courage and justice).23

Aristotelian meanings abound in several of the remaining terms and their definitions (nos. 3, 10, 11, 20, 21, 30, 31, 38, 45, 46, and 52). Those of NOUN (3), in a grammatical sense, belong to him; in fact, the second definition is found verbatim in Int 17a9: "A sound significant by compounding, which has no reference to time, and of which no part is significant apart from the rest." For FIXED STAR (10), see Cael 296b4: they "always rise and set in the same part of the earth" (cf. [Ps.-Arist.] Mu 392a10). So also with the IMPOSSIBLE (11), which

---

20 Amalyan, 176.
21 Armenian ed. (Venice 1889), 89.
22 Terian, Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus, 149, 150, 167.
23 Ibid., 155, 157.
is defined by him as "that of which the contrary is of necessity true" (Metaph 1019b22; cf. Cael 280b13; 281a2-28; Ma 699b18-30). Another exact definition is that of MALE (20): "an animal that generates in another" (Ga 716a14). As for BLOOD (21), Aristotle defines it as the ultimate and universal nutriment (Spir 481a12) and the material of which the whole body is made (Pa 651a14, 652a7). While those of PROOF (30) are rather conventional (q.v. apodeixis in Liddell and Scott, 196), the first is to be understood in the sense of Aristotelian logic; i.e., deductive proof by syllogism, a subject to which Aristotle devotes his Analytica priora (24b10-70b39). On GROWTH (31) as a movement, see Cat 15a13; Ph 211a15, 226a31; De An 406a13; MA 700a27-b3. INVOLUNTARY (38) acts are treated by him in terms of internal and universal compulsions (EN 1109b35-1110b17; EE 1223a30) and as actions due to ignorance (EN 1110b18-1111a20). The term is related to atuchême, "unintentional fault", as compared with injustice (adikia) of "deliberate wrongdoing" (EN 1135a21-1136b14). The definition in the glossary: "Involuntary, the origin of which is external yet none of the affecting power is under one's control" however, as Amalyan notes,\(^24\) belongs to Nemesius' De natura hominis\(^25\) (interestingly, the example of finding a treasure is found also in Nemesius De natura hominis M.40.763A). Owing to Aristotle is also the definition of ALTERATION (45) as motion (Cat 15a13-b16; Top 121a32; De an 406a12) in respect to place and quality (Ph 226a26; Cael 270a27, 277a14, 310a23, b16, 319b5-320a7). The definition of MAN (47) owes to Aristotle's repeated views in the De generatione animalium, that the male holds the efficient cause of generation (passim; see no. 20 above). As for HEALTH (52), here too the thought is derived from Aristotle, who places health within the realm of the mean: all excess damages health (EN 1104a16; cf. Ph 246b5).

Among other definitions owing to classical philosophy are nos. 16 and 24: CRAFTSMANSHIP (16) or ART (24), which are often indistinguishable in the Greek technê (later I shall remark on the distinction made in the glossary). The dependence of art on knowledge is repeatedly emphasized by Plato, for whom the first characteristic of any art is knowledge based on understanding of the real nature of the subject or object. He sums up his concept in Grg 465a, where nothing irrational (alogon pragma) deserves to be called a technê (cf. Aristotle, Ph 194a22-27; Metaph 981a17). The phrase "with the causes", added to the first definition of art, understandably, refers to the four Aristotelian causes: a) material b) formal c) efficient and d) final (Top 149b16; Ph 195b30; De an 415b8-11;

\(^24\) Amalyan, 171-172.

\(^25\) Armenian ed. (Venice, 1889), 114.
Somn Vig 455b15; Metaph 983a26-33; 1013a24-1014a25; 1070b26). Art, according to Aristotle, is an acquired skill (Metaph 1046b36; cf. 1047b32; EN 1140a1-22) and is to be directed to the necessities of life (Metaph 981b13-19). This last definition in somewhat similar words appears also in the Philosophical Definitions [Φαινόμενον ἐξαντλαμένων] (386.5), where it is rightly attributed to Aristotle.

Several terms and definitions derived from the classical period appear in early Christian literature with mixed meanings (nos. 4, 15, 19, 22, 25, 26, 29, 39, and 40). The earlier connotations of these, however, are somewhat identifiable, as those of INDIVIDUAL (4), which in Aristotle's logic refers to the eidos, the subdivision of species or forms (De an 414b27; Metaph 1034a8; cf. 1039b20-1040b4). The meaning of PRAYER (15), which appears verbatim in Olymp. Ecd. 5:3 (M.93.540C): "Prosechē estin aiteis agathon para theou," may be seen in the very etymology of the word euchē. The basic concept in the identification of God with the CREATIVE CAUSE (19) is Aristotelian: God is essentially the final cause of the existence of the world and its order, as developed in the Metaphysica (see especially 1072b7-14; q.v. aitia B.1 in Lampe, 54). PIETY (22) is here found in the sense of eusebeia, the external piety expressed in cultic worship of the gods. The definition of SUN (25) as "divine fire" is reminiscent of the Stoic pur technikos (SVF I, 22-32). Likewise, PROPOSITION (26) (prothesis), with its reference to "predestination" (proorismos) and its attendant meaning or synonym, "necessity" (anagkē), is marked by reminiscence of Stoic fatalism (SVF II, 264-298; q.v. I.B.2 in Lampe, 1149). On DETERIORATION (29) as the opposite of generation, see Aristotle GC 319a28-29 (cf. Cat 15a13-32, b2; Cael 282b5-9); as movement or change see ibid., 320a2. The deteriorative nature of man is overstressed in early Christian literature (following numerous Pauline passages; e.g., Rom 1:23; 1 Cor 15:42, 50, 53-54). The primacy of the EYE (39) among the organs of sense is derived obviously from Plato Tim 47A-E (cf. Nemesis, De natura hominis M.40.637B).

Curious indeed are the second and third definitions of LAW (40). In Greek thought the problem of a nomos that is against another nomos, which is therefore dubious and cannot be kept, receives much attention in light of the belief that all laws are of divine origin (e.g. Sophocles in Antigone). The Platonic solution in the Republic is noteworthy: there is an inner nomos whose taxis is controlled by the norm of the pseuchē; i.e., righteousness and temperance (dikaiosunē and sophrosunē). The Stoics emphasized that above the law of the state, which derives from divine law, is another divine law of ancient origin, an
unwritten law (the agraphos nomoi) or the law of nature (nomos phuseos) which is set over against the polis. Of particular interest is a passage in Bas Is 23 (M.30.164A), where after talking about the laws of Sodom and Gomorrah, there is mention of just and unjust laws, practical and impractical laws, etc.

The remaining terms and definitions are among the more conventional words and meanings in Christian and common usage (nos. 1, 6, 12, etc.). The definition of GOD (1) in terms of divine attributes abounds in the post-apostolic fathers (q.v. C.2 in Lampe, 633; also onoma, A.1.c. in ibid., 964). One such attribute is THE ONE WITHOUT BEGINNING (6) (q.v. B.1. in ibid., 119). So also is the UNSEEN (12), which echoes Heb 11:1.

Several other related terms of common Christian usage may be treated together (nos. 5, 13, 14, 32, 43, and 51). The opposite of FREEDOM FROM AVARICE (5), philarguria, is synonymous with GREED (51), pleonexia, with which it appears in lists of vices in Greek ethical literature (see especially D Chr Or 67, which is a speech peri pleonexias — “the greatest evil for a man himself” (67.7). Its abundant usage in early Christian literature arises from primitive Christian experience — emphasis on non-possession (cf. 1 Tm 6:10, where philarguria is the root of all evil, in repetition of a pre-Christian saying with regard to money as the mother of all evil, Ps-Phoc 42). Polycarp fights strongly against avarice in his references to philarguria and pleonexia (Ep 2:22; 4:1 [echoing 1 Tm 6:10]; 4:3; 6:1; cf. 1 Clem 35:5; 2 Clem 6:4). Likewise, in early Christian literature THE UNSPIRITUAL (13), pseuchikos appears repeatedly as opposite of the spiritual pneumatikos, especially in discussions of “Second Adam” Christology and in the exegesis of 1 Cor 2:14; 15:44, 46 (q.v. B.1. in Lampe, 1553). Note that the SELFISH (14) is not condemned, but the love of self in excess, as in Aristotle, Pol 1263b1. OSTENTATION (32) appears in a rather Christian meaning, derived from the post-apostolic fathers (q.v. in Lampe, 69). The thought in the definition of POOR (43) owes to Matt 5:3.

Of the more conventional terms with somewhat common meanings we may note nos. 2, 23, 28, 34, 35, 36, 41, 46, 48 and 49. The broad definition of ASTRONOMY (2) appears frequently (see, among others, Olymp in Mete 68.20; etc.), as also that of PRONUNCIATION (23) (q.v. I.i. in Liddell and Scott, 1540). The first definition of MARRIAGE (34) appears verbatim in Clement Strom 2.23 (M.8.1085C): “the joining of man and woman to beget children” (gamos men oun e sti sunodos andros kai gunaikos ... epi gnéshon teknon). On that of MONTH (35), cf. (Ps-) Aristotle Mu 399a7. Those of MORNING

26 Terian, Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus, 160-162.
(28), SUMMER (36), VINE (46), and AUTUMN (39) are very common indeed, as is also that of AIR (41), which departs somewhat from the traditional understanding of air as moisture and heat (Aristotle, GC 330b4; cf. Mete 354b4 for the environing air). The all-encompassing definition of UNIVERSE (48) from the majestic cycles of heavenly bodies to the minutest anatomical and physiological details abounds in Stoic philosophy, where also we find the exact wording of the first definition: “the structure of heaven and earth and natures therein”, found in SVF II, 168.11 and 169.39 (kosmos esti sustêma ex ouranou kai gês kai tôn toutois phaseon).

It is clear from the above underlined identifications of the original sources of certain of these definitions that some of them derive from works never translated into Armenian (see the comments on nos. 3, 15, 17, 20, 33, 34, 38, 42, and 48). This implies derivations from secondary sources in which the respective works were treated and which in turn were translated into Armenian. This could well be among the best evidences that the Philosophical Definitions [Uwlilwup ᰤᰫᰫᰫᰫᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤᰤenchmark 15 above) and also the Hellenizing School had not yet attained the height of its translational activity. Also noticeable is the predominance of the Aristotelian influence, which may be due to the works and translations of Dawit‘ Anhaght‘.27

Some Semantic Peculiarities

The Greek meanings of these Armenian terms are inescapable. Some definitions show traces of Greek etymology, and syntactical peculiarities of translation from Greek are obvious throughout. While not all terms are strictly philosophical, their definitions abound in technical meanings. Some of these definitions find adequate basis in Christian and non-Christian usage, and thus attest to the merger of philosophy and theology in late antiquity. Others find no such basis; they attest to the usage of philosophical terms and not concepts, philosophical terms and not meanings.

It may be argued convincingly that lexical meanings leave much of the contextual meanings to be desired. It may also be said rightly that once such words have been removed from their Greek context and translated into Armenian, their semantic value has suffered doubly in the process: in the loss of some of

27 See also the list in Banber Matenadarani III (1956), 394-401.
their original meanings by way of detachment from context and in the acquisition of certain alien meanings by way of translation. However accurate such theoretical reasoning may be, the evidence presented by the sample suggests that the semantic value of these words has changed either slightly or not at all. The data is that of Armenian words and Greek meanings that were never assimilated into the Armenian language. It is noteworthy that of the fifty-two terms only eighteen are found in the 16th-17th-century Armenian Dictionary [Բուրանքբառ] of Yeremia Meghrets'28 and none with any of the meanings found in this glossary (3, 4, 16, 18, 20, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47; cf. also 33, 43, 45, 51).

The definitions not as yet identified in Greek thought and literature cannot be attributed with certainty to Armenian origin; e.g., the second meaning of HATE (50), which borders on “envy”, suggesting that one hates the person of whom he is envious; or such a conventional meaning of PROOF (30) as the one given last; or simple definitions by way of opposites (29, 42). The Armenian element is to be sought elsewhere.

More than the translation into Armenian, the compilation and the redaction of the glossary add some new word-concepts and some new conceptual content for old words. I shall illustrate this with the examples below.

The second term, ASTRONOMY (Arm. asteghagitut'iw; Gk. astronomia), appears in the Philosophical Definitions [Աղոթեքիտւիթ ] (an anonymous source of Greek origin translated into Armenian and then used by the compiler of the glossary)29 as ASTROLOGY (Arm. asteghabashkhus'tiw; Gk. astrologia) yet with identical definition. The Greek words are synonyms, as both terms appear interchangeably in early Greek literature; only in the late Hellenistic period does one find the stricter meaning of astrologia as “astrology” (q.v. in Liddell and Scott, 263). The immediate indication is that the original source of this term and its definition belongs to early Greek literature, to the time when no distinction was made between the two Greek words. But since the definition is suggestive of “astronomy” and not “astrology”, the compiler substitutes the first word (asteghagitut'iwn) for the second (asteghabashkhuts'iwn). Where no distinction is made between the Greek terms, leaving their respective meanings to the discretion of context, the Armenian compiler makes a distinction by the very choice of the term that best fits the definition.


29 Arevshatyan, “Two Antique Philosophical Texts,” 388.
A similar choice of terms is discernible in nos. 16 and 24: CRAFTSMANSHIP (Arm. arbest; Gk. technē) and ART (Arm. aruest; Gk. technē). Whereas the Greek terms are identical and are used to indicate both applied and fine art, the Armenian makes a distinction by the use of different terms which so often appear interchangeably in Armenian translations from Greek, as equivalents of the indiscriminate word technē. Since no. 24 does not appear in recension A, its insertion in recension B must be credited to the perceptiveness of the redactor.

From among other examples EMOTION / DISEASE (42) is equally noteworthy. The Greek word pathos stands for a number of Armenian words and meanings, which in the work of the compiler (recension A) are scattered in four parts. But in the reworking of the redactor (recension B), where the various meanings are brought together, the potential difficulties arising from one Greek word representing a number of Armenian synonyms or words of related but by no means identical meaning are resolved in a rather disentangled way.

Additional observations on the sample might be made; however, the above notations should suffice. What began as a short introduction to a medieval glossary of philosophical terms and concepts became a lengthy, preliminary study of the making of such a glossary. The study may serve as a methodological model for similarly treating the rest of the document — if not as an introduction to a future publication of the entire document.

More than showing a later use made of the Armenian translations by the Hellenizing School, the glossary is a fine example of medieval Armenian lexicographical interest and philosophical curiosity. The document with its two recensions illustrates the making of the first alphabetically arranged Armenian glossary of philosophical terms and concepts. It is a witness to the transition from the earlier, thematically arranged glossaries to the later, alphabetically arranged collections that take the form of dictionaries.
An Enigmatic Letter of Grigor Magistros

The document under consideration is Letter 12 of Grigor Magistros (ca. 990-1059), an Armenian nobleman and writer, whose more than eighty T'iyght'k' or Letters contain valuable correspondence with certain native and foreign dignitaries of his day. While the collection is a mine of historical, political, social and biographical material, this Letter is noted not so much for its contents as for the inherent difficulties of the text, which borders on unintelligibility. Grigor's writing style in general is not easy: what makes the Letters somewhat incomprehensible is the fact that his language is heavily influenced by Byzantine training and abounds with Greek elements that he tries to pass on as a mark of erudition. This study is an attempt to derive as much meaning as possible from what appears to be the most enigmatic writing in the entire collection.

Introduction

Brief introductions to the sender and to the recipient of Letter 12 are necessary before we proceed to the text, translation, and commentary. On Grigor, the introduction by K. Kostaniants' in his edition of Grigor's Letters is hitherto unsurpassed. In the same edition Kostaniants' devotes an appendix to the addressees of Grigor, where a fair introduction to the recipient, Hovhannēs, Archbishop of Siwnik', is found among others. To be sure, a more detailed account of Grigor's life and a commemorative treatment of the Letters, beginning with a critical text and translation and culminating in a historical and literary com-

2 He tries very hard to impress the addressees with his learning, as may be gathered also from his epic poetry addressed to Manuch'ē, a Muslim scholar whom he met in Byzantium; Epic Verses of Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni [Տղանակում Գրիգորյի Դրիթըն Յունքահռամանի Ծիծեբական], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1868.
3 Kostaniants', ix-xlvi.
mentary, are needed — with the biographical part of the needed study being necessarily informed by the Letters.

Grigor was born in Bjni, a village in the valley of the Hrazdan or Zangu River — a tributary to the Araxes west of Lake Sevan — to the princely Pahlavuni-Kamsarian (Neo-Kamsarakian) family with claims to Parthian and Jewish ancestry and relation to Grigor the Illuminator and the Mamikonians. He flourished in the first half of the 11th century, excelling more in literary than in military prowess. His Letters indicate that he was well versed in Greek literature and, like his epic poetry on biblical history (Taghasats'ut'iwunck — the first epic of considerable length in Armenian literature), they reveal a profound knowledge of the Scriptures. A truly erudite person, he was not slow to display his erudition throughout his correspondence, a factor that adds significantly to his already difficult style. On the political scene, he was somehow obliged to turn over to the Byzantines several Armenian fortresses under his jurisdiction. This was attributable partly to the independent Armenian states’ succumbing to the demands of Emperor Basil II (976-1025) and his successors and partly to traditional family rivalries between the pro-Byzantine Mamikonians and the cautiously pro-Islamic Bagratids. Grigor, however, was compensated by being made Dux of Mesopotamia, which included the southern districts of Vaspurakan and Taron, and was given the title of Magistros by the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1055).

More could be said about the author, but little is known about the recipient, Hovhannès, Archbishop of Siwnik’ for fifty years (1006-1056). An intimate

---


6 See above, n. 2.

7 The tension between the two dynasties is felt strongly in Grigor’s correspondence with an intimate friend, Sargis Vardapet of Ani (Letters 18-21; cf. 22). Grigor’s uncle, Prince (Sparapet) Vahram Pahlawuni, however, made a final and futile attempt for the cause of Gagik II (1042-1045) and to save the city of Ani, where he died in battle (1047). On these turbulent years in Armenian history, see R. Grousset, Histoire de l’Arménie des origines à 1071, Paris: Payot, 1947, 566-584.

8 Cf. Letter 67.

friend of Grigor, he is the recipient of Letters 11-17. He was Grigor’s teacher at one time, as indicated by the closing paragraph of Letter 11: “These my [words] to you are the fruit gathered from your own vineyard, my father and lord, nurturer and teacher.” In the opening line of Letter 13, Grigor addresses him as “You who imparted light to me.” In the same Letter Grigor complains about some strange — if not bizarre — funerals conducted by certain priests and begs the Archbishop to take action against them. The Archbishop’s religious reforms are acknowledged by the 13th-century historian of Siwnik, Step’anos Örbelian: “[The rebellious elements] he won back and subordinated unto himself, and relentlessly chased away the alien and wolf-like shepherds.”

These remarks on the activities of the Archbishop and his times are in harmony with the Geist of the Letter under consideration.

The date of Letter 12 has to be placed after 1047, the year Grigor’s uncle Vahram Sparapet died in a futile attempt to save the city of Ani. This is the date of the eulogizing Letter 11, sent to the same recipient, who officiated at Vahram’s funeral. Grigor was in Constantinople at the time and did not return to his native land until four years later (1051). Since the contents of the Letter under consideration suggest that it was written in old age and in native land, and since the Archbishop died in 1056, it remains to conclude that the date of the Letter would be ca. 1051-1056, at which time, most likely, Letters 13-17 were also written. Of these, 14-17 are composed in a somewhat similar style of allegorizing. Letter 13 has Tarön as its provenance of writing and in it Grigor tells of his plan to go (once more) to the Emperor (Constantine IX Monomachos, 1042-1055) to plead for an end to the turmoil besetting the land, so that thereafter he could devote himself completely to God. He urges the Archbishop to remain at his bishopric in the meantime. Grigor’s complete devotion to God is realized in this enigmatic Letter, where we find him among a group of elderly monastics.

---


11 Ibid., xxiv; see also above, n. 7.

12 Ibid., xxvi.

13 On the year of Grigor’s birth, see ibid., xxix and n. 2; Grigor would have been in his sixties at the time of writing; see also the Commentary, on the internal evidence of the Letter.

14 Grigor’s earlier presence at the imperial court (1045) and his prolonged stay in Byzantium were to avert the impending trouble; ibid., xli.
The Text

The text below is that published by Kostaniants' (pp. 45-46), to which we have added the marginal enumeration of lines for quick and easy reference. Also, following the text, we have reproduced the variant readings provided in the apparatus criticus of the same edition (p. 257).

(45)

An Enigmatic Letter

Translation

LETTER 12

To the Archbishop, on philosophizing a little about fish.

Three reasons compel us to philosophize a little, O head of the priestly circle.

A floating creature from Aratzan moved to our quarters; having come, he settled without making proper arrangements beforehand with the superintendent, [and] is [now] reproaching us. So we appeal | to you, considering [you to be] a just judge, since the latter duly followed the same extreme example in condemning us. He shoved aside those who understand us, and, at times, he even catered to this fellow. Those of their species don't leave our kind alone. Like enemies, they are after seeking revenge from us, | they are bent on slaughtering and exterminating [us]. [Yet] we managed to know no physical harm at the hand of this fellow, for one of our molluscan company, constrained by the guts of sheltered residents, and all by himself, dislodged and sent him away. And this [man] especially deserves [our] gratitude.

As for | our company, they all have gained knowledge by becoming disciples of one another. We were never fed the fruits of others' labor, whether in homes or in fields or even in towns. We received no defend-
ers against wolves or thieves; nothing nurturing, instructive, or edifying; or any other gratifying thing. And really, it is not fair to contrive against us; and that is not because we have been saved collectively from their school of swordfish; but because, by the only sustaining Power, we are older than you, sinless, harmless, [and] not, like you, from the source of wind; neither beyond your reach nor stranger[s]: rather, we have been reared in these fields. Judge us, Lord.

And behold they have sent a gift while knowing that your superior authority receives offering year after year, to this day, from the quarters of those who chased this fellow whom the Savior delivered. But you are in need of nothing else. And that is as certain as the total number of squares obtained from a single cube; or perhaps [the offspring] of the two generative faculties; or perhaps the mysterious significance of four by three; or [the descent] from an ancestral stock; or of rays from the direction of the sun; or a symbolical vision from the invincible Power or holy and life-giving [Spirit]; or being constituted of four [elements] and having obtained both soul and body; or [like] modern-day descendants of those who cast the net, who, upon getting the stater [from the mouths of fish], will give them for the Savior's deliverance.

Live long.

The apparatus provides a preferable alternative to one of the questionable readings in the text (line 20): for hardarman read hordorman. The preference rests on usman ew hordorman being cognates and hence their combination. Moreover, two of the remaining variants (lines 2 and 25) may be deemed as legible as the readings in the text, though not quite as preferable. Line 2: for eris one may read seris. The latter ("our genus") is comparable to nots\'unts\' serk' ("their species") in line 9. A possible scribal error could be due to the omission of the initial, ornate letter. The sense, then, would be: "The very essence of our genus compels us . . ." However, the preference for eris (accusative of erek', "three") rests on its agreement with the case of the next word and on the fact that there are "three reasons" for writing the Letter (see the Commentary, Part IV). Line 25: for chashakelov one may read chayakelov. While the latter provides a more appropriate construction with yandastans (emending zandastans; cf. line 18), the former is to be preferred on the basis of line 17. As for the rest of the variants, priority is to be given to the readings in the text.
Several conjectural emendations might be made. However tempting, these steps have to be deferred to a future time — after some of the few manuscripts are collated for a critical text. For want of a better text, we have restrained ourselves from emending common corruptions of tense and mood, number and case — the high frequency of which is well attested in the transmission of Armenian texts in general. As for corrupt words transliterated from Greek (lines 22 and 37), they are noted in the Commentary. The translation occasionally departs from the punctuation of the text.

Commentary

This is not the place to discuss in detail the form or body of the Letter. Suffice it to say that there is a clear structure: letter-opening (lines 2-3), body-opening (lines 3-15), body-middle (lines 15-26), body-closing (lines 27-38), letter-closing (line 38). As for the purpose of the Letter, a threefold intention is discernible in its three major parts; see the comments below, on lines 2-3.

The identity of the Archbishop and the date of the Letter are discussed in the Introduction, above.

A metaphorical usage of imagery is employed throughout the Letter, where fish and other sea creatures consistently represent people (lines 3, 12-13, 22, [37]). This is how Grigor is "philosophizing" here. In Letters 14-17, addressed to the same recipient, we find somewhat similar "philosophizing" on the oak tree (14), apples (15), a blind musician (16), and the horse (17). In these, however, he is content for the most part to cite what certain writers have said about them in mythological writings. There is, however, a distinction between the more or less unique usage of imagery in Letter 12 and the usage of imagery in the rest. Moreover, the epistolary style in this Letter is somewhat distinct from the others.16

15 E.g., line 4, for i... tsayré (ablative) read i... tsayr (locative); the letter è possibly being a ditto graphical error derived from the first letter of the next word, etè, which letters (e / è) are often indistinguishable paleographically.

16 The metaphorical elements in this Letter may be compared with the parabolic elements in Letter 58, the parable of the lion and the flies. Letter 74, addressed to Grigor's son-in-law, T'o'rnik, reveals much about fishes and cuisine.
Lines 2-3: Letter-opening

The three reasons for writing the Letter correspond with the three parts of its body: 1) to solicit support for the courageous individual who against the wishes of the superintendent dislodged the unwelcome guest (lines 3-15) 2) to be protective of the community whose virtues he praises (lines 15-26) and 3) to prevent the Archbishop from obligating himself to the opponents of the community (lines 27-38).

Lines 3-15: Body-opening

_Ghughak_, as in Gk. _plósos_, stands for fish or water-animals in general and the _muraenae_ in particular. The Arastan (Murat Su) is a major tributary of the Euphrates east of Lake Van. As suggested earlier, unless all references to fish or water-animals in the Letter are taken as allusions to people, the Letter would be altogether meaningless. Accordingly, the “floating creature from Arastan”, the unwelcome guest, is a transient lodger from the province of Tarón and, probably, a heretical missionary.

At the outset, the Letter seems to suggest that Grigor had joined a monastic community, perhaps for some time during the closing years of his life. The repeated references to his community in this section and the next, and his use of the first person plural — whereby he intimately associates and identifies himself with the group, are noteworthy. It was not uncommon for medieval nobility to join monastic communities at least for a season of penance or for temporary withdrawal from worldly cares: one good example, among others, is that of King Het’um II (1289-1293, 1295-1297) of Armenian Cilicia. Letter 11, addressed to the same Archbishop, who in 1047 officiated at the funeral of Grigor’s uncle Vahram, credits the parents of the deceased, that is, Grigor’s grandparents Grigor and Shushan, with founding new monasteries and restoring old ones,

---


19 I.e., between 1051 and 1059; see the Introduction, above, and comments on lines 15-26.
adding that there were no monastic establishments until their day. In the same eulogizing Letter Grigor refers to the building activities of his late uncle, which are attested by the contemporary chronicler Aristakes of Lastivert. It could be that Grigor was at one of the monasteries built or restored by his ancestors — if not at one of those restored by himself and that within the province of Siunik'. Hayots‘ T'ar, in the vicinity of Gni, not far from Erevan, was restored by the young Grigor in 1013 and appears to have been a favorite place. Another possible site could be the convent of Surb Astuatsatsin in his native Bjni, where he also built a church bearing the same name in 1031. Another place where Grigor might have retired — though not at the time of writing this Letter — is the monastery of Kech’aris or Kech’aruk', in the province of Tsaghkunik' or Tsaghkotn, which was dedicated to his namesake Grigor the Illuminator, and was restored by him in 1051.

Throughout this section and the next, Grigor's community appears to be elderly. The vulnerability of the superintendent to the persuasions of the unwelcome visitor and his joining him in censoring the members of the community may be due to the effects of advanced age (moreover, it may not be wrong to assume that positions of oversight in monasteries usually belong to the seniority). This also explains why Grigor does not criticize the superintendent in his further remarks but speaks of outside enemies collectively and is protective of his community as a whole. It is also noteworthy that Grigor refers to the courageous member of his community as “one of our molluscian company”, thereby alluding perhaps to the age-hardened skin of the elderly members who are thus “sheltered” or “armored”. This may be further substantiated by the allusion to the opponents in the following section as “swordfish”, and in this section by the distinction made between “their species” and “our kind”.

20 History of the Armenians [Գաւնդինը Լեռն], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1844, 37. Vahram's magnum opus was the monastery of Marmashen, where he was buried. Its construction lasted from 986 to 1029; it stands at the northwestern extremities of the Akhurian River or Arpa Chai (Kostaniants', xx).

21 For the dedicatory inscription, see Kostaniants', xxxii.

22 Ibid., xxxii-xxxiii.

23 The date of the dedicatory inscription coincides with the year of Grigor's return from Byzantium and the terminus post quem of the writing of this Letter; see ibid., xxxiv.
Lines 15-26: Body-middle

In his monastic environment Grigor appears to be a spokesman more for his peers than for himself.\textsuperscript{24} He is apprehensive of external influences possibly resulting from heretical tendencies.\textsuperscript{25} He is on guard against outsiders and protective of his community, which seems to have practiced extreme abstinence, perhaps even a hermetic life. Grigor’s presence at such a place and association with such a company may be seen as extreme — if not final — penance. This view may be further established by the observation made earlier that the Letter belongs to the closing years of his life.

The notion of the community’s advanced age is repeated here. The words “we are older than you” do not necessarily mean that the writer is older than the recipient, whose vigor or zest is referred to as “from the source of wind”, but are to be seen in light of Grigor’s associating and identifying himself with a group of elderly men, who on the average would be older than the Archbishop, who is himself an old man.\textsuperscript{26}

A major substantiation of the metaphorical usage of fish for people is to be seen in the reference to the opponents as a “school of swordfish” (Arm. k'isiw'isey appears to be a derivative of k'isiw'ie, from Gk. xiphias).\textsuperscript{27} The depiction of the opponents as “swordfish” marks the height of Grigor’s polemic against them.

Lines 27-38: Body-closing

The concluding lines of this section, as we shall see, suggest that the opponents of Grigor’s community have sent money to the Archbishop. Grigor’s burden here is to prevent the Archbishop from accepting it, lest he be obliged to yield to the demands of the donors. The Archbishop is reminded of the revenue

\textsuperscript{24} For his age (not much younger than the Archbishop), education, and political and literary activities, see the Introduction. Letters 45-46; addressed to his disciples Barsegh and Eghishé, are suggestive of his education and teaching. Cf. Letters 23-26 addressed to Sargsis Vardapet of St. Karapet, another student; Letters 24 and 26 contain instruction in philosophy; cf. also Letters 85-87 addressed to lazy, anonymous students.

\textsuperscript{25} See above, n. 18.

\textsuperscript{26} See the Introduction and n. 24.

\textsuperscript{27} Q.v. k'isiw'ie in Bedrossian, Dictionary, 753; also, q.v. xiphias in Liddell and Scott, Lexicon, 1190.
he receives regularly from Grigor's quarter and, in a straightforward manner, is
told that he is in no need of additional income. Grigor goes on to illustrate this
certainty with a long list of veracities and in his customary style.

The last illustration, which also serves as a final appeal and helps clarify
much of the ambiguity of the Letter, is based on an episode recorded in Matt
17:24-27. According to the Gospel account, Peter was confronted by the col-
collectors of the temple dues who inquired whether Jesus paid the half-shekel required
annually from every Jewish male. Upon presenting the matter to Jesus, Peter was
sent to the sea with the prediction that he would catch a fish with a statēr in its
mouth and was told to give this coin on behalf of the two of them. Arm. sater is a
corruption of Gk. statēr, the equivalent of a tetradrachm or a shekel. The use of the
plural "staters", instead of the singular in the biblical text, is in keeping with
Grigor's epistolary intention. The coins obtained from the mouths of fish, the
donors, are indicative of the monetary gift given to the Archbishop.

With this biblical illustration Grigor is suggesting that the Archbishop,
who stands as a spiritual descendant of the Apostle, should do likewise in not
keeping the money for himself. Should it be that he has already accepted the
money, there is still an opportunity for him to give it back to those laying bur-
densome demands.

**Line 38: Letter-closing**

"Live long", or simply, "Live"; a common letter-closing, which appears also
at the end of Letters 13-17, addressed to the same recipient.28

**Excursus**

Our understanding of Letter 12 differs sharply from that of Kostaniants'.
He gives the following interpretation in his brief remarks on the Archbishop:
"From the banks of Arastan the Pahlavuni prince [Grigor] has sent fish to his
friend [the Archbishop] on the day of the holy Apostles; on that occasion he
amuses himself by putting in the mouths of fish a protest against the fisher-
men." He then quotes lines 26-29 and goes on to add: "The number of the fish is
12, which is symbolic; there are 12 apostles, patriarchs, zodiacal signs, months of
the year, etc.; he shows this in a riddle." Lines 30-32 are then quoted.29

---

28 Among the earlier documents in the collection, see the closing lines of Letters 2, 4-7, 9-10.
29 Kostaniants’, 293-294.
While Kostaniants' admits of some symbolism in certain lines, he fails to see it throughout the Letter. He also fails to recognize — much less identify — the specific species and their metaphorical use, thereby missing the whole point of the Letter. Should the fish be understood literally, there would be numerous and serious difficulties with most of the other parts of the Letter, including the Scriptural passage contemplated in the closing lines. Until a better sense can be made of the document as a whole, we shall remain committed to our interpretation.
Plato in David’s Prolegomena Philosophiae

The PROLEGOMENA PHILOSOPHIAE is a defense of philosophy against Pyrrhonian skepticism and its dictum that all knowledge, including the testimony of the senses, is uncertain. David considers this to be not only a threat to philosophy but also a denial of it, so he argues for the viability and permanence of philosophy. Unlike the pedantic commentaries by the later Neoplatonists of the 6th century, to which David is a contributor in his own right, the Prolegomena as a philosophical treatise marks a return to the comprehensive

1 For the Greek text, entitled Τὰ προλεγόμενα τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀπὸ φωνῆς Δαβίδ, see A. Busse, ed., Davidis Prolegomena et in Porphyrii Isagogen commentarium (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca XVIII/2), Berlin: G. Reimer, 1904, hereafter Busse; for the Armenian text with a Russian translation, see S.S. Arevshatyan, ed., David the Invincible: Definitions of Philosophy [Դավիթ Ծովիրյան. Հայը միջին հայկական փիլոսոփիա], Erevan: 1960, hereafter Arev. The Greek title (Ἀρμ. Προλέγομενα ἤμισοι διηγηματικοί) seems to be original (cf. Busse 79.29; Arev. 158.15) and the Armenian (Gk. Οἱ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ὀρισμοί) derivative (cf. Busse 49.9; Arev. 112.10).


2 In addition to the Prolegomena, as the preceding note indicates, to David belongs a commentary on Porphyry’s Isagoge, which, like the Prolegomena, survives in the Greek original and in an Armenian translation published with a Russian translation by S.S. Arevshatyan, ed., David the Invincible: A Commentary on Porphyry’s Isagoge [Դավիթ Ծովիրյան. Փորֆիրիոսի Հայը միջին փիլոսոփիա], Erevan: 1967. To him also belongs a commentary on Aristotle’s Prior Analytics, which survives in an Armenian translation (Commentary on the Fourteen Heads of Aristotle’s Analytics [Հայը միջին ավելի մարդ հայկական Արիստոտելի Կատարակտում]) and, perhaps more recently, Elia’s Aristotle’s Categories commentary [ելիա ավելի մարդ հայկական Արիստոտելի Կատարակտում] has been attributed to David. It must be noted that the latest authority cited in the Prolegomena is Olympiodorus the Younger (Busse 16.3, 31.34, 64.32; Arev. 38.13, 72.32; the third reference is missing in the Armenian translation: Busse 64.28-65.3 should follow Arev. 134.15), who flourished at Alexandria as head of the Neoplatonic School and died after 564-565. He could have been David’s teacher, since David refers to him alone as “the philosopher.”
synthesis of Plotinian Neoplatonism and deserves to be studied for its own sake. Notwithstanding its eclecticism, it leans heavily on Platonic norms: it contains twenty-one Platonic citations and even more allusions to Plato by name, compared with only ten Aristotelian citations and about as many allusions to Aristotle.

In his well-structured treatise David depends on Plato rather systematically, especially in the central part, which deals with the six definitions of philosophy. David quotes Plato at the most crucial points in his argument. Consequently, as one traces the Platonic citations in the Prolegomena the entire treatise unfolds, thus enabling a contextual study of the citations and a synoptic study of the work as a whole. Since David's work survives in the Greek original, and because the Armenian translation abounds in unwarranted omissions, the Greek text is used primarily, with the Armenian text utilized for comparison and accounted for in the references.

In the preamble to the Prolegomena (Busse 1.4-2.29; Arev. 2.4-6.17) David focuses on teleology, the end or purpose toward which every creature is directed for fulfillment in a universal relationship. To affirm that the universe is composed of the sum of its parts and that in the absence of any of its parts the universe remains incomplete, David quotes Timaeus 41B: "There are yet left for our consideration three kinds of mortal creatures that have not been brought into being; if these be not born, the heaven will be imperfect." (Busse 2.17; Arev. 4.31) The creatures not yet described in the Timaeus are those of air, of water, and of land, without which the world, as a living creature that must embrace all kinds of lesser living creatures, is not yet complete. David singles out the presence of man as that essential part which gives completion and fullness to the whole. In fact, the very purpose or reason for man's presence is to render the universe whole. Man furthermore brings his contribution to the world he lives in. This contribution, at its best, is in the realm of philosophy, which need not be confusing as it has been confusing to some — even as Aristotle admits in Physica 193a7: "Such confusion, however, is not unknown; it is like a man born blind arguing about colors." (Busse 2.25; Arev. 6.12) Consequently, David goes on to state his purpose in life, his reason for writing the Prolegomena. He sees himself as one who is called to clarify confusions regarding philosophy and to elucidate that which ought to be known.

---

3 The omissions range from a word to three pages; e.g., Busse 50.3-53.15 should follow Arev. 112.25.

4 "For our consideration", literally, "for us".
As a cautious philosopher, David begins by stating his method and challenges skepticism with well-established norms of philosophical inquiry. He quotes Aristotle's four questions posited in *Analytica posteriora* 89b23: "Whether it exists, what it is, how it is, and what it is for." (Busse 1.13; Arev. 2.18) He then stresses the relationship between philosophy and knowledge and provides four propositions or statements (dealt with separately in the sequel) whereby philosophy is defined in terms of knowledge: 1) philosophy as knowledge pertaining to changeless things 2) philosophy as knowledge and hence recollection 3) philosophy as knowledge pertaining to sense-perceptible qualities, whether theoretical or practical and 4) philosophy as knowledge and therefore an art. (Busse 2.31-8.20; Arev. 6.21-20.6) He digresses to discuss whether philosophy is knowledge of things in general or of things in particular. He seems to favor its pertaining to things in general without ruling out its pertinence for the particular, such as God.

Important for our consideration are the reminiscences of Plato's theory of knowledge as found in the *Meno*, the *Phaedo*, and the *Theaetetus*, and to some extent in the *Parmenides* and the *Timaeus*. Thus it is not surprising to find in conjunction with the second statement, on philosophy / knowledge as recollection, a citation from the *Meno* (81C): "Virtuous souls not only have an awareness of what may follow but do anticipate them and have previous knowledge of things which have occurred beforehand." (Busse 4.32; Arev. 12.16) David stops short of quoting Plato's maxim in the lines that follow (81D), "Research and learning are wholly recollection," which is based on the theory of rebirth and assumes the immortality of the soul and its recall of previous knowledge. Likewise, in conjunction with the third statement, on philosophy / knowledge and sense perception, David cites *Timaeus* 47A: "The Creator bestowed sight and hearing upon us in order that through them we may be directed to philosophical inquiry." (Busse 5.2; Arev. 12.22) There follows a long and elaborate defense of this proposition and the subdivisions of theoretical and practical knowledge,6

---

5 The sequence followed by David, 1) εἰ ἐστι 2) τί ἐστι 3) ὁπόθν τί ἐστι 4) διὰ τί ἐστι, is more logical than that in the *Analytica posteriora*, where the order is 3) τὸ ὅτι 4) τὸ διότι 1) εἰ ἐστι 2) τί ἐστι. Whereas the Greek has ὁ ἀριστοτελικὸς θεομοι, the Armenian translation has "those who say" [*որոն մեկեն*].

6 For a detailed and lengthy discussion of theoretical and practical knowledge, see below, Busse 54.28-79.29; Arev. 114.17-158.15.
with several allusions to Plato (Busse 5.10, 21, 26; Arev. 14.4, 19, 25)7 and Aristotle. (Busse 5.30.6.8; Arev. 14.31)8

David intensifies his attack on Pyrrhonism (Busse 8.22-11.14; Arev. 20.9-26.18) because it questions Plato’s theory of apprehension (Busse 8.28; Arev. 20.17)9 and Aristotle’s assertion in the Protrepticus (Busse 9.2; Arev. 20.22) that the act of philosophizing is in itself an affirmation of the existence of philosophy.10 Thus it is important for David, the defender of philosophy, to reiterate some of the probing questions posed in the preamble (Busse 9.13; Arev. 22.5) and to insist on certain guidelines without which one could be misled easily. So he quotes Phaedrus 237B: “There is only one way, dear boy, for those who are to take counsel wisely: to know what the inquiry is about, or it is sure to be utterly futile.” (Busse 9.20; Arev. 22.14)11 He enhances his argument in terms of Plato’s method of division12 and challenges opponents by quoting Sophist 235C: “For the method of dividing boasts of escape to no one” (Busse 9.29; Arev. 22.25) and Philebus 16C: “The [method of dividing] was granted to us by Prometheus together with a gleaming fire.” (Busse 9.32; Arev. 22.30) However, David wonders whether the discussion of division should give way to a discussion of definition.13 He concludes that it should, since the method of defining is more appro-

---

7 Cf. Busse 57.19, 74.6; Arev. 120.18, 148.16.
8 Cf. Busse 57.22; Arev. 120.24; Busse 6.8, which is an allusion to Physica 259a18 or Metaphysica 1073a28, is omitted in the Armenian translation (Busse 6.5-20 should fall in Arev 16.6).
9 The word here used is κατάληψις (Arm. Ծանձրություն). Plato’s theory of knowledge is obviously contemplated.
10 Fragment 6 of the lost Protrepticus (ed. I. Düring), a popular exhortation to the philosophia life based partly on the sophistic protrepticus that Plato gives in the Euthydemus. Cicero wrote his protrepticus Hortensius after the model of Aristotle, as also Iamblichus with his Protrepticus.
11 For “inquiry” (σχέψις, Arm. Տնատատես) Plato’s text has βούλη, “counsel”.
12 A branch of dialectic amplu discussed in the Sophist. For the place of διαίρεσις (Arm. Տարբերություն) in Neoplatonism, see, e.g., Ammonius, In Aristotelis Analyticorum Priorum Librum 1 commentarium 7.31 (ed. M. Wallies, [Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca 4.6], Berlin: Reimer, 1899); Iamblichus, De communi mathematica scientia 20 (ed. N. Festa, Leipzig: Teubner, 1891).
13 The term δορισμός (Arm. Տոնրամահություն) is frequent in Socratic ethics and Aristotelian logic. For its place in Neoplatonism, see, e.g., Ammonius, In Aristotelis Analyticorum 7.32 Syrianus, In Metaphysica commentaria 12.12 (ed. H. Rabe); Olympiodorus, In Aristotelis M...
priate when dealing with the singular and that of dividing when dealing with the plural; and since the singular precedes the plural, therefore definition should precede any further discussion of division.14

At this juncture there is a turning point in the literary structure of the Prolegomena, for David now concentrates on the central part of his work, namely, the definitions of philosophy. (Busse 11.5-14; Arev. 26.9-18) He begins by asking the following syllogistic questions, which he answers in the sequel: (Busse 11.16-26.28; Arev. 26.21-62.23) 1) What is definition? 2) How does definition differ from defining, description, and descriptive definition?15 3) What is the origin of the word “definition”? 4) How is it developed? 5) What is complete definition and what is incomplete definition (what is bad definition and what is good definition)? 6) How many definitions of philosophy are there? 7) Why are there so many definitions of philosophy and neither more nor less? 8) What is their order? 9) Who coined these definitions?

In answer to the sixth question above, David provides the following six definitions of philosophy, (Busse 20.26-31; Arev. 50.3-15) the order and authors of which he establishes in his responses to the eighth and ninth questions: (Busse 23.4-26.28; Arev. 56.5-62.23) Philosophy is a) knowledge about beings, whereby they are beings b) knowledge about divine and human matters c) concern about death d) likeness to God insofar as it is possible for man e) art of arts and science of sciences and f) love of wisdom. He attributes a, b, and f to Pythagoras, on the authority of Nicomachus; (Busse 26.10; Arev. 60.29) c and d he ascribes to Plato, on the basis of Phaedo 64A: “Other people are likely not to be aware that those who pursue philosophy aight forget themselves and others, and are concerned about nothing else but dying and being dead,” (Busse 26.16;

teoro commentaria 275.22 (ed. W. Stüve [CAG XII], 1900); Elias, In Porphyrii Isagogen commentaria 3.28 (ed. A. Busse [CAG XVIII.1], 1900).

14 David devotes the last third of his treatise to this subject (Busse 54.28-79.29; Arev. 114.17-158.15).

15 On differentiating between the definitory (ὁριστικός, Arm. ὄντωδοςευρήματος) and the descriptive (ὑπογραφικός, Arm. ὑπογραφικήσ) in Neoplatonism, see, e.g., Porphyrius, In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium 64.16; Simplicius, In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium 22.16 (ed. C. Kalbfleisch, [CAG VIII], 1907); Asclepius, In Aristotelis Metaphysicorum libros A-Z commentaria 385.12 (ed. M. Hayduck, [CAG VI.12], 1888); Olympiodorus, In Categorias commentarium 44.1 (ed. A. Busse, [CAG XII.1], 1902).

16 Literally, “the beings” in both instances. The definite article here is extremely important to David. He stresses it repeatedly in his comment on this definition (Busse 26.30-29.11; Arev. 62.26-66.17).
Arev. 62.4) and *Theaetetus* 176A: “Seeing that it is impossible, Theodorus, that evils should be done away with, and they cannot have their place among the gods, but must inevitably hover about mortal nature and this earth, therefore we ought to try to escape from earth to the dwelling of the gods as quickly as we can. What then is this escape? To become like God in so far as it is possible for man. To become like God is to become holy and righteous and wise.” (Busse 26.19; Arev. 62.10) Lastly, he assigns definition e to Aristotle, on the basis of the *Metaphysica*, apparently alluding to 982a4. (Busse 26.27; Arev. 62.20) In the preceding discussions on the order of the definitions, however, he assigns the same statement to Plato’s *Phaedo*, apparently alluding to 61A. (Busse 25.21)\(^{17}\)

The central part of the *Prolegomena* comprises a lengthy commentary on the six definitions. (Busse 26.30-49.6; Arev. 62.26-112.6)\(^{18}\) Except for his comment on definition b, that philosophy is knowledge about divine and human matters, David quotes other Platonic passages as additional “proof texts” for each of these definitions. Thus, in commenting on definition a, that philosophy is knowledge about beings, he quotes *Phaedo* 60C: “God joined the heads of things together, from above and from beneath: from above in accordance with the creative power inherent in creation and from beneath in accordance with matter.” (Busse 27.25)\(^{19}\) In commenting on definition c, that philosophy is concern about death, he quotes *Phaedo* 64A once more (Busse 29.14; Arev. 66.19) and adds 67B: “That which is impure cannot attain the divinely pure;” (Busse 29.25; Arev. 68.2) and 62B: “As though we men are in a kind of prison and no one must free himself or run away from it.” (Busse 29.33; Arev. 68.12) He then repeats the last quotation and adds that no one should break loose from his confinement until he is let free, meaning, as in the *Phaedo*, that no one should put an end to his life, but that one should wait patiently for natural death. (Busse 34.4; Arev. 78.15) Likewise, in commenting on definition d, that philosophy is likeness to God insofar as it is possible for man, he repeats the quotation from *Theaetetus* 176A (Busse 37.3; Arev. 84.35) and adds *Leces* 653A: “One would be fortunate even in old age to

\(^{17}\) Omitted in the Armenian translation; Busse 25.2-24 should fall in Arev. 60.15.

\(^{18}\) On definition a, see Busse 26.30-28.21, Arev. 62.26-64.29; on b, Busse 28.22-29.11, Arev. 64.30-66.16; on c, Busse 29.13-34.12, Arev. 66.19-78.23; on d, Busse 34.14-39.13, Arev. 78.26-90.33; on e, Busse 39.15-45.25, Arev. 92.3-106.9; and on f, Busse 45.27-49.6. Arev. 106.12-112.6.

\(^{19}\) Omitted in the Armenian translation; Busse 27.25-28 should follow Arev. 64.9.
have wisdom along with intelligence.” (Busse 36.22; Arev. 84.19) In commenting on definition e, that philosophy is the art of arts and the science of sciences, he quotes a Socratic question, Gorgias 449A: “In what art should we say you are skilled?” to which Gorgias answers “rhetoric” — contrary to Socrates’ estimation of philosophy as the true art. David then refers to Plato’s calling the creative man “a man with art” in Sophist 219A. (Busse 43.5; Arev. 100.21) As for definition f, that philosophy is love of wisdom, David reflects on it as an activity of the mind by itself and adds Timaeus 47B: “Such a thing, Theodorus, has neither been generated by men nor bestowed by God,” (Busse 48.11; Arev. 110.13) a statement repeated at the end of the Prolegomena. (Busse 78.28; Arev. 156.27)

In his comment on the last of the six definitions David goes on to argue that there are four processes of thought occurring between the five powers of cognition and culminating in philosophical activity: between sense perception and impression, experience; between impression and judgment, inquiry; between judgment and thought, skill; between thought and mind, knowledge. (Busse 47.24-48.9; Arev. 110.1-6) He thus treats the processes of thought as distinct from the powers of cognition and ascribes knowledge not so much to the apprehension by the mind as to the activity of the mind itself. It may be noted that David is again following Plato, who perceives the fifth power of cognition, the mind, as capable of not only reflecting upon data received from the lower types of cognition by the commerce between bodily organs and objects, but also gaining its acquaintance with forms through its own instrumentality; even the lower types of cognition involve the mind in an inward debate with itself when it comes to perceiving, imagining, judging, and thinking.

Moreover, David sums up his discussion of the six definitions by stating that there are four kinds of definitions: a and b, philosophy as knowledge about beings and about divine and human matters, are “implications”; c and d, philosophy as concern about death and likeness to God, are “realizations”; e, philosophy

20 Σοφία τε καὶ φρόνησις (Arm. ինկաձիանքիցև ծեխտերերից); in the text of Plato, φρόνησις only.
21 Τεχνή (Arm. արվեստարություն).
22 Several of the Greek lines are omitted in the Armenian translation. The five powers of cognition are: αἰσθήσεως, φαντασία, δόξα, διάνοια, νοῦς (Arm. ինկաձիանքիցև, քրիթեամիզքիցև, առունք, ազդաամիզքիցև, անքատ). The four processes of thought are: έμπειρία, ιστορία, τέχνη, επιστήμη (Arm. առավետքիցև, պատմություն, արվեստ, գիտականություն).
23 Theaetetus 184B-186E.
24 Ibid. 187A-201C; cf. Sophist 263D-264D.
as art and science, is "projection"; and philosophy as love of wisdom, is "etymology". (Busse 48.16-23; Arev. 110.19-26) We may observe that there are two sets of fours preceding the discussion of the six definitions of philosophy: the four questions of philosophical inquiry and the four propositions or statements whereby philosophy is defined in terms of knowledge; (Busse 1.13, 2.31-8.20; Arev. 2.18, 6.21-20.6) and two sets of fours at the end of the discussion of the six definitions: the four processes of thought and the four kinds of definitions.

Like the later Neoplatonists, David digresses into arithmology and deals with the symbolism of odd and even numbers. (Busse 49.8-54.26; Arev. 112.9-114.14) This digression, however, is not unrelated to the preceding discussion, for in Platonism numbers are conceived in the mind and not perceived by the senses.

The last third of the treatise is devoted to the Platonic method of division, applied to the genus philosophy and its species, theoretical and practical knowledge. (Busse 54.28-79.29; Arev. 114.17-158.15) Here David expands on the method that was briefly announced earlier (Busse 10.26; Arev. 24.23) and begins by defining division in terms of its logical components, further division and subdivision. (Busse 54.28-57.7; Arev. 114.17-120.4) He gives three reasons to justify the division of philosophy into theoretical and practical species: 1) philosophy, like a living creature, coexists with us in these two realms 2) like God, philosophy has theoretical and practical powers and 3) like the human soul, philosophy has these two dimensions. The theoretical in turn is subdivided, according to Plato, into two: the natural sciences and theology; and, according to Aristotle, into three: the natural sciences, the mathematical sciences, and theology. (Busse 57.9-60.8; Arev. 120.7-124.29) While David is fond of Plato’s two-part division and enthusiastically quotes Epinomis 992A: “This is the way, these the studies, whether easy or difficult, this the path which is not permissible to neglect,” (Busse 59.13) he seems to prefer Aristotle’s three-part division because

---

25 The four differentia (διαφορά, Αρμ. τίμωνωνκατάμορφος) are: ύποκειμένον, τέλος, ύπεροχή, ἐτυμολογία (Αρμ. δυνατός, διακόιμησις, ἑωκείμενος, ημερικωμενήθη). The διαφορά here differ from Aristotle’s division by διαφορά terminating in definition; cf. Topica VI, 143a29-145b23.

26 Plato, Theaetetus 195E.

27 Διαίρεσις, ἐπίδιαρέσις, ὑποδιαίρεσις (Αρμ. ρωστρωσις, δυσκολίωσις, ναπρωσ- δωσις).

28 The text of Plato has: τρόπος for δός, “way”; “easy or difficult” in reversed order: πορευτόν for ἴτον “path”; omitted in the Armenian translation (Busse 59.13-17 should fall in Arev. 124.19).
it encompasses the whole range of existences. However, he dwells upon the various disciplines constituting the mathematical sciences only, discussing them under five headings: 1) the four branches of learning: mathematics, music, geometry, and astronomy 2) the areas they cover 3) their order 4) their discoverers and 5) their cognates. (Busse 60.10-65.9; Arev. 126.3-134.23)

After a digression to explain the method of division, (Busse 65.11-73.32; Arev. 134.26-148.10) David resorts to subdividing the practical. Here he prefers Plato’s division of the practical into two parts: legislative and juridictive, over Aristotle’s three parts: ethical, administrative, and political. (Busse 74.2-75.31; Arev. 148.12-152.9) His preference rests on the fact that the Platonic subdivisions include the Aristotelian and are more logical sequentially. (Busse 75.33-76.28; Arev. 152.11-31) Having sung the praises of philosophy, calling it the light and adornment of the soul, David concludes with a summary of philosophical understanding derived from the method of division and quotes Timaeus 47B once more to emphasize the noetic origin of philosophy: “Such a thing, Theodorus, has neither been generated by men nor bestowed by God.” (Busse 78.28, d. 48.11; Arev. 156.27, d. 110.13)

Although David stands within a tradition in Neoplatonism started by Porphyry that is sympathetic toward Aristotle and has much in common with the later Neoplatonists, there can be no question about his overwhelming reliance on Plato in the Prolegomena. In his wish to command order in an area where he saw great disorder, David follows Plato for the most part in the art of definition and inference. He constantly resorts to dialectic, insisting on consistency through the various stages of reasoning. There is no complexity of concepts in his work, and the few structures of his thought that cannot be placed within Platonism are discernible within Pythagoreanism, Aristotelianism, and Stoicism. Yet, judging from the Prolegomena, David is not so much an eclectic philosopher or a historian of philosophy as he is a homo multarum literarum who is philosophizing in his own right and is concerned with obtaining what light he can, and that not from any quarter. As a matter of fact, he supports the construction he puts upon the doctrines of other philosophers with blocks of Platonic "proof texts."
Koriwn's Life of Mashtots' as an Encomium

MOST OF THE LITERARY OUTPUT of the Golden Age, which began with the completion of the Armenian alphabet by Mashtots' in AD 406, consists of biblical and patristic translations produced by his school of translators. There are but few works composed in Armenian by these early scholars. Mashtots' himself is credited with writing "numerous easily understood and gracious sermons" (Koriwn, 78.3-5) and "many hortatory and cautionary epistles" (92.1), and some liturgical works are attributed to his associate and patron, the Catholicos Sahak (cf. 74.13).1 Of their immediate disciples, Eznik wrote A Refutation of the Sects, and Koriwn, The Life of Mashtots'. Koriwn's tribute to his beloved master is the best known of these earliest writings in Armenian. Its literary form, however, has not been studied sufficiently, whereas much attention has been focused on its biographical and historical contents.2

Further Introduction and Inquiry

The "honorable" Hovsēp', an early disciple of Mashtots', and then locum tenens of the Catholicosate, commissioned Koriwn to write The Life of Mashtots' (22.14-15). Considering it a great privilege, Koriwn declares himself "the least" of the disciples to be given such an honor (22.18).3 Upon further encour-

---

1 See M. Abovyan's note on 78.3-5 in Koriwn, Life of Mashtots'. Text with Critical Apparatus, Translation, Introduction, and Notes by Prof. Dr. M. Abovyan [Գորիուն Մաշտոցի կյանք. Արմատական փոփոխությունները, Ներկայացուցիչ և արդահան գրականությունը, Վարպատ, 1941], Erevan: Haypethrat, 1941 (repr. with intro. by K.H. Maksoudian in Classical Armenian Texts Reprint Series, Delmar, NY: Caravan, 1985), 118-119. References to the text of Koriwn in this study are to the pages and lines of this edition.

2 For a select bibliography, see K.H. Maksoudian, "Introduction," in Koriwn, Life of Mashtots', xxix-xxx.

3 The meaning of κρίτη σεραγών (22.18) need not be limited to "youngest". For comparable commonplaces, see below, n. 50; see also N. Akinian, Der Hl. Maschtots Wardapet, sein Leben und sein Wirken nebst einer Biographie des Hl. Sahak, mit einer deutschen Zusammenfassung [Ուշարձան Մաշտոցի. Հավական Նույնիսկ Բաղտակոտի Նախագիծ, Թբիլիսի, 1899].
agement by fellow disciples he embarks on his task, which, though not lengthy, prooves to be a magnum opus. It consists of some forty average pages in manuscript form. There is, however, a shorter version of the Life dating from the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 9th century. It omits significant parts including the lengthy proem, a very important segment of the document and crucial for the subject of this study, and at the same time shows conflation of later sources in its supplementary information. Scholars have rightly preferred the longer version, which survives in a few late manuscripts, the earliest of which date from the 14th century. Of the six editions of the longer text, the first critical edition by M. Abeghyan is generally preferred.

As the title of the work suggests, the Life abounds with biographical information. It is the primary source on the history of the events surrounding the beginnings of Armenian literary activity and of those responsible for that enlightenment. Enough is said about Mashtots' biographically: his birth, education, service at the royal court, excellence in secular law and the military art, priestly devotion, vigils, evangelistic efforts, gathering of disciples, travels in the quest for letters, translational activities, and his eventual death and burial. The biographical information is often punctuated with hagiographical overtones, and this is to be expected in writings on saints. The miraculous is commonplace, and the work concludes with heightened religious sentiments. For Ko-

---

For the various editions of Koriwn, see the list in Maksoudian, "Introduction," xxxi-xxxii, especially nos. 2 and 7 for the text of Ps.-Koriwn.

N. Tsokvakan [=Bogharian / Pogharian], "The Author of the Shorter Koriwn" [Φρέγγι Βογχάρικ Στόχάρικ], Sinai XXXIII (1959) 167-168, observes the redactor's dependence on the shorter, later version of the Armenian translation of Socrates Scholasticus' Ecclesiastical History, which could not have been translated before the end of the 7th century.

For a list of the manuscripts, see Maksoudian, xxxii.

See above, n. 1.

riwn, however. Mashtots' is more than a saint: he is ranked with the perfect, the prophets and the apostles (24.6-34.24; cf. 52.1-8; 90.2-11).

Affinities between Koriwn's literary style and the rhetorical tradition have been observed by K.A. Melik'-Ohanjanyan in the first part of a short, tripartite study on the Life. He notes that the structure of the treatise follows the six principles for encomium outlined in the Girk 'pitoyits', a Greek rhetorical textbook identified in part with the Progymnasmata of Aphthonius (late 4th cent. AD), translated into Armenian late in the 6th century by the so-called Hellenizing School and once wrongly attributed to Mvosēs Khorenats'is. But the no longer extant Greek version of the Girk 'pitoyits' seems to be too late to have been utilized by Koriwn, since its latest source is the 5th-century Progymnasmata of Nicolas. The present study, however, is to show that the structure of Koriwn's Life is neither limited to any of the outlines for encomium in the rhetorical textbooks nor dependent on these near-contemporary progymnasmata, but that his work reflects broad familiarity with theoretical texts and literary

9 B. Norechad's rendering of vark as "biography" could be misleading; see his translation of Koriwn, The Life of Mashtots', New York: St. Vartan Press, 1964; repr. in Koriwn, Vark' Mashtots' ), p. 26; "life" or "mode of living" would be a better translation, as of Gk. bios and Lat. vita (cf. 24.7).


12 Greek text in J. Felten, ed., Nicolai Progymnasmata (Rhetores Graeci 11), Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.

13 Five progymnasmata survive under the names of Aelius Thcon of Alexandria (2nd cent. AD), Hermogones of Tarsus (2nd cent. AD), Libanius of Antioch (4th cent. AD), his pupil, Aphthonius of Antioch (late 4th cent. AD), and Nicolaus of Myra (5th cent. AD). The first and parts of the last two of these progymnasmata are among the Armenian translations by the so-called Hellenizing School of the late 6th century.
models. Moreover, a definitive treatment of the literary genre of the Life is needed for its classification as an encomium. The lengthy and well-defined poem, which contains the author’s declared intention and several other elements recurring in classical poems, is decisive for determining the genre of the work on the basis of internal evidence. I discuss these elements and others in the remaining parts of the treatise after a short survey of the genre and its recurring features — at least those discernible in the Life.

**Encomium Traditions in Classical Literature**

There are several studies that treat the encomium genre as a whole, beginning with its early development within Greek poetic traditions of the 6th century BC: the odes to cities and countries, their gods, heroes, distinguished citizens, and popular events. The development of encomiastic prose is attributed to Gorgias of Leontini (ca. 483-376 BC) and his famous pupil, Isocrates (436-338 BC). Their prose encomia were responsible for establishing an early pattern by highlighting only the noble and by citing deeds as evidence of virtue. The speech of Pericles recorded by Thucydides (ca. 460/455-ca. 400 BC) and the Agesilus of Xenophon (ca. 428/7-ca. 354 BC) became equally important models, reflected in later historians like Dio Chrysostom (ca. AD 40-112) and Tacitus (ca. AD 56-115), especially in his *Agricola*. Voluminous authors like Plutarch (ca. AD 50-120) and Lucian of Samosata (ca. AD 120-190) wrote several encomia.

---


15 Of the works of Gorgias, the *Encomium of Helen* and *Defence of Palamedes* are extant; of Isocrates, *Helen, Busiris, Archidamus, Evagoras, Philippus,* and the *Panathenaicus* are noteworthy.

The widespread popularity of prose encomia is further attested among Latin authors like Cicero (106-43 BC).  

Isocrates seems to have been equally responsible for setting yet another trend: that of producing handbooks of rhetoric with instructions for composing encomium, treated under epideictic oratory. Although his handbook is no longer extant, it probably influenced the well known Rhetorica ad Alexandrum, once attributed to Aristotle (384-322 BC) and now to his contemporary Anaximenes of Lampscacus (ca. 380-320 BC). Two sections of this early manual of rhetoric deal with encomium. Of Aristotle’s own works, the Rhetoric, deemed “the greatest of all oratorical theories”, contains a section on encomium, as do also the later theoretical handbooks and the more popular progymnasmata, the practical textbooks that provide preliminary instruction in rhetoric and exercises in composition.

A review of the three Aristotelian divisions of rhetoric, with some elaboration on the third and its subdivisions, is essential for a better understanding of the genre under consideration. Aristotle, whose theories of rhetoric were perhaps anticipated by Anaximenes and were generally followed by later theoretic-

---

17 See especially his Pro Marcello, De Imperio Gn. Pompeii, and the Philippicae.
18 Cf. Quintilian Institutio Oratoria 3.1.14.
19 Cf. ibid. 3.4.9.
20 Chapter 3 (1425b34-1426b22), on embellishment; chapter 35 (l440b5-1441b29), on praise and blame.
22 1366a23-1368a37.
23 Among Latin handbooks with traditional Greek elements, cf. Ps.-Cicero (early 1st cent. BC) Ad Herennium 3.6.10-8.15; Cicero (106-43 BC) De Oratore 2.84.340-86.350; Partitiones Oratoriae 21.71-23.82; and Quintilian (ca. AD 30/35-100) Institutio Oratoria 3.7.1-28 and 8.4.1-29.
25 Rhetoric 1358a36-1359a29, 1366a23-1368a37.
26 Rhetorica ad Alexandrum 1436a32-1445b3.
ians,\textsuperscript{27} divided rhetoric into three categories determined by three kinds of listeners to speeches: 1) the judicial or the forensic (Gk. dikanikon; Arm. atena-kan), of concern to judges and jurors, is to accuse or defend someone for an act in the past 2) the political or the deliberative (Gk. symbouleutikon; Arm. khorbdakan), of concern to politicians, is to urge someone to act or not to act — depending on the expediency of schemes for the future 3) the epideictic or the demonstrative (Gk. epideiktikon; Arm. ts'uts'akan), of concern to spectators, is to praise or blame someone in the present.

The subdivisions of the third category are characteristic of its intended use: praise (Gk. egkômion or epainos; Arm. nerboghakan or govasanakan) by dwelling on the virtues, and blame (Gk. psogos; Arm. parsawakan) by dwelling on the vices. Epideictic is not merely "the ceremonial oratory of display", as Aristotle calls it; it has a pragmatic dimension, for by praising the virtuous "we shall be able to inspire confidence in ourselves or others in regard to virtue."\textsuperscript{28} The two terms for praise and that for epideictic (Gk. egkômion, epainos, and epideiktikon) appear interchangeably in rhetorical literature, with each of these terms extended to denote the whole exercise. The third division thus becomes synonymous with its predominant subdivision.\textsuperscript{29} Such terminological fluidity and structural flexibility underscore Aristotle's preference for intent over content. He offers no formal structure in his treatment of epideictic. While the importance of intent is primary and that of content secondary, the significance of the latter need not be minimized; content is governed by intent. Hence Aristotle goes on to propose certain considerations for composing encomia. They may be summarized as follows: 1) to cite the noble or the virtuous: justice, courage, temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence, and wisdom — especially deeds that best exemplify these and are esteemed by the audience and 2) to magnify these deeds especially by amplification and comparison, for "where we take our hero’s actions as admitted facts, our business is simply to invest these with dignity and nobility."\textsuperscript{30} It appears that encomiastic classification on the basis of uniformity in contextual features would constitute a

\textsuperscript{27} See Ps.-Cicero \textit{Ad Herennium} 1.2.2; Cicero \textit{De Inventione} 1.9.12-10.13; \textit{De Oratore} 1.31.141: \textit{Partitiones Oratoriae} 20.69-70; Quintilian \textit{Institutio Oratoria} 3.4.1-16, among others.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Rhetoric} 1366a23-1368a37.

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. Quintilian \textit{Institutio Oratoria} 3.4.12.

marked departure from the Aristotelian standpoint that recognizes no fixed structures within the genre.

The concern for structure is sharply pronounced by Anaximenes, whose second division of rhetoric is devoted especially to encomium.\(^31\) He specifies three points to be made in the encomiastic proem: stating the proposition, refuting misrepresentations, and inviting attention by noting the most remarkable deeds of the subject.\(^32\) He then outlines the rest as follows: advantages external to virtue, that is, noble descent, physical strength, charm, and wealth; and those inherent in virtue, namely, the cardinal virtues, that is, wisdom, justice, courage, and commendable life-style.\(^33\) Then should follow the subject’s birth, youth, early manhood, and adulthood, using the cardinal virtues as the organizing principles for the latter.\(^34\) The use of comparison, enthymeme, maxim, and other literary constructs like amplification and recapitulation is often recommended for concluding sections.

The traditional Ciceronian elaborations on these principles contain further instructions for composing the various parts. The directions for the introduction (principium) account not only for the treatment of the person being praised or the subject under consideration, but also for the inclusion of the encomiast and the audience.\(^35\) Instructions for the narration or statement of facts (narration) repeat the advantages noted above, dividing them into three categories: external circumstances (descent and education), physical attributes (charm, beauty, strength, agility, and good health), and character traits (exhibited in wealth or poverty, power, fame, friendship or enmity, loyalty, benevolence, and good will) demonstrable in the pursuit of the four cardinal virtues.\(^36\) Hence it is necessary to recite actions illustrative of the virtues praised; “but the most welcome praise is that bestowed on deeds that appear to have been performed by

\(^{31}\) *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 1440b5-1441b29.


\(^{33}\) *Ibid.* 1440b14-23 (cf. 1422a7-11 and Ps.-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.6.10-8.15, where the three types of praise, built on external circumstances [*rerum externarum*], physical attributes [*rerum corporis*], and qualities of character [*rerum animi*], seem to be indebted to Anaximenes; the classification could be traced to Plato [*Philebus* 48E; *Phaedrus* 241C; *Euthydemos* 279A-D; *Gorgias* 447C; *Laws* 697B; *Epistles* 8.355B]).

\(^{34}\) *Ibid.* 1440b24-1441b13. Anaximenes goes on to provide brief instructions for the opposite, blame (1441b14-27).

\(^{35}\) Ps.-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.6.11-12.

brave men without profit or reward," especially if they involve toil and danger and are profitable to others. "And one must select achievements that are of outstanding importance or unprecedented or unparalleled in their actual character." Moreover, comparison is highly commended: "A splendid line to take in a panegyric is to compare the subject with all other men of high distinction." Cicero, however, insists that no formal argumentation is needed within the tripartite schema of advantages when treating matters that are certain; nonetheless, the encomiast should adopt a suitable style and be mindful of neologisms, archaisms, metaphors, parallelism, similes, antitheses, doublets, and rhythmic periods. The use of embellishment is urged, including "surprising or unexpected events or things foreshadowed by portents and prodigies and by miracles, or what will appear to be occurrences sent by heaven or by fate to the person of whom we shall be speaking." Achievements may be treated either chronologically, whether the earliest or the most recent first, or topically, under the virtues. In the Partiones Oratoriae Cicero goes on to discuss at length the treatment of virtuous acts, summing up his discussion as follows:

In the whole fabric of the speech the greatest attention is to be focused on the quality of a person's breeding and upbringing and education and character; and on any important or startling occurrence that a man has encountered, especially if this can appear to be due to the intervention of providence; and then each individual's opinions and utterances and actions will be classified under the scheme of the virtues that has been propounded, and these same topics of research will be drawn on to supply the causes and results and consequences of things.  

---

37 Cicero De Oratore 2.85.345-347 (cf. Quintilian Institutio Oratoria 3.7.15-16, where he values unique achievement, especially if done for the sake of others rather than for oneself; owing to Aristotle Rhetoric 1366b3-6, 1367a19).

38 Ibid. 2.85.348.

39 Partitiones Oratoriae 21.71-22.74 (cf. Ps.-Cicero Ad Herennium 3.8.15, where greater flexibility is allowed: "We need not use all three ... because often not all of them apply, and often, too, when they do, the application is so slight that it is unnecessary to refer to them").

40 Ibid. 21.73 (cf. Quintilian Institutio Oratoria 3.7.4-6, where proof is required should the claims appear incredible to the hearer or reader).

41 Ibid. 22.75 (cf. Ps.-Cicero Ad Herennium 3.7.13 and Quintilian Institutio Oratoria 3.7.10, 15, where the chronological is preferred).

42 Ibid. 23.82.
Finally, there should be a summary (*enumeration*) and brief amplifications now and then.\(^{43}\)

Most of these features appear also in later Greek writers, especially Menander (3rd cent. AD). A considerable amount of traditional material is transmitted in the two treatises *Peri epideiktikon* that pass under his name. The same traditional concerns for composing encomium recur in the rhetorical textbooks, the *progymnasmata*. These concerns, in addition to the preliminary and concluding statements, may be summed up as follows: origin and family, birth and upbringing, accomplishments and actions according to virtue.\(^{44}\) Typical of the *progymnasmata* is the following passage from Aphthonius, cited by Melik’-Ohanjanyan as the ultimate source containing the canons for encomium to which Koriwn adheres in his composition of the *Life*.\(^{45}\) It is given here in its entirety both for its summation and in anticipation of the ensuing discussion:

You will make the exordium according to the subject at hand; next, you will place genus, which you will divide into race, fatherland, forebears, and fathers; then, you will take up education, which you will divide into inclination to study, talent, and rules; then, you will bring out the most important topic of the encomium, the achievements, which you will divide into the spirit, the body, and fortune - the spirit like courage or prudence, the body like beauty, swiftness or strength, and fortune like power, wealth, and friends. To these you will add comparison, in order to infer a greater position for the one being praised through the process of placing side by side; finally, the epilogue more in the style of a solemn prayer.\(^{46}\)

**Encomium Traditions in Koriwn**

Classical rhetoric, including literary models, theoretical manuals, and practical textbooks, had considerable influence on later literature. D.A. Russell’s general observation that “the exercises done in schools of rhetoric . . . had a more

43 Ps.-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.8.15.


45 Melik’-Ohanjanyan, 49-52, quoting the Armenian text in part.

powerful influence on literature than any amount of theory⁴⁷ is quite convincing.

Koriwn’s familiarity with the early *progymnasmata* and other rhetorical literature could be attributed to his Greek education, possibly obtained at Samosata (46.19-20); it could also be owing to his Constantinopolitan sojourn (74.24-28).⁴⁸ His composition of the *Life*, as demonstrated below, clearly reflects the impact of his rhetorical training, especially the epideictic or, more specifically, the encomiastic; that is, the third Aristotelian division of rhetoric and its later amplifications. The *Life*, however, does not seem to conform to any of the detailed outlines for encomium in the later *progymnasmata*, but is more in keeping with the broad guidelines for such composition. It seems to depend more on a tradition than on one of its late proponents. Moreover, Koriwn reveals familiarity with literary models in his details of the *Life*. Such literary works are noted in the discussion below.

This part of the study follows the recurrent pattern of encomium noted above: proem, origin and family, birth and upbringing, accomplishments and actions according to virtue, and epilogue.

**Proem**

A sixth of the document is devoted to the proem (24.6-36.4), which is preceded by a brief statement on the intention to write the treatise: “I had been thinking of the God-given script . . . and through what kind of man that new divine gift had been revealed, as well as the luminous teaching and angelic, virtuous piety of that person, so as to cause memorials to blossom in an individual volume.” (22.8-14) Koriwn declares himself unworthy of the task, calling himself “the least [of the pupils]”. (22.18)⁴⁹ Such modesty is commonplace in classical literature, especially on the part of encomiasts of great men.⁵⁰

---


⁴⁹ On the meanings of *kr[t]eragoyyn*, see above, n. 3.

⁵⁰ Cf. Isocrates *Panegyricus* 13; *Panathenaeus* 36; Ps.-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.6.11; Philo *De vita Mosis* 2.1.
Equally typical is the beginning of the proem. The author wonders "whether it is allowed to declare in writing the lives of men of perfection." (24.6-7) He affirms that the challenge to praise such men derives from the Scriptures, where one finds a host of those named and unnamed "devout masters", both before and after Christ. (30.1-9) Following a list of biblical examples of praise, he observes: "Hence it is evident . . . that praise of all the God-loving elect is from the Lord Himself, some from angels, and some from one to another, not for personal pride, but to stir up one another to be zealous, so that being mutually encouraged, we may succeed in the accomplishment of good works." (34.12-16) Like others before him, Koriwn is critical of the use of encomium for sheer ostentation;[51] he opts for its pragmatic use (cf. 98.12 in the epilogue). He then alludes to the writings of the apostolic fathers, now deemed extra-canonical: "We have also the gracious canonical writings which came after the apostles, indicating how they honored and praised one another in accordance with their true faith and evangelical piety." (34.19-21) He concludes: "And thus we have been allowed by them both [i.e., the canonical Scriptures and the extra-canonical writings] to commit to writing the life of the just man." (lines 23-24)[52]

The repeated use of the words govt'iwn (praise) and govel (to praise) in the proem is noteworthy. All seven occurrences of the verb are found only in the proem, as also six of the eight uses of the noun (the remaining two being praise given to God).[53] What Koriwn is about to render to the subject of his writing is — by implication — what the Scriptures and the extra-canonical writings have rendered all along to the worthies of the past, namely, praise. These elements, together with Koriwn's intention to write (stated immediately before the proem) and his purpose for writing (stated at the end of the proem), are of considerable significance for the identification of the whole treatise as an encomium.[54]

[51] Cf. Aristotle Rhetoric 1367b36; Cicero De Oratore 2.84.341; Quintilian Institutio Oratoria 3.7.1.

[52] Note that at the beginning of the proem Mashtots' is acclaimed as a perfect man and at the end as a just man.


[54] Contrary to Abeghyan, who sees the proem as an apology for the ensuing historical account (pp. 13-16; cf. Maksoudian, xiv-xv); and Akinian, who considers it a later addition by the author ("History of the Life of St. Mashtots' Vardapet: Research and Text" [Քյուհաղբյուր
Origin and Family

Koriwn treats the encomiastic requirement of origin and family very briefly, by simply naming the birthplace, the province, and the father, “a blessed man” (36.5-7). Here he follows the instructions to omit discussing family should the person eulogized have no ancestral distinction. 55

Birth and Upbringing

The early life of Mashtots’ is likewise covered briefly. Reference is made to his having been tutored in Greek literature from childhood, his service in the royal secretariat, and his mastery of law and the military art. Koriwn hastens to add that with regard to the Scriptures, Mashtots’ was self-taught while serving the princes. (lines 8-17) Koriwn fulfills several conventional requirements in these few lines.

Accomplishments and Actions according to Virtue

The achievements of Mashtots’ are treated chronologically and not topically under the virtues. The former is by far the preferred method in composing encomium. A summary of the actions of Mashtots’ is given first, beginning with his abandoning the princely service and entering the service of Christ. All subsequent steps follow that initial move of joining a monastic order. A long list of hardships endured in the course of piety is given, and the summoning of pupils is seen as part of the same religious exercise. “And thus, bearing with a willful courage all the temptations that came upon him, and growing in radiance, he became known and pleasing to God and men” (38.2-17).

The master’s toil on behalf of others is stressed (40.14; 48.6-7; 82.16-17). Toil and hardship in great accomplishments are among the essential elements in the composition of encomium. 56 Miracles or providential interventions accompanying these selfless efforts are noted (40.11-13; 42.8-10; 48.7-8; 92.17-20;

55 Anaximenes Rhetorica ad Alexandrum 1441a5-6; cf. Cicero Partitiones Oratoriae 22.74.
56 Cf. Aristotle Rhetoric 1366b3-6, 37-1367a5, 19; Cicero De Oratore 2.85.345-347; etc.
94.8-10). These also are among the expected features. Somewhat related to the preceding, but perhaps more to the external advantages (e.g., having influential friends), is the parade of dignitaries who readily commit themselves or the services of their good offices to Mashtots': the Catholicos Sahak (passim), Shabte, Lord of Goght'ın (40.2-6; 60.10-13), his son and successor, Giwt (60.13-16), King Vramshapuh of Armenia (42.13-44.14; 46.7-8; 54.1-4, 9-10), Daniel, "a Syrian bishop of noble lineage" (42.15-17), Vaghenak, Lord of Siwnik' (60.18-22), his successor, Vasak (62.1-7), King Bakur of Georgia (62.14-19), the Emperor Theodosius (64.25-68.4), the Patriarch of Constantinople, Atticus (66.10-11), King Artashēs of Armenia (70.8-9), King Arsvagh of Albania (70.13-72.9), Khurs, Lord of Gardman (72.18-24), King Ardziwgh of Georgia (72.25-28), and Ashushay, Lord of Dashir (72.29-74.2).

The four cardinal virtues are touched upon in passing, especially with reference to the scriptural examples in the proem. With reference to Mashtots' and his work, all four are contemplated: justice (34.24), courage (38.15-16; 78.15-18; 90.10-11), wisdom (50.4-7; 54.14; 58.18), and temperance (passim, in the vigils of his devotional and monastic life). As a teacher, Mashtots' exemplified these virtues in his own life (58.15-16; 76.12-14; 80.11-12), "for all true teachers habitually set their virtues as rules for their pupils" (82.17-18). This Socratic ideal is widely held in Greek paideia and is a recurring feature in the encomiastic literature. Understandably, in the Life, Christ is the Teacher who set the ultimate example for his disciples, and they in turn passed it on to their followers. "Thus the blessed one [i.e., Mashtots'] had assumed this honored tradition, and similarly admonished all who came near him with the same exhortation" (86.3-4; cf. 84.3-5, 17-19; 86.1-2).

Comparison with renowned persons is yet another often recommended step to extol great men and their meritorious achievements. Such instances of encomiastic comparison are highlighted in the Life. The concern of Mashtots'
for his people is no less than that of Paul for his people (40.18). In describing the profound joy of Mashtots' on his return to Greater Armenia with the newly finalized alphabet, Koriwn declares: "Even the magnificent Moses was not as happy when he descended from Mount Sinai" because of the sinful people, "causing the bearer of His commandments to weep bitterly with a broken heart, as the bearer's sadness is readily perceived from his breaking the tablets" (52.1-8). Koriwn then adds this extended note:

Let no one consider us too bold for what we have said. We may be subject to censure for our analogy: equating a very modest man with the magnificent Moses, who had spoken with God and had done wonders. But we are all the more persuaded in the belief that there is no reason to disparage, overtly or covertly, that which is from God; for it is the grace of the one omnipotent God that is distributed to all earth-born nations (lines 13-19).

This is followed by comparing the ongoing scribal and evangelistic activity with that mandated by Moses in the Law, David in the Psalms, and Christ in the Gospel (54.18-56.9). Finally, the deeper sorrow of the ever-active Mashtots' over the death of his associate Sahak is compared with the sadness, loneliness, and relative inactivity of the Apostle Paul because of the temporary absence of his associate Timothy (90.2-11). Koriwn observes:

For if the holy Apostle upon not finding his co-worker, Timothy, says that his soul was restless, how much more intense is deemed the survivors' grief over those who are forever departed? Whereas the sadness caused by loneliness would not allow [someone like Paul] to be cheerful, yet he [i.e., Mashtots'] continued with the grace of God, unerringly, the course of evangelism and administration of the Holy Church and strove even more (lines 5-10).

---

60 Alluding to Rom 9:1-3.
61 Alluding to Ex 31:18-32:19.
62 Judging from the context, there seems to be a conflation, if not confusion, between Acts 17:14-16a (cf.18:5) and 2 Cor 2:13 (cf. 8.23). If the allusion is more to the latter passage, then the reference would be to Titus and not Timothy, and an early scribal error could be suspected here.
The two persons with whom Mashtots’ is laudably compared are the first of
the prophets and the last of the apostles: Moses and Paul, the two most famous
biblical characters in the Old and New Testaments, respectively.

Beginning with the introductory comparison of the author’s praise of
Mashtots’ and that of the biblical worthies, the masterful use of the Scriptures
to draw contrast, to restate, and to reaffirm is noteworthy.

Epilogue

The last page of the treatise, following a detailed description of the Saint’s
death and burial, is a well-defined epilogue (96.18-98.14). The concerns
indicated at the outset are restated in summary form. Koriwn has accomplished
his task, which is in keeping with what the Scriptures and the extra-canonical
writings have for the worthies of the past, namely, praise. He goes on to suggest
that his work is another, simpler “[Acts] of the Apostles” (98.6-7). He employs
a literary commonplace by referring to the “much more” that could have been
said about Mashtots’ (lines 3-4), whom he calls “my father” (lines 2-3), and
concludes with restating the pragmatic aspect of encomium “as an inspiring
example” for posterity (line 12; cf. 34.12-16). In the closing lines he gives
necessary dates and “glory to Christ” (98.16-100.5).

The terminus ad quem for the composition of the Life seems to have been
the solemn transfer of the body of Mashtots’, three years after his death and
burial, to its final resting place at the newly built church in Oshakan (94.11-18).
This may be cited as further evidence for the Life as an encomium or
“ceremonial oratory” written for that occasion.

Cf. Eccl 12:9-12; John 20:30; 21:25; Philo De Posteritate Caini 144; De Ebrietate 32; De vita
Mosis 1.213. In a way, the reader is taken back to the personal inadequacy motif expressed by
the encomist at the beginning of the treatise (22.18).

See above, n. 51.

Cf. the verse encomium by Komitas Catholicos (ca. 560-628), Hymn to the Holy Hrip’simé
and Her Companions [Հրիփսիմէ Ուրբայ Լայնասարակու] (each of its thirty-six stanzas
begins with each of the letters of the alphabet), composed on the occasion of the transfer of
the relics of St. Hrip’simé to the church built for her near Ejmiatzin early in the 7th century.
Summary and Conclusion

Koriwn’s celebrated Life of Mashtots, the best known of the earliest works composed in Armenian amidst the numerous translations of the Golden Age, is a disciple’s tribute to his beloved master. Notwithstanding the overwhelming biographical and hagiographical elements in Koriwn’s magnum opus, the present study shows that the work is composed as an encomium. The opening pages of the Life are crucial for identifying its literary genre within the rhetorical tradition. The repeated use of the words goyut'wun (praise) and govel (to praise) in the proem is indicative of the genre.

The common features of encomium, as found in encomiastic prose in classical literature, are readily recognizable in Koriwn’s work. The author’s thorough familiarity with this genre is discernible in much of the detail within the broad, recurrent pattern of encomium: origin and family, birth and upbringing, accomplishments and actions according to virtue. As an encomiast, Koriwn shows awareness of theoretical manuals and literary models, as well as practical textbooks. The Aristotelian notion of comparison, among several other elements recurring in classical encomia, is a dominant feature in Koriwn. This is best seen in his drawing on biblical examples to exalt Mashtots’. Koriwn compares his praise of the blessed Saint with the Scriptures’ praise of biblical worthies, suggesting that his writing is no less inspired than the Scriptures and that Mashtots’ is no less a worthy than the prophets and the apostles. The bearer of the Armenian alphabet is likened to the Lawgiver of the Hebrews and the Apostle to the Gentiles. The high praise accorded to Mashtots’ as a divine man bespeaks more of the Life as an encomium. Clearly, its author stands in the mainstream of a rhetorical and literary tradition.

The Life does not appear to have been structured according to a single pattern or one of the progymnasmata, and this is in keeping with the lack of structural uniformity discernible in existing encomia. There is, nonetheless, a general conformity with the basic rules for composing encomium, and encomiastic features abound in the details.
Armenian Grammatical Activity: An Account by Hovhannès Erznkats’i

In the *Grand Catalogue* of the St. James Monastery manuscripts collection, Archbishop Bogharian provides the full text of the lengthy preface to Hovhannès Erznkats’i’s (ca. 1240-1293) *Grammatical Interpretation* (ד’סִּיראָתָה מְדוּקְדֳּקָה). The text is that of Jerusalem ms 1311 (dated 1602), entitled “A Miscellany” and containing an anthology of grammatical and orthographical works attributed to various authors. The preface (pp. 58-69) is preceded by the Armenian translation of the *Ars grammatica* (the τέχνη γραμματική of Dionysius Thrax, pp. 7-57) and followed by Erznkats’i’s interpretative work on grammar (pp. 70-502). A compilation of grammatical selections from works dating from the 6th to the 8th centuries and attributed to Movsēs K’ert’ogh, David the Philosopher, Step’anos Siwnets’i, and Mambré Vertsanogh are also provided in this epitome on grammar (pp. 503-650; some short studies are given in their entirety). The orthographical works are those of Erznkats’i’s contemporaries: Aristakēs Grich’, also known as Rhetor (pp. 651-757), who flourished at the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th centuries, and Gēorg Skewrats’i (pp. 758-842), who flourished also in the 13th century.

---


2. The text of Erznkats’i’s grammar, according to Bogharian, is preserved in three other manuscripts: Ancry ms 133; Erevan ms 2380; and Jerusalem ms 2392 (*Armenian Writers*, 322).

3. Most of these early works have been published by Nicholas Adontz in *Dióscy* Φρακτίκην καὶ άρμανικὰς τολκαται (Bibliotheque Armeno-Georgica 4), St. Petersburg: 1915 (Fr. trans.: *Denys de Thrace et les commentateurs arméniens*, [Bibliothèque arménienne de la Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian], Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1970.) A fragment of an elementary work on the eight parts of speech by Mambré Vertsanogh, *Criticism of Constructions* ([Կոռուպցիա հայկական բառի կարգեր]), is attested in this manuscript only (pp. 642-644).
The preface, in which Erznkats'i recounts his activities and accounts for grammatical works known to him, is no less important than the Grammatical Interpretation itself. The latter work reveals such heavy dependence on earlier works that the margins of the Jerusalem manuscript are full of annotations identifying several of the sources. One would suspect that many of these marginalia existed in the lost exemplar. Erznkats'i's indebtedness to his predecessors constitutes much of the reason for the preface. His own contribution to the grammatical enterprise, by his own admission in a colophon, was to sort out the confusion surrounding the use of pronouns in Armenian. The short colophon is worth quoting:

The pronoun was very much blurred and confused by the [earlier] interpreters. However, we were able to clarify what we could. As you attain wisdom, O lover of learning, I beg you to remember the deficient laborer on this, Hovhannēs Vardapet. (p. 415)⁴

Readers of Classical Armenian cannot but appreciate the relevance of the problematic subject with which our author was concerned. More will be said on Erznkats'i's dependence on others as well as on his contribution after we have surveyed the contents of the preface.

The preface is entitled "A foreword to the compilation Grammatical Interpretation, and an address by Hovhannēs, who has labored on this subject, to the steward of the word."⁵ After an elaborate commendation to the readers of his work and a disclaimatory statement about his mastery of the subject, Erznkats'i cites the circumstances leading to his involvement in the present work. He had been on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the year 1281, and upon his return through Cilicia, the Catholicos Hakob I Klayets'i (in office 1267-1286), nicknamed

---
⁴ Տերրավուն մինչ այժմ են ռասպելու երբ իտեսած եմ, ինչ են դիտել սաի գլխավոր էջի տեղում, որի էջերը, առանց նրանց պատկերագրությունների, որը ցույց է տալիս այս ժամանակի պատմության բնության մասին: (Bogharian, Grand Catalogue, IV: 557).

⁵ Տառավորություն բացի, մասնագիտական ճանաչման գրականության բնագավառում բաց էր մինչ այժմ հետևյալ բնագավառներ: Աշխատակիցների համար. (Bogharian, Grand Catalogue, VIII: 25).
“Scholar” (Զինվություն) and known for his command of the Scriptures and patronage of learning, prevailed on him to teach grammar to fellow ecclesiastics, and this led to the production of the present work. Equally instrumental in persuading him was a written request by a certain Hovhannēs Vardapet who had once served at the church of St. Karapet in Tarōn and who afterwards became a renowned teacher and interpreter of the Scriptures. To complete his task, Erznkats'i resorts to the solitude (անձինք) of St. Minas (on Mt. Sepuh), where he had received his early education and where he was dedicated to the priesthood.

The first grammarian of note mentioned by Erznkats'i is Grigor Magistros (ca. 990-1059). The remarks on Magistros reveal that he was the redactor of a compilation containing three earlier works — by Davit' the Philosopher, Movsēs K'ert'ogh, and an anonymous grammarian. To this compilation Magistros “added some words of his own”. This work, produced under “princely patronage”, was the most authoritative handbook on grammar at the time when Erznkats'i embarked on his project. To justify the need for a new work on grammar at a time when that of the famed Magistros had acquired a great vogue, Erznkats'i first cites the aforementioned requests, as well as his desire to convey to posterity his knowledge of the subject. He then hastens to add that there is a serious lack in the compilation by Magistros: there is no harmony or synopsis obtained between the three works comprising the compilation and, more importantly, it lacks a thorough interpretation of its contents, especially since not all of the eight parts of speech had hitherto been interpreted or commented upon. Moreover, Magistros has not taken into account other early interpreters of (or commentators on) grammar, nor has he quoted the three authors equally; there is a vast disparity in his utilization of the three. Worse still, his syllogistic work perplexes the mind, is tedious to readers, and is full of syntactical irregularities. There is a ring of modernity in Erznkats'i’s criticism of Magistros.

Thus it was necessary for Erznkats'i to go about his task carefully. Over an unspecified period of time, he had collected works on grammar — thanks especially to a certain Hovhannēs, the son of Sargsis the Bishop of the city of

6 The manuscript has the numerical letter Հ (70) instead of Ո (8), a possible corruption unnoticed by Bogharian.

7 Այս առաջին դրաբանքը նույնպես անավերջության մեջ չէ, բայց լավ է պատված թե դա առանց արտահանում է, և հավասար է բացասական քանր և գունատ է գիտակցության (Bogharian, Grand Catalogue, IV: 555). For the work of Magistros, see Adontz, Denys de Thrace, 221-249.
E[rz]nkay, who had gotten hold of five ancient manuscripts which he then exchanged with our author. These manuscripts included the works of Dawit' the Philosopher, Mowsės K'err'ogh, and three anonymous treatises. They were eventually bound together, because of their brevity perhaps, into one volume to which a few more documents were added: an interpretation by a certain Barsegh, discovered earlier by Erznkats'i in the solitude of Derch[a]n, another interpretation by Hamam Arewelts'i (ca. 825-ca. 890), and the orthographical work by Aristake Grich' (or Rhetor, ca. 1170-ca. 1240). At Erznkats'i's disposal were several other unspecified works, all dealing with grammatical issues treated by native scholiasts. It is not clear, however, whether these latter works were also bound along with the aforementioned works. For his work, and by his own admission, Erznkats'i drew from all of these native sources. Since the Armenian declension of nouns lacked certain technical classifications, he borrowed these categories from unidentified foreign sources.

The work is dedicated "to the children of the Church", for their edification and acquisition of wisdom. Thus his work is the key to the gate of wisdom. He grieves over his people's lack of interest in logic, to the extent of their not knowing the titles of works by familiar native authors. He warns would-be-scribes not to copy his work until they have perfected their orthography, lest they should otherwise corrupt his work. The same applies to copying other philological works. Moreover, they should not because of indolence delete this preface, supposing it to be unnecessary. Here ends the preface.

Curiously enough, Erznkats'i is altogether silent about the Grammatica Interpretation (Ukhumad'ihi Ahrpuwhe) by his mentor, Vardan Vardapat Arewelts'i (ca. 1200-1271). This work was completed after Vardan's pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1240, when he visited Cilicia on his return and stayed a Hromklay for five years (1241-1246). There he became the most trusted friend of the Catholicos Constantine I Bardzrberdts'i (in office 1221-1267) and was commissioned by King Het'um I (1224-1269) to write this grammar. Vardan Arewelts'i also wrote another short grammar, On the Parts of Speech (Hw' Hw'munwug pwiw), upon the request of ToRos Kahanay, the nephew of th

8 βωρνηθ δικαίωμα. The syntax suggests an instrumental and not a genitive; i.e., not an interpretation of St. Basil of Caesarea.

9 This work, Grammatical Re-analysis [Ukhumad'ihi Ahrpuwhe], is included in Adont Denys de Thrace, 251-285.

10 Jerusalem ms 657, pp. 13-120; ms 857, pp. 243-316 (Boghaian, Armenian Writers, 296).
Catholicos.\textsuperscript{11} Conceivably, Erznkats'i could have known about these works by his mentor, who had also preceded him at the Cilician Court. These could have been among the several unnamed works in his possession. His silence about them, however, seems to indicate that for one reason or another these late works did not command the same status as did the earlier compilation by Magistros. They abound in illustrative examples and have little grammatical content.

In his account Erznkats'i makes it clear that there were no comprehensive grammars in his time. The existing works, for the most part, were but short treatises dealing with certain issues. Altogether, these works did not account for every major part of speech; their coverage was insufficient. His assessment seems to be accurate, since all grammatical interpretations to his day were essentially attempts to interpret the grammar by Thrax or parts thereof. There is good reason to believe that all works that bear the title \textit{An Interpretation of [the] Grammar} (Մեկանունից բերաբարիք) deal with the one and only grammar, the \textit{Ars grammatica} of Thrax, the Armenian version of which was among the earliest translations produced by the Hellenizing School (6th - 8th centuries). These translations taxed the would-be interpreters' ingenuity because of the Greek syntax; all the more so as interpreters became farther and farther removed from the period of the Hellenizing School. Magistros was perhaps the last person in antiquity qualified to do justice to any of the translations produced by this School. Such grammars or, to be more precise, interpretations of Thrax by early Armenian scholiasts, were indeed useless; hence the persisting need throughout the Middle Ages for a definitive Armenian grammar.\textsuperscript{12} But breaking away from the tradition of tackling Thrax was difficult indeed. Erznkats'i succeeds in taking but a small step away from it, enough to prepare the way for others to follow in his footsteps. His lengthy work, longer than any of the previous grammatical undertakings on which he relies heavily, was essentially to make up for both the partiality and the brevity of the former works, including the compilation by Magistros. The latter, however, seems to have inspired Erznkats'i to embark on his broad and eclectic project. Apparently, he sets himself to outdo Magistros.

Still, he seems to have been bound by some other traditions. There was an old tradition of dealing with certain grammatical issues — as in the colophon he

\textsuperscript{11} Published by Levon G. Khach'erian in \textit{Bulletin of the Armenian Academy} [Տիգրանաշատարան Եզմանթաշատարան] II (1943); cited by Bogharian; see preceding note.

\textsuperscript{12} A similar development is discernible in the Syriac attempts to resolve the problems surrounding the Syriac translation of the \textit{Ars grammatica}. Obviously, the Greek grammar was far less suited to Syriac.
refers to his special contribution in resolving the problem of pronouns. The pedantic style of compounding examples to illustrate certain rules, at the expense of dwelling on the whole apparatus of grammatical study, is part of the same tradition. There was also a newly emerging tradition—whether begun by Magistros or by others earlier—of producing grammatical compilations. The preface shows how such compilations of grammatical works could have come about in the first place, as Erznkats’i refers to several works in his possession eventually bound together in a single volume.

In conclusion, it can be said that Erznkats’i’s work is to be prized for whatever value it may have had in helping to break away from the prevalent grammatical tradition of his day. This was the tradition passed on by the Hellenizing School, which was grammatically dominated by the Armenian translation of the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax and its early Armenian interpretations. This was the only kind of grammar known until Erznkats’i’s time, and the work of Magistros did not succeed in breaking away from it, for his work retained the complexities and perplexities of the Greek syntax that was incomprehensible even to learned monastics since it was essentially alien to Classical Armenian. Erznkats’i’s criticism of Magistros on this point is quite appropriate. Consequently, Erznkats’i may be deemed the progenitor of a new Armenian grammar, which was to hold sway for the remainder of the Middle Ages, influencing the later grammars by Esayi Nch’ets’i (ca. 1255-1338),13 Hovhannës Tsorotsorets’i / Erznkats’i (ca. 1260-1335),14 and Arak’el Siwnets’i (ca. 1356-ca. 1422).15 These, for the most part, are but abridgments of Erznkats’i’s magnum opus. It is not by accident that Erznkats’i’s work was left out of the celebrated edition of the early Armenian grammarians by Adontz. Beyond the periodic limits set by the renowned editor of the volume, the omission serves to show that Erznkats’i does not stand fully in the tradition of Thrax that dominated Armenian grammar for so long.

14 *A Short Survey of the Grammar* [Կուժնասա իբրատեր բբրաբնիստեր], Jerusalem ms 1084, pp. 316-383; ms 1257, pp. 357-468; ms 1514, pp. 255-464 (relying on his mentor, Esayi Nch’ets’i).
15 *Short Analyses of Grammar* [Կուժնասա իբրատեր բբրաբնիստեր], Jerusalem ms 857, pp. 5-99; ms 1468, pp. 296-534; ms 2391, pp. 293-483.
However small or great, Erznkats’i’s achievement was a result of the enlightened patronage that characterized the Cilician Court and the Catholicosate of the day.
The Bible in Verse, by Grigor Magistros

LONG BEFORE MILTON'S PARADISE LOST, there was a tradition of rewriting parts of biblical history in verse, a tradition often traced back to the Hes- aemeran literature of the Patristic Period treating the six days of creation. The inspiration for such works may have been drawn also from the poetic parts of the Bible itself, such as the Psalms and many of the prophetic oracles. But as for the medieval attempts to rewrite the Bible in epic verse, there seems to have been another starting point. Grigor Magistros stands near the beginning of that literary development, and he is perhaps our best source of information regarding the widespread popularity of the biblical epic in the Middle Ages. His preface to the more than a thousand lines of epic poetry, which for the most part is a summation of the Bible in verse, is as enlightening as the epic itself.

In the preface Magistros spells out the reason for his writing: it emanates from the early Islamic argument for the greater inspiration of the Koran on the basis of its literary superiority over the Bible, and from the challenge such an argument posited to Christians. Magistros attempts to provide a Christian sample with which to counteract the arguments for the literary and inspirational excellence of the Koran, and goes on to employ consistently for a rhyme in his epic the often recurring koranic word-ending -in. The Koran and early Islamic poetry were clearly decisive factors in the introduction of rhyme in medieval Christian poetry.

Before expounding the preface and outlining the contents of the epic, a brief introduction to the author and to the circumstances leading to his writing is

1 Grigor Magistros was born in ca. 990 and died in 1059, hence this paper is to commemorate the millennial anniversary of his birth.

2 Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni's Writings in Verse [Սուրբ Միհրամ Պահլաւունի Երեւան, Սուրբ Պահլաւունի Երեւան, Venice: San Lazzaro, 1868, 1-79. There are several manuscripts containing the epic. The Mashtots' Matenadaran lists 11 such manuscripts, the oldest of which is but from the 16th century (ms 6734, dated 1570; cf. ms 6045, dated 15th, 17th centuries). The rest are from the 17th and 18th centuries. They all maintain the poetic line divisions and show similar scribal formatting. I have collated the oldest four of the Erevan manuscripts against the Venice edition of 1868. Any future edition of the text will necessarily be a critical one.
Magistros was born in ca. 990 in the village of Bjni, immediately to the west of Lake Sevan, to the princely Pahlawuni Kamsarian (Neo-Kamsaran) family, which made claims to Parthian and Jewish ancestry and relation to Grigor the Illuminator and the Mamikonians.³ Both his parents and grandparents sponsored the construction and the restoration of several monasteries, and Magistros himself is credited with the restoration of the monastery of Hayots‘ T‘ar in the vicinity of Gārni (1013), the convent of Surb Astuatsatsin in his native Bjni, where he also built a church bearing the same name (1031), and the monastery of Keh‘āris in the province of Tsaghanotn, dedicated to Grigor the Illuminator (1051). His uncle, Vahram Sparapet, built the famous monastery of Marmashēn, the construction of which took more than forty years (986-1029). There is good reason to believe that in the closing years of his life Magistros retired to one or another of these monasteries, as was customary for medieval nobility.⁴

The family’s role in the Church is to be seen also in the fact that a son, two grandsons, and a great-grandson became heads of the Armenian Church: Grigor II Pahlawuni, also known as Vkayasēr (1065-1105), and his nephews, Grigor III Pahlawuni, who was elevated to the Catholicosate at the age of 20 (1113-1166), and his brother, St. Nersēs IV Klayets‘i, also known as Shnorhali, “the Graceful”, for the many theologically rich writings that have come from his pen, including the best literary epic in Classical Armenian, Jesus the Son (1166-1173). Shnorhali was succeeded by a nephew, Grigor IV Pahlawuni, also known as Tghay (1173-1193).

Because of his princely upbringing Magistros received the best of Byzantine education, as is attested in his erudite correspondences⁵ and in his difficult interpretation of the Armenian version of the Technē grammaticē of Dionysius

---

³ These ancestral claims may have some implications for the final tenth of the epic, which culminates with the spread of Christianity, the conversion of the Armenian people, and a personal confession of faith by the author, who underscores the continuity with the biblical past.


Thrax. He was also skilled in the art of warfare, being in command of several eastern fortresses which he was later to relinquish to the Byzantines in exchange for non-Armenian castles in the southwest, near Edessa and the Mesopotamian frontiers. One might say that he is better remembered for his literary rather than his military achievements. He was, nonetheless, a friend of the Byzantine imperial family and visited Constantinople on several occasions, especially during the reign of Constantine IX Monomachus (1042-1055).

It was on one such visit to Constantinople, in the year 1045 (494 of the Armenian era), as he tells in the preface to the epic, that he met a certain Moslem intellectual by the name of Manuchir, a learned poet who engaged him in a discussion on the Bible and the Koran. During the discussion, the standard Islamic argument emerges: that the Koran is superior to the Christian scriptures in that it was written in such beautiful verse, while the evangelists show no such familiarity with poetics as does Mohammad because of his superior inspiration. Magistros seeks the aid of the Holy Spirit as he responds by saying that he could write in four days something similar to what it took Mohammad forty years to compose. Manuchir answers: "If you are able to do that, then I will become a Christian." So, after four days Magistros reads to Manuchir his epic poetry, whereupon the Moslem scholar is awed and asks with amazement: "With what sort of skill were you able to write so swiftly and quickly?" Magistros answers: "The Holy Spirit comes to strengthen us and He teaches us the whole truth." Thereupon Manuchir "confessed with fear and trembling that the God of the Christians is great."

The original title of the epic seems to have been lost — if it ever had a title. The earliest manuscripts simply have in lieu of a title: "By Grigor Magistros, said against the lawless Tachik, Manuchir, who confronted him; and, being defeated by Grigor, he became a Christian." To be sure, the preface by Magistros does not state anything about Manuchir's conversion to Christianity: it simply alludes to his confessing the greatness of the God of the Christians. For the ancients, however, such a confession could be tantamount to conversion.

As it stands, the epic is entitled "To Manuchir" since, as stated by the author, it was addressed to him. Here we have a case where the dedication seem-

---


7 Owing perhaps to Acts 2:11.
ingly becomes the title of the work. Titles were generally derived from the opening words of a document, as was customary in ancient literature. Were there a title derived from the opening line and suggestive of the contents of the epic as a whole, it might have been something like Zmetsametts Astutsoy (Magnalia Dei, or The Mighty Acts of God).

A certain Manuchir appears among the more distinguished poets employed in the court of the Ghaznavis. He died in 1041, which makes him an exact contemporary of Magistros. However, our epic, according to the preface, was composed in 1045 and Constantine IX Monomachos did not ascend the Byzantine throne until 1042. It may therefore be said that either the Manuchir to whom the epic is dedicated was another distinguished poet by that name, or else the date given for the death of Manuchir needs to be reconsidered in the light of the preface. It is inconceivable that Magistros would be off by four years. Be that as it may, the 9th to 11th centuries mark the height of Iranian literary development, especially poetry, under the patronage of the Ghaznavis. During this period court poets made a concerted attempt to represent history and culture in a light which was favorable to their patrons. The best example of this is the Shahnamah, “The Epic of the Kings”, which begins from mythical times and ends with the fall of the Sassanid kingdom in 651. This famous epic of sixty thousand lines in Pahlavi or Middle Persian was completed in 1010 by Ferdousi (933-1025) for Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna (997/8-1030), a descendant of Yazdigard III, the last of the Sassanid kings.

Obviously, Magistros was influenced by the upsurge of interest in poetry at the time, if not by the Shahnamah itself, for he employs the same kind of syllabic couplets or hemistichs, with the rhyme coming at the end of the second hemistich. This form, called the Masnavi, was well established before the Shahnamah, though much of that early poetry has been lost. The Iranian influence on later Armenian poetry is well attested by the abundance of Middle Iranian loan

---

8 A.V.W. Jackson, Early Persian Poetry, from the Beginnings down to Firdausi, New York: Macmillan, 1920, 70.

9 In his “Elegy on the God-Bearing Cross” (Works in Verse, 80-88), dedicated to Catholicos Petros I Getadardz (1019-1054), Magistros employs the Homeric dactylic hexameter.

words.\textsuperscript{11}

The admission that this epic was written in four days does not allow us to compare it with the far more famous epics which took years to write — such as the \textit{Shahnameh}. Our epic is far from being a literary masterpiece (Virgil’s famous epic, the \textit{Aeneid}, took the poet twelve years to write, only for him to be dissatisfied with it at the end). The very notion of epic poetry, however, calls for lofty verse, and this Magistros demonstrates to the best of his ability.

The preface shows awareness of the requirements for writing an epic in accordance with the Classical Greek tradition. It was imperative that the epicist should declare in a preface the circumstances leading to the writing of the epic and the reason for it — just as Magistros does. Moreover, epics usually begin with an invocation of God, or earlier, by invoking the assistance of a muse. Twice in the preface Magistros invokes the help of the Holy Spirit. In fact, the first fifty lines of the epic are devoted to God, listing traditional adjectives and attributes of the Deity, such as those that characterize many a medieval prayer. (In Islam, likewise, there is a tradition of naming the many names and titular adjectives of God; and it is conceivable that Magistros is providing something similar also to what is commonplace in Islam. Moreover, at lines 31-36 we find a possible response to a familiar Islamic criticism of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity: that God has no partner.)\textsuperscript{12} The following is a detailed outline of the contents of the epic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>On God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-61</td>
<td>The Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-97</td>
<td>Eden and the Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-111</td>
<td>Noah and His Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112-139</td>
<td>Abraham and Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-191</td>
<td>Jacob and the Twelve Patriarchs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192-253</td>
<td>Moses and the Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254-261</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262-276</td>
<td>The Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277-286</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287-296</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{11} See J.R. Russell’s introduction to \textit{Yovhannës Tlkourantsi and the Medieval Armenian Lyric Tradition} (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 7). Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987, especially pp. 1-2. Russell mentions the \textit{Epistolary} or “Letters” of Magistros but not his epic poetry, for which he is equally renowned.

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. the formulaic \textit{lā īlāh .SC īllāh wahdah, lā sharik lab.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297-303</td>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304-310</td>
<td>The Sins of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311-327</td>
<td>Elijah and Elisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328-329</td>
<td>The Exile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-353</td>
<td>Daniel and the Three Young Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354-364</td>
<td>The Annunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365-374</td>
<td>The Birth of John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375-404</td>
<td>The Birth of Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405-414</td>
<td>The Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-425</td>
<td>John in the Wilderness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426-441</td>
<td>The Baptism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442-444</td>
<td>The Temptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445-468</td>
<td>Instructing the Twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469-511</td>
<td>Dialogue with Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512-524</td>
<td>Encounters with Jews and Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-533</td>
<td>The Transfiguration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534-547</td>
<td>Miracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548-560</td>
<td>The Raising of Lazarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561-574</td>
<td>Entering Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575-591</td>
<td>On Mount Olivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592-603</td>
<td>At the Home of Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604-626</td>
<td>The Last Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627-637</td>
<td>Gethsemane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638-649</td>
<td>The Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-662</td>
<td>Peter's Denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663-705</td>
<td>The Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706-759</td>
<td>The Crucifixion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-765</td>
<td>The Burial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766-812</td>
<td>The Resurrection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813-847</td>
<td>The Founding of the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848-891</td>
<td>Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892-901</td>
<td>The Fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902-931</td>
<td>Grigor the Illuminator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932-946</td>
<td>Confession of Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947-995</td>
<td>The Last Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996-1016</td>
<td>Concluding Prayer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lines 1-353 cover the Old Testament and lines 354-891, the New Testament. The remaining lines, 892-1016, cover in more sentimental terms the history of the spread of Christianity and the conversion of the Armenian people, and end with a personal prayer by the author. His rereading of the biblical tradition may well be termed a mythopoetic revision, a revision rooted in a particular view of salvation-history that saw continuity between the biblical past and the Arme-
nian present. The interrelation of the two worlds is stressed not only through the spread of Christianity and the conversion of the Armenian people, but also in the author's seeing himself as being part of that development. This kind of mythical perception has its apologetic counterpart in the dynastic history of the Pahlawuni family, which was related to the old Kamsarakans and the Mamikonians, with kinship not only to Vardan Mamikonian but also to Grigor the Illuminator. It even claimed to be descended from the Hebrew kings, as did the ruling Bagratids during the dynastic rivalries of the time.  

It should be restated that no attempt was made to rewrite the Bible in verse before the rise of Islam. Two somewhat exceptional works come to mind. The first is a paraphrase of the Psalms in hexameter attributed to Apollinarius the Younger, Bishop of Laodicea (360-375), who was condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 381 for questioning the perfect humanity of Jesus in favor of his divinity. The date and authorship of this work, however, have been seriously questioned by Golega, who ascribes it to the presbyter Marcianus. The latter died in Constantinople after 471 D. One may hasten to add that by their very poetry the Psalms lend themselves to such a poetic restoration to compensate for stylistic losses in the course of translation from Hebrew.

The other work is the Paschale Carmen of Sedulius, composed in Latin in ca. 425-450, and which is limited to the Gospel narrative. It was intended to provide a Christian counterpart to Virgil's Aeneid, since the idiom of the Virgilian epic was the most preferred style in late antiquity. As we can see, the resorting to transforming the Bible into epic poetry must have had an apologetic origin: be it when intended to provide a Christian counterpart to the best of Pagan poetry or when, later on, Christians were faced with the Islamic challenge posited by the literary excellence of the Koran.

However the early development of the tradition of transforming the Bible into verse may have been, the argument that relates the question of inspiration

---


to the quality of literary output is as old as the Homeric tradition. Moreover, we should not forget that much of the Bible is in beautiful verse, such as the Psalms and many of the prophetic oracles. The encounter with Islam, however, remains decisive in influencing the medieval efforts to put the entire Bible into verse. The genre appears to have begun in Byzantine circles, where also we have the setting of the encounter leading to the production of our epic. The tradition then moved West, culminating with still greater efforts, such as the *Cursor Mundi* with its more than thirty thousand rhyming couplets, but certainly not for the same reason(s) as at the beginning in the East.

One should not discount the native Armenian poetic influence on our epic. The best religious poetry in Classical Armenian, and reflective of the mystical mindset of the 9th century, is the *Lamentations* of Grigor of Narek. His prayerful poetry has had an unmistakable impact on all subsequent religious poetry in Armenian, including that of Magistros. Grigor of Narek, however, was not an epicist but a poet of the most contemplative sort.

The work of Magistros remains the earliest literary epic in Classical Armenian. Within the Armenian literary tradition, there can be no doubt about its influence on the more famous work *Jesus the Son* by Nersès Shnorhali (ca. 1102-1173), the grandson of Magistros. This epic of two thousand stanzas could be classified among the best and the last of its medieval genre. Except for some scant indications of familiarity with either of these two epics, there are no clear influences of these two works on later Armenian literature. The era of the biblical epic in Classical Armenian lasted but for a century: Magistros marking its beginning and his grandson, Shnorhali, its end.

---

16 Unequalled in Classical Armenian, this composition is comparable to some later Renaissance works, such as that by Marco Girolamo Vida (1480-1546), who was commissioned by Pope Leo X in 1513 to write a poem on the life of Christ, entitled *Christiade*. Like other Renaissance writers, Vida was influenced more by the earlier classical tradition than by the medieval precursors, as seen also in his *Ars Poetica* composed in 1523 and reflecting the impact of Horace’s *Ars Poetica* on the Renaissance period (among the later followers of Horace are Boi été in his *L’Art Poétique*, and Pope in his *Essay on Criticism*). Similar classical influences may be discerned in Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata*, a final Catholic call for another crusade to liberate Jerusalem. In this epic consisting of twenty-four books, published in 1575, Tasso attempted to imitate Homer. The latter work may be relegated to the transitional period from the Renaissance to Neo-Classicism. In Middle English, John Lydgate’s (ca. 1370-ca. 1451) *Pilgrim*, a religious poem of about twenty-five thousand lines of octosyllabic couplet, written as an allegory of pilgrimage through life, anticipated the 17th-century works of John Bunyan and John Milton.
Armenian Writers in Medieval Jerusalem

THE ARMENIAN COMMUNITY OF JERUSALEM has its beginning in early Byzantine monasticism. By the 6th century there were spacious Armenian monasteries around the city, as the ruins with several inscriptions in mosaic floors found on the Mount of Olives to the east and in the vicinity of Damascus Gate to the north indicate.1 These monasteries must have suffered the fate of

1 An earlier version of this revised and expanded article appeared in the Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies VI (1992-1993) 11-31; reprinted in Sion LXX (1996) 82-102. A much shorter version was read at the annual meeting of the Middle East Studies Association, November 11-13, 1993, Research Triangle Park, NC. As before, so also now, I dedicate this study to the memory of my mentor, Abp. Norayr Bogharian (1904-1996), who was quite gratified when he read the earlier version on his ninetieth birthday. This article could not have been written without his overwhelming contribution to Armenian studies.

2 For an illustrated description of these floors, see Bezalel Narkiss, “The Armenian Treasures of Jerusalem,” in Bezalel Narkiss et al., eds., Armenian Art Treasures of Jerusalem, New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas Brothers, 1979, 21-28. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, The Holy Land: An Archaeological Guide from Earliest Times to 1700, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980, 106, has this to say about the one in the Damascus Gate vicinity: “this mosaic floor is perhaps the most beautiful in the whole country.” Additional discoveries in more recent years have revealed the extensiveness of this site. For a fine study on the dominant motif of birds, see Helen Evans, “Non-classical Sources for the Armenian Mosaic Near the Damascus Gate in Jerusalem,” in East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period, ed. Nina G. Garsoian et al., Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1982, 217-222. Armenian legend has it that St. Grigor and King Trdat came to Jerusalem, and there they met with Pope Sylvester and Emperor Constantine, at which time the holy places were divided by lot among their custodians, thus explaining how Armenians in the Holy Land came to possess their places (see, e.g., the 13th-century sage and hymnographer Vardan Arewel’ts’i, in Panegyris on St. Grigor the Illuminator by Yoohannes Sarkawag, Vardan Bardzberdts’i and Yoohannes Erznkats’i [Սուրբ Սիրուան Շենչուհի Սուրբ Ցիգանջ, Սուբ Թրենուան Սուրբ Սիրուան] in the series Armenian Books [Սուրբ Սիրուան], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1853, 5:77-78; he lists: the Manger, Golgotha, and the convents of St. John the Forerunner and St. James). For a far more dramatic description of an alleged meeting of these four leaders in Rome, see ibid., 66-68; cf. Agat’angeghos (Aa) 873-880 (Armenian text, G. T‘r-Mkrtch’ian and S. Kanayeants’, eds., Agat’angeghos’ History of the Armenians [Երաստի Տնաստեղծություն] Tiflis: 123
nearly all such buildings and churches in the Holy Land during the devastating invasion in 614 by Khosrow II of Persia (590-628). The boundaries of the present-day Armenian Quarter, covering nearly a sixth of the Old City at the south-western corner and around the monastery of St. James, were fairly well established by the end of the 11th century, and the community thrived under the Crusaders. Unlike other communities in the Armenian diaspora, and those in Armenia as well, the Jerusalem community was seldom disturbed and hardly ever displaced from its present Quarter. Its continuity enabled it to flourish as a religious and learning center and to become territorially the largest monastic establishment in the medieval city.

Part of this historic legacy today is the collection of nearly four thousand medieval manuscripts at St. James, recently catalogued by Archbishop N. Bogharian. These include scores of texts identified by him as having some unique content. Nearly half of these were penned locally, and a few of them were written by local chroniclers, liturgists, lexicographers, and poets. The rest are copies of broadly disseminated religious works, yet with occasional colophons vividly recounting contemporary and near-contemporary events and encounters with

---


4 Armenian clergy in Jerusalem were persecuted during the anti-Frankish upheavals instigated by the Mamluks (1365-1369), and the St. James Monastery was temporarily seized by the Greek Orthodox Church (1658-1659); information obtained from colophons: Jerusalem mss 122, 975-978; and 16, 1310-1314. The first of these colophons is comparable with that of Erivan ms 7091, on which see L.S. Khachikyan, Armenian Colophons of Fourteenth-Century Manuscripts [երևան, 1949], Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1950, 473. A history of later conflicts over sacred sites, including the St. James Monastery, is found in Jerusalem ms 3825.


other Christian as well as non-Christian entities. Unfortunately, however, these special manuscripts and others in the larger collection that were penned locally have not attracted the scholarly attention they deserve, in spite of the fact that the careful cataloguer has provided the full colophons of nearly all manuscripts. To these may be added the scores of other codices copied in Jerusalem and now kept elsewhere among other collections of ancient Armenian manuscripts. With an effort to contextualize these medieval resources at St. James, I shall explore briefly the Armenian literary activity in Jerusalem from Byzantine times onward, through the wider gateway that the Cilician Kingdom and the Crusades opened to the Holy City. In this short survey I shall account for the learned ecclesiasts who resided there for some time during these centuries — whether as members of the monastic brotherhood or as pilgrims — and on whose writings the time spent in Jerusalem appears to have had an indubitable impact.

The earliest Armenian document written in Jerusalem is the letter of Grigor Bishop of the Artsrunis (ca. 500-570). This letter, written in ca. 560 and sent to followers in Armenia, stresses the necessity of celebrating Candlemas or Pen-

---

7 The major repositories are the Matenadaran in Erevan, the Mekhitarist Libraries in Venice and Vienna, and the All-Savior Cathedral in New Julfa. For the respective catalogues, see O. Eganyan, A. Zeyt’unyan and P’. Ant’abian, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library Named after Mashtots* [Յուղարայի Մաշտոցյան Սերմեր տպարտանքային հարկանիք], 2 vols., Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1965-1970 (currently being revised with expanded descriptions); Barsegh Sargsian and Grigor Sargsian, *Grand Catalogue of the Armenian Manuscripts in the Library of the Mekhitarists in Venice* [Վարդաներայի Մաշտոցյան Տպարտանքային հարկանիք, 2 vols., Venice: San Lazzaro, 1914-1924 (a 3rd vol., *Mashtots’-Girk’ dzerbardar’ents’,* was published in 1966); J. Dashian, *Kata-

8 A critical text of the document, based on Jerusalem mss 3152 (A), 71 (B), 1A (C), 15A4 (D), 764 (E), has been edited by N. Bogharian, “An Epistle from Jerusalem to the Armenians Regarding the Penthente” [Յուղարագրական Սերմեր Արմենացիներին մասին Սբուրիկիթ], *Sioc* XXXVIII (1964) 33-36.
thesis, a festival in honor of the purification of the Virgin Mary and the presentation of the infant Christ in the Temple forty days after His birth (Teirméndaraj), on the traditional day, the fourteenth of February. Grigor begins by referring to an imperial letter sent by Justinian I (527-565) in the thirty-third year of his reign to the Patriarch Eustochius (or Eutychius, 552-563) and the rest of the bishops in Jerusalem ordering them to combine the feast day with that of the birth of Christ on the twenty-fifth of December. Grigor encourages his followers not to yield to revisionist Byzantine pressures under Justinian. To underscore the veracity of the traditional date, he speaks of a great miracle on Mount Zion that day, water streaming from a pillar, while services were being held (presumably in the Martyrium of St. Stephen) in defiance of the imperial order. He goes on to describe the defiant celebrations led by the Patriarch Macarius (563-574) a year (or two) later. While offering the Eucharist, the celebrant bishop had a vision which he then recounted: an angel coming from Golgotha and striking the second pillar of the Martyrium with his right arm, leaving on it an imprint of the nailed right arm of Christ, which the people could see; even more, an image of the Blessed Virgin with the Child holding a crimson cross in His right hand, and the same crimson cross appearing on every pillar. Many of those who witnessed the miracle were healed that day. Grigor cites the dramatic experience of a crippled Armenian woman from Mokk' named Soghovmē, who was healed after she crawled toward the pillar on which were revealed the images of the right hand of the Lord and of the Virgin with the Child. Soghovmē stood erect as with faith she embraced that pillar, whereupon she and all those present began to praise God in unison.

The historicity of this document is verifiable in the development of the Jerusalem liturgy as well as in the history of imperial meddling in Church affairs under Justinian I; for indeed, in the fifteenth year of his reign (542) Justinian ordered the observance of the feast of Pentecost at Constantinople as a thanksgiving for the cessation of a plague at Christmas time. Apparently, it took another fifteen years for the new feast day to become an issue in Jerusalem and perhaps in other parts of the Empire. Moreover, the document clearly indicates that in Jerusalem these festal services were still being held not only on the traditional date but also at the traditional site: in the Martyrium on Mount Zion, as

---

indicated in the Armenian Lectionary (Chashots) of the 5th century (preferred text in Jerusalem ms 121, p. 71)\textsuperscript{10} and no longer in the Holy Anastasis, as described by the 4th-century pilgrim Egeria in her travel account (Peregrinatio, 26).\textsuperscript{11}

With rare exceptions, the close harmony between Egeria’s memoirs and the services in the old Armenian Lectionary, the foremost of the early Jerusalem Lectionaries extant, has long been noted in “Egeriana” scholarship.\textsuperscript{12} The old Armenian Lectionary was translated from Greek between 417 and 438 and most likely in Jerusalem: it follows the early Jerusalem tradition for the services there, its injunctions are for use in Jerusalem primarily, and the last saint it commemorates is Bishop John of Jerusalem who died in 417.\textsuperscript{13} Although the translation from Greek does not require that it have been done at Jerusalem, there is no good reason to reject the possibility since the use of the complete Jerusalem Lectionary was geographically limited; its use elsewhere in the Greek-speaking Church was limited to the lections or Bible readings, and that is how it was transmitted after the 5th century.\textsuperscript{14} The time and place of the Armenian translation of this complete Lectionary have overwhelming implications not only for the Byzantine liturgical tradition in Jerusalem but also for the religious life and the literary activities of Armenians there at that time.\textsuperscript{15}


\textsuperscript{12} For a brief survey, see Wilkinson, \textit{Egeria’s Travels}, 253. The striking harmony between Egeria’s account and the old Armenian Lectionary is to be seen at the outset, in the vigils of Epiphany and Easter: Armenians in Byzantine Jerusalem held each of the eight-day services after Epiphany at various churches in and around the city, the last being held in the Holy Anastasis; so were also the services of the Great Week.

\textsuperscript{13} On the date of the Armenian translation see Wilkinson, \textit{Egeria’s Travels}, 254.


\textsuperscript{15} Avedis K. Sanjian heightens the possibility for an Armenian scriptorium there in the 5th century: \textit{The Armenian Communities in Syria under Ottoman Dominion}, Cambridge, MA:
Also worth mentioning here, as we proceed chronologically, are the three eyewitness accounts by 7th-century Armenian pilgrims to various sites in the Holy Land — even though they do not account for any scholarly activity in Jerusalem during this early period. A vivid description of Mount Tabor by an anonymous pilgrim, found at the end of The Epiphany of the Lord on Mount Tabor [Ծանձուրուն Տառուն Սուրբ Մարիամ Լեռն] has been wrongly attributed to Eghishē in Writings of Our Holy Father Eghishē Vardapet [Ծանձուր Սուրբ Մարիամ Լեռնե Մարիամ Տառունու]. A description of churches in Jerusalem and its vicinity, Bethlehem, and the Jordan Valley by the hermit Hovsep' of Arts'akh, preserved in History of the [Caucasian] Albanians [Դասկուրու Աբանախի Հերոսքի] (2:50-51) by Movsēs Kaghankat'uats'ı or Daskhurants'ı, has been known in Holy-Land studies for a century. So is also the report to Vahan Mamikonian by Anastas Vardapet Akořets'ı (ca. 636-


16 Robert W. Thomson, “A Seventh-Century Armenian Pilgrim on Mount Tabor,” Journal of Theological Studies XVIII (1967) 27-33, with translation of the text found in the 1859 Venice edition of the works attributed to Eghishē (by the given title), 236-239. It is likely that such a description is in keeping with the requirements set in the Progymnasium, the popular textbooks of rhetorical exercises in Late Antiquity, which included a section on descriptive writing.

650; Catholics 661-667), recounting his visit to monasteries in and around Jerusalem built by Armenians and Caucasian Albanians (the Aghvank), likewise preserved by Kaghankat'ua'ts'i (History, 2.52). Serious questions persist, however, regarding the reliability of this report in its redacted form.

According to the Autobiography of Anania Shirakats'i, a 7th-century sage and prolific author who wrote some twenty treatises covering every aspect of the sciences known in the early Middle Ages (corresponding to the second division or the Quadrivium of the classical curriculum), he came to Jerusalem before continuing to Alexandria and Constantinople. This was before “the father of the exact sciences in Armenia”, as Anania is often called, returned to his native country to teach. His journey to Jerusalem seems to strengthen the ascription of several religious compositions to him, such as Homily on the Lord’s Epiphany [Զունի Բազիմն.Բարիկ Տաւոր] and Homily on the Lord’s Easter [Զունի Բազիմն.Սբոր], and hymns on Pentecost and the Transfiguration, with others on the prophets and the apostles.


21 Hymnal of Spiritual Songs of the Holy and Orthodox Church of Armenia [Հայոց Սուրբ Տաճարի արձակ մերձ եպիսկոպոս հիբերեան Զունիմատերք], Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1936, 5; cf. Anasyan, Armenian Bibliography, lxxv-lxxiv.
Equally noteworthy is the testimony of the chronographer Samuél Anets’i (ca. 1100-1180) that mentions by name five pupils of Shirakats’i (Hermon, Trdat, Azaria, Ezekiél, and Kirakos) who left their renowned teacher, embraced Diophyte Christology, and resided in Jerusalem as ascetics or monks. Although there are five centuries between Anets’i and the reported event, he probably had at his disposal some documentary evidence for this somewhat specific piece of information — possibly obtained at Haghbat where he studied with great masters (Hovhannēs Sarkawag Vardapet and Gěorg Vardapet Urchets’i, later Bishop of Haghbat). Moreover, as a careful chronographer, Anets’i had thoroughly studied the chronological works of Shirakats’i, which he utilizes, and had researched the authorities behind the latter’s primary sources, carefully identifying them all. However late or dubious his testimony may be, the credentials of the source and the naming of the five should lend it some credibility. Shirakats’i complains in his Autobiography about students who were eager to leave his circle in order to teach prior to completing their course of study.

Much later documentary evidence for translational activity in Jerusalem has been drawn from an often-copied colophon (with slight variations) from the year 869 or 879/880. The colophon in question pertains to the anonymous hagiography on the legendary life of St. Dionysius the Areopagite. One version has: “This history of St. Dionysius was translated from ancient Greek in the city Jerusalem, and the physician Hovhannēs translated [it] into ours; 318 by the Armenian reckoning [=869].” Another version has: “This history of St. Dionysius was translated in the holy city Jerusalem from lofty Greek, and the physician Hovhannēs translated [it] into ours; 329 of the Armenian era [=880].”


23 The first two texts are quoted by Mktrich’ (Episkopos) Aghawuni, Members of the Brotherhood and Visitors to Armenian Jerusalem [Սուրբ Հակոբ Տեր Միքեյենց Հայոց պատմության], Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1929, 354, following Zarphanalian, Library of Translations, 382. The preferred text, however, is the third: that of Jerusalem ms 282, so in Hovsepian, Manuscript Colophons, no. 30 (cols. 81-82); also in Bogharian, Grand Catalogue, II:99: cf. I:30, 303, 458; II:276 for the texts in mss 1C, 97, 154D, 368. All these Jerusalem manuscripts have the year 879 in the often-copied colophon. On the history of the Greek version, see Alexander Kazhdan and Nancy P. Ševčenko, “Dionysios the Areopagite,” in The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, I: 629.
Still another has: "This history of St. Dionysius was translated in the holy city Jerusalem from Greek, and the physician Hovhannès translated [it] into ours; 328 of the Armenian era [=879]."

On earlier translational work there, I agree with the following assessment by Stone: "It can be safely assumed that in fact such activity antedates these 9th-century references." Further evidence for such translational activity may be derived from a colophon by Vardan Vardapet Arevelts'i, one of the most renowned theologians of the Armenian Church (ca. 1200-1271). While on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1239/40, he became acquainted with two apocryphal writings previously unknown to him that narrate the martyrdom of St. James the brother of St. John: one on his being beheaded, an account usually found following the text of his teaching, and the other on his headless body being washed away miraculously to Spain. The first, with the teaching, was translated by a certain Dawit', and the second by a certain Hovhannès. Arevelts'i copied the works translated by the two, combining them into a single document, and dispatched copies from Jerusalem to several places — conceivably in Armenia and Cilicia. From the fact that Arevelts'i was not familiar with these ancient translations prior to his pilgrimage and from his subsequent role in spreading these writings around, it may be concluded that they were unknown outside Jerusalem. Intriguing as the recurring name Hovhannès may be, it would be difficult to identify either of these early translators with others named above, given the popularity of such biblical names in medieval Armenia.

Moreover, to this period may belong a little-known author from Jerusalem: the hermit Grigor Sarkawagapet Yerushaghêmat'si, whose name we encounter among the panegyrical compositions in medieval Armenian literature dedicated


25 For the colophon, see the collection by A.S. Mat'evosyan, Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, Thirteenth Century [Հայերեն արձանագրություններ հին հայ գրականության մեջ,جلبرات 30], Erivan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1984, 402 (no. 320; Erivan ms 4086).

to St. Grigor the Illuminator. His work is one of the two earliest laudations of some length on the Illuminator by an Armenian author, and it is not far removed from two such compositions traditionally attributed to St. John Chrysostom (ca. 350-407), or to his circle, that were translated into Armenian in the 11th-12th centuries upon the request of Catholicos Grigor II Vkayasert (in office 1065-1105). Unlike all other medieval panegyristS on St. Grigor, our author shows no dependence on these translations. His general familiarity with the life of St. Grigor is owed to the 5th-century History of the Armenians by

These works have been collected in the small yet celebrated Armenian Books series; vol. IV: Panegyrics of John Chrysostom and Grigor Sarkawagapet on St. Grigor Lusavorich’ (Հերոն) written by Grigor Lusavorich’ (especially 129-157), and vol. V: Panegyrics on St. Grigor Lusavorich’ by Hovhannes Sarkawag, Vardan Bardzberd’s, Hovhannes Erznkats’ (Հերոն) written by Hovhannes Erznkats’ (Venice: San Lazzaro, 1853).

The other early composition worthy of note is the sharanak on the release of St. Grigor from the pit, O you blessed St. Grigor (Ձեզ բարեգործ Ստորև էջեր, որտեղ էջեր), attributed to Movses Bishop of Siwnik’ (in office 725-731); Hymnal of Spiritual Songs, 554-564; cf. N. Bogharian, Armenian Writers, V-XVII Centuries (Հայոց գրականության 6-17 դարերը), Jerusalem: St James Press, 1971, 109.

The translation by a certain Abraham Grammatikos was revised by Catholicos (St.) Nerses Shnorhali (in office 1166-1173) upon the request of his brother, Catholics Grigor III Pahlawuni (in office 1113-1166), according to a colophon by him at the end of the first of these two panegyrics (Armenian Books IV:5-87, last two pages especially). Although the full title of the first panegyric (“... at Cucusa in [Cilician] Armenia, while he was in exile, upon the request of a certain bishop and vardapet, his Armenian-born compatriot named Dioscoros...”) suggests that it was written between 404 and 407, the year of Chrysostom’s deportation to Pityus or Colchis on the Black Sea (he died en route at Comona in Pontus), there is reason, and that more than the geographical anachronism in the word “Armenia” in the title, to suspect both works as spurious (the popularity of Chrysostom as preacher and writer gave rise to several such works in Greek, some attributed to Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, who moved to Constantinople and was a friend of Chrysostom). Vkayser’ himself is the translator of the Life of St. John Chrysostom from Greek (History of the life... of St. John Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, translated from Greek into Armenian by Catholics Grigor, called Vkayser’)[Հուշագրք Ստորև, որտեղ էջեր, որտեğ
Agat'angeghos. Although the exact time of Grigor Sarkawagapet is unknown, the place of his activity is certain. The full title of his work bears this clearly: “A Composition on St. Grigor the Illuminator by Grigor the Archdeacon and Hermit, recited in the Holy City, Jerusalem” [Թղթագար Ստորագրագիր ու Սրբ. Թղթագար Նկարագրիչ, արհեստական եկեղեցիություն]. The title, with such archaic words as “archdeacon” and “hermit”, along with the specified place of recitation or writing, suggests an early date for our author. Altogether, the designation seems to point to a period within Byzantine Jerusalem, perhaps as far back as the 6th century. He could well be the same person mentioned in the title of another work: “A Panegyric on the Holy Cross of Christ our God by St. Grigor Sarkawag of Jerusalem” [Սբ. Գրիգոր Սարկավագ Օրեսխոր, Հիսուսի Ասուր, Աստվածածին (Սբ. Գրիգոր) Ջերուսաղեմում]. This work, however, belongs to St. Cyril of Alexandria, yet it may have been translated by Grigor Sarkawag(apet) in Jerusalem, hence the erroneous ascription to him. The word “saint” in this title is commensurate with the attributes in the title of the previous work. And even if we allow for two individuals here by that name, this does not diminish the significance of the data either for the place of activity or for the general period (between the Byzantine dominance in the Holy Land and the coming of the Crusaders).  

A notable period of Armenian literary activity in the Holy Land began immediately following the First Crusade (1099). Much of this revival is to be credited to the Armenian nobility in Jerusalem. Queen Arda, wife of Baldwin I, the first Latin king of Jerusalem (1100-1118), was the daughter of T’oros Rubènian, the


32 Bogharian, Grand Catalogue, 1:13 (ms 1B); cf. 449 (ms 154C); 2:441 (ms 461):

33 Aghawnuni, Brotherhood and Visitors, 93-94, lists them separately, without any likely date for the latter.
Armenian Prince of Edessa (Urfa). Several privileges were bestowed upon the local community through her beneficence. This state of affairs continued as another Armenian queen succeeded her: Morphia, wife of Baldwin II (1118-1131). This royal patronage, together with the relative proximity of Palestine, helped pave the way for a constant flow of learned clerics from both Armenia and Cilicia. There were also occasional royal visits from Cilicia. The hun-

34 Godfrey, Jerusalem’s first Latin ruler, preferred to be known as Protector of the Holy Sepulchre rather than king. It should be noted that there is debate about Arda’s identity and her actual role in Jerusalem.

35 For the many clerics whose visits are documented in dedicatory colophons, inscriptions, and various registries at St. James, see Aghawuni, Brotherhood and Visitors, passim, giving names with brief vitae alphabetically arranged, down to this century. It should be stated that not all persons mentioned in the present study are accounted for by Aghawuni.

36 That of King T’oros II (1145-1169) is recorded by Guillaume of Tyre, in Guillaume de Tyre et les continuateurs, 2 vols., Paris: Firmin Didot, 1879, I:289-291; that of King Het’um II (reigning intermittently, 1289-1301), is recorded by Minas (H)amdets’i, in Genealogy of the Armenians by Minas Hamdets’i [Մինաս Համդեցիներ Լուսաբուխ անունաված Հայեր], Vagharshapat: Mother See Press, 1870, 45; and that of Queen Mariun, the widow of King Constantine (Guy or Gyd Lusignan) III (1343-1345), recorded in a colophon described further below. It is important to note that several of the most prized biblical manuscripts in Jerusalem are those which once belonged to members of the Cilician royal families. The colophons of these manuscripts are invaluable for the dynastic histories they contain. Jerusalem ms 1973, e.g., the personal Gospel of Queen Mariun, contains a colophon by the scribe, Bishop Nerses (of Lambron), in which he claims to have copied it “from an original by the translators” [Մինաս Համդեցիներ Լուսաբուխ], thus making the document particularly attractive for text-criticism. More importantly — from a historian’s perspective — Nerses spells out the close ties between Church and state and names every member of the royal family, both living and dead. The manuscript also contains a few representations of the Queen within the various scenes from the life of Christ, including an identified representation of her within the scene of the deposition of Christ from the cross (see the four reproductions in Narkiss, Armenian Art Treasures, 85-88, nos. 108-111; Bogharian thinks the young princess represented in the scene of the Nativity is possibly Mariun’s daughter Pheme; idem, Armenian Scribes IX-XVth Centuries [Մինաս Համդեցիներ Լուսաբուխ], Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1992, 137. These illuminations on parchment, inserted within the Gospel on paper, are by the famed Sargis Pitsak and resemble other such royal representations in other royal manuscripts at St. James (cf. the Gospel manuscript of Queen Keran and others in Narkiss, Armenian Art Treasures, 65-69. The widowed Queen Mariun came to Jerusalem following a brief captivity in Egypt after the fall of Sis in 1375 to the Mamlik viceroy of Aleppo and the imprisonment of the last king of the Armenians, Levon VI Lusignan (1374-1375), in Cairo. The death and burial of the queen after three years’ residence in Jerusalem is the subject of another, later colophon found in a Gospel manuscript of the year 1280 and once owned by her husband, King Constantine III, and then given by the widowed queen to a certain Vahram,
dreds of guestrooms at St. James enabled many of these visitors to stay there for some time — some even for years.37 Foremost among these visitors are two of the six princely Pahlawuni heads of the Armenian Church: Catholicos Grigor II Vkayasër (in office 1065-1105) and a grandson of the latter’s sister Mariam, Catholicos Grigor III Pahlawuni (in office 1113-1166). The first came to Jerusalem in 1099, in the wake of the Crusaders’ capture of the city, and the second in 1142 to attend an ecumenical council convened by the Roman Catholic Church (in the previous year he had attended a similar council held in Antioch). A nephew of Grigor III, Catholicos Grigor IV Tghay (in office 1173-1193), wrote a lengthy “Lament over Jerusalem” (ՆԵՐ ԲՐՆԱՅՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ) upon the city’s fall to Salah ad-Din in 1187. Although there is no mention of his visit to Jerusalem, there is no good reason to rule out the possibility of his having been there. His sentiments for the city reflected in the “Lament” would almost certainly require that he had been there previously.38 One of his close associates and relatives, from the same princely Pahlawuni family and a prolific writer, theologian, and ecumenist, Archbishop Nersês Lambronats’i (1153-1198), was in Jerusalem during the city’s fall. His eyewitness account of the warfare and of the massacres that followed is found in a few manuscripts.39 The literary contributions of the Pahlawuni heads of the Armenian Church are too numerous to enumerate here, not to mention their patronage of literacy. Jerusalem in the time of the Crusaders must have been a source of inspiration for them.

37 A register in Jerusalem ms 1776 names the subdivisions of the monastery and enumerates more than three hundred guestrooms (pp. 68-101). Moreover, there were several Armenian monasteries not far from the Old City; for their history see Mkrtich’ Aghawnuni, Ancient Armenian Monasteries and Churches in the Holy Land [Աղավունի Նահում Վարդապետ], Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1931.

38 Another such lament over Jerusalem was written by Nersês Vardapet Mokats’i during his stay at Jerusalem in 1609 (Venice ms 1624).

39 Partial colophon in Aghawnuni, Brotherhood and Visitors, 396-397; see also the references there (those to Jerusalem manuscripts are either inaccurate or outdated; cf. ms 146, 623-627, and Grand Catalogue, I:418). Perhaps during an earlier visit, Lambronats’i likewise chronicled the 1178 Mamluk attacks on Jerusalem, under Yusuf; see Jerusalem mss 2542 and 2546. For more on Nersês, see (Archbishop) Mesrob Ashjian, St. Nerses of Lambron, Champion of the Church Universal, New York: The Armenian Prelacy, 1993.
These prelates paved the way for countless clerics to follow in their footsteps. Among them was Vardan Vardapet Aygekts’i (ca.1170-1235), a noted homiletic who also composed a prayerbook while in Jerusalem (Jerusalem ms 1130; cf. 939, 1576, 1690). The prayers, written to be read at various sacred sites, anticipate many such compositions in subsequent centuries and in various languages — most immediately by Catholicos Grigor VII Anawartets’i (in office 1293-1307), who wrote meditations on the sacred sites in Jerusalem; Bishop Nikoghayos Akhk’ermants’i, who in 1483 prepared a detailed list of the sacred sites to be visited; and Yeremia Ch’elepi K’omirwchants’ (1637-1695), the prolific chronicler of life in his native Constantinople, who also wrote meditations on the sacred sites during his visit in 1665. While in Jerusalem, Ay-

40 A Prayerbook for the Holy Sites, [Աստուած երկրների անապատ արքախորհուրդ]; for manuscripts with varying contents and early editions, see Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 279.

41 An incomplete work, Venice ms 742, 100-109; see Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 335.

42 Published with an English translation by Gbewond Alishan, along with the earlier list of Armenian monasteries in the Holy Land by Anastas Vardapet, Anastas Vardapet on the Armenian Monasteries in Jerusalem [Ավանդաբանական գրքերի գրականության առաջին փուլի արշավանքը], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1896; Aghawmuni, Brotherhood and Visitors, 401.

43 Elegy on the Passion Sites in Jerusalem [Կրոնիական վերջինակետների արքախորհուրդ] (according to Vrej Nersessian, Catalogue of Early Armenian Books: 1512-1850, London: The British Library, 1980, 19, no copy of this privately published book survives; printed in Ch’elepi’s own press in Constantinople, 1677). On his visit Ch’elepi must have donated to the local library several copies of his works, including his celebrated diary for the years 1648-1662; the history of the fires in 1660 that swept Constantinople, illustrated with illuminations; and his History of Istanbul [Այրարագնական պատմություններ], in verse (V.H. T’orgomian, ed., 3 vols. [Azygyn Matenadaran 71, 130, 144], Vienna: Methhitarist Press, 1913-1938). Cf. Siméon Dpir Lechas’i (1584-1637), who wrote on his travels through the Holy Land, including a description of the St. James brotherhood, the first of such travel accounts in Armenian literature; Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 512-514. A century after Ch’elepi, a certain Archbishop Martiros wrote Laudation of Jerusalem [Հայաստանի առաջին չերախորհուրդ] in verse, while at St. James in 1773 (Nicosia ms 62). Early in the 19th century, Yovhannes Ka’nets’i (Nodar) wrote several poems on the holy sites (e.g., Jerusalem ms 1844, a miscellany of the year 1812, has one “On the Sea of Tiberias” written in 1805), published posthumously in A Notebook of Prayers [Ավանդաբանական պատմության], Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1914. A later and better representative of this tradition or genre of meditations in the Holy Land is Catholicos Khrimian Hayrik (Mkrtich’i, in office 1893-1907) who on his visit to Jerusalem in 1850 wrote Inveter to the Promised Land [Հայրապետի այսօրակյան], Constantinople: Yovhannes Miwhentisian, 1851; repr. with a new preface, Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1892; and in this century, writing in prose, Harut’iwn G. Mrmrian, Alleluia in Jerusalem [Ալելյայի առաջին], Constantinople: Zardarian Gratun, 1903.
gekts'i apparently received his inspiration for yet another work: an encomium dedicated to Sts. James and John, the sons of Zebedee, and the rest of the Apostles (Jerusalem mss 1, 154). It should be noted that the St. James Cathedral marks the traditional site of the Apostolic Council held in Jerusalem in AD 49 under the leadership of St. James "the brother of the Lord" and the likely author of the Epistle of James in the New Testament (Gal 2:1-10; cf. Acts 15:1-30), whose remains are believed to have been interred beneath the main altar. There too, in a side chapel within the cathedral, is the traditional burial spot of the head of St. James "the son of Zebedee" and brother of St. John, beheaded by Herod Agrippa I in AD 44 (Acts 12:1-2). Such an edifice with its twin apostolic traditions must have had a great impact upon the author.

A rather unusual pilgrim was the cleric Hovhannes Garnets'i (ca. 1180-ca. 1245), a missionary and writer on moral maxims, who was also known as a healer and miracle-worker. During his short stay at St. James (1222/3) he witnessed several miracles, such as the one recorded on his authority in the Armenian History of Kirakos Gandzakets'i. He covered nearly every site on a pilgrim's itinerary, in conformity with a favorite prayer he wrote for the safety of fellow travelers. When at the River Jordan, his prayer was interrupted by three Iranian Moslems wanting to be baptized by him. Doubtful of their sincerity at first, he yielded to their request afterwards, when the eldest among them began recounting familiar visions identifying in one of them our pilgrim priest as their baptizer. Garnets'i also reports a pilgrimage to Mount Sinai by a group of forty Armenians, of whom he was one, and miracles accompanying them at the Monastery of St. Catherine.

The ultimate authority behind these and other stories about Garnets'i is Vardan Vardapet Arewelts'i, the renowned theologian and editor of the ancient

---

44 Kirakos Gandzakets'i, History of Armenia [Ջրաստանի պատմություն], ed. K.A. Melik-Ohanjanyan, Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1961, 348-355; note especially the miracle of the talking murals representing the Annunciation to the Blessed Virgin by the Archangel Gabriel.


46 For a history of Armenian pilgrimages to the Sinai, see M.E. Stone, Armenian Inscriptions from the Sinai (Armenian Texts and Studies 6), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
translations of the apocryphal writings on St. James, of which we spoke earlier. He visited Jerusalem in 1239/40, and on his return to Armenia he was urged by Catholicos Kostandin I Bardzerberdts'i (in office 1221-1267) to stay at the Cilician capital Hromklay, where he lodged for five years (1241-1246). There he became the most trusted friend of the Catholicos and was commissioned by King Het'um I (1226-1269) to write a grammar. At Hromklay, Arewelts'i became acquainted with Garnets'i, whose fame had compelled the Catholicos to invite him there earlier. The two guests had a close relationship at Hromklay, till Garnets'i's death and burial there in 1245. Arewelts'i returned to Armenia, where he was a highly sought after teacher for years and at various monasteries (especially Khor Virap, where he died in 1271). He went on to translate and to write several treatises on diverse subjects, as well as prayers and hymns; but it is in his biblical commentaries that we are apt to discern some influence of the Jerusalem pilgrimage.

To be sure, very few of the numerous learned pilgrim clerics in Jerusalem are known to have authored a work while there. Most are like Garnets'i and Arewelts'i's pupil, Hovhannès Erznkats'i (ca.1240-1293). The latter refers to his pilgrimage to the Holy City in the "Preface" to his Compilation of Commentary on Grammar [Արտաքիզե արձանիչների բանասիրական]. Like his teacher, Erznkats'i had been to Jerusalem in the year 1281 and, like him, upon his return through Cilicia he was persuaded by Catholicos Hakob I Klayets'i (in office 1267-1286), nicknamed Gitnakan ("Scholar") and known for his command of the Scriptures and patronage of learning, to teach grammar to fellow ecclesiastics; and this led to the production of the book. It would be wrong, however, to

47 Jerusalem mss 657, 13-120; 857, 243-316; text published by L. Khach'eryan, Vardan Arewelts'i, Commentary on Grammar [Արտաքիզե արձանիչների բանասիրական]. Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1972. Arewelts'i also wrote another, shorter grammar upon the request of T'oros K'ahanay, the nephew of the Catholicos (cited by Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 296).

disregard the likely influence Jerusalem must have had on the later homilies by Erznkats’i.

The most prominent of these pilgrim scholars is perhaps Grigor Tat’ewats’i (ca. 1344-1409), the renowned dean of the monastic school at Tat’ew, who was ordained as a priest in Jerusalem in 1371 by his mentor and fellow pilgrim, the equally voluminous Hovhannès Orontets’i / Ōrbelian (1315-1387). Another of Orontets’i’s pupils, Grigor Vardapet Khlat’ets’i / Tserents’ (ca. 1350-1425) spent three years in Jerusalem (1403-1405) where, upon his arrival, he completed his very contemporary History of the Conquests of Tamerlane [Զարդշթանի աշխարհագրությունը], in verse.49 The inspiration these and other writers drew from Jerusalem for their subsequent works could be demonstrated; such an exposition of their writings, however, is beyond the limits of this article. Suffice it to say that some of these pilgrim scholars must have left copies of their works in the local library, and subsequent copies were made there from these originals or near-originals; others must have left behind one or another of their most cherished manuscripts.50

Other writers could be mentioned: from the 16th and early 17th centuries, Tadé Tokhat’ets’i (ca. 1540-1602), the author of Ode on the Passion of the Lord [Տիրուանքի երթ], describing the Easter celebrations at Jerusalem and dwelling on the festival of the Holy Light;51 Nersès Vardapet Mokats’i (ca. 1575-1625), who on a visit in 1609 wrote his Lament over the Fall of Jerusalem [Երազմության մհերատ],52 Panegyric on the Ascension of the Bearer of God [Գահասպանության պատմությունը] (later expanded by his pupil Step’anos Shatakhet’si), and possibly also his Ode for the Third Day of Transfiguration [Ուղղության երրորդ օր],53 and Catholicos


50 A scholar who fits this profile is Grigor Vardapet Archishets’i, who likewise spent three years in Jerusalem (1480-1483), teaching the Gospel of Luke; this according to a colophon in the textbook used by him: Commentary on the Gospel of Luke by Bishop Ignatius, a vardapet at the monastery of Shap’ir in Sew Ler, ca. 1130 (Jerusalem ms 352, dated 1272; Bogharian, Grand Catalogue, II:249); cf. Aghawnuni, Brotherhood and Visitors, 94-95.

51 Partial text in Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 480-481.

52 Cf. the earlier Lament over Jerusalem by Catholicos Grigor IV Tghay, upon the city’s fall to Salah ad-Din in 1187.

53 Bogharian, Armenian Writers, 489-490.
Movses III Tat'ewats'i (in office 1629-1633), who previously had spent five years in Jerusalem (1605-1611) and who is known for his hortatory pastorals and encyclicals.

Jerusalem, however, was not without its native scholars in this period. To a certain Grigor Yerusalghemats'i (flourished ca. 1200) is attributed the earliest Armenian glossary of philosophical terms and concepts: the Philosophical Definitions [Անվանական Փոստորոպտային էսաներ] in its earliest recension (a), preserved in the oldest surviving manuscript of this work, Erevan ms 6897 (dated 1317), fols. 397v-410r. In the crude compilation of this recension there is no alphabetical arrangement beyond the initial letter of the entries. In a later recension (b), represented in Jerusalem ms 1213 (dated 1635-1636), pp. 155-181, and showing a more refined alphabetical arrangement with some additional entries, we are inclined to see the result of a redaction that may have been pursued in Jerusalem during the intervening years. The compiler's name was lost in the meantime. Consequently, several late manuscripts (including the Jerusalem manuscript) wrongly attribute the work to the Neoplatonist philosopher Dawit', whose Philosophical Definitions [Անվանական Փոստորոպտային էսաներ] bears close resemblance to the title of the glossary, Philosophical Definitions [Անվանական Փոստորոպտային էսաներ]; hence the confusion. To this same lexicographer and etymologist belong two other compilations: one entitled Various Definitions, Drawn up by Saints and Advanced Doctors [Անվանական Փոստորոպտային էսաներ վավերական այս աշխատությունը], gleaned from the writings of the philosopher Dawit' and Saint Gregory of Nyssa; the other entitled The Fundamental[s] of Philosophy [Անվանական Փոստորոպտային էսաներ].

A less well-known figure is Grigoris Vardapet Pilisop'ay, a member of the

54 Ibid., 508-511.


56 The first of these compilations is preserved in a number of manuscripts in Erevan (ms 464, 1980, 2041, 2269, 2771, 3082, 4166, 5254, 5443, 8132); of the second a fragment only, in a 13th-century philosophical and theological anthology at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (ms 303). See F. Macler, Catalogue des manuscrits arméniens et géorgiens de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1908, 155-156.
Jerusalem brotherhood and grand sacristan of St. James, named in a colophon of a local manuscript (ms 67, Commentary on the Catholic Epistles [St."fumphwqnhwqnrh], by Sargis Vardapet) dated 1424.  

III

Prominent scribes who likewise came as pilgrims to Jerusalem also stayed there for a while and contributed the fruit of their penmanship to the local churches, besides doing so for their respective patrons. Some seventy scribes and / or illuminators are known by name during the most productive years of 1300-1600.

To my knowledge, the earliest extant manuscript copied in Jerusalem is by the scribe and binder Hovhan, a collection of homilies [qwnkwnhwp] of the year 1215 (Venice ms 204). In the colophon he refers to the Theotokos Church (Surb Astsatsatsin) built by Géorg K’ahanay between Jerusalem and Bethlehem and the solitary life there of Géorg’s nephew, the recipient of the manuscript, the hermit Hovhannès.

In the early 14th century, codices were copied at a number of places in and around St. James, such as at the monastery (later, convent) by the Church of the Holy Archangels, located within the walls near Zion Gate, and at the monastery by the Church of the Holy Savior, on the traditional Mount Zion outside Zion Gate and immediately south of the St. James compound. Sufficient data may be gathered from the published colophons of 14th-century manuscripts. In one such publication there are sixteen colophons from as many manuscripts, penned in Jerusalem by fourteen different scribes.  

Foremost among them is Step’anos Yerkayn (active 1295-1327), who seems to have spent two terms in the Holy City — judging from the colophons of the seven surviving manuscripts by him. The first of these manuscripts was penned at the Monastery of the Illuminator on Mount Sepuh (1295), the next two at the Holy Archangels in Jerusalem (1314, 1316), the following two at Drazark (1318, 1921), the next one again at Jerusalem, at St. James (1321/2), and the last

57 See Aghawnuni, Brotherhood and Visitors, 103.

58 Colophon in Hovsep’ian, Colophons, no. 346; Aghawnuni, Brotherhood and Visitors, 347-348, and the references there; cf. 357, on the work of the scribe Hovhannès Sanahnetts’i in 1311. These manuscripts are not accounted for by Stone in his history of scribal activity in Jerusalem ("The Manuscript Library," 27-28).

again at Drazark (1327). Another such scribe who made repeated visits to Jerusalem is Vardan Baberds'i or Gririmts'i (ca. 1310-1380). He was determined to return to Jerusalem after having made a pilgrimage from Ghrim (= the Crimea); following his return he spent twelve years at St. James and became a bishop (1363-1374). His colophons describe the hardships under the Mamluks (1365-1369), when the Frankish remnants were expelled from Jerusalem and their churches shut — including the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (the gate of which was walled for some time). The Armenian clergy were also persecuted, and some were “martyred” in 1367 (the colophons of Matenadaran ms 7091 and Jerusalem ms 122 are noteworthy). A scribe named Manuel praises the virtue of the Patriarch Basilios (in office 1341-1356) in a colophon of the year 1352, at the end of Matenadaran ms 2233, *The Preaching of Bartholomew* [Բարթոլոմյան Հոգենք].

Step'anos K'ahanay, a little-known scribe from the early 15th century, wrote an inspiring poem entitled *In Praise of This Book* [Ուկտագան գրգրու] at the end of a local compilation of biblical interpretations by Grigor Tat'ewats'i, in the year 1411 (Jerusalem ms 1128). Ghazar Gririmts'i, a more prominent cleric and scribe (active 1419-1437), resided in Jerusalem for a while. One of the nine extant, massive codices by this attested teacher of calligraphy was copied at the scriptorium of the Holy Savior monastery in 1426 (Jerusalem ms 1988). The colophon of this Psalmody mentions a number of local persons who were in one way or another helpful in the production of the codex, beginning with the

---

60 Bogharian, *Armenian Scribes*, 115-124 gives present-day locations of the seven manuscripts. Those of the years 1314 and 1316 have long been assumed to be the earliest dated manuscripts penned in Jerusalem (the first, a Hymnal, is ms 121 of the Lewis Collection in the Free Library of Philadelphia; the second, a Lectionary for the patriarch of the day, Dawit', is Jerusalem ms 271).

61 *Ibid.*, 163-174; cf. Vardan’s colophons in Jerusalem ms 30 and Erevan ms 5557. Equally significant is the colophon of Venice ms 222, where the scribe Nersès Krakts'i, writing in Jerusalem in 1335, describes the recent Mamluk invasion of Cilicia and the massacre and exile of Armenians. He repeatedly expresses fear that the same might soon happen in Jerusalem, and he hopes against hope that there will be a Frankish intervention. His fears came true, as the colophons by Vardan Baberds'i indicate. Cf. Jerusalem ms 282 for an earlier colophon (1331) by Krakts'i, naming fellow monastics at the scriptorium of Holy Archangels (Bogharian, *Grand Catalogue*, II:99-100).


63 Published by Bogharian, *Grand Catalogue*, IV:197-198. The date of this manuscript is significant, given the fact that Tat'ewats'i died in 1409.
Bishop Melk’iset’ who provided the material. Another contemporary cleric and scribe who stayed in Jerusalem for at least a couple of years is Grigor Elmeli’ents’ (active 1427-1441). Of the eight extant manuscripts by him, the last three were copied in Jerusalem during the years 1439-1441 (Ancyra ms 312; Antelias ms 84; Venice ms 974). Grigor was also an illuminator and binder of manuscripts.

Three more scribes from the 15th century may be mentioned: T’adéos Kronawor or Sarkawag, the copyist of Jerusalem ms 2149, *A Book of Anthems* [*9awdyanhp*] of the year 1449 penned at Holy Savior, and Aleppo ms 23, a Gospel copied partly in Jerusalem and partly at the hermitage of Mar Saba in the Judaean desert; Soghomon, a pilgrim scribe and a newly-ordained priest at St. Savior, is the copyist of a much-prized Gospel of the year 1475 (Jerusalem ms 1943, with illuminations by a certain Hovhannës) and the author of a colophon narrating the Armenians’ loss of Golgotha to the Georgians in 1476 and the immediate appeal to the sultan, who permitted the Armenians to build a new stairway to the sacred place; and Martiros Pursats‘i, Patriarch of Jerusalem (in office 1491-1501). On an earlier visit to the Holy City (1463-64) Martiros completed the copy and illumination of an equally prized Gospel (Jerusalem ms 2567) as well as the illumination of a Synaxarion (Jerusalem ms 27), both at Holy Savior.

---


66 The end-gatherings of this manuscript contain a portion of the *Mystagogical Catechises* attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem (bishop 349-386) and / or to his successor, John of Jerusalem (bishop 386-417). The text in three columns on four folia is in uncials (*erkat'agir*) and has been described briefly by Bogharian, *Grand Catalogue*, VII:201.

67 Colophon provided by Aghawunami, who also equates the identity of the scribe with the scribe of the Jerusalem manuscript (*Brotherhood and Visitors*, 148-149).

68 Narkiss, *Armenian Art Treasures*, 89, 94-95, 152; Bogharian, *Grand Catalogue*, VI:488-491; colophon also in Aghawunami, *Brotherhood and Visitors*, 475. Apparently, the alternate stairway to Golgotha is the winding one, on the south side. The fact that Golgotha was an Armenian chapel is attested in other colophons, e.g., Jerusalem ms 1973 with its colophon of the year 1396, by Oshin Khanut'pan, donating the Gospel “to the sacred site of Golgotha” (*ibid.*, 514).

The scribes of the 16th and 17th centuries are numerous, as are also the restorers of manuscripts during these centuries. The colophons by these restorers are no less significant than those by the original scribes, for they also recount contemporary events. Suffice it to mention five scribes and/or restorers from this period. Mik'ayel K'ahanay was a talented poet besides being a scribe. Two of his poems, one in onomastic acrostics, appear at the end of a prayerbook copied by him locally in 1583 (Jerusalem ms 1915). Bishop Astatsatur Taront'si was active in Jerusalem during the years 1581-1594. Several colophons attribute to him the restoration of a number of manuscripts (chronologically: Jerusalem mss 1784, 27, 1272, 1924, 265, 331, 1987, 332, 1339, 503, 345) and the penmanship of some others (Jerusalem mss 1974 and 1597, both containing Psalms; cf. Matenadaran ms 2578, a miscellany compiled, in part, in Jerusalem). And from the 17th century three more bear mentioning: Melkis'et K'ahanay Mokatsi, active in Jerusalem from 1628-1635 (Jerusalem mss 1567, 1576, and 2672); his compatriot, Step'anos Yerets' Mokatsi, active there from 1625-1639 (Jerusalem mss 1483, 2381, 1567, 2352, 1733 [in Bethlehem], and Isfahan ms 514; thereafter, in 1641, we find Step'anos in Van: Jerusalem ms 1980); and Hovhannes K'ahanay Khizantsi, a prolific scribe and illuminator, active in Jerusalem from 1625 until his death sometime after 1663 (Jerusalem mss 2515, 1829, 1945, 2659, 1919, 2175, 2639, 2668, 1438, 984, 2651, 1549, 2013, 2608, 2613, 355, 2665, 15, 2596, 1403, 2652 [the latter four were penned in Bethlehem], and Erevan ms 1256).


71 Bogharian, *Armenian Scribes*, 249-253. A lesser contemporary was Martiros K'ahanay Khizantsi, the primary copyist of ms 1920, a Synaxarion of the year 1591. Bogharian mistakenly refers to the latter as Mattos, 253.

72 Five other manuscripts have reached us from his two visits to his native Khizan, in 1644 and 1649–1650 (Jerusalem mss 2631, 1969, 2203, 2286, 3904); *ibid.*, 336–341. Khizantsi seems to have followed in the footsteps of two earlier — though less prolific — scribes and illuminators from Khizan who preceded him to Jerusalem: Sargs K'ahanay Khizantsi (ca.1500-1572), who left behind a colorful calendar of feasts or "Lesser Synaxarion" [*Σεμισματα*] penned and illuminated at St. James (Jerusalem ms 2494); and Khach'atur K'ahanay Khizantsi (ca.1552-1608) known for two codices completed at St. James: a miscellany (Aleppo ms 117) and a Synaxarion (Jerusalem ms 1920). For details, see N. Tsokakan (=Archbishop
Later restorers have often used the blank folia of earlier manuscripts to chronicle contemporary events, such as in Jerusalem ms 1920 (a Lectionary of the year 1591, written locally). The restorer recounts a night-time robbery of the monastery at Holy Savior, carried out by the nomadic Bedouins (p. 1208, dated 1692). In another, Jerusalem ms 251 (a Gospel of the year 1260, written in Hromklay and illuminated by Toros Roslin), a chronicler recounts on the final folio the manifold activities of the Patriarch Grigor VI, the Chainbearer (in office 1715-1749; an obituary by the Patriarch’s hand laments the loss of his assistant and historian of the city, Bishop Hovhannes [Hannë] Yerushaghémats’i (d. 1733); see ms 303; cf. ms 598 for another obituary of this distinguished man). In yet another Jerusalem ms (16, a local Lectionary of ca. 1600) a lengthy colophon details down to the year 1838 the tension between the Armenian and the Greek Churches and the aftermath of the fire that devastated the Holy Sepulchre Church in 1808 (pp. 1310-1313). The same colophon covers the 1831 political uprising that spread from Palestine to Transjordan and the efforts of Ibrahim Pasha in putting it down. Moreover, Jerusalem ms 83 (1821) gives a biographical history of the Ottoman vezirs from the 14th century through much of the eighteenth (1785), leaving the reader curious about the earlier sources of this constantly updated history. Jerusalem ms 3694 (1743-45) provides a local monastic chronicle for the years 1743-1745.

---


73 For more on Bishop Hannë’s *History of Holy Jerusalem* [Քաղաքին. Երուսաղեմ] and its various editions, see Aghawuni, *Brotherhood and Visitors*, 358-359. Several of the paintings in the St. James Cathedral are the work of this much loved bishop.


75 Of special interest is the biography of the seventy-fourth Vezir, Ermeni Siwleyman Pasha (in office 1654-1655; thereafter twice mayor of Constantinople). Text provided in the *Grand Catalogue*, l:272-273.

76 Kevork Hintlian, *History of the Armenians in the Holy Land*, Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1989 (2nd ed.), 61-62, invites attention to the several tombstone inscriptions at the Armenian cemetery on Mount Zion, by the old scriptorium at Holy Savior. Two of them are worth quoting: “Here rests / Ghewont of Van, the lover of letters, / The scribe / Who copied so many manuscripts / Both old and new; / Copied so many colophons. / And now, I left all
IV

The purpose of this study was not simply to provide information, but to stimulate further interest in the resources at St. James. Because the brevity of the original paper was one consideration in this survey, I have relegated considerable information to the notes. Also, in my coverage of the last centuries I have by no means exhausted the parade of learned clerics with some writing to their credit. Still, this part of the survey provides a fair sampling of the narrow range and limited variety of their contributions. The opposite is true, however, for the earlier centuries, where the writers considered are somewhat diverse and quite far apart in time.

Beginning with the first document written in Jerusalem, we have seen how indirectly it invites attention to the 5th-century Armenian translation of the Lectionary, which follows the early liturgical tradition in Jerusalem. Amongst the many pilgrim clerics, we have encountered a few local writers who with their works are seldom mentioned or anthologized. Notwithstanding their liturgical concerns, monastic accomplishments, and pilgrimages in the Byzantine period, the Cilician Kingdom provided the Armenians a wider door to the Holy Land, a door through which many more learned clerics came bearing their gifts of various sorts — both material and non-material. Unfortunately, however, there never developed a particular school of thought peculiar to Jerusalem, except perhaps one to be noted for meditations on sacred sites, an appreciable literature in praise of Jerusalem.

As indicated, the earliest extant manuscript copied in Jerusalem is a collection of homilies [8unpluhp] of the year 1215 (Venice ms 204), and it may well be the only surviving Armenian manuscript copied in 13th-century Jerusalem. Consequently, the literary environment that may have existed there before the 14th century cannot be reconstructed from an inventory of the kinds of manuscripts copied locally. Moreover, most manuscripts include several works by different authors, and writings that are often centuries apart; they cannot always be an adequate representation of the intellectual environment that produced them. Nor can the relation between these writers be established in such a way as to show contact and continuity of thought. Most of the local writing was done because certain scribes or recipients preferred this or that work, mostly of re-

these behind. / My love — manuscripts / I leave all these, O Father, / As my testament"; another has: "This is the refuge of the just. / Sing Alleluia / For the binder / Of holy books, / For the monk Mekhit'ar."
stricted scope and use.

Nonetheless, there remain abundant resources, so long treasured at St. James, that have not as yet been fully considered when writing the history of the Armenian community in medieval Jerusalem. The now complete Grand Catalogue of the St. James manuscripts collection provides much of the necessary information for such an undertaking, not only for the history of the Armenian community in particular but also for some of the history of the medieval city of which the Armenian community has always been a substantial part.

Khorenats‘i and Eastern Historiography of the Hellenistic Period

In book I of his *History of the Armenians*, entitled “Genealogy of Greater Armenia”, Movses Khorenats‘i stresses the ancient origin of his people by following certain historiographical or literary forms found also in the national histories of Eastern writers who were influenced by Greek historians: e.g., Berossus in his *Babylonian History* (early 3rd century BC), Manetho in his *Egyptian History* (3rd century BC), Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities* along with its *Apology* or *Against Apion* (1st century AD), and Philo of Byblos in his *Phoenician History* (AD 64-141). In their reaction to Greek civilization and response to Greek historians, thought to be poorly informed about ancient cultures, these Eastern authors, writing in Greek, resorted to apologetic histories of their distinctive antiquity with the conviction that the older the origin of a nation, the greater the superiority of its civilization. It is rather surprising that Book I of the *History of the Armenians* by Khorenats‘i has not been studied alongside these works which he must have encountered in Eusebius of Caesarea — his primary source for much of the antiquity transmitted by him — even though his overwhelming dependence on Eusebius has long been established.

Except for the works of Josephus, which survive in their entirety, the works

---

1 One part of this study was presented as a lecture at Columbia University, for the Department of Middle East and Asian Languages and Cultures, 25 April 1991, under the title “Khorenats‘i and the Myth of Ancient Archives in Eastern Historiography”. Another part was presented as a paper at the International Conference on the 1500th Anniversary of the *History of the Armenians* by Movses Khorenats‘i, held in New York City, 20-22 May 1992, under the title “The Historiographical Emphasis on Antiquity in Khorenats‘i”. The two parts are synthesized and expanded here.

of these Hellenized writers survive only in part, as considerable excerpts preserved mostly in the works of Eusebius. Eusebius' *Chronicon*, which survives only in a Latin translation by Jerome and an Armenian translation known to Khorenats’i, is our best source for both Manetho and Berossus, and his *Praeparatio Evangelica* for Philo of Byblos. Thus it was in Eusebius where Khorenats’i must have read the fragmentary works of these writers and noted their apologetic commonplaces for a model. As for his use of Judaeo-Greek writers, this also was indirect, through Eusebius, the source for Josephus and his predecessors: the Alexandrian Jewish historians whose works were collected by Alexander Polyhistor, a Greek writer from Miletus, in the 1st century BC and preserved in part

For these and other excerpts in later Greek chronographers, see especially F. Jacoby, ed., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 3 vols. in 16 parts, Berlin / Leiden: Brill, 1923-1958; (abbr. *ErgHist*) 3 C 680 for Berossus, 3 C 609 for Manetho, and 3 C 790 for Philo of Byblos; cf. C. Müller, ed., *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 5 vols., Paris: Firmin Didot, 1841-1872 (repr. 1928-1938; repr. Frankfurt, 1975); II:495-510 for Berossus, II:511-616 for Manetho, and III:560-576 for Philo of Byblos. Besides those transmitted by Eusebius, some of the older fragments are found also in one of his major sources, Josephus. Consequently, Khorenats’i’s use of Josephus also seems to be secondary, through the extracts in Eusebius (see the next two notes).

The *Chronicon* survives as a whole in a 5th-century Armenian translation from a revision of the first Greek text (published by J. Auffer, ed., *Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopi Chronicon Bipartitum*, 2 vols., Venice: San Lazzaro, 1818) and in an earlier Latin translation by Jerome. The Greek text survives in part in the *Chronicon* of George Synclerus (ca. 800). For a translation of the Armenian version of the *Chronicon*, see J. Karst, *Die Chronik des Eusebius aus dem armenischen übersetzt* (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 20), Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911. While there is no evidence for an Armenian translation of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* except for its likely use by Khorenats’i, he acknowledges the availability of Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica* in Armenian translation, attributed by him to the circle of Mesrop (Mashtots’) (2.10). This was translated from the Syriac version and not the Greek text: see W. Wright and N. McLean, eds., *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphili: Syriac Text. With a Collation of the Ancient Armenian Version by A. Merx*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1898; repr. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1975); also E. Preuschen, tr., *Eusebius Kirchengeschichte. Buch VI und VII aus dem armenischen übersetzt* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 22.3), Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902, who provides a poor translation of the two books now missing in the Syriac version (to supplement the earlier German translation of that deficient text). For the extant Armenian text, with Western Armenian translation, see A. Charian, *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius of Caesarea* (եՈւսեբեիսը Կեսարեացի Պամֆիլ Հայերեն Պատմություն), Venice: San Lazzaro, 1877.
in Book IX of Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica* (17-39). It is in their apologetic histories that Khorenats’i observed the linkage between biblical and non-biblical figures, especially in the extracts belonging to Eupolemus, Pseudo-Eupolemus, and Artapanus — the latter particularly. Khorenats’i names Polyhistor by translating his composite appellation as “Bazmavêp” (1.4) and refers to Berossus (1.2, 4, 6), Manetho (2.13) and Josephus (1.4; 2.10, 15, 26, 35) by name. Oddly enough, Khorenats’i refers to Eusebius but once, claiming that Mesrop (Mashtots’), the founder of the Armenian letters early in the 5th century, himself translated the *Historia Ecclesiastica* (2.10).

Thus, we ought to assess Book I of the *History of the Armenians* by Khorenats’i alongside the national histories of these Eastern writers with whom he was so thoroughly familiar — thanks to the lengthy excerpts in Eusebius. However, before we look closely at Khorenats’i alongside these Eastern authors, we ought to consider briefly the early development of the apologetic historiographical tradition in which they stand: the emergence of a peculiar, somewhat mythographical genre that lends itself just as much to literary as to historical criticism — if not more.

**Classical Historiography a Prerequisite**

In its most rudimentary form, the historiographical concern with ethnic or national antiquity has its origin in Classical Greek writings inspired by the Persian wars since the beginning of the 5th century BC. The authors of the early *Persica* wrote soon after the respective wars, without trying to cover prior his-

---


6 In addition to these three (from Judaea, Samaria, and Alexandria, respectively) Polyhistor accounts for ten other Jewish writers, excerpted in Book IX of the *Praeparatio* and comprising two-thirds of that book. Others are excerpted in Book X (Ps.-Hecataeus) and Book XIII (Aristobulus). Of the various editions of this collection, see especially C.R. Holladay, ed., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, Volume I: Historians* (Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations 20 = Pseudopigrapha Series 10), Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
tory except for the preludes to the stories of the wars. The earliest usage of the words *historia* (Ionic *historiē*) and *historeō* is in contexts of observation, curiosity, and personal experiences of contemporary events, and in the respective authors' participation in those events; i.e., eye-witness accounts of what one has learned or experienced, telling one's own story when inquiring about or searching for peoples, places, or things. An appropriate meaning of *historia* is conveyed by the German word *Zeitgeschichte*; it had little or no connotation of ancient history or of events in the distant past. In time, however, the Greek term came to be restricted to the study of the past; the inquiry shifting gradually from describing contemporary or recent events to probing into antiquity.

Quite instrumental in the emergence of Eastern history among the Greeks were the long-lost works of Hecataeus of Miletus (flourished ca. 500 BC), which were known to Herodotus later in the 5th century. What is left of Hecataeus' *Periegesis* or travel accounts gives to places etiological tags derived from experiences there. His only other work, the *Genealogia* (reminiscent of the first word in the title of Book I of Khorenats'i: "Genealogy of Greater Armenia" [αὕωναρμυαίων ἀνθρώπων Ἵθελε τοὺς] contained the often-repeated encounter with the Egyptian priests at Thebes who explained each of the 345 statues there as representing a *piromis* or a ruler who had served for one generation. Hecataeus was astounded by this since he could trace the human past only in terms of his Greek past in the Homeric epics: to sixteen generations or not long before the Trojan Wars (14th-13th centuries) when time began with the appearance of a god; but the Egyptian priests assured him that no god had appeared during all 345 generations (2.143).

A broader concept of history evolved with Herodotus' use of a variety of terms and categories in his overall work entitled *Histories*. Under this heading came primary and secondary accounts as *logoi*, catalogues of various deeds as *erga*, regnal years of Asian and other rulers as *chronologia*, genealogical tables embrac-

---


9 A similar episode is recorded by Plato regarding the lawgiver Solon, who was astounded by the antiquity of Egypt (*Timaeus* 22a-c; Plato introduces this subject as "archaic history").
ing theogonies, cosmogonies, king lists and the founding of cities introduced as genealogia, and their recounting — along with the utilization of existing texts and documents — as archaialogia. In this early development within the history of Greek historiography we find an ever-increasing recognition of lengthier chronologies, connections between events now seen as a whole, and appeals made to previously unknown documents and archives. Thucydides, a close contemporary to Herodotus, was the first to react negatively to this broad perspective of history that inquired into foreign customs, the investigation of ancient fables, or the indulgence of romantic storytelling. He dwelt upon the causes of the war between Athens and Sparta, a war in which he participated and which he considered “the greatest event in history”. Thus, the historiography of culture was considered a departure from the history of events, wars and the circumstances leading to their genesis. Interest in national histories however, persisted insofar as the Persian Empire kept threatening and expanding, and the contention with the Greeks continued — hence the later Persica.

Among these were the voluminous books by Ctesias, another late contemporary to Herodotus who thrived at the close of the 5th century. He began his account with the mythical founders of the Assyrian empire, Ninus and Semiramis, and tried to account for the deeds of the Assyrian, Median, and Persian monarchs to the seventh year of Artaxerxes II (397 BC). But Ctesias was familiar primarily — if not only — with Persia, having been a physician at the royal court for seventeen years and having accompanied Artaxerxes II at the battle of Cunaxa (401 BC). To accomplish his task Ctesias invented the vast majority of his sources, claiming to have used royal archives everywhere and to have seen and heard everything else that he reports. He elaborated on Herodotus, contradicted him almost throughout the coverage of Persia in the Histories, and attacked “the father of history” on every front. What is worse, Ctesias was believed and enjoyed unparalleled popularity for an author whose work is now lost — after his Persica was repeatedly abridged, even as late as in the 9th century by Photius the Patriarch of Constantinople.11


11 Note the following allusion to Ctesias by Lucian of Samosata, a 2nd-century AD Greek satirist: “The historian’s sole task is to tell the tale as it happened. This he cannot do as long as he is afraid of Artaxerxes when he is his physician or hopes to get . . . a reward for the eulogies in his work” (Historia [How to Write History] 39; Eng. trans., K. Kilburn in the Loeb Classical
Thus, something very significant happened in the history of Greek historiography at the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 4th centuries. It could be summed up as follows: by extending the scope of the Histories and by broadening the meaning of historia to include his method of gathering information on the East, Herodotus made the historiographical discipline vulnerable to incredible stories such as those told by Ctesias, Xenophon, and others. Thereafter, Greek historians like Hecataeus of Abdera toward the end of the 4th century, Megas-thenes early in the 3rd, and others following the conquests of Alexander the Great, perpetuated the fascination with the East by writing somewhat fancifully on the antiquity of distant nations.

**Hellenistic Historiography a Requisite**

A century after Ctesias, Eastern writers took note of the numerous and conflicting statements among the Greek historians that were not always complimentary to the East. They accused Greek historians of misrepresentation and went on to claim that their own traditions were the source of Greek learning. Their resentment was further heightened by their dis-enchantment with the Greek hegemony under the successors of Alexander the Great, even though they at times flattered these monarchs for ruling such ancient lands. Consequently, in their reaction — if not "religious resistance" — to Greek civilization and in their efforts to correct certain misconceptions in the Greek accounts of Eastern history, several Easterners, writing in Greek, resorted to apologetic histories of their origin and greatness. The following lines of Josephus are illustrative of

---


12 Drews, 77-84, 103-121.


the sentiments these writers entertained regarding the Greek historians of earlier times: "Surely, then, it is absurd that the Greeks should be so conceited as to think themselves the sole possessors of a knowledge of antiquity and the only accurate reporters of its history." He adds: "While, then, for eloquence and literary ability we must yield the palm [branch] to the Greek historians, we have no reason to do so for veracity in the history of antiquity, least of all where the particular history of each separate foreign nation is concerned." (Ag Ap 1.15,27) In between these statements Josephus is quick to point out the existence of discrepancies in the Greek historians. He attributes these inconsistencies to the early negligence of the Greeks to keep official records of current events, thus creating a total lack of documentary evidence. A second reason for discrepancies is said to be the Greeks' regard for style rather than accuracy.

Greek ethnography with its bewilderment by Eastern antiquity thus paved the way for a historiographical development among ethnic respondents who felt the need to prove that they were more ancient than the Greeks. Consequently, there emerged a whole new genre of apologetic historiography. This genre, related to Greek rhetorical historiography, is defined as "the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group's own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world." The genre seems to have been well in place before the 1st century BC — before the histories of Josephus and Philo of Byblos. They had the histories of Berossus and Manetho before them, just as these two had access to the histories of sympathetic Greek

---

15 Cf. the similar chastisement of the early Armenian kings in Khorenats‘i (1.3; 3.1).
16 Patristic writers dwelt heavily on these statements of Josephus in their favoring the older and hence more reliable Hebrew tradition over the Greek; see M.E. Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius* (Brown Judaic Studies 128), Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989, 9 and 94-95.
17 The early ethnic respondents' works seem to have had considerable effect on later Greek historians such as Diodorus Siculus (1st century BC), judging from his *Bibliotheca historica* in forty books, the first third of which treats the mythic history of non-Hellenic tribes, including Egyptian religion and Mesopotamian history. Note the following: "With respect to the antiquity of the human race, not only do the Greeks put forth their claims but many of the barbarians as well, all holding that it is they who are autochthonous and the first of all men to discover the things which are of use in life, and that it was the events of their own history which were the earliest to be held worthy of record." (Bibliotheca historica, 1.9.3.)
writers like Megasthenes and Hecataeus of Abdera. Moreover, Josephus also had the works of several earlier Hellenistic Jewish respondents whose fragmentary Greek writings, as pointed out earlier, likewise survive in Eusebius. Following in the footsteps of their predecessors, Josephus and other Hellenized Jewish writers, like his early contemporary Philo of Alexandria, went so far in their apology as to claim that Greek legislators and philosophers — along with Babylonian, Egyptian, and Phoenician sages — obtained their wisdom from Moses, the lawgiver of the Hebrews.19 Other ethnic respondents, like the wise man Calasiris in the Aethiopica of Heliodorus, asserted that Homer was fathered by Hermes-Toth in Thebes (3.14; cf. 2.34). Similarly, according to Athenaeus in the Deipnosophistae, Meleager of Gadara, a 2nd-century BC philosopher of Syrian origin, “claimed in his work The Graces that Homer was a Syrian by birth” (4.157a-b).20 Phoenician or Syrian descent was also claimed for Thales and Pythagoras.21

Berossus, a priest of Bel or Marduk at Babylon, is the earliest of these Easterners who wrote in Greek and whose works survive in part in Eusebius’s Chronicon. Berossus’ Chaldæa or Babylonica in three books was dedicated to Antiochus I (285-261 BC) when he became sole ruler of the Seleucid Kingdom in 281

19 The testimony by Hecataeus of Abdera about the Egyptian ties of Moses and the derivation of Jewish civilization from the Egyptian (Diodorus, Bibliotheca, 40.3.1-8; cf. 1.94.1-2) was countered by Jewish writers claiming that the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt is responsible for much of Egypt’s civilization. Artapanus, e.g., claimed that Abraham taught the Egyptians astrology, Joseph taught them finance and the use of measures, and Moses invented the weapons and the war machines of the Egyptian army, commanded a force of 100,000 men, and waged war successfully for ten years in Ethiopia (FGrHist 726 FF 1-3 = Eusebius, Praep Ev 9.18.1; 23.1-4; 27.1-37; Holladay, Fragments, 204-225). An extreme claim by Artapanus is that Moses invented the hieroglyphs and taught the Egyptians how to plough (ibid.); cf. Eupolemus, who claims that Moses is the “first wise man” who invented the alphabet and the written laws, which the Phoenicians learned from the Jews, and the Greeks from the Phoenicians (FGrHist 723 F 1a-b = Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, 1.23.153.4 and Eusebius, Praep Ev 9.26.1; Holladay, Fragments, 112-113). The Phoenician origin of the Greek alphabet was granted by several Greek historians, beginning with Herodotus (Histories, 5.58; cf. Ephorus of Cyme, FGrHist 70 F 105). For more on this theme in later Jewish writers, see Philo of Alexandria, Quaestiones in Exodum, 2.9; De confusione linguarum, 141; De specialibus legisibus, IV.60-61; Quod omnis probus liber sit, 57, and especially his De vita Mosis; Josephus, Ag Ap 1.1-5; 2.168; cf. Ps.-Demosithenes, Against Stephanus, 2.6-7; Against Eubulides, 4; Against Leochares, 55.

20 For more on this tendency, see M. Hadas, Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion, NY: Columbia University Press / London: Oxford University Press, 1959, 83-104.

21 Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, 1.62.2-4; cf. Herodotus, Histories, 1.170.
BC. Book I dealt with origins to the Flood, Book II extended to Nabonassar (747 BC), and Book III to the death of Alexander (323 BC). The Babylonian author was eager to dismiss the Semiramis legend invented by Ctesias whereby she emerges as the founder of Babylon.²² Aware of the antiquity of Egypt and the fascination of certain Greek writers with the civilization of the Nile valley, Berossus took his earliest authority to 432,000 years before the Flood, to the first year of the reign of Alorus, who received a revelation regarding the creation of the world from a semi-human creature named Oannes. As Burstein observes: "By identifying Aloros and his successors as Chaldeans Berossus established a link between the Chaldeans of his day and the pre-Flood kings."²³ Berossus went far beyond elaborating allegorically on his possible source, a version of Enuma Elish, the Babylonian creation account from antiquity. For Greeks whose recorded history did not begin until the Trojan Wars of the 14th-13th centuries BC, this was too much — if not altogether unbelievable. No wonder that they made no use of it until the abridgement of Berossus by Alexander Polyhistor in the 1st century BC, and often dubbed Berossus and his like as "barbarian".²⁴ It must be noted that not until Book III of his History can correlation between him and the Babylonian Chronicles be made.²⁵ Even then, "no greater obstacle exists to the proper understanding of Berossus' book than the insistence that it was primarily a history."²⁶

²² Legendary writings on Babylonian history abound in a number of other Classical authors, including Herodotus and Xenophon, and in Hellenistic compilers like Diodorus Siculus and Claudius Ptolemaus.


²⁴ Yet Berossus may be seen as following in the footsteps of Megasthenes (flourished ca. 300-280), a Greek in the Seleucid realm who was enchanted by Indian philosophy. For the general attitude of Hellenistic chronographers to Eastern traditions, see B.Z. Wacholder, Eupolemus: A Study of Judaic-Greek Literature (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 3), Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1974, 97-121.


²⁶ Burstein, 6 (SANE 1:148); cf. p. 8 (SANE 1:150): "In the past Berossus has usually been viewed as a historian and considered as such his performance must be pronounced inadequate. Even in its present fragmentary state the Babyloniaca contains a number of surprising errors of simple fact of which, certainly, the most flagrant is the statement that Nabopolassar
Like Berossus and not long thereafter, Manetho wrote his *Aegyptiacae*, also in three books, corresponding to the recognized threefold division of the thirty-one Egyptian dynasties into old, middle, and new kingdoms, and likewise dedicated it to his monarch, Ptolemy II (285-246 BC). By virtue of the long-standing antiquity of Egypt and the mostly favorable testimonies of Greek historians, he was able to cover with relative ease — so it seems — the history of Egypt from mythical times to 323 BC. In his role as a priest of the Serapis temple at Sebennytus (today’s Samannud in the Delta, on the west bank of the Damietta branch of the Nile) and later perhaps as high priest at Heliopolis, he must have had vast archival resources at his disposal. Unfortunately, however, in what is preserved of his writings we do not have any statement regarding his sources, except for a vague claim to have consulted the “sacred records”, a claim suggesting a greater reliability than that of the Greek writers on Egypt.\(^{27}\) The following assessment in Waddell’s introduction to Manetho in the Loeb Classical Library edition is not surprising in light of the fact that the line of demarcation between mythology and ancient history is blurred: “It is hardly to be expected, however, that Manetho’s *History* should possess more worth than that of his sources; and the material at his disposal included a certain proportion of unhistorical traditions and popular legends.”\(^{28}\) Waddell sees the works of Berossus and Manetho as revealing the rivalry between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, each dynasty

ruled Egypt. Beyond revealing such slips, the fragments allow no doubt that Berossus offered only the most superficial explanations of the events he recorded . . . In a historian such flaws would be damming, but then Berossus’ purpose was not historical, it was apologetic.” The fine introduction and notes of this latest edition of Berossus yield numerous insights for our assessment of Khorenats’i as well (in 1.6 Khorenats’i wrongly ascribes to Berossus a quotation from the *Oracula Sibyllina*).

\(^{27}\) Manetho may be seen as following in the footsteps of Hecataeus of Abdera (flourished 321-304 BC), a Greek in the Ptolemaic realm enthused by Egyptian antiquity. His lost history of Egypt, written upon the request of Ptolemy I (323-285 BC), is preserved in part in Diodorus Siculus (*Bibliotheca*, 1.10-98). Like Hecataeus of Miletus before him (and Herodotus as well), Hecataeus of Abdera underscores the superiority of Egyptian civilization because of its antiquity, and acknowledges the Greeks’ appropriation of Egyptian culture. Along with his personal observations, he claims to have used the sacred archives of Egypt (*FRHist* 3 A 264 F 25).

seeking to proclaim the greater antiquity of its land.\textsuperscript{29}

Thoroughly familiar with the works of Manetho and Berossus, and those of his Jewish predecessors, Josephus likewise writes in a manner that “it will appear to all the Greeks worthy of their study,” as he declares in the preface to his \textit{Antiquities of the Jews}. He insists on the antiquity — and therefore the reliability — of his sources and his faithful handling of the Scriptures (\textit{Ant} 1.5). But while he claims to follow “the Hebrew records”, he simply paraphrases the Septuagint in Hellenistic categories, hoping that reading his paraphrase would take the place of reading the Septuagint. And though he promises to follow the precise details of the Scriptures only, “neither adding nor omitting anything” (\textit{Ant} 1.17; cf. 10.218), he punctuates his account with extra-biblical legends. And when he comes to summarize his observations on the Law, he realizes that he may be reproached by fellow countrymen who read his work for “having gone astray” with his insertions (\textit{Ant} 4.197).\textsuperscript{30} As he traces Jewish history to creation, he acknowledges the special place of Egyptian wisdom and distinctive elements in Babylonian and Phoenician civilizations, including their ancient records; however, by underscoring the greater antiquity of his culture, he makes other great cultures derivative from it. In the spirit of the encounter and conflict between Jewish and Hellenistic thought, he draws on testimonies in the writings of his Eastern predecessors as well as the writings of Greek historians as he elaborates on the biblical tradition, persistently maintaining the greater antiquity of the Jewish people in his \textit{Antiquities} and, more apologetically, in his \textit{Against Apion}.\textsuperscript{31}

Philo of Byblos, writing early in the 2nd century AD, declares his intention clearly: he writes to correct the errors perpetuated by the Greeks who were ignorant of Phoenician names and were “misled by the ambiguity of translation” (\textit{Frag.} 2B [=\textit{Praep Ev} 1.10.8]). Philo must be referring to succession lists of Phoenician kings such as the one said to have been translated from the archives

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Ibid.}, \textit{x}. Writing for the Seleucid and Ptolemaic monarchs respectively and relying on their Greek predecessors Megasthenes and Hecataeus of Abdera, both Berossus and Manetho criticized Herodotus for inaccuracy as they went about making their case for greater antiquity.

\textsuperscript{30} Most of his additions, to be sure, have no parallels in ancient Judaism; however, most of his omissions on Moses are likewise omitted in Philo of Alexandria’s \textit{De vita Mosis}, suggesting that both authors were following an established apologetic tradition on Moses (fragmentary evidence of which is found in earlier Judaico-Greek writers). Philo also makes declarations like those of Josephus.

\textsuperscript{31} For a list of these ancient testimonies cited by Josephus, see the “Appendix” by W. Whiston in the updated edition of \textit{The Works of Josephus}, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987, 891-894.
of Tyre by Menander of Ephesus or Pergamon, on whom Josephus depends heavily for synchronizing the Hebrew and Phoenician kings (Ant 8.144-146; cf. 9.283 and Ag Ap 1.116-127). The tradition of archives may also lie at the basis of other Phoenician histories by Laitus (Mochus), Dius, Hestiaeus, Hieronymus of Egypt, and Claudius Iolaus. Consequently, for a more reliable translation Philo turns purportedly to a native authority who lived prior to the Trojan War: Sanchuniathon, who in turn discovered rather miraculously the writings of Taautos, the first man of learning under the sun. These contained information about the origin of the world and of the living beings, the origins of religion and civilization, and the deification of early kings and inventors in Phoenicia among other things. The mythical nature of Philo’s work had always been recognized by scholars familiar with classical studies in spite of the discovery since 1929 of the Ugaritic texts at Ras Shamra on the coast of northern Syria, which seemed to offer some resemblances to his prosopography and thereby some credibility to his claims among an increasing number of orientalists in the decade following the discovery. The latest editors of the fragments of Philo’s Phoenician History, however, rightly state: “Our own position on the central issue of the authenticity of Philo’s alleged ancient sources is somewhat more skeptical than the prevailing scholarly consensus.” Eusebius mentions several lost works by Philo of

32 FGrHist 3 C 783.
33 FGrHist 3 C 784-788.
Byblos, among them one with a dubious title, *Ethothion*, and another, with an equally incredulous title, *Incredible History*. In yet another work, *On the Jews*, of which two fragments survive (in Origen and in Eusebius), Philo offers a different explanation of his access to the Taautos traditions (the name itself a form of the Egyptian Thoth). 36

**A Genre for Khorenats'i**

In their efforts to correct and to inform the Greeks, the Eastern writers were inevitably caught in a rivalry for antiquity among themselves, some trying to outdo the others with their often exaggerated antiquity. 37 In the meantime a genre had been established, one with which Khorenats'i was well acquainted. Despite the divergences of language and the considerably different character of Books II-III of the *History of Armenia*, and the fact that Khorenats'i is a late-comer to the scene and did not write for Greek readers, nor did he have to respond to Greek historians writing poorly on Armenian civilization, the similarities between his presentation of the narrative in Book I and that in the histories of these Eastern writers are striking. The parallelism between them cannot be accidental, given his obvious dependence on Eusebius, our primary source for most of these writers whose polemical and fragmentary texts pose diverse problems to researchers trying to determine the historical reliability of their claims. When read alongside these works, Book I of Khorenats'i invites nearly all the questions raised in the history of critical scholarship on these works.

That Khorenats'i was at times fascinated with Berossus is clear. He calls him “the Chaldaean skilled in all wisdom” (1.2) and “more truthful than most other historians” (1.6, though the quotations immediately following belong to the

---

36 Attridge and Oden, *Philo of Byblos*, 93 n. 147.

Oracula Sibyllina 3.97-110, 121-141). He commends Greek scholars for seeking out the great writings of such wise men among other nations (1.2). But as for the origin of the human race and the universal flood, the accounts by Berossus, Polyhistor, and Abydenus are to be rejected since they are "contrary to the Spirit and in disagreement with each other" (1.4). Manetho is mentioned but once, in a passing reference to the last king of Egypt, Nectanebo (2.13). Khorenats'i finds no need to cite Manetho in Book I, and he never mentions Philo of Byblos by name. However, he probably had them in mind when criticizing Berossus: "As for the beginning, sometimes they tell the truth, sometimes they lie." (1.6) Josephus is mentioned by him several times: in conjunction with the two mythical inscriptions attributed to the sons of Seth (1.4; cf. Ant 1.69-71), as a corroborative witness to Edessene archives later utilized by Sextus Julius Africanus the Chronographer (2.10; but there is neither mention of Edessene archives in Josephus nor reference to Armenian dynastic records in the extant works of Africanus, ca. AD 160-240, who nonetheless journeyed to Edessa and Armenia among other places), to the murder of Mithridates of Pontus (2.15; cf.

38 Josephus, e.g., uses Berossus in much the same way as Khorenats'i uses these same writers: "I will now proceed to the allusions made to us in the records and literature of the Chaldeans; on various points these are in close agreement with our own scriptures. My witness here is Berossus, a Chaldean by birth, but familiar in learned circles through his publication for Greek readers of works on Chaldean astronomy and philosophy. This author, following the most ancient records, has... come down to Nabopolassar, king of Babylon and Chaldea."

39 Khorenats'i alludes to the incredibly long years of the reign of Alorus, as ten shars or 36,000 years according to Abydenos (1.4; cf. 1.6 where the same time span is given without attribution to any ancient authority by name; the statement on the authority of Abydenos, a 2nd-century AD writer who was dependent on Alexander Polyhistor for his source, is taken from the Armenian version of Eusebius' Chronicon [see Aucher, Eusebii... Chronicon, 1:62].

40 Africanus (ca. 160-240), a Roman author born in Jerusalem, was the first Christian chronographer and universal historian. Of his lost Chronographies in five books, used by Eusebius as model and source for his Chronicon, considerable fragments survive — thanks mostly to George Syncellus (text in Patrologia cursus completus, series graeca, ed. J.P. Migne et al., Paris: Imprimerie catholique, 1857-1891, X:63-94; Eng. trans. in Alexander Roberts and James
Ant 14.53), to the death of Herod Agrippa caused by worms (2.26; cf. Ant 19.343-
350), to the charity of Helen, queen of Adiabene, and her burial in Jerusa-
lem (2.35; cf. Ant 20.51-53). These few and at times distorted references not-
withstanding, the historiographical dependence of Khorenats’i on these earlier
writers is overwhelming. He met them all in the Armenian version of the works
of Eusebius.

Khorenats’i goes a step beyond admiration and utilization of the authors
cited above. His Book I is modeled after their works, and that by his own admis-
sion:

If in truth those kings are worthy of praise who in written accounts fixed and
ordered their annals and wise acts and inscribed each one’s valor in narratives
and histories, then like them the compilers of books of archives who were oc-
cupied with similar efforts are worthy of our eulogies. Through these, I say,
when we read their accounts we become informed about the course of the

Donaldson, eds., The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers down to AD 325, 10
vols. in numerous printings; VI: 130-138). These books detailed the chief events in history
from the foundation of the world to the 4th year of the Emperor Elagabalus, AD 221.
Khorenats’i claims that Africanus was a transcriber of Armenian dynastic history found in
Edessene archives brought from Nisibis and Sinope (for more on these archives, see 2.27, 38;
3.62 and the discussion below). Thomson remarks somewhat hastily that these archives “are a
figment of Moses’ own imagination” (Movses Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 27). A
twisted borrowing from Eusebius, however, is very likely — given the repeated mention of
Edessene archives in the Abgar legend “[which] are found still preserved down to the present
day” (Eccl Hist 1.13; 2.1; tr. Christian Frederick Cruse, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book
House, 1989). This statement of Eusebius, as shown further below, must have prompted
Khorenats’i to claim to have seen the Edessene archives. A. Topchyan, “Julius Africanus’
Chronicle and Movses Xorenac’i,” Le Muséon CXIV (2001) 153-185 fails to convince the
reader that Africanus was utilized as a primary source by our author. The passing reference to
Tigran II in Syncellus, even if it were from the mostly lost work of Africanus as a source (pp.
160-161), is a far cry from Khorenats’i’s claim to a whole Armenian dynastic history in the
5th book of Africanus, which purportedly served as a source for the ensuing information —
whether for the next 15 chs. or the ill-defined immediate context, chs. 11-13.

At this point Khorenats’i seems to follow Eusebius’ modification of the Josephan passage,
brought into agreement with the account in the Acts of the Apostles (Eccl Hist 2.10).

Khorenats’i makes Helen “the chief of Abgar’s wives” and her conversion to Judaism he twists
to Christianity (cf. Eccl Hist 2.12). Apart from these direct references to Josephus, Khoren-
ats’i has numerous adaptations from his Wars simply to Armenianize the respective ac-
counts and to work them into his own framework (see Thomson, Moses Khorenats’i, History
of the Armenians, 27-29).
world, and we learn about the state of civilization when we peruse such wise discourses and narratives — those of the Chaldaeans, Assyrians, Egyptians, and Hellenes. It is indeed to the wisdom of these men, who undertook such studies, that we aspire. (1.3)

Even the order of the peoples cited here follows that of Eusebius' Chronicon.43 By writing the History of the Armenians in three books or as a trilogy Khorenats'i seems to follow further the pattern set by Berossus and Manetho. Curiously enough, the equivalent of what these writers had once covered in three books, from mythical times to Alexander the Great, our author has given in Book I: a collection of ancient legend and redacted tradition concerning the origin of the Armenian people, from Adam to the advent of Alexander the Great. Books II-III interpretively cover the rise and fall of the Armenian kingdoms from the time of Alexander to the early 5th century AD. Moreover, a tripartite division is discernible in each of the three books. Book I: early sources (1-9), early heroes (10-20), and early kings (21-32), followed by a distinct excursus on Persian fables concerning Biurap Ashdahak, a mythical ancestor of the Persians,44 whose incredible stories serve to render more credible the fabulous sources and stories provided earlier in the book and which seem to create a compositional frame or an inclusio, a parallel to the accounts given at the beginning — even restating the patron's inquisitiveness, adding that it includes interest in this subject as well (33); Book II: the Parthian / Roman era (1-36), the Orontid era (37-66), and the era of the Armenian Arsacids, including the rise of the Sasanians (67-92); Book III: the later Arsacids to the death of Arshak II (1-35), to that of Arshak III (36-46), and to those of Sts. Sahak and Mesrop (Mashtots') (47-68). However, Books II and III are respectively thrice and twice the length of Book I, by a rough count of the chapters (32, 92, and 68 chapters respectively).

Like all ancient historians who state their approach to historiography usually in the prologue, early in Book I Khorenats'i underscores the purpose for historical writing as a bequest to posterity (1.1). He then announces his own purpose: "to write the history of our nation in a long and useful work, to deal accu-

43 Aucher, Eusebi... Chronicon, 1:7.
44 For similarities between Khorenats'i's description of Ashdahak and Firdowsi's description of Zohak, see B.L. Ch'ukasyan, "The Fable of Byurap Ashdahak According to Movses Khorenats'i" [Պատմական-արձակագիր գրքի վերարտարումը Մովսէս Խորենացի], Teqhekgagr (1958.1) 67-84; idem, Armenia-Iranian Literary Relationships, 5th-18th Centuries [Հայ-Իրանական գրականության 5-18-րդ դարերը], Erevan: 1963, 64-90.
rately with the kings and the princely clans and families” from the beginning to the present, genealogically, in keeping with the wish of his purported patron Sahak Bagratuni (1.3; cf. 32; 2.27). Later on he declares: “There is no true history without chronology.” (2:82) His chronological construct, however, depends on selectivity when tracing genealogies. Drawing on biblical and non-biblical genealogies as chronologies of the beginning, he establishes a genealogy of the Armenian people and creates “historical” linkages for their mythical past, associating them with other ancient peoples. His method is commonplace in

See 1.1 for the dedication of the work to Sahak Bagratuni, who is said to be the first among Armenian nobility to request a record of early Armenian history (1.3). Sahak was the father-in-law of King Vagharchak of Greater Armenia (378-379; no wonder that in 1.8 King Vagharchak is said to have wanted to know more about the early rulers of Armenia, and so he sent Mar Abas Catina to Nineveh to search the archives) and became the commander in chief of the army of King Khosrov III/IV after the latter’s enthronement in 384 as king over the Persian part of Armenia (3.44, 51, 56). For other references to him, see N.G. Garsoian, The Epic Histories Attributed to Paustos Buzand: Buzandaran Patmut’iumk’ (Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies 8), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989) 5:44, pp. 420-421. Khorenats’i’s work was commissioned probably by a descendant of Sahak, but stops short of the 451 war of Vardan against the Persians so as not to glorify the rival Mamikonian dynasty; hence the purported patron and date of the work.


Beginning with Adam and the three sons of Noah, Khorenats’i focuses on Japheth’s descendants: Japheth’s firstborn, Gomer, begat T’iras, who begat Togarma (the connection follows: Togarma begat Hayk, the legendary ancestor of the Armenians [1.5.9, and 12]). Khorenats’i follows the Armenian text of Genesis 10:1-3, which transmits the reading of the Greek text (LXX); in the Hebrew text (MT) of both Gen 10:1-3 and 1 Chr 1:5, T’iras is a brother of Gomer (so also in the Armenian and Greek texts of 1 Chr 1:5). Thus, the Armenian text of Gen 10:1-3 allows Khorenats’i to add a generation. The linkage, however, is not original with Khorenats’i, for Togarma, *Torgom* in Armenian, is identified as the progenitor of the Armenians in Agar’angeghos, History, 16 (Eng. trans., R.W. Thomson, Agathangelos, History of the Armenians, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1976, 29) and in Hippolytus, an early 3rd-century bishop of an unknown see whose *Chronicle* survives partly in Greek and wholly in Latin and Armenian (*Chronik*, ed. A. Bauer and R. Helm, [Die
apologetic historiography, leading to a construct where the weight is on a somewhat contrived national antiquity.

The fusion of divergent myths is an essential characteristic of the genre, where the created associations are syncretistic rather than synchronistic. Thus Khorenats’i goes on to narrate oral traditions and to place Hayk, the legendary ancestor of the Armenians, said to be an early descendant from Japheth of the Bible, against the Titan Bel, identified with Nimrod of the Bible (1.7, 9). By placing Hayk among the Titans or the giants, Khorenats’i — or the tradition behind him — seems to imply that the ancestor of the Armenians, like the mythical ancestors in the non-biblical genealogies, is descended from the gods. The divine or cosmic connection is intensified by the fact that Hayk is also the Armenian name of the constellation Orion. 48 Khorenats’i then names Hayk’s de-


scendants through several generations as far as Tigran I (1.19), synchronizing three of them with biblical characters: Aram and his son Ara with Abraham, and Sur with Joshua. The father and son are also synchronized with Ninus and Semiramis. Aram secured the borders of Armenia by defeating the Assyrians and other enemies; hence the country is named after him (1.13-14). As for the lustful widow Semiramis, she was so infatuated with Ara’s beauty that she invaded Armenia in order to have him, albeit dead; later she died in Armenia (1.15-18). Others also are synchronized with non-biblical characters and events: Haykak with the Chaldaean Belok’os, and Zarmayr with the Homeric Priam, king of Troy (1.19). In the latter passage Khorenats’i goes a step further by identifying Zarmayr with Memnon, the general sent by Teutamis to aid Priam during the Ilian war.49 Here he follows another mode used by the Eastern authors writing in Greek, trying to establish a place for themselves within the Hellenic tradition. Some went so far as to claim blood kinship with Greek people on the basis of common descent.50 Thus, Khorenats’i embarks on an ambitious effort in Book I, trying to show the broader and early relation of Armenia to ancient peoples, even to the Canaanites of old (1.19), and not simply to propagate the tradition of his patrons, the Bagratids. There is but one direct reference to this latter point in Book I (22), where he alludes to “some unreliable men” who say that the Bagratids are of native Armenian descent and not of Jewish origin, as he advocates (cf. 2.3, 8, 9, 14, 33, 63).

Khorenats’i’s method so far is increasingly identifiable within the apologetic historiography of the Hellenistic period, speaking of which Hadas observes:

---

49 Y. Awgerian, “Memnon and Zarmayr” [U’b’tun i. Rupduj], Baznamep (1946) 197-204, 232-241; (1947) 97-107. A parallel to associating or synchronizing Armenian mythical ancestors with equally mythical, biblical, or historical characters, especially dwelling on the Hellenic connection, is to be seen in the tendency in Agat’angeghos to equate Armenian deities with Greek deities: Astghik with Aphrodite, Anahit with Artemis, Nané with Athena, Tir with Apollo, Mihr with Hephaistos, Vahagn with Heracles, and Aramazd with Zeus (see, e.g., Thomson, Agathangelos, xxxviii-xxxix).

50 M. Hadas, Hellenistic Culture, 84.
The remains of these books [by Berossus and Manetho] are too fragmentary to provide a basis for judgment, but the fact that their design was clearly apologetic makes it certain that they used all the liberties which hellenistic historiography allowed. By modern canons they would be classed probably as historical fiction rather than history.

He adds:

Later apologists based on the remote past moved farther in the direction of fiction. The next step after the chronological scheme was apparently to center a story upon the eponymous or national hero of a people, its founder or lawgiver. It is apparently to such works that Plutarch alludes (Iisis and Osiris, 360b) when he speaks of the Assyrians celebrating Semiramis, the Egyptians Sesostiris, and the Phrygians Manes. We shall see that the Babylonians celebrated Ninus similarly, in the Ninus Romance, and the Jews Moses, in Artapanus' "history". To judge from these two, each hero was made the protagonist of a story which permitted him to display great prowess and Wisdom, and was also provided with a love story, to suit contemporary hellenistic taste.51

Khorenats'ë's alleged source for the ancestral history from Hayk to Ara is Abydenos (1.5), a second-century AD writer who was dependent on Alexander Polyhistor and with whom our author became acquainted through the Armenian version of Eusebius' Chronicon.52 Strangely enough — though not surprisingly — Abydenos' account of "the beginning" was earlier rejected by Khorenats'ë (1.4), for whose fanciful attributions the name Abydenos becomes more useful than the content of the quotation in Eusebius. The quaint process of selectivity here is limited to the value of the name of Abydenos. Equally misleading yet traditionally justifiable is the author's equation of history with chronology, construed in terms of the tracing of genealogies, as in the opening statements of his Eastern predecessors. Although he denounces their method, yet like them he traces genealogies from legendary times as he constructs a chronology. He claims to give all the facts while resorting — like them — to both selectivity and in-

---

51 Ibid., 90.

52 See Aucher, Eusebi . . . Chronicon, 1:46-47. On the possibility of Khorenats'ë's use of an ancient source for his list of the descendants of Hayk, however fanciful the construct, see E.V. Gulbekian, "The Significance of the Narrative Describing the Traditional Origin of the Armenians," Le Musée LXXXVI (1973) 365-375.
vention. He thus binds himself to the genre of apologetic historiography from the outset of his History, a genre already established in the apologetic histories of the Hellenistic period, as seen in what survives of Berossus, Manetho, Josephus and his Alexandrian Jewish predecessors, and Philo of Byblos. As mentioned earlier, Khorenats’i became acquainted with these writers through the works of Eusebius. Even though he is in good company with his Eastern predecessors there, to a certain extent he may be compared also with Eusebius himself, and to the Christian chronographers of the Early Middle Ages in their use of Eusebius as a primary source; e.g., Malalas, Syncellus, Cedrenus, and others.53 These Christian writers opted to follow the Jewish historians and their biblical chronology to guide them regarding origins, and not the pagan historians with their myths. Taking note of the Christian continuity with the earlier biblical tradition, they favored the Hebrew account over the Greek, claiming Moses’ priority in time over Homer.54 So also Khorenats’i; he wishes to give an account “like the Hebrew historians . . . without error from the beginning”, unlike “the fables of the pagans” (1.3). Yet he produces an account that incorporates both Jewish and pagan elements in an interesting amalgam, contrary to his declaration of intent, which is but a reiteration of Jewish historiographical apologetics as found in Eusebius.55

The dependence of Khorenats’i on these Eastern writers is to be seen also in his projecting some of their anti-Hellenism: the slightly subdued anti-Hellenism of Manetho and the more blatant anti-Hellenism of Berossus and


54 See M.E. Hardwick, Josephus as an Historical Source, 94-95.

55 Khorenats’i, however, has neither a declared nor a tacit religious agenda. His obvious preference for the biblical schema (owing to Eusebius who, in turn, follows Josephus) is to be seen in his association of Armenian mythical ancestors with biblical characters and, remotely, in his claim that his patron Bagratids are of Jewish descent. Even though he uses the Bible considerably (see Thomson, Moses Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 17-20), he has nothing akin to the Church Fathers’ adoption of the biblical view that God works his ways into history, from the creation of the world to the return of Christ. In his historiography Eusebius viewed history as the arena where God works out His purposes; so also Josephus (see T. Rajak, Josephus: The Historian and His Society, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984 [c. 1983], 9).
Josephus. These and other writers exalted certain of their kings over and above the Greek heroes. Thus in Manetho the image of Ramses II looms larger than that of Alexander; in Berossus, Nebuchadnezzar II is made greater than Seleucus, more magnanimous than Alexander, and more courageous than Hercules; and in Josephus the power, grandeur, and wisdom of Solomon are unsurpassed, "as no other mortal man, neither kings nor ordinary persons, ever had." (Ant 8.24; cf. 42, 190, 211) Similarly, in Khorenats’i we read that the exploits of Artashes I surpass those of Alexander; and to substantiate his claim, he cites testimonies from obscure or hitherto unknown Greek authorities: Polycrates, Evagoras, Seamandros, and Phlegonius (2.13). Introducing quotations from shadowy authorities to validate a point is likewise a recurring feature in certain accounts of Eastern writers; so is also their preference for Chaldaean or other Eastern archives over Greek sources. Although at the beginning of his History Khorenats’i defends the reliability of the Greek historians and praises the Greeks for patronizing the sciences and for having the ancient sources translated into their language, he joins the others in declaring his detestation of Greek mythology and preference for local or neighboring archival records known to him through his sources (1.2-3). Scorning early Greek rulers for not keeping written records prior to the Trojan period is another recurring feature in Eastern historiography (e.g., Josephus Ap 1.15-27). In Khorenats’i, however, the censuring is of the early Armenian kings who failed to keep records prior to the discovery of the Armenian script (1.3, 21; 3.1).

The Archival Tradition

Khorenats’i uses the archival topos of apologetic historiography to the full.56 To underscore the antiquity of his people, he appeals to non-Armenian archives both within Armenia and beyond. These, according to him, provided much of the information for the period prior to the invention of the Armenian script early in the 5th century AD. Even though he reproaches the early Armenian kings for not keeping records in a foreign language when there was no Armenian script, a serious negligence on their part for which he wishes to compensate by accounting for much earlier times, he mentions the availability of Greek and Persian documents in Armenia that dealt with Armenian localities and nobility (1.3; cf. 2.10, 27, 38, 66). Recording the deeds of the Armenian kings was but a recent

56 On this long literary tradition in antiquity, see W. Speyer, Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike (Hypomnemata 24), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1970.
development in his time (1.21).

For the early period of the History, including the dynastic history of Armenian kings, Khorenats‘i claims to have relied on one document in particular, found at the Parthian Arsacid archives in Nineveh by a Syrian scholar versed in Chaldaean and Greek, named Mar Abas Catina (1.8-9). The Syrian scholar was sent there by King Vagharshak of Greater Armenia (378-379), the son-in-law of the purported patron of Khorenats‘i, Sahak Bagratuni. The king wanted to learn more about the early rulers of his land, and subsequently wrote to his elder brother, King Arshak III of Persian Armenia (378-385; d. ca. 390), addressing him as though he were the king of Persia, having Nineveh within his territorial jurisdiction if not as his capital, to allow the visiting scholar and envoy to search the archives. The discovered document purportedly had a caption stating that it was translated from Chaldaean (i.e., cuneiform) into Greek at the command of Alexander the Great. Mar Abas Catina extracted only the reliable part pertaining to Armenia and brought it in Greek and Syriac versions to King Vagharshak in Nisibis who then had a portion of it inscribed, apparently in both languages, on a stele. This part eventually became the source of Khorenats‘i’s account of the earliest times in Armenian history: from the days of the giants down to the reign of Arshak I (1.9-2.9).

The anachronisms of this story lie beyond our immediate concern. Suffice it to say that Khorenats‘i seems to have been inspired at this juncture by an early Armenian source, conveniently named the Primary History (from ռազմական պատմություն, lit., History of the Ancestors), used also in the anonymous 7th-century history attributed (wrongly it seems) to Bishop Sebōs.58

57 Nineveh, e.g., was the capital of the Assyrians and its archives were those of the Assyrian kings, not of the Parthians, and the city was irreparably destroyed by the Babylonians and the Medes in 612 BC. The territory was never part of Persian Armenia, nor was it ruled at this time by the Persian Arsacids, to whom the Armenian Arsacids were related, since that branch of the Parthian dynasty lasted from ca. 250 BC to AD 224.

58 G.V. Abgaryan, ed., The History Attributed to Sebōs [Կորոնատիպյան պատմություն], Erevan: 1979, 48 and line 2 for the derived title. Idem, The History Attributed to Sebōs and the Enigma of the Anonymous [Սեբոսի պատմություն ու անեանուն անուններ], Erevan: 1965, had earlier ascribed the work to the monk Khosrovik; however, he retains the name of Sebōs in both titles out of deference to past scholarship. In his later work, The History Attributed to Sebōs he concludes on the basis of internal evidence as well as the manuscripts — however late — that the Primary History ends with ch. 6 (pp. 47-64 of his edition; see especially 224 n. 117). Previous treatments of this work, especially translations (see ibid., 12-25, for a bibliography), tend to end it with ch. 4 (pp. 47-57 of Abgaryan’s edition), omitting the third part, the chronological table of Persian and Byzantine rulers down to the end of
This short account contains a brief reference to “Mar Abas, the philosopher of Mtzurn”, who found in the ruins of that city built on the Euphrates by King Sanatruck (an early Arsacid king of Armenia, possibly first century AD) a stele inscribed in Greek with this title: “I Agathangelos the scribe wrote on this stele with my own hand the years of the first Armenian kings, taking them from the royal archive at the command of the valiant Trdat.” The anonymous author of the Primary History then adds: “A little later you will see the content thereof in its [appropriate] place.” It is conceivable that this historical tradition in the Primary History also inspired the name Agat’angeghos for the pseudonymous author of the work that likewise bears the title History of the Armenians and chronicles Armenia’s conversion to Christianity. The Primary History itself refers to a “short version” and titled “Le Pseudo-Agathange: histoire ancienne de l’Arménie” (V. Langlois, ed., Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l’Arménie, 2 vols., Paris: Firmin Didot, 1869, 1:195-200), has in the annotation the differences vis-à-vis the so-called “long version” as found in Khorenats’i (the latter appears under the title “Mar Apas Catina: histoire ancienne de l’Arménie,” in ibid., 18-53). The English translation of the Primary History by Thomson, as an appendix to his Moses Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 357-367 (with an analysis, 53-56) covers the text through ch. 4, the Arsacid kings of Armenia. Far less is said about the Primary History and no translation of the document is provided in The Armenian History Attributed to Sebés, tr. and notes by R.W. Thomson, historical commentary by J. Howard-Johnston, assistance from T. Greenwood, 2 pts (Translated Texts for Historians 31), Liverpool: 1999, I:xxxii-xxxiii; the translation begins with ch. 7 of Abgarian’s edition (64). On the impertinence of the Primary History for a reconstruction of the history of early Armenia, see R.H. Hewsen, “The Primary History of Armenia: An Examination of the Validity of an Immemorially Transmitted Historical Tradition,” History in Africa II (1975) 91-100.

59 It is not clear whether this refers to the Arsacid rulers in the Armenian king-list in the Primary History; so Thomson, Moses Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 358 n. 9. Abgarian, History Attributed to Sebés, 195 n. 14, acknowledges the impossibility of identifying in the present work wrongly attributed to Sebés the locus to which allusion is made at the beginning of the document (which has no integral relation to the so-called History of Sebés). It remains to suggest that the Primary History was probably longer than the extant three parts (chs. 1-6), or that its first part is an abridgement of a lengthier account — judging from the opening word of the title added to ch. 1, Khostabanut’iwn... (lit., “Veridicality...”), which seems to be a corruption of Khostabanut’iwn, meaning “Abridgement” (note the likely confusion resulting from the first letters of either of the two Armenian words in question — whether in the old uncials or in the later minuscules). Abridgement is not so uncommon a development in ancient historiography.

60 “The paradox that the author of an Armenian work presumably composed before the creation of the Armenian alphabet should have a patently Greek name is but a foretaste of the difficul-
(possibly with the Armenian version of the Acts of Thaddaeus and the first redaction of the life of St. Grigor the Illuminator) is a likely source of the now lost Books I-II of the Buzandaran. These, in turn, are thought to have been among Khorenats' i's sources — given his reliance on the extant Books III-VI of the Buzandaran in the remainder of the History. The extant books of the Buzandaran, compiled by an anonymous author late in the 5th century, chronicle the conflict of church and state in the 4th century, to the partition of the Arsacid kingdom in ca. 387.

Khorenats' i, however, is more than an eclectic and creative redactor of tradition. After a passing reference to the ancient archives of the Chaldaeans, Assyrians, and Persians as witnesses for the beginning of Armenian royalty under Paroryt (1.21), Khorenats' i dwells on the purported Edessene sources for much of the rest of his History (2.27). He recounts the transfer by King Abgar V (4 BC-AD 50) of the royal archives from Nisibis, considered an Armenian capital (cf. 1.9), to the newly built capital Edessa, likewise considered an Armenian capital by him — as also in the Buzandaran (5.32), where King Pap (ca. 368-ca. 374) claims that his ancestors built Edessa. Several philologists and historians have pointed out that the Armenian name for Nisibis (Mtzbin) and the Armenian claims to the city are a result of confusion with Mtzurn or Mtzurk', the capital of King Sanattruk, the above-mentioned early Arsacid king of Armenia.61 There is good reason to believe, however, that the shift from Mtzurn or Mtzurk' to Mtzbin (Nisibis) could be more than simply a result of either scribal confusion or linguistic affinity. After all, the parallel Armenian claims to Edessa (Arm. Utha) cannot be explained away in like manner — whether in terms of scribal error or linguistically, nor can they be seen as an eventual result from an earlier confusion between Mtzurn or Mtzurk' and Mtzbin. A more fundamental reason

---

for these Armenian claims must be sought. It could be found in the early and
overwhelming influence of Edessene Christianity on Armenians, whereby they
came to identify the traditions of the early Syriac speaking church as their own:
appropriating the Abgar legend along with the Thaddaean apostolic tradition of
that church and, eventually, the legendary archival tradition of that city — even
the patron saint of Nisibis, St. James, as a cousin of St. Grigor.62

The Edessene archives are said to be considerably vast. Khorenats’i refers to
the transfer of all the neighboring archives to Edessa (2.38), ordered by the
Roman governors after the city fell to Rome (AD 194) and became a Roman colony
(AD 214).63 Special mention is made of the temple archive which was in Sinope
in Pontus, said to have been used by earlier chronographers and concerning
which Khorenats’i declares: “Let no one doubt this, for we have seen that ar-
chive with our own eyes.” (2.10) Whether among the alleged Edessene archives
or not, the last of the sources from before the invention of the Armenian script
mentioned by Khorenats’i is the temple history of Ani (Kamakh), written by
the local priest Olympius (2.48, 66). This is said to have been updated and tran-
slated in its entirety into Syriac by the heretical Bardaisan, who had read it while
on a visit to that city to make converts. The same is said to have been translated
into Greek at a later time, becoming the author’s source for the period “from the
reign of Artavazd up to the stele of Khosrov.” (2.51-65)

The Edessene archival tradition in Khorenats’i seems to have its origin
in the introduction to the Abgar legend in the Historia Ecclesiastica of Eusebius
(1.13; 2.1). The church father remarks:

For this there is a written testimony, taken from the public records of the city
of Edessa, which at that time was governed by a king. For in the public regis-
ters there, which contain both the events of the past and also the transactions
concerning Abgar, these also are found preserved from his time even until now.

James of Nisibis to the Illuminator, see (Ps.-) Hovhannēs (Hovhan) Mamikonian, History of
Tarōn [Թարուն] (TMp1 Թարննիւն), ed. A. Abrahamyan, Erevan: 1941, 70-71; Eng. trans., L.
Avdoyan, Pseudo-Yovhannēs Mamikonian: The History of Tarōn (Scholars Press Occasional
Papers and Proceedings: Columbia University Program in Armenian Studies 6), Atlanta:

63 Thomson points out an anachronism here: Khorenats’i has Eruand yielding Mesopotamia to
Vespasian and to his son Titus more than a century before the actual fall of Edessa to the
Romans (Moses Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 180 n. 4).
But there is nothing like hearing the letters themselves, which we have taken from the archives and translated literally from the Syriac.

The legend about the king’s correspondence with Jesus and subsequent healing and conversion to Christianity at the hand of the apostle Thaddaeus appears to have been fabricated not long before its citation by Eusebius, possibly to counteract Marcionism and the Manichaean version of the Christian faith. These, together with the ongoing Manichaean mission, were threatening the nascent orthodoxy in Edessa — as the Chronicle of Edessa clarifies the historical situation at the beginning of Christianity there: Marcion, Barisai and Mani dominated the scene while orthodoxy was only an emerging minority.

Critical scholarship, as summed up in Thomson’s fine introduction to Khorenats’i, has shown that these non-existent archives are but conveniences to give a sense of veracity to the account of the pre-Christian period of Armenian history. Such conveniences were inspired, we may add, by a tendency in apologetic historiography and sustained by the above-mentioned Primary History and Eusebius’ preamble to the Abgar legend. Claims to have had archival access for succession lists of monarchs were common in the Hellenistic period, like the famous list of Egyptian dynasties compiled by Manetho and that of Babylonian rulers by Berossus, along with such Phoenician king lists variously translated from the Tyrian archives following the example of Sanchuniathon.


67 FGrHist 3 C 609 F 2-4 (Manetho); 3 C 680 F I-II (Berossus); FGrHist 3 C 783 (Josephus [Ant 8.144-146; 9.283]) on Menander of Ephesus or Pergamon, who is said to have translated the archives of Tyre from the Phoenician dialect). “Barbarian” historians of the Hellenistic
Far from being dependent on archival and primary sources for the early periods, Khorenats’i quotes ancient authors from secondary sources, primarily from the works of Eusebius besides other Greek writings already translated into Armenian, such as the Alexander Romance and certain of the works of Josephus and Philo of Alexandria. These he utilizes also in his coverage of the later periods of Armenian history in Books II-III. There, however, he is much more dependent on the earlier Armenian sources: the histories of the extant books of the Buzandaran collection, Agat’angeghos, and Ghazar, among others, as it has been demonstrated repeatedly.

Summary and Conclusion

We have delineated the emergence of apologetic historiography from Greek ethnography through the Classical and the Hellenistic periods, and have shown how, through much of Book I of his History, Khorenats’i follows some well-established historiographical tendencies discernible in the national histories of


Most recently by Garsoian, The Epic Histories, especially 249-250 (on 3.7-8; cf. Khorenats’i 2.12, 41), 283-286 (on 4.15; cf. Khorenats’i 2.60).
Eastern writers who were influenced by Greek historians. Hence, a study of the similarities obtaining between them can be of considerable help, provided the differences are given equal weight and the distinctive character of the Armenian material recognized, so that we look ultimately for an explication of that material from within the peculiar tradition to which it belongs. This, however, is the subject of another study. Nevertheless, having identified the genre of Book I of Khorenats’i’s History as apologetic historiography, we can henceforth move towards a different and hopefully more positive assessment of his work and appreciation of the man called patmahayr (“father of [Armenian] history”).

Although Khorenats’i wrote neither in Greek nor for Greek readers, he shares significant commonplaces with Eastern writers following Greek traditions: denigration of mythology while employing it; berating the Greeks while emulating their historians; and joining the rivalry in the claims for antiquity through linkages of Armenian legendary figures with known yet equally legendary persons in other traditions. In Khorenats’i, as in these earlier writers (except for Josephus and his Jewish predecessors, who had the Hebrew Scriptures in Greek translation), the emphasis on antiquity is heightened by repeated references to ancient archives. Moreover, it is noteworthy that he and the other Eastern writers are guilty of the very thing for which they fault the Greeks: inventiveness. After all, ever since Classical times and through the Middle Ages history was presented in Greek form in both the East and the West — irrespective of the popularity of Latin biography; the East responding in kind to the West.

It must be said that a writer has to be assessed in accordance with the conventions of the genre that he himself has proposed. On the basis of such an evaluation, it becomes evident that Khorenats’i is a faithful follower of the Greek historians and their Eastern respondents especially, with whom he shares all the commonplaces of apologetic historiography. He is also a most faithful follower of Eusebius himself, the very source of his non-Armenian historical

---

70 Even if we examine Khorenats’i “on his own terms, that is as a historian, or, more accurately perhaps, from our point of view, as a compiler of the Armenian historical tradition as received in his day” (R.H. Hewsen, “Movses of Khoren as a Historical Source,” Armenian Review XXXIX [1986] 49-70; here, 49) our examination would still leave something to be desired if we do not also explicate the nature of ancient historiography or the dictates of that discipline in antiquity.

71 Eusebius himself may be said to be guilty of gross exaggerations and distortions (see M. Werner, Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas, Bern: P. Haupt, 1941, 112-113): nonetheless, his work as a historian of the first three centuries remains indispensable. His various
information which he synchronized with an existing Armenian tradition attested in the *Primary History* and suspected in the lost books of the *Buzandaran*, expanded and intensified by him on the basis of verisimilitude in non-Armenian sources. Thomson refers to this process as "tradition forming,"72 which in less diplomatic terms is the same as "mythologizing". In Khorenats'ī's inventiveness, however, there is adherence to tradition, both native and foreign. Moreover, there is some semblance in his chronography of what Eusebius himself must have done when following Africanus, his predecessor in Christian chronography, and of what Africanus must have done when following Josephus, and of what Josephus did when following his predecessors, and so on. Commenting on this historiographical tendency, Helm observes: "It seems therefore that Eusebius in the historical notices that he entered alongside his years followed very closely in the footsteps of Africanus . . . . That he collected material from someone else and turned it to his own use in a new form is therefore no matter for scorn."73

The method of Khorenats'ī's "historical" synthesis by which he establishes linkages between mythical Armenian ancestors and time-honored (yet equally mythical) foreign characters is not without parallels in Hellenistic historiography. Our author may have surpassed his predecessors somewhat in the quest for confirmation of his "historical" constructs in terms of analogous associations, by following principles of verisimilitude drawn from the lengthy excerpts in Eusebius, including the appeal to non-existent or imagined archives. His seemingly harmonious confirmations in Book I meet somewhere between two distinct efforts of "historical" reconstruction: 1) to account for a national history before the conquest of the Armenian plateau by the Achaemenids in the second half of the 6th century BC, and 2) to historicize Armenian legends so as to account for that early period. Khorenats'ī's synchronisms are clearly inspired by his primary source, Eusebius, who in his *Chronicon* accounts for more than a millennium of chronographic history derived from the above-mentioned chronographic traditions of the Hellenistic period and the chronology presupposed by his works, intended to be an *apologia* for the Christian message and for his patron the Emperor Constantine, make him more of an apologist than a historian.


Scripture. Beginning with Abraham, Eusebius recounts the sacred history of the Hebrews, synchronizing it with that of the Assyrian, Greek and Egyptian dynasties. In this endeavor Eusebius himself was inspired more by Josephus (than by Africanus) who, as mentioned earlier, took it upon himself to show the antiquity of Hebrew culture alongside other Eastern civilizations and relative to Greco-Roman antiquity. Similarly, through simple as well as complex associations and analogies, Khorenats’i was constructing periods of the Armenian past, inventing probable scenarios that could account for or give a context to that unknown past. This kind of activity may be described as reconstruction of historical probability. Evidence was sought in archival data, however real or unreal, and confirmation in association, whether real or unreal. The longer the genealogy and the more complex the associations the more probable the so-called historical construct or the history of the possible would appear.74 By virtue of his familiarity with Greek ethnography in Classical historiography and the subsequent apologetic historiography of the Hellenistic period, more through secondary sources than through primary, Khorenats’i enables the Armenian reader to find an ancestral place in earlier history.

We disagree somewhat with Thomson’s observation that Khorenats’i was not merely enlivening his narrative with borrowings from non-Armenian writings “but recasting the Armenian past in the mold of his own making.”75 To be sure, non-Armenian archetypes of that mold existed long before Khorenats’i’s time, and they were well used by others before him. Moreover, there is reason to believe that a similar mold existed in the Armenian tradition prior to Khorenats’i, such as that discerned in the anonymous and fragmentary Primary History and suspected in the lost books of the Buzandaran. Judging from the Primary History, it seems that there was a nascent tradition in Armenia along the same apologetic lines of thought.

Models of the distant past, however, are the paradigms of mythology and this, not historical evidence, is the grounds on which to assess Book I of Khorenats’i. Failure to recognize a mythical quality in nearly all historical writing in

74 Quite unconvincingly, Traina tries to explain the improbable synchronisms in the History by inviting attention to the possible convergence there of the perceived cyclical view of history (as in the Classical tradition) with the perceived linear view of history (as in Eastern Christianity), the cyclical line meeting the linear at various points every now and then (G. Traina, Il complesso di Trimalcione. Movês Xorenac’i e le origini del pensiero storico armeno [Eurasiatica 27], Venice: Casa Editrice Armenia, 1991, 41-44).

75 Thomson, Moses Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 40.
antiquity is glaringly apparent in Khorenats’i scholarship. Phenomenologically speaking, one need not be skeptical about the historical value of mythology, for writings so described are not altogether devoid of some empirical truth. There is always a historical kernel or a seminal tradition around which further traditions evolve — thus creating and expanding a myth. It is extremely difficult, however, to demythologize in order to arrive at that seminal tradition of historical worth. It seems that myth has to be cherished in its entirety so as not to be stripped of its historicity. Yet it is true that myth as such does not tell of historical events. The stories it tells are usually placed in the pre-history of the immediate readers, extending far beyond their awareness; however, these stories are not unrelated to their experience. The events of myth, usually arranged in a distant genealogy and embedded within a chronological schema, present to the reader a cosmic order underlying all things. They are archetypal to history in that they set out in dramatic form a structured or divinely ordained pattern that is working itself out in time and place, giving meaning to meaningless events unfolding in history (comparable to the Hebraic view of Yahweh as the God of history, or to the attempts of Herodotus to explain the relationship of unrelated events as “chance” would have it). There was, therefore, in the ancient world a basic correlation between myth and the world of concrete experience that makes the distinction between myth and ancient history intricately difficult. The archaiologia of the ancients moved from cosmogonies to pre-history, in essence becoming ancient history for those who formulated the myth. In the words of Khorenats’i, “Now whether someone else considers these to be fables or whether he reckons them to be the truth, nonetheless, as I am persuaded, there is much truth in them.” (1.6) Thus, the line of demarcation between ancient history and myth is forever blurred; the ancients seldom made a distinction between the two. In all writers on origins we see a fine line of mythical continuity between cosmogony and ancient history.

Khorenats’i’s “evidence” for the Armenian past is derived mythically and utilized in an apologetic historiography that cannot be confirmed through archaeology. It may suffice to identify his models in the archaiologia of the an-

---

76 Critical to all historical research is the evaluative identification of evidence. Thomson’s and others’ perceptive and repeated challenge about the very existence of evidence is appropriate in the scope and totality of their direct and implied criticism. However, the summary of archaeological evidence in J.-P. Malé, "Entre Moïse et Mahomet: Réflexions sur l'histoiriographie arménienne," Revue des études arménienes, n.s. XXIII (1993) 121-153; here, 121-124, fails to persuade a critical reader on the grounds of its insufficiency and the incidental nature — if not forced character — of the associations made between the scant and
cients, as found in the cited sources utilized by Eusebius. It cannot be said that Khorenats'i was trying to break away from myth (which he detested strongly as did the earlier Eastern writers — theoretically at least or as a commonplace in apologetic historiography) by giving it a semblance of history. On the basis of his Book I and its genre, he remains an apologetic mythographer and not a historian in the current sense of the word. Therefore, the question does not hinge on whether Khorenats'i or the earlier authors like him are trustworthy, but rather on basic methods of historiography in Classical and Late Antiquity. Had it been that Book I of the History were all that we possessed from Khorenats'i, we would have been quick to conclude that he was but a compiler of legendary stories — like certain of the Greek historians of the Classical period and their Eastern respondents of the Hellenistic age, authors who ventured to write on cosmogonic and ancestral origins. All these writers who ventured into mythography were apologists to a certain extent. Such awareness may help correct the intrinsic negative bent of historical criticism when analyzing the works of these ancient writers. We are obliged to consider their “historical writings” as part of ancient literature. The issue is akin to the question Hecataeus of Miletus raised in his commentaries on the Mediterranean peoples, distinguishing mythision (legend or story) from historia (research or inquiry), a distinction that the tireless and prolific ethnographer Herodotus never learned, however much he may be popularly known as “the father of history”. The same lesson remains to be learned when researching Book I of Khorenats'i's trilogy.

Our study leaves no doubt that what Khorenats'i does with early Armenian history is commonplace in Eastern historiography of the Hellenistic period.


Consequently, we are persuaded that Book I, regardless of its historical claims, should be treated more as literature than as history. The same holds true for much of the other national histories from Classical times through Late Antiquity, as the critical observations by the respective editors and translators of these works consistently indicate. The very genre of these writings, including that of Book I of the History by Khorenats'î, constrains us to subject them to literary criticism before subjecting them to historical criticism. Thus, what is needed is a comparative literary-historiographical analysis of Book I prior to subjecting the entire work to hard questions of present-day historical criticism. Such an approach will make one less critical when faulting these writers for historical inaccuracy. Moreover, when reconstructing ancient history, these writings should be dealt with cautiously since they belong more to the realm of mythologically contrived apologetics than to that of historical objectivity. The caution should be taken far more seriously when utilizing Book I of Khorenats'î in reconstructing the early history of Armenia. For unlike the Mesopotamians, the Egyptians, the Jewish people and the Phoenicians, Armenians have precious little history of their own antiquity from the formative, pre-Achaemenid centuries; nor is there any substantial material in non-Armenian sources whereby to verify most of the claims made in the historically questionable accounts in Book I of Khorenats'î (i.e., should verification be necessary). Ancient historiographers are not historians in the current sense of the word, even when they provide a descriptive ordering of data in a chronological framework and proceed to expound upon the material at hand creatively and intentionally. We should not treat as history that which is not, since for us history is rather a process of interrogation and interpretation of data from the distant as well as the recent past. The problem in dealing with ancient historians, after all, is methodological, and it lies not so much with the respective authors as it does with certain of their interpreters who seem to have forgotten that literary criticism (more than just source criticism) should precede historical criticism, the more so when dealing with apologetic historiography from Classical times through Late Antiquity — as one should approach ancient historiography in general.

78 See, e.g., I.M. Diakonoff (=Diakonov), Prehistoriia armianskogo naroda, Erevan: 1968; Eng. trans., The Pre-history of the Armenian People, by L. Jennings, with revisions by the author, Delmar, NY: Caravan, 1984, especially 179-180 and n. 297; also the insightful and cautionary article by Hewsen, "Movses of Khoren as a Historical Source," 49-70.

79 The questions Thomson asks in his introduction are invariably historical in nature, especially as he keeps raising the question of reliability (Moses Khorenats'î, History of the Armenians, pas-
Khorenats’i’s questionable place in Armenian historiography has been apparent to his critics since the beginning of the 19th century, and there is no need to repeat the controversies surrounding his work, especially those regarding his date.  Although challenged by the scholarly quests of the last two centuries, the traditional Armenian sentiments regarding Khorenats’i have not diminished. Apologetic arguments for historicity, that the traditions conveyed in Book I of the History are plausible or possible — or that they are not falsifiable — continue to ignore or try to dismiss the findings of critical scholarship, the sine qua non of which is openness and objectivity. The nearly canonical sacredness with which Khorenats’i’s historically questionable narration is taken in the historical reconstruction of Armenian origins is somewhat perturbing — to

(sim), a query often left alone in the study of ancient historiography where nowadays the focus tends to be more on the literary. Questions about the use of sources and method are very legitimate indeed; and it is not that the literary complexity of the early Armenian histories is not raised by Thomson — it is left for others to unravel.

say the least.\textsuperscript{81} Equally disquieting, however, are the overly critical falsifications of our author’s History. Invaluable as historical criticism is for our study of the past, it would seem preferable to dismiss the hard historical questions on Khorenats’i’s version of Armenian origins as largely irrelevant to the genre of Book I. It is noteworthy that in ancient Near-Eastern scholarship today none of these apologetic writers of the Hellenistic period are taken seriously, and researchers consistently prefer to follow the latest archaeological evidence instead.\textsuperscript{82} At their best, questions of historicity regarding this genre of apologetic historiography help identify false approaches, compelling us to resort to literary criticism (form criticism in particular) and to relegate such ancient writings, the genealogia and the archaialogia of antiquity, to serve only as prolegomena to the ensuing histories. Indeed, ancient cosmogonies and delineations of origins simply served that very purpose; so also in Khorenats’i. Perhaps we could learn this much from the typically Hellenistic Book I, that it is only a prolegomenon to Books II-III, “the threshold of our history” (1.13).

\textsuperscript{81} For certain historians and archaeologists in the present Republic, committed to the integrity of a cherished tradition regarding Armenian origins, confirmation is unfortunately reduced to amplification and illustration of the text, and probability takes on the assertiveness of a triumphal non-falsifiability that rests so satisfied with the complexity of its circular argumentation as to think plausible anything that is not impossible, and probable anything that might be seen to support the interpretive presupposition (echoing the stock arguments of V. Hats’uni, Mousés Khorenats’i’s Back in the Fifth Century [Ուռքու Ղուրենարի երեքրդրա ստեղծվածք Սպանատ Սև], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1935, reprinted from his articles in Bazmavet of the same year, and more so when Khorenats’i’s credibility is at times substantiated in once-questioned instances in Books II-III). Illustrative of this approach is the work of Sargsyan / Sarkissian, for a sample of which see the bibliography in Thomson, Moses Khorenats’i, History of the Armenians, 383-384; cf. P. Yovhannesian, The Bibliography of Mousés Khorenats’i’s Studies [Ուռքու Ղուրենարի գրողների գրքահանկար բազմահորդակ], Erevan: 1991. It would be credulous to imagine the diminution of the dominance of Khorenats’i’s historiographical validity from discussions of Armenian beginnings.

\textsuperscript{82} A short period of fascination with Berossus followed the discovery of ancient Babylonian texts, and likewise with Philo of Byblos following the publication of the Ugaritic texts.
Church-State Relations at the Dawn of Kingship in Cilician Armenia

The coming of the Crusaders helped forge an Armenian kingdom in Cilicia, where the Rubenians had consolidated themselves as the ruling family. Their fortunes were invariably bound to those of the Crusader principalities in Jerusalem, Cyprus, Edessa, and Antioch, given their common endeavor and the generally steady political alliances. These ties, strengthened through intermarriage, which was very common between the Armenian and Crusader nobility, led to the seeking of a rapprochement between the Armenian Church and the Church of Rome. In the closing decades of the 12th century, the dwindling fortunes of the Crusader principalities in the East compelled the Cilician principality to grow more dependent on Rome, even to hope for a new Crusade in the face of rising Mamluk threats and attacks and the ongoing menace of the Seljuk sultanate of Konya — not to mention the Byzantine military efforts to reassert sovereignty over lands lost to the Armenians and the Crusaders. As the push for rapprochement with Rome intensified, a new and disquieting era in Church-State relations began to unfold in Armenian history.

The preparations for the Third Crusade, sparked by the fall of Jerusalem to Salah ad-Din in 1187, could not have come at a better time for Prince Levon II Rubenian (1187-1199). This was the year when his brother, Prince Ruben II (1175-1187), handed the rule of the land over to him and retired to a monastery. Difficult as the times were, they provided a golden opportunity for Levon to seek a royal crown from the West and thereby to become, under the watchful eye of the Armenian Church, King Levon I (1199-1219).

As Cilicia was the gateway to the Latin East and the preservation of what remained of the Crusader states was dependent on Armenian good will, in 1189 Levon received a letter from Pope Clement III (1187-1191) asking him to render

---

1 Paper read at the annual meetings of the Middle East Studies Association (MESA of North America) on November 24, 2002 in Washington, D.C.

2 These efforts turned to theologically motivated persecution of Armenians living under Byzantine jurisdiction, especially during the reign of Emperor John II Komnenos (1118-1143) and that of Emperor Isaac II Angelos (1185-1195, 1203-1204).
every assistance to the Latin army led by Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (1152-1190). Since it was customary to receive the crown from either an emperor or the Pope, Levon wrote to the Pope and to the Emperor asking that he be crowned king while the Emperor was in the East. Both recipients of Levon’s letters agreed, and a crown was promised by the Emperor because of the help rendered to the Crusaders by the Armenians. It was indeed a great disappointment for Levon when he learned in 1190 that the aged Emperor had accidentally drowned when his horse fell in the river Calycadnus (Saleph) in Cilicia. The coronation had to wait. As a consolation to Levon, Bishop Herman of Münster handed the Latin text of the coronation ritual to (St.) Nersēs of Lambron, Archbishop of Tarsus (1153-1198), who was the head of a delegation to welcome Frederick into Cappadocia, to translate into Armenian in the meantime.3

As for the Cilician prince, he had some homework to do in making peace with the prince of Antioch, Bohemond III (the Stammerer, 1163-1201), with whom he was embroiled in struggles, and in preparing the Armenian Church to cooperate in the endeavor for the coveted crown from the Catholic West. And there was much to encourage him despite objections from nationalist churchmen in the East.

The initial contact with Rome had been made by Catholicos Grigor II Vkayasēr (1066-1105) who sent a delegation to Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand, 1073-1085), the most remarkable personality in medieval papal history, to seek help to halt the inroads of the Turks and to ask for a pallium to symbolize the fraternal relationship between the two churches. The Pope was sympathetic to the pleas of the Armenians, who continued their rapprochement with Rome for a century thereafter, under the successors of Vkayasēr and long before Levon’s rise to power as Prince or Baron (1187-1199). The Popes, ready as always to extend their supremacy eastward, and aware of the Armenian rejection of the Council of Chalcedon (AD 451) and the Tome of Pope Leo I (440-461), seem to have been interested more in the differences between the Armenian, Greek, and Latin liturgical practices than in doctrinal details and were at last content with

---

3 Gh. Alishan, Sisdan and Levon the Magnificent [Սիսուն և Լեվոն Մագնիֆիս] Venice: San Lazzaro, 1885, 447-449. Armenian text of the Latin coronation rite, 472-475 (apparatus), also D. Dawa’yan, “The Coronation Rite in the Armenian Church” [Հայկական թագավորական երազե] (Vardapetakan thesis), Ejmiatzin, 2001, 75-91 (recension A); 92-105 (recension B). Alishan thinks that the successors of Levon were crowned with this liturgy. For yet another, shorter liturgy that nonetheless seems to combine elements from an earlier Armenian coronation rite and from the preceding, see Dawa’yan, 65-69 (recension A); 70-72 (recension B). The main manuscripts are cited by Dawa’yan.
demanding that the Armenians add water to their Eucharistic wine and observe Christmas on December 25. Armenian hierarchs and their delegates nearly always agreed to these conditions, but were slow to implement their commitments with every improvement in the Armenian political fortunes. There was also considerable resistance by church leaders in the Armenian homeland to the Pahlawan Catholicoci, who were seen as determined to lead the Church westward for the Cilician rulers’ political expediency. Their fears were not unfounded, given the ill-fated Council of Hromklay, which convened in 1179 to iron out the Christological differences between the Armenian and Greek Churches (substantially the same as between the Armenian and Roman Churches). The council assembled under the auspices of Catholicos Grigor IV Tghay (the Rash, 1173-1193), who pursued the ecumenical efforts of his uncle, (St.) Nerses IV Shnorhali (the Gracious, 1166-73) and those of the tireless spokesman for the party seeking reconciliation first between the Armenians and the Greeks and later the Latins, Nerses of Lambron.

But when the Greek hostilities towards the Armenians turned into religious persecution after 1179, the Catholicos turned to Pope Lucius III (1181-1185) for help. In a letter carried by a Latin-speaking Armenian envoy, bishop Grigor of Philippopolis, the Catholicos recounted the tribulations that the Armenians were suffering because of the Greeks and solicited the Pope’s prayers and blessing, as his predecessors had done. The envoy met with the Pope at Verona in 1184, and after a warm reception they concelebrated the Eucharist. In his very cordial response, dated December 3, 1184, the Pope asked the Armenians to celebrate Christmas on December 25, to add water to the Eucharistic wine, and to consecrate the holy oil during the week before Easter. The letter was accompanied by gifts: a miter, a pallium, a ring, and liturgical books for the Armenians to follow.4

When the envoy returned, Nersès of Lambron was on hand to welcome him. Fascinated by the Latin rite, and upon the request of the Catholicos, Nersès translated substantial parts of the liturgical works into Armenian. These were adopted in part by the Armenian Church, including the service of priestly ordination, which came to resemble that of induction into knighthood — with the granting of liturgical vestments and other objects for liturgical use instead of the sword. The existing rite of ordination of priests in the Armenian Church is heavily influenced by the one mandated by Pope Lucius III and translated by Nersès of Lambron. A parallel development is seen in the episcopal vestments


6 Although the origin of the Armenian rite of ordination of priests is attributed to St. Sahak the Great, the last patriarch of the Gregorid house (in office 386-438), there were several redactions in the ordination manuals for all the clerical ranks thereafter. Vaticanus Arm. no. 3 (13th cent.) places the origin of the rite in the 111th year after the death of the Illuminator. The Armenian Canon Law transmits 55 chs. of canons on the ordination and role of a “country bishop” [Khorepiskopos] under the name of St. Sahak (V. Hakobyan, ed., *Canon Book of the Armenians* [Հայկականների երաժշտություն], 2 vols., Erivan: 1964-1971, I:363-421). A cursory survey of manuscripts and published texts compels one to speak more accurately of recensions of the respective rites of ordination. For the most thorough and detailed description of *Euchologia* manuscripts, beginning with the oldest in existence, see B. Sargsian and G. Sargsian, *Grand Catalogue of the Armenian Manuscripts in the Library of the Mekhitarists in Venice, III: Euchologia - Ordination Manuals* [Վարանձավ եղանակային կերպարիներ Հայոց եկեղեցու կազմակերպումները], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1966; cf. the detailed contents, beginning with the earliest manual in existence, in Gh. Fogolian, *The Ordination Euchologion of the Armenian Church according to 33 Manuscripts in the Library of S. Lazzar* [Վարանձավ եղանակային կերպարիներ Հայոց եկեղեցու կազմակերպումները], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1966-1974. See also F.C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1905, ix-xxv and 231-242; Claudio Guggerotti, “I riti di ordinazione e la Cilicia Armena” (Diss. Pontificio Institutum Studiorum Orientalium Ecclesiarum), Rome: 1996, 22-27 utilizing Conybeare’s A (Venice no. 457, dated 9th-10th centuries) under the signum E, and another manuscript, Venice ms 1657, dated 1248, under the signum Z. Of interest also are Jerusalem mss 2027 and 2156, dated 1266 and 1370 respectively. The canon of ordination of priests is part of the *Episcopal Euchologion* [հայերեն վարանձավ], the manual containing the rites performed by bishops. It is sometimes referred to as *Ordination Euchologion* [Գերեզմանական եղանակային կերպարիներ], the manual containing the rites performed by priests, it is referred to as *Mother* or *Grand Euchologion* [Վարանձավ]}
used in the Armenian Church today, as also in the vestments of celebrants of the Divine Liturgy, and in the prayers over the vestments and the prayers of vesting.

When the Catholicos Grigor IV died in 1193 as a result of a fall from his horse, the obvious choice of a successor would have been Nersès of Lambron. But it was not until that his outright openness to western traditions had fueled the antagonism of the nationalist churchmen. Fearing their fury, Prince Levon opted for a young and inexperienced nephew of the late Catholicos, who assumed the name Grigor V (1193-1194). Still, to carry through with his plans it was essential for Levon to have the Catholicos on his side. But the young Catholicos would not be pressured by the Prince, who now sought to get him out of the way. With the treacherous help of John, Archbishop of Sis (later Catholicos, 1203-1221), Levon had Grigor V imprisoned and deposed at a council convened in Sis. Nersès of Lambron was not party to these events, and according to the sources, Levon had to write him five times before he would attend. The bishops did Levon's bidding at the council. Attempting an escape from the fortress of Kopitar, where he was held, the Catholicos fell to his death when the knotted ropes came apart (hence his cognomen Karavëzh, "Fallen off the rock").

Disappointed with his prior choice of a young hierarch who could not be swayed, Levon sought the election of the elderly Apirat, age 72, who assumed the name Grigor VI (1194-1203). The aged Catholicos was for church unity with both the Greeks and the Latins. This larger euchologia at times include also the Patriarchal Euchologion [Վեզրարի Աշխարհի Եվխուլիա], the manual for the rites performed only by the Catholicos, with the canon for the anointing of kings.

compromise statement was signed by twelve bishops — Nersès of Lambron among them.8

Satisfied with the tokens of compliance and the promises of union with Rome, the Pope supported the request; and the Emperor, having plans for a new crusade, promised a crown to Amalric (Amaury) of Cyprus and to Levon. In September 1197 the imperial chancellor, Conrad, Bishop of Hildesheim, came to Nicosia and crowned Amalric king of Cyprus. The recent death of the Emperor and that of the Pope notwithstanding, the imperial chancellor along with the papal legate, Conrad of Wittelsbach, Archbishop of Moguntia (Mainz), came to Tarsus bearing the long-awaited crown. Thereupon the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius III Angelus (1195-1203) rushed a royal crown to Levon just in time for the coronation.9 An impressive ceremony took place on January 6, 119910 in the Cathedral of St. Sophia. The Western representatives must have crowned Levon according to the Latin rite, handing him a scepter whereby he became a vassal of the German Emperor; while the Armenian Catholicos Grigor VI anointed him as king of the Armenians.

The ancient sources compel us to conclude that the coronation ceremony was in two parts, the first in the Latin rite with the papal and the imperial representatives officiating, and the second in the Armenian rite with the elderly Catholicos officiating.11 Moreover, in a manuscript of Nersès Shnorhalì’s Interpretation of the Catholic Epistles, penned by the scribe Hakob in 1198, we have the following colophon:

---

8 Örmanian, National History, III.3, §§ 1056-1058. There can be no doubt that Levon had made certain promises regarding unity between the two churches that enraged the hierarchs in the Armenian homeland. In his letter of May 23, 1199 to Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), on which see Alishan, Sukuan, 477-478, one may find the kind of promises Levon must have made earlier, committing the Armenian Church to unite with Rome. See also Gandzakets’i, History, 3 (ed. Melik’-Ohanjyan, 157; trans. Bedrosian, 121) on Levon’s deceptive promises.


10 On the date of Levon’s coronation, see the summary of the seemingly conflicting testimonies in V.A. Hakobyan, ed., Minor Chronicles, XIII-XVIII Centuries [Urvjp Թարգմանիչ Եվրոպայի պատմություններ, 5-9-11], 2 vols., Erevan: 1951-1956, I:51-52 n.9. Preference is given to the testimony of the anonymous Cilician historian (on whom see the short note by Gh. Alishan, Hayapatum, Venice: San Lazzaro, 1902, 436 n.1); see also below, n.12.

11 For the text of the Armenian coronation rite, see Dawk’yan, 65-69.
And after [a few] days another journey challenged my Lord and Catholicos of the Armenians, for he was summoned by Levon, who is from the ancients of our nation overlooked by the Seer and [who] now bears the royal title which the Armenians had. He uniquely received the purple robe of the augusts and was anointed like Tredat the Great by the will of the courageous Greek people (azgin Hunats’), who brought him the crown bearing the sign of the Cross. And he respectfully asked the spiritual Lord Grigorios to come and anoint him with the sanctifying and purifying oil of anointing (miwrion) and to crown his head with the seal of the sign of the Cross.  

12 G. Kat’oghikos (=Garegin Hovsep’ian), Manuscript Colophons [3p2wawwhwpw ətəwqəw病理], Antelias: Armenian Catholicosate of Cilicia, 1951, no. 277 (col. 611); cf. Alishan, Sisian, 471-475, (as well as idem, Hayapatum, 441-443). Other colophons of that year with reference to Levon are: no. 278 (cols. 617-618): “Now, in the year 647 of the Armenian Era [January 31, 1198 - January 30, 1199], when Levon, who is of the Rubenians, assumed the kingship of the Armenians . . .”; no. 283 (col. 624), attributed to Nerses of Lambron and appended to his translation of the Commentary on the Apocalypse of John by Andreas of Caesarea, at the end of several biblical manuscripts, especially Jerusalem no. 1930: “. . . and we were scorned by our neighbors down to the year 647, the year in which Levon of the Rubenians was highly honored as king of the Armenians, pious and triumphant in God, whose reputation for courage moved Henry the Great, Emperor of Old Rome, and Alex of New Rome to crown him with precious jewels in the church of Tarsus, which is shepherded by my unworthiness . . .” (since Lambronats’i died on July 14, 1198, he could not have witnessed Levon’s coronation on January 6, 1199. Either Levon was crowned on January 6, 1198 or else the colophon is the work of a continuator: the latter is more likely; see G. Hakobyan, Nerses Lambronats’i, Erevan: 1971, 356; and no. 285 (col. 631), from a Chrysostomian homily penned in memory of Nerses of Lambron, whose recent death is acknowledged in two colophons in the same manuscript: “. . . in 647, in the 10th year of the captivity of the Holy City of my Lord Jesus [i.e., ten years after the fall of Jerusalem to Salah ad-Din in AD 1187] and during the reign of the pious and Christ-crowned King Levon of the Armenians . . . remember in prayer the [intended] recipient of this book, the Lord Nerses, who was adorned with divine grace and filled with knowledge, who in this year rested in Christ, that the Lord may make him rest with His saints; also his parents, relatives, and friends who with deep devotion had this [codex] penned for the brightness and adornment of His Church . . .” and “In Christ remember the Lord Nerses who in this year rested in Christ.” See also the addition to the chronicle of Samuel Anets’i, Compilation from the Writings of Historians [Hwpwawwpw qqam qamwawqpwa病理], ed. A. Ter Mik’dian, Vagharshapat: Ejmiatzin Press, 1893, 114: “In the year 646 [January 31, 1197 - January 30, 1198] Levon was anointed King of the Armenians, reigning over the House of T’orgom twenty-two years, the crown being sent to him by the two emperors, of the Greeks and of the Franks, with which he was anointed king by the Catholicos of the Armenians, Lord Grigor.” Anets’i (d. ca. 1180) did not live to see the end of Levon’s reign, the length of which was subtracted, it seems, from the year of the king’s death, 1219. Levon’s coronation on January 6, 1199 is based upon the histo-
Barring any confusion here between the Greeks and the Franks, the author of this colophon suggests that the anointing was in conjunction with the second crown, that sent by the Emperor Alexius III, which provided the opportunity to have the Catholicos do the anointing according to the Armenian rite.

The Catholicos had yet another role to play at the time of Levon's coronation: to administer an oath of loyalty to the Armenian Church. Given the fact that the Rubenian family was partially Latinized because of intermarriages with the Crusader nobility, and that certain of the Armenian Church hierarchs and the barons of other leading families were apprehensive when Levon was within reach of his western crown, and more so given the likelihood that Levon was crowned first in the Latin rite, there was sufficient reason to exact from the newly crowned king an oath of loyalty to the Armenian Church. According to the anonymous Cilician historian,

An oath was demanded of Levon, which was this. They placed the Gospel before him, and this is a copy of the oath: "I, Levon, King of the Armenians, who by the will of God shall be King of the Armenians, do promise, pledge, and swear before God and the blessed Saint Grigor the Illuminator that I shall henceforth be guardian and protector of the Patriarch and of the holy Armenian Church and all her clergy, preserving her at all cost and for her benefit, and to attend to the needs of the Fatherland, its honor and rights, to the best of my ability, by the help of God, in keeping with my knowledge and ability, in the pure, Orthodox faith. So help me God ... and he repeats it three times."

The present tense "... and he repeats it three times" suggests a continuous practice. Although there is no record of the same oath being administered at later times, it was customary to take an oath at coronation time, which no doubt included allegiance to the Church and a promise to safeguard her well-being — a subject to which we shall return shortly.

---

13 Quoted by Alishan, *Sisuan*, 548 n. 473.
The first real test of the seriousness of such an oath came quickly. At his death on May 2, 1219, Levon left an infant daughter, Zabel, as his only heir. She was proclaimed queen and placed under the regency of Baron Atan of Baghras. Shortly thereafter, bandits assassinated Atan and eventually the regency passed to Constable Kostandin of the Het'umian family, who took his trust seriously by doing away with the pretenders to the throne.

When Zabel was barely six years old, Kostandin offered the throne to the second son of Bohemond IV of Antioch (the One-eyed, 1201-1216, 1221-1233), the eighteen year old Philip, probably in the belief that the alliance would serve as a deterrent to the Seljuk sultan of Konya, Kaikobad (1219-1237), who had earlier invaded Cilicia and whose brother Kaikaus (1211-1219) had inflicted a disastrous defeat on Kostandin's army near the end of Levon's reign. Philip took an oath to be faithful to the Armenian Church and her rites, to make no effort to introduce Latin customs, and to abide by the rules of the Cilician court. Within a year he had violated all his promises. Worse still, he smuggled the royal treasures, including the crown jewels, to his father in Antioch. Thereupon the Armenian barons imprisoned Philip in the fortress of Bardzrberd (Tel-Hamdon) late in 1224 and had him killed by poisoning when his father refused to return the treasures.

In 1226 Kostandin obtained the consent of CatholicoS Kostandin I Bardzrberdts'i (1221-1267) and the majority of the some seventy barons to marry his eleven year old son Het'um to the nine year old Zabel (Het'um I, 1226-1271). The marriage and crowning in Tarsus on June 14, on the feast-day of Pentecost, ended the long dynastic and territorial rivalries between the two leading families. Kostandin made peace with his neighbors, the Sultan of Konya in particular, until the Armenians allied themselves with the Mongols following Het'um's visit to Karakorum in 1254.

The several joint victories against Het'um's enemies ended on August 8, 1266, when the Mamluk sultan Beibars invaded Cilicia. Aware of the danger, Het'um entrusted his two sons, Levon and Toros, with the guarding of the country while he set out to seek the help of Abagha, the Ilkhan of Tabriz. The young princes with their army of 15,000 were no match for the Mamluk forces. Toros was killed and Levon was captured in the ensuing battle near Nicopolis.

---

14 Ibid., 527.
15 Ibid., 528.
16 Ibid., 401-402.
One Mamluk army sacked the coastal cities, and another pillaged Sis and set the city to the flames. Many were enslaved and the sacred books destroyed.

Upon his return with a small Mongol army, Het'um was forced to conclude a costly treaty with Beibars in which he ceded several frontier forts. The crown prince Levon was released and returned to his country, and the aged Het'um retired to a monastery. He died a year later, in October 1270.

Like his grandfather Levon I, the young Levon II (1271-1289) was crowned on January 6, 1271 in the St. Sophia Cathedral of Tarsus. Yet unlike his grandfather, Levon II went to his coronation with much reluctance and after three months of mourning over his father. While we do not have the details of the ceremony, there is good reason to believe that the oath of loyalty to the national Church was administered by the Catholicos of the day, Hakob I Klayets'i (cognomen Gitakan, “the Scholar”, 1268-1286). Fortunately, however, we possess an important oration by Vahram Rabun (ca. 1215-ca. 1290), who was the Chancellor of Levon II. The oration, delivered on the occasion of the coronation of the king whose loyal servant Vahram was, is more a theological treatise on kingship than an adulation of the king. The idea of universal monarchy with the divine right of kings, traced to its Davidic roots, was very vital for the Cilician kings — as it had been for the Bagratids before them. Near the end of the oration the author stresses the ethical obligation of a king to abide by his oath or promise, whether oral or written. At the conclusion he makes special mention of Queen Zabel (d. 1252), to whose benefaction he attributes his education. The royal support of the Church through lavish gifts and by providing for the education of the clergy surrounding the Catholicos is characteristic of the period.

Additional evidence for the kings’ loyalty to the Church is to be gathered from the Tagavoroṙnbēk, the coronation rite as preserved in the Euchologia, the clerical manuals, especially those used by the Catholicos, the Mayr Mashtots or the Main Euchologion. Of these, several manuscripts are preserved in various collections, especially at the Matenadaran in Erevan, where ms 3822, penned by a certain Bishop Melk’isèt and dating from the 13th century, may be deemed valu-

17 Ibid., 270, 519; Ormanian, National History, §1156.
18 Text in Ararat I (1868) 137-141; II (1869) 8-9, 36-39, 49-52, 73-78, 97-101; also A Message on the Theophany of the Lord and on the Anointing of Levon [Բուհ Բագրատունչուների Սերմու է, քրիստության տերցե, Երևան], Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1875.
19 Ararat II (1869) 78.
able for the period under consideration. Although neither a separate oath of loyalty nor a slot for an oath is found in this text of six folia, loyalty to the national Church is unambiguously clear in the rite itself, especially in the three prayers offered on behalf of the would-be king prior to his consecration by the Patriarch (Hayrapet). The following is the first of the prayers:

O Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords, Creator of all creatures, Savior of the world, grant us our petition, Lord, and answer with favor our prayer which we offer to you before the sacred altar, that you may keep constant and firm the covenant (zukhts) of the holy Church, by giving us this person whom you have newly chosen and called, [NAME], for the kingship and the governance of the House of T'orgom, to shepherd with care and to safeguard from enemies; that he may keep the universal (zendat'ughike) Church ever high and crowned with ever new glory, and that he may direct the horn of our faith in firm and steady direction and in righteousness for many days, through the intercession of the Holy Bearer of God; for you are our redemption, refuge, and helper, and to you befits....

The two remaining prayers have some repetitiousness and are equally clear about the king's obligations to the Church. Note the following from the second prayer: "...Establish him in the pure faith and hold his strength conspicuously high, so as to safeguard your holy, universal [and] Apostolic Church in the Orthodox confession (ughgbap'ar dawanut'eadam)...."

Other Euchologia of this period abound in new services of blessing items related to practices introduced at the height of the Latin influence. A rare Mashtots' at St. Lazar in Venice, ms 86, dated 1346/7 and penned probably by a certain Bishop Bartholomew (Bart'oghimeos, name erased) of Pononia at an unknown location, contains prayers for the blessing of armor and all kinds of weapons used by the cavalry, even banners, insignia, etc. The early adoption of western practices by the Cilician nobility may be gathered from the military code of con-

---

20 Cf. no. 965, dated 1432; no. 958, dated 1473. On these, see Davr'yan, especially 65-69. See also Jerusalem ms 2673, dated 1294 (p. 644). Such texts of Kingly Blessing [ womwemrop'um] or Canon for consecrating a king [wumwem rop'um] were still being copied at the beginning of the 19th century; see Venice ms 381 (Mashtots' no. 17 [Cat. vol. III, col. 665]), dated 1807 and penned in Constantinople.

21 Mashtots' no. 49 (Cat. vol. III, cols. 347-360).
duct translated from an old Greek manuscript by Nersès of Lambron, as well as from the oration of Hovhannès Erznkats’i (ca. 1230-1293) delivered at Hromklay on the induction of the princes Het’um and his brother T’oros, the sons of Levon II (1270-1289) into chivalry in 1283.

The most trying times in Church-State relations seem to have been during the intermittent reign of Het’um II (1289-1306, d. 1307) who, as a convert to Catholicism, became a Franciscan friar in 1294, assuming the name “Brother John.” The tensions continued to the last year of Het’um’s life, culminating with a council convened in March of 1307 in Sis by Catholicos Grigor VII Anawarzets’i (1293-1307), a staunch Latinophile and unreservedly Chalcedonian hierarch of the Armenian Church, who was elected through the intervention of Het’um.

Anawarzets’i, along with Het’um and his nephew, the co-regent Levon III (1301-1307), were determined to bring about union with the Roman Church so as to hasten another Crusade, which in turn would prove redemptive for the country’s ills because of the Mamluk attacks. No common theological grounds for the union of the two churches were to be found, and the Catholicos showed no reluctance towards the Roman demands — tantamount to Latinization of the Armenian Church and adherence to Rome. Anawarzets’i would have had his way had it not been for the increasingly vocal and uncompromising nationalists. His efforts were very divisive and created a great turmoil in the land. Possibly at the instigation of the nationalists, Het’um and his nephew Levon, in the first year of his sole reign, were murdered with about forty Cilician barons in Anazarba later in that year, on November 17, by a Mongol general who, ironically, had been sent by the great Khan to help Het’um against the Mamluks.

Upon hearing of the murders, Het’um’s brother Öshin (1308-1320) declared himself ruler of the land and was crowned the following year in the St. Sophia Cathedral in Tarsus. The new king was more zealous than his brother about the union of the two churches, and with the help of Catholicos Kostandin III Kesarats’i (1307-1322) he tried to force the nationalist factions to comply

---

22 Alishan, Hayapatum, 432; Hakobyan, Nerses Lambronats’i, 324-326.

23 Alishan, Sisstan, 224.


25 Örmanian, National History, §§1196-1244.
with his agenda. He even resorted to imprisoning those who opposed him. An organized protest in Sis threatened to turn into a rebellion in 1309. Unrelenting, Öshin, with the help of the Catholicos, had a church council held in Adana in 1316/17, at which churchmen and nobles agreed to adopt Chalcedonian Christology and Roman liturgical practices and to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, in a bid for western military assistance. Consequently, the king was poisoned in 1320, and his son and successor, Levon IV (1320-1342), was murdered by anti-Roman factions for relentlessly courting the West.

Hostility towards the Cilician ecumenical endeavors was not limited to the traditionalists in the East, who were appalled at the tendency of the Pahlawuni Catholicoi to compromise the anti-Chalcedonian position of the Armenian Church. Through itinerant monastic teachers and students the hostilities spread as far west as Erznka in the ancient province of Ekeghets', and worsened after the meddlesome reign of Öshin and the no less cruel reign of his son, Levon IV. The old anti-Chalcedonian polemics were revived along with harsh refutations and attacks against Anawartzets'ı and Kesarats'ı, as is attested in the writings of Movses Erznkats'ı (ca. 1250-1325).26

There being no immediate heirs to succeed Levon IV, the throne went to his cousin, Guy Lusignan (1342-1344), called Kostandin II by the Armenians, the son of Levon's paternal aunt Isabel and Amaury de Lusignan, Count of Tyre, and kin to the Lusignan kings of Cyprus. The Lusignan court was thoroughly French and absolutely Catholic, and perhaps altogether insensitive to local feelings in pursuing the efforts to bring about a union between the Armenian and Roman churches. Consequently, the king was killed within two years of his enthronement. The short-lived Lusignan period in Cilician history was rather turbulent (1342-1375), down to the reign of Levon V (1374-1375, d. in Paris, 1393), who on September 14, 1374, was crowned first by a Latin bishop and then, contrary to his wish, by Catholicos Póghos of Sis (1374-1382).27

In the eastern provinces, especially at the main religious centers, there was lack of enthusiasm about the Cilician kingdom from its beginning. The royal title King of All Armenians (amenayn Hayots' t'agawor) assumed by Levon I could well indicate an attempt at healing a schism — if not a claim to something

27 Örmanian, National History, §1338.
that was more of a desideratum than a reality. Prior to the end of the kingdom, it was customary to mention the reigning Armenian king by name during the liturgical services, especially during the Divine Liturgy, (in "For the peace..." [vasn khaqbaglut'ean...]); in the litany of the Liturgy of the Hours (in "Let us all say..." [asastis'uk amenek'ean], where nowadays the litany has "For pious kings..." [vasn barepasht t'agaworats' ]); and in the Andastan service, the uniquely Armenian blessing of the four corners of the earth, where nowadays mention is made of "...Christian kingdom[s]... [t'agaworut'iwn[k'] 'Kristonèits']". After the Mamluks exiled Levon V to Cairo in 1375, an event that marked the end of the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, the special mention of the king by name was dropped, giving way to the general petition for all Christian rulers.  

Moreover, shortly after the demise of the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, we find a shifting theology of kingship in the writings of the last great theologian of the Armenian Church in the Middle Ages, Grigor Tat'ewats'í (1344-1409). While at first his interpretation of the symbols of royalty appears to exalt kingship, an exegesis of the key passage shows that his real intent is to demonstrate that man, created in the image of God, has all the distinctive marks of royalty, more than appears to be invested in earthly kings. Here is Tat'ewats'í's theology of kingship from his monumental Book of Questions [Girk 'Harts'mants'] (Bk. V, ch. 28).  

And now, the authority of the king is indicated in four things. First, in the crown, since he is the head and lord of all his subjects. Second, in the purple, since he is of royal descent and kingly-born. Third, in the scepter and the ring, since he is established over and supported by princes and those in subjection. Fourth, the red shoes, since to the extent of giving their blood they are subjugated under his feet. They signify this. And just as they depict the image of the king with crown and with the purple and with the other [things] and they call the image king, in this way, then, the King of the entire universe created man according to His own image. And instead of the purple, He vested [him] in virtue, which is more royal than any vestment. And instead of a crown, He

---

28 Ibid., §1347.

29 Tat'ewats'í completed his Book of Questions in 1397. Composed of ten volumes (batork'), the work was the first comprehensive manual of systematic theology for the Armenian Church. Numerous copies of the text were executed in the author's own lifetime, attesting to its popularity. It was published in Constantinople, 1729, and reprinted in facsimile, in Jerusalem, 1993 (see p. 271).
adorned [him] with free will. And instead of the scepter, He established [him] with eternal blessedness. And instead of shoes, He subjugated everything under his feet (Ps. 8:6). Thus, man is called the image of God in many ways.

Expanding on the tacit point in his description of royalty, Tat’ewats’i goes on to cite several other particulars in which man resembles God.\(^3^0\) Tat’ewats’i belongs to the few in his time who still asserted man’s innate capacity to attain a part of the divine good, when many others of his contemporaries — both in the East and in the West — insisted upon man’s natural inadequacy and his need for God’s grace.

In conclusion it may be said that for churchmen, the Church, as the agency of grace, was clearly superior to the State. Yet the priest and the prince divided the world’s government, and hierarchs did not doubt that the former judged the latter. In the age of persecution of heretics, the Church needed the civil sword, as the Armenian Catholicoci did during the Bagratid Kingdom, when persecuting the Tondrakians to the point of annihilating them by the time of the fall of Ani in the 11th century. The same dependence of the Church on the State persisted during the Cilician kingdom, an age of invasions and defections to Islam, a period of insecurity for the Armenian Church as the Catholicosate prolonged its sojourn in the “diaspora”. The Church gained much by its alliance with the State, and vice-versa. The partnership between the two was mutually beneficial in Cilicia and, on the whole, seems to have been balanced. Whereas the rapprochement with the Byzantines was pushed mostly by the Church and for religious reasons, the rapprochement with the Latins was pushed mostly by the State and for political expediency.

Apart from the traditional trends in Church-State relations, characteristic of Byzantine times and generally adhered to in previous Armenian dynastic periods, there emerged an ever-widening role for the hierarchs of the Armenian Church — thanks to the introduction of western liturgical practices and ceremonial observances associated with chivalry, knighthood, and kingship. Thus the Latin influence in Cilician Armenia was paradoxical in that it strengthened both the State and the Church simultaneously, and the Latinizing pressure exerted by the State was tempered by the fundamentally Orthodox stance of the Church. Although Prince Levon appointed the higher clergy and called their

\(^3^0\) S. La Porta, “Additional Remarks Concerning ‘Man as the Image of God’ in Grigor Tat’ewats’i’s Book of Questions,” St. Nersess Theological Review VII (2002) 67-84; see especially pp. 69-70, from where the above quotation (revised) is taken.
councils even before the dawn of kingship in Cilicia, this did not become a trend with his successors who — at times — tried to do likewise. To be sure, there was occasional meddling of the State in the affairs of the Church. Similarly, prudent Catholicoi were able to keep the increasingly Latinized kings of Cilicia within the orbit of the Armenian Church, down to the inevitable demise of the kingdom.
Mandakuni’s “Encyclical” on Fasting

A substantial part of the early Armenian writings on fasting is associated with the name of Hovhan Mandakuni, a prominent churchman of the 5th century who held the office of Catholicos for twelve years — if not longer (478-490). As a late contemporary of the “holy translators”, he was involved in translating extra-canonical and Patristic writings into Armenian, including the apocryphal Third Letter to the Corinthians. Moreover, he was a contributor to the liturgical formation of the period. A few prayers of the Night and Noon offices in the Horologion, as well as certain services in the Euchologion — those of blessing churches, both at the laying of foundations and at dedication; those of blessing clerical vestments and other religious objects or artifacts; and the wedding service in particular, have been ascribed to him. To these may be added the hymn to the Ark of the Covenant in the hymnal or Sharaknots. These ascriptions no doubt stem from his role as an early collaborator in liturgical development: as translator and author of liturgical prayers and architect of certain services, he thus left an early and lasting imprint on the Armenian liturgical tradition.¹

Of the early and long-known documents on fasting,² the following have


² Of the early texts not associated with the name of Mandakuni, the following are noteworthy: the ninth homily in Often Repeated [and] Enlightened Discourses of Our Blessed Father Grigor the Illuminator [Հարություն Հայոց գրող Գրիգոր Առաջինի զարգացման ու տարբեր աշխատանքներ], ed. A. Ter Mik’elian, Ejmiatsin: Mother See Press, 1894; also in Often Repeated Discourses and a Prayer of Our Holy Father Grigor the Illuminator [Հարություն Հայոց գրող Գրիգոր Առաջինի զարգացման ու տարբեր աշխատանքներ և տարբեր աշխատանք], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1954; the exhortation by Khosrovik Vardapet (ca. 670-ca. 730), “The Teaching on the Forty-day Fast” [Բազմ հարություններով աշխատական իրավաբանություն], Handes Amsoyren XVIII (1904) 310-316. See also the 29th canon attributed to Catholicos Nerses II
been ascribed to him as authentic works: 1) the “encyclical” in the *Book of Letters* [Թղբեր Ծաղանգ],³ discussing the significance and the observance of the Lenten fast 2) canons in the *Book of Canons* [Քաղաքանքեր],⁴ mostly on the regular weekly fast days, i.e., Wednesdays and Fridays, with questions about fasting on Sundays during Lent, and 3) the Great-Lent proclamation or *k’aroz* in the *Horologion* [Ճառագրեր].⁵ Moreover, in a homily once attributed to him,⁶ the third homily titled “On Strictness in Fasting” is among the long-known works on the subject.⁷ The authorship of this homiliary, however, has been seriously questioned by Tër-Mkrtch’ian⁸ and others,⁹ who ascribe it to Hovhan May-


³ Text in *Book of Letters* [Թղբեր Ծաղանգ], ed. N. Bogharian (=Poghiaran), Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1994, 125-127 (= pp. 239-240 of the 1901 Tiflis edition). The text is found also in the collection of homilies once attributed to Mandakuni; *Homilies of Lord Hovhan Mandakuni, Patriarch of Armenia* [Տղարթեգութ Մանդակունի Պատրիարհ Զիրք], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1836, 204-206 (= 209-211 of the 1860 Venice edition).

⁴ *Canon Law of Armenia* I:491-500 II:242-243. These canons appear to be derivative; redaction is discernible throughout.


⁶ *Homilies of Lord Hovhan Mandakuni*. These editions contain additional writings that were not part of the original collection, which must have had 23 homilies only, ending with that “On Comforting the Bereaved”. The ensuing poem and prayer, whether by the same author or another, mark a clear ending of the collection at one time, before the additional writings, including the discourse “On Witches and Sorcerers”, were made part of the homiliary. As for other documents that follow in the Venice editions, they were gleaned from other collections where they bear Mandakuni’s name; e.g., the canons from the *Book of Canons* [Քաղաքանքեր] and the short writing on the forty-day Lenten fast, referred to as “encyclical” here, taken from the *Book of Letters*.

⁷ *Homilies of Lord Hovhan Mandakuni*, 30-37.


ragomets'i (ca. 575-ca. 640). 10 While not all arguments against Mandakuni’s authorship of the homiliary are convincing, 11 there are enough reasons to retain the question mark when it comes to determining the authorship of the latter work.

Far more noteworthy, however, is Tër-Mkrtch’ian’s edition of a little-known yet significant treatise, rightly attributed to Mandakuni and titled “On Love and Sanctity Whereby Creatures Prosper”. 12 The central third of this treatise is on fasting and leaves no doubt that the “encyclical” in the Book of Letters was part of this work, from where it was excerpted for use as a letter or encyclical subsequently included in the Book of Letters (the first compilation of which can be traced back to the 7th century, to the time of Catholicos Komitas, in office 615-628). Rather than providing a translation of the treatise in its entirety, 13 I shall give but a synopsis to help place the “encyclical” in its immediate context,

10 Mayragomets'i was the author of a larger homiliary, entitled Counsel for Life [Προτυπος Καθημερινών], which, according to a preface, contained 44 homilies of which 21 were entitled “Some Counsel on Faith” [Προτυπος Καθημερινών] and which were lost. Thus, the 23 homilies that survive under Mandakuni’s name were thought by Ter-Mkrtch’ian to be those left of Mayragometsi’s homiliary. But the 23 homilies encompass counsel on both life and faith, or the life of faith, and are altogether devoid of any hint of the Christological controversy that beset the Armenian Church as of the 6th century. Mayragometsi’s, on the other hand, was a strong anti-Chalcedonian, a polemicist whose surviving works bear the imprint of the Christological controversy of the time. For a list of his works, see Armenian Writers, 68-69.

11 Curiously enough, Ter-Mkrtch’ian and others singled out the homily “On Fasting” to substantiate on internal grounds the slightly later date of authorship and to attribute the collection to Mayragometsi’s. They dwelt on the use of the word apaghas, which is a transliteration of Gk. apalos, meaning “soft”, “tender”, etc., and which they claimed was not as yet attested in Greek writings before the 6th century. 11 But the Greek adjective was used with reference to food, e.g., meat, eggs, etc. from Classical times (see the Gk. term in A Greek-English Lexicon, ed. H.S. Jones et al., with a Supplement ed. by E.A. Barber, Oxford: Clarendon, 1968, 176), and its use with reference to fasting is attested in early Greek Patristic writings (see “apalotes” and “apalosis” in A Patristic Greek Lexicon, ed. G.W.H. Lampe, Oxford: Clarendon, 1961, 173). The term is comparable with Arm. p’ap’ek and p’ap’kgiwn, terms used several times in the homily and which should be translated “dainty” and “dainties” respectively (in the sense of delicacies).


13 A forthcoming publication will include this homily along with the other, aforementioned homilies on fasting.
along with an annotated translation of the excerpted passage. In the translation I include, in italics, those parts that were omitted in the course of excerption.

**Synopsis of Mandakuni’s “Treatise on Love and Sanctity”**

Mandakuni begins his treatise with the fall of Adam and speculates for a moment on what would have happened had there been no Fall. Given the reality of what happened, divine economy granted the Law and the Prophets as forerunners of Christ and the Gospel. Mandakuni moves quickly to compare the two dispensations: that of ancient Israel under the Law and that of the Church under Christ’s grace. Although the Prophets bridge the two dispensations, the Jewish people continue to be committed to works that disregard faith. He then speaks of the need for both faith and works (one finds here a bringing together of Paul’s theology and that of James). Yet faith cannot be contemplated without hope and love (1 Cor 13).

Fasting constitutes an ideal combination of faith and works, and this is how the author dives into a lengthy discussion on the Lenten or the forty-day fast.

In this segment of the treatise, which constitutes the central third of the discourse, Mandakuni defines the forty days of Lent as remembrance of Good Friday, as days of opportunity to participate in saving acts for both oneself and others in anticipation of the joy of the resurrection (lines 200-08). During the forty days of Lent it is as mandatory to fast on Saturday and Sunday as on the regular days, Wednesday and Friday (209-20). Lent is atonement time; hence moderation is a must. He lists the forbidden foods and recommends some good substitutes (221-37). Lent is a time to suffer with Christ so as to rise with Him (238-50). He then compares and contrasts the forty days before Easter with the forty days after Easter; that is, leading up to the Ascension. There follows a long and tedious comparison of the sorrow of the one period of forty days, called “Fri-

---

14 For a short statement on the Armenian position regarding the traditional fast on Wednesdays and Fridays, see Stepa’anos Siwnet’i (ca. 680-735), *A Response to the [Caucasian] Albanian Doctors of the Church* [Դարձայիլ ու դարձնելուր Անահատ Անանոս] in the St. James, Jerusalem manuscript collection, ms 145 (741b-742a). The Armenian position is traditional, as specified in the *Didache or The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (8:1), the earliest Christian manual on morals and Church practice, and as adopted in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (5.15; 7.23), compiled late in the 4th century (both works in Ante-Nicene Fathers 7). Of significance is the 4th canon in the first set of canons attributed to Mandakuni; it deals with abstinence from wine, oil, and fish — besides meat — on Wednesdays and Fridays (text in *Canon Law of Armenia* 1:491-500).
day”, with the joy of the other period of forty days, called “Sunday”. The lengthy comparison ends with reference to the forty-day fasts of Moses and Elijah, a *topos* in patristic homilies on fasting, and to two other fasts: that of the three young men in the book of Daniel and that of the Ninevites in the book of Jonah (251-311). The remaining lines reprimand misbehaving priests (*k’ahanayk’*) who find an excuse during Lent to indulge themselves with some Eucharistic wine on Wednesdays and Fridays — presumably while celebrating the Eucharist (*Patarag*). According to Mandakuni, the Eucharist is reserved for Sundays during Lent (312-37); however, this should not give license to indulge. He chastises those who begin indulgence at sundown on Saturday by being all too eager to celebrate the Eucharist, “lest they be guilty of breaking the fast without *Patarag*, [so] they claim.” (320)

One surprising element in this homily with so much about the forty-day fast and the significance of what immediately precedes and follows Easter is that there is no reference to the fast of Holy Week; that is, through the Saturday before Easter. The Holy Week fast was habitual from the 3rd century (Dionysius of Alex. *Ep ad Basilidem*, can. 1;15 *Didascalia* 21). St. Athanasius mentions a fast of six days before Easter (*Ep* 1, 10 [329]), but later he declares that the traditional fast is that of forty days (*Ep* 3, 1 [331]).

Mandakuni goes on to decry the ordination of ill-prepared young men as priests when they cannot read the Gospel. He holds those who ordain them responsible on the Day of Judgment. He stresses the necessity of the priests’ impeccability. When so much virtue was expected of Moses to bring Israel out of Egypt and into the Promised Land, how much more is to be expected of priests to lead people out of sin and into the Kingdom of Heaven! (338-79) His remarks here corroborate the canons attributed to him in the *Kanonagirk*.

Mandakuni returns to the fall of Adam as a result of the strategies of Satan and contrasts the fall of Adam with the triumph of the Second Adam (380-405). The homily ends with two long lists of sins illustrative of the straying to the left and to the right, in violation of the commandment “Do not swerve to the right or to the left” (Prov 4:27; cf. Deut 28:14 and par.). The passions of the body constitute the straying to the left, and the worst of these sins is gluttony; the passions of the soul constitute the straying to the right, and the worst of these is pride. All other sins stem from these two. These sins beset the monastics (*vakanans*) openly, and the lay people (*ashkharhakans*) insidiously (405-59). Such

lengthy lists of abominations have been typical of moral speeches since Hellenistic times.

These sins multiply as the end time approaches. The author concludes with a lament inspired by 2 Tim 3:1-5; 4:3-4 (460-508). Hard times are predicted, indeed experienced. The nakbarars, the Armenian feudal lords of Arsacid times, are converting to the religion of the Magi, and the Persian authorities are nullifying the canon law for bishops — historical realities that help date the document and establish its attribution to Mandakuni. 

[200] Now, during the forty days of Lent is remembered that Friday of the Lord’s suffering and crucifixion, [days that give] opportunity to remember those who are suffering in the world, to have for oneself the example of the Lord’s suffering for the salvation of those who are co-sufferers with Him and for the preservation of the souls of those who keep His commandments. So that having become co-sufferers in the Lord’s crucifixion, [we may] share in the glory of the resurrection. And [they give us] opportunity to call sinners unto repentance.

Now, during these forty days when Friday is remembered, [210] one must observe [the fast on] Saturday and Sunday, following the injunctions as for Friday and Wednesday. (And the Sunday following the forty days is called the First Day, that is the beginning of the resurrection days, the joy to the world and the good news of the Kingdom, full of every joy for the souls of all that keep the commandment of righteousness.) One must eat on Saturday and Sunday as on Friday and Wednesday. Just as from Easter to the Lord’s Ascen-


17 The forty-day fast is the Major Fast or Great Lent [E Gum Wbwpq wq], which lasts from the Monday that follows Carnival [Bnv Gwmpkhkbq wq] to the day before celebrating the resurrection of Lazarus. Our author is silent about the fast of Holy Week, which follows the period of Great Lent. An interpolatory allusion to Holy Week is made in lines 212-216, parenthesized below.

18 This statement, reiterated in the succeeding lines, contradicts the second of the first set of the heavily redacted canons attributed to Mandakuni in Canon Law of Armenia, I:491-500: “As for fasting on Sunday, there are neither canons nor teachers mandating it; rather, they place anathemas and curses [on those who teach so]. The 318 patriarchs at the holy council of Nicaea anathematized and established the same.” Cf. the 20th canon framed at Nicaea; for the Arm. version, see Canon Law of Armenia, I:131.

19 A likely interpolation; see above, n. 16.
sion is called Sunday, so also from the beginning of Lent to [220] Easter [is called] Friday.

Now, figure it for yourself, for your own conviction: these forty days of atonement correspond with the forty days of rejoicing. Weigh the one forty against the other forty, and Friday and Wednesday against Saturday and Sunday, and you will find this in common: there is neither satiety nor joy in the one, and neither abstinence nor sadness in the other. These forty days [give] opportunity to atone for the sins of the year, and the other forty [grounds] for the joys of the year.

[230] Now, it is mandatory to be sober during these forty days of Lent, until Easter, since this period is called the atoning and expiating time of the year. Thus it is absolutely unlawful to consume wine, oil, eggs, fish, cheese, butter, shellfish,20 the salted perch,21 buttermilk, milk, the dish made from the cow’s first milk, and caviar.22 It is improper for anyone to eat such things, whether for adults or for children, the just or the unjust. We have plenty of other delicious foods during these forty days: hemp-seed, lin-seed, flour of parched corn, grain, and fennel-water.

Now, by such forty days the Lord defeated the tempter, Satan, on the Mount of Temptation. This is to be held as an ideal example [240] of victory for all believers. Did God ever need to fast? Did He not do it as an example for people?23 Now, if we are unable to “die daily”, according to the saying of Paul (1 Cor 15:31), let us at least try to partake of the suffering of Christ during these forty days, to lay on the altar of sacrifice the sins of the year. Let us hum-

---

20 The word kaghti is found only in this document. As a hapax in Classical Armenian, its meaning is unknown (see Hrach’ya Acharian, Armenian Etymological Dictionary [Լայնքեբք հայերեն բառերի բանաստեղծություն], 4 vols., Erevan: Petakan Hamalsaran, 1971-1979, II:496-497; reprint of the 1st ed., 1926-1935). Etymologically, the word is related to gaghini, meaning “secret,” “hidden” or “concealed”, hence our translation as “shellfish”; cf. gaghakur, “oyster”. It is noteworthy that there is no mention of meat in this line of prohibited foods, or anywhere else in the document. The reason may well be that there was no question about not eating meat on those days, whereas there was a controversy first with the Nestorians and then with the Greek Church regarding sea foods. There could be some remote relation between kaghti and aghirti, “tripe” or some other entrails, such as an animal’s tongue; however, such a meaning is unlikely here.

21 On the rare word patzin, see ibid., I:390.

22 Arm. aqkan mor; lit., “berry of the fish”.

23 A recurring point in the literature on fasting; cf. “On Strictness in Fasting”, the third in the homiliary once attributed to Mandakuni.
ble ourselves for forty days. Do you not know that only those who in a determined way become partakers of the suffering of Christ will be able to share in the glory of the resurrection of Christ? For he says that "it behooves us not only [250] to believe in Christ but also to suffer for His name's sake" (Phil 1:29).

Now, these forty days [pertain to] the suffering associated with the Lord's crucifixion, and the other forty [pertain to] the Lord's resurrection unto life. These forty [pertain to] the vinegar and the gall of the Lord's suffering, and the other forty [pertain to] the honeycomb and the broiled fish of the Lord's resurrection. These forty [pertain to] the sealed tomb under the soldiers' watch, and the other forty [pertain to] the angels' giving the good news of the Lord's resurrection to the [three] Marys. These forty are for Peter's tears for denying the Lord during His suffering. [260] and the other forty for the threefold affirmation of Peter's love for the Lord. These forty are for Paul's dying daily for the Lord's sake, and the other forty for Paul's being crowned by the Lord. These forty are for the disciples' sorrow over the suffering of the Lord, and the other forty for the disciples' joy over the Lord's resurrection. These forty are for Mary's sorrow over the Lord's crucifixion, and the other forty for Mary's joy over the Lord's glorious rising to heaven at [the time of] the resurrection. These forty are [270] to strengthen for good deeds, and the other forty to lead to the rewards. These forty are a means to repentance, and the other forty a guarantee of forgiveness. These forty are for the atonement of transgressions, and the other forty for having sins forgiven. These forty are to plead with God, and the other forty for the peace of reconciliation. These forty are for the reduction of wrath, and the other forty for the passing away of anger. These forty are an opportunity for propitiation, and the other forty to obtain mercy. These forty are for grief and sorrow, and the other [280] forty for love and peace. [280] These forty are for weeping and tears, and the other forty for joy and rejoicing. These forty are for planting the seed with pain and sorrow, and the other forty for reaping with glory and praise. These forty are an opportunity for works, and the other forty for the showers of blessing. These forty are to teach good deeds, and the other forty for the distribution of good gifts. These forty are to set sail for profit, and the other forty for the port of peace. [290] These forty are an instrument for righteousness, the other forty for the Kingdom with open gates. These forty mark the beginning of repentance, and the other forty perfect righteousness.

Now, with these forty Moses the great prophet received the Law and gave it to the people, with the other forty Moses atoned for the sins of Aaron and the sins of the people. With these forty the Prophet Elijah fled to Mount Si-
nai,24 [with the other forty] he received the Lord’s consent to take him up to heaven. By such [300] fast the three youths lived through death by the high-rising flames of the horrible fire. By such fast the Ninevites were saved from the Lord’s decree of condemnation unto death and, prostrating themselves, they avoided through temporary death the death-bearing [message] of the prophet. Do you see the amenable compliance and the timely obedience of the Ninevites, who not only made the people from the oldest to the youngest to fast but also made the cattle to fast? [310] They complied with the fast of penitence and were quick to forsake the sins of their transgression.

Now, in the canons for these forty days that recall the Lord’s suffering there is no written injunction to offer Patarag25 on Wednesdays and Fridays, but only on Sundays. Because of the weakness of the priests of the Church it is forbidden to offer morning Patarag during the weekdays of these forty days and thus break the fast. But lest they be guilty of breaking the fast without Patarag, they say: [320] “We offer Patarag during the week because of the fast.” Yet priests violate the canon of fasting at the conclusion of the Sabbath (i.e., as one enters Sunday);26 however, it must be observed each day, according to Paul’s admonition: “One man observes each day, another man observes every day.” (Rom 14:5)27 And they sup in the evening, [even] before the end of the Sabbath, and they eat delicious foods and violate the canon of fasting. When monastics eat constantly during the free days, are they not shamed and reproved by people? How much more when they do this on the important and highly significant days? [330] When kings, judges, chiefs, bishops and all lay people observe [the fast], following the Lord’s command and each according to one’s ability, does it befit the monastic to violate constantly and become pathetic in thought, embarrassed, and a stumbling block

24 Some manuscripts have Mount Horeb.

25 Arm. for the Eucharist, meaning “sacrifice”, a covenantal term with reference to the Last Supper as the setting of the “New Covenant” (cf. Matt 26:28 and par.).

26 The word Shabat’ahanats’ (from Shabat’ahan) seems to be a hapax legomenon; it does not appear even in the New Lexicon of the Armenian Language [ psycopgwpw wwpqjwp wwpqjwp tdpwp], 2 vols., Venice: San Lazzaro, 1837 (repr. Erevan: Erevan University Press, 1981). It is a variant of Shabat’s banel at line 325, and thus seems to be a synonym of Kiraqamut.

27 The author is following the Arm. Bible verbatim (Arm. pwww opq = Gk. katth’ bêmeran; lit., “day by day”) which at this juncture differs from the Greek text (bêmeran par bêmeran). Both parts of the verse in the Arm. version justify daily observance. Moreover, the context here gives the verse a twist, a meaning other than that intended by Paul, where the observance is of a certain day and not of the fast.
to those who proceed to the finish line daily, calmly, in true piety, with love, sanctity and peace?
St. Grigor of Narek’s K’aroz on St. Grigor the Illuminator

Introduction

The text translated and commented upon in this study is the twenty-sixth “Ode” in Grigor Narekats’i, Odes and Hymns [աստծբեր երկկույտի գիրք]. The composition in poetic prose entitled “K’aroz by Grigor Narekats’i, Composed upon Saint Grigor the Illuminator” [Բարեգրուպ Պետրոսական Հայկական Հայրենիքները Հայրենիքները] was intended for liturgical use, as the word k’aroz (used in Armenian and Syriac liturgical rubrics) implies. The structure of the composition follows the form of the litanies of the saints, called k’aroz in the Zhamagirk’ or the Horologion of the Armenian Church, such as are found in the Morning Office [Սուրբ Սուրբ Երրորդ] of the Armenian Daily Offices. These short compositions consist of a series of petitions concluding with the word aghb’emk’ (“we plead”), addressed to the remembered saint, and culminate with a formal bidding (maght’ank’). Of the five such compositions in the Zhamagirk’ the first is traditionally attributed to St. Grigor the Illuminator and is used for the feasts of St. Hirsimé and her martyred companions and for those of the Apostles and the Prophets. Thus it is proper to compare the structure of Narekats’i’s K’aroz with that attributed — however questionably — to his namesake, to whom it is dedicated.

Because of its brevity, I shall here provide a complete translation of the K’aroz attributed to the Illuminator and shall then compare it with that dedicated to him by Narekats’i.

2 Horologion of the Holy Armenian Church [Ծառագրիչ Հայկական Մարտակերտի, Antelias: Catholicosate of the Great House of Cilicia, 1986, 294-303. I am grateful to my colleague, the V. Rev. Fr. Daniel Findikyan, for inviting my attention to this structure.
3 The attribution of this first k’aroz to St. Grigor the Illuminator cannot be ascertained; see the next note.
Great God, mighty and glorified, enlightener of the saints and abiding in the saints, we beseech the perseverance of the holy Apostles for mediation with you, we plead.

Hear, Lord, and have mercy.

You who are ceaselessly being blessed by the ranks of spiritual beings, the heavenly wakeful ones, make us worthy to bow down before your awe-inspiring Lordship in accordance with the proper praise by your saints, we plead.

We praise you in unison, in love for the memory of your confessors, who became followers of your luminous ways, Lord, you who took upon yourself the torments of the cross and of death, we plead.

Doers of the pleasure of your divine will, they sacrificed themselves for the confession of your true love and perfumed the sweet aroma of your Lordship, we plead.

They sanctified themselves to become a sanctuary for your holy Name, cleansing their minds and thoughts with your holy fear, and were ranked with the spiritual beings, the heavenly wakeful ones, we plead.

Through the intercession of the holy Bearer of God, of John the Forerunner, of the holy Apostles, the Prophets, and the martyrs, and of Saint Grigor our Illuminator, through the intercession and prayers of Saints (named), whose memorial is today, and of all your saints, Lord, who were drawn to your divine love, remember the souls of those of ours who are asleep and visit them at your coming, we plead.

*Remember, Lord, and have mercy.*

---

\(^4\) This part of the *maght'ank* has become traditional in the pre-festal services held on the eve of the saints' feast days. The invocation of St. Grigor the Illuminator could hardly be original in a work attributed to him. The attribution of the composition as a whole to St. Grigor is equally suspect.
Moreover, grant us [to abide by] the admonitions to love and [to do] good deeds, we pray.

Give us, Lord God.

Let us submit ourselves and one another to the Lord God Almighty.

Narekatsi’s more elaborate composition in eleven parts conforms to the structure of the liturgical k’aroz; indeed it is inspired by the liturgical k’aroz, and thus it carries the same rubric, which is difficult to translate without reference to the little-known liturgical genre. His work is replete with petitions to St. Grigor the Illuminator, with each of the first seven sections or petitions culminating with the usual refrain: to ask the Lord through the mediation of the Saint “to grant His gift of atonement and grace of mercy to the rational flocks, the children of men, we plead.” Even such minor differences as the switch from “we pray” to “we plead” in the two admonitions (at the end of the ninth and tenth sections, lines 131, 133) are influenced by the admonitions at the end of the liturgical k’aroz. Similarly, the composition culminates with an elaborate bidding addressed to the Holy Trinity. Whereas the admonitions follow the bidding in the above quoted k’aroz, in Narekatsi’s composition the admonitions precede the bidding. Moreover, the bidding in Narekatsi’s work is marked in the manuscripts with the word p’okh (“change”), indicating a variation or transition in the recitation (lines 134-158).

Like the later odes and the much longer panegyrics on St. Grigor, Narekatsi’s K’aroz was composed for the celebration of his “memorial day”, as indicated at the beginning and at the end of the ode: “The children of Zion celebrate the day of your remembrance” [swywhi tων υποφ ςεκ του της Ἰησοῦ] (line 2); and “of St. Grigor, whose memorial is today” [ώρηπ στρ’ επιτειμ πρ’ Ἰησοῦ] (line 149). Of the several feast-days commemorating the major events in the life of St. Grigor, as observed in the Armenian Church, the earliest and foremost was that of his death and the discovery of his remains (giwt nshkharats’). That this was the feast contemplated by Narekatsi can be further discerned from the emphasis placed on St. Grigor as shepherd (lines 4, 43, 110 and the refrains), a theme inspired by the Gospel reading from John 10:11-16, the pericope of “The Good Shepherd”, which is the lesson prescribed in the Lectionary for the feast-day of the discovery of St. Grigor’s
remains. This was also the occasion for the first of the hymns on St. Grigor, by Movsēs Bishop of Siwnik’ (ca. 670-731). The following, the first of the eight parts of that hymn, shows how traditional is the content of Narekats’i’s *K’aroz*:

O happy lord, Saint Grigor, minister of sanctity and leader of the rational flock, we have you for a mediator with Jesus — the Only-begotten — and an intercessor on behalf of those who have allied themselves with you. Hasten to ask for forgiveness of sins for us, discipled by you.

O blessed lord, Saint Grigor, we have you for a mediator with Christ on our behalf. You who are not ignorant of the misleading ways of the tyrant, we have you for a mediator with Christ on our behalf. You who are ranked with the disembodied ones, we have you for a mediator with Christ on our behalf.

True substance of the divine precepts and foundation of faith for the human race, lord Saint Grigor, beseech Christ for us through your intercessory prayers. Chosen of God, true high priest and spiritual shepherd of the rational flock, lord Saint Grigor, beseech Christ for us through your intercessory prayers.

---

5 Prior to the reforms of Catholicos Hovhan(նէս) Mandakuni (in office 484-490), this single feast of St. Grigor was celebrated on March 9, as a fixed day. Mandakuni’s reforms made it moveable, to the fifth Saturday of the Lenten period, thus falling between March 1 and April 10 (with Easter falling between March 22 and April 25, a 35-day variable). According to a 13th-century testimony by Kirakos Gandzakets’i, this feast was celebrated on the sixth Saturday of the Lenten period (Arm. text: K.A. Melik’-Ohanjanyan, ed., *Kirakos Gandzakets’i: History of Armenia* [Քերակոս Գանձակետի Հայոց պատմություն], Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1961, 14; Eng. trans., R. Bedrosian, *Kirakos Gandzakets’i’s History of the Armenians*, New York: Sources of the Armenian Tradition, 1986, 11). Nowadays, the feast is celebrated on the third Saturday after Pentecost. The other feast days of St. Grigor were introduced at a later time. Eventually, the fifth / sixth Saturday of the Lenten period was relegated to commemorating the Saint’s confinement in the pit, and the old feast was moved to its present place in the liturgical calendar. For the early history of the Gregorid feasts, see V. Vardanyan, *The Church Calendar of the Armenians: 4th-18th Centuries* [Հայոց եկեղեցական աշխարհի անվանական աշխարհագրություն], Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1999, 589-612.

Wreath of decorum of the Church of Christ and leader unto life eternal, lord Saint Grigor, beseech Christ for us through your intercessory prayers. Chosen of God, true high-priest, and spiritual shepherd of the rational flock, beseech Christ for us through your intercessory prayers.

You who through your calling, your dedication to Christ, rose like a sun and enlightened the land of Armenia with the knowledge of God, lord Saint Grigor, mediate for us without ceasing. You who were translated to the heavenly tabernacle of light after your virtuous perseverance, mediate for us without ceasing.

The Christian churches were made glorious through you, ever glorifying the union of the Holy Trinity, lord Saint Grigor. Mediate for us without ceasing.

Similarly, Narekats’i’s homage must have had considerable influence on the subsequent odes and panegyrics on St. Grigor, produced during the Cilician period, especially the two Pseudo-Chrysostomian panegyrics (one attributed to St. John Chrysostom and the other to his disciple Theophilos) and those by Hovhannès Sarkawag, Vardan Arewelts’i, and Hovhannès Erznkats’i. All these panegyrics share countless common elements among them and with Narekats’i’s composition. Like the latter, these quasi-liturgical texts were composed for celebrations of the Saint’s “memorial day”; they are replete with praise and adulation of the Saint and employ inclusive, participatory vocabulary.

There can be no doubt about the attribution of the work under considera-

---

7 These works have been collected in the small yet celebrated series, Armenian Books [Ազգային գրականություն], vol. IV: Panegyrics on St. Grigor the Illuminator by John Chrysostom, [His Disciple Theophilos], and Grigor Sarkawagapet [Հովհաննես Սարկավաղաս բնակչության զարգացման շրջանում], ed. V.: Panegyrics on St. Grigor the Illuminator by Hovhannès Sarkawag, Vardan Barzerberdts’i [read Arewelts’i], and Hovhannès Erznkats’i [Հովհաննես Սարկավաղաս, Վարդան Բազիզերդցի [read Arewelts’i], Հովհաննես Էրզնկատցի], Venice: San Lazaro, 1853. A critical text of Arewelts’i’s panegyric is found in Vardan Arewelts’i, Panegyrical Speeches [Պանեգիրական երգեր], ed. Hakob K’yosayan (Theological Texts and Studies [Առաստագործական գրքեր, պատմություններ, գիտություններ]), 2), Erivan: Oskan Erevants’i, 2000, 306-322; a second, shorter panegyric by Arewelts’i on the Illuminator follows, 323-330.

tion to Narekats'i. In fact, the initial letters of the respective sections create an onomastic acrostic (spelling out the author's name) and designate the composition as a formal "hymn" (gandz): GRIGORI GANDZ. The same arrangement, yielding the author's name, is found in several of his authentic compositions collected in Odes and Hymns. As for the acrostic designation of the composition as a gandz, this too is attested in several of his works entitled k'aroz. K'yoshkeryan observes that while these compositions are inspired by the form of the traditional k'aroz, they have hymnic characteristics and are to be considered as quasi-liturgical texts. She invites special attention to such a k'aroz by St. Basil of Caesarea, ("K'aroz on the Paschal Season" [Քարոզ Հանդես] in the Gandzaran of the Armenian Church (a collection of hymns secondary to those in the official Sharaknott), which could have served as a model for Narekats'i. This does not preclude his reliance on the more common models found in the Zhamagirk or the Horologion, especially the one traditionally attributed to the Illuminator.

As for the text, I prefer to see it as a composition in poetic prose rather than in free verse. The same applies to much of the rest of the works of Narekats'i, including his Matean Oghbergut'ean. Thus, the prose text of the K'aroz in the most recent edition of Narekats'i's works is to be favored. However, given the recitative nature of the text, K'yoshkeryan's free-verse arrangement may be deemed justifiable, and the line enumeration comes in handy for reference. And although her general arrangement of the text may be acceptable, certain of her line divisions are not. The section divisions are clearly marked by the acrostic initials and substantiated by the repetitive petitions, the admonitions, and the bidding — the traditional features of the liturgical k'aroz.

---

9 K'yoshkeryan, Odes and Hymns, esp. 131-225.
10 Ibid., 23-30; note esp. 26-27.
12 See the recent, millennial edition of Narekats'i's works: Book of Lamentation and Other Works [Սուրբ Աբակունուն և մյուրագրիք], Antelias: Catholicosate of the Great House of Cilicia, 2003, 624-627.
Annotated translation:

ODE BY GRIGOR OF NAREK COMPOSED UPON SAINT GRIGOR THE ILLUMINATOR

[G] 1-13
With overwhelming joy the children of Zion
celebrate your memorial day
with passionate zeal, O great confessor
and shepherd of the rational flocks, Saint Grigor.
With earnest petitions, heartfelt tears,
we beseech you, O good teacher and father,
to have tender compassion on your children
to whom you gave birth in travail, through the womb and the bosom
of the [baptismal] font, the mother of us all.
Please present with entreaties the petitions
of the present celebrants,
constituents brought together by the power of the Word,
that He may grant His gift of atonement and grace of mercy
to the rational flocks, the children of men, we plead.

[R] 14-27
Of all tribes and nations, you were found to
be superior among Adam’s descendants.
By an amazing miracle, to evil ancestors who murdered their master,
you were a God-given child, a virtuous son,
a rose grown from a thorny bush,
saffron and graceful lily of the valleys,
a plant from dried up roots
planted along the fertile windings of rivers,
feeding the children of New Zion, those
starving for the heavenly Bread of Life;  

---

13 Same as “children of New Zion”, “children of the daughter of Zion”, and “children of Zion” below (lines 21, 91, 107); a recurring designation for the people of God in the Prophets, appropriated by 1st-century Christians.

14 Cf. line 149. On the feast day(s) of St. Grigor, see above, n. 5.
a refreshing cup [of water], delicious, gushed forth from the rocks for the panting children of Eve, the tribes descended from Hayk. 16
Please petition the Lord, who chose us, who called and crowned you,
to grant His gift of atonement and grace of mercy
to the rational flocks, the children of men, we plead.

[I] 28-39
From the dense darkness of godlessness,
a nursling infant, you were brought to the edifice of light,
where you were doubly nursed with milk
from the breasts extending from Zion,
the New and the Old Testaments 17 for a spiritual drink,
with which you were amazingly fed.
You attained to mature manhood in Jesus, the Savior of all. 18
You arrived at His deep mystery like Paul, in full command, 19
a revealing teacher and preacher of the
inscrutable, hidden mystery.
With a benevolent will, mediate with God,
the Creator from non-existence, the Provider and Restorer,
to grant His gift of atonement and grace of mercy
to the rational flocks, the children of men, we plead.

[G] 40-52
Superior to the band of the Eleven, 20 a preacher for the world

---


16 Hayk, the legendary ancestor of the Armenians; see below, n. 24, on "the sons of T'orgom" at line 42.

17 So also in the author's Commentary on the Song of Songs, on 1:1, 3, 12 (cf. on 4:5, where the two breasts are the two natures in man: soul and body; not commented upon at 4:10). For the Armenian text, see the recent, millennial edition of Narkeats' i's works: Book of Lamentations and Other Works, 464-465, 470, 484, 486.


19 Arm. bazarapa, literally, "commander of a thousand men", is a military term corresponding to Gk. chiliarch.

20 A recurring designation in this K'aroz, it refers to the Disciples after the exclusion of Judas Iscariot; cf. the ode by Catholicos Grigor III Pahlawuni (in office 1113-1166): "Ode said for
and seasoning salt,\textsuperscript{21} filled with the intelligible light, you appeared from the West\textsuperscript{22} to the regions of the North,\textsuperscript{23} to the sons of T'orgom\textsuperscript{24}

S. Grigor Lusavorich" [Sawt U. Քրիստափեր Լաուրատի և Աստվածածին] in Armenian Troubadours, Popular Singers and Song Writers [Քրիստափեր և պոպուլյար երգեր էպում], ed. T. Paiean, 2 vols., Izmir: Mamurian, 1911-1912, II:236-237. That St. Grigor is superior to the Apostles is a recurring theme in the panegyrics. The thought is based on the tradition that while the Apostles were assigned specific realms to evangelize, our Saint had no such limits, echoing later apocryphal sources claiming that the world was parcelled out by lot among the Twelve Apostles for evangelism (The Acts of Thomas I; cf. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, 3.1; The Teaching of St. Gregory, tr. Robert W. Thomson, [AVANT 1], New Rochelle, NY: St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 2001 (rev. ed.), §§609, 688). In the Panegyric attributed to St. John Chrysostom, St. Grigor, unlike the Twelve Apostles who divided the world for evangelism among themselves, was privileged by God to preach universally (Armenian Books, IV:31 and 79-81).

\textsuperscript{21} Echoing Matt 5:13 (and parallels), "seasoning salt" is a common metaphor in the panegyrics to the Saint. Cf. the first torture of the Saint, the salt blocks placed on his back (Agat'angeghos, History of the Armenians, §§69, 72; Arm, text: G. T. Mkr'tch'ian and S. Kanayeants', eds., Agat'angeghos', History of the Armenians [Քաղաքաղներ Հայ պատմություն], Tiflis: Martiros' Ants'ts', 1909; Eng. trans., R.W. Thomson, Agathangelos: History of the Armenians, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1976); also the toponym of the ancestral domain of the Gregorids, the district of Daranaghik' (lit., "storage of salt").

\textsuperscript{22} Although of Eastern origin, St. Grigor came to Armenia from the West, from Cappadocian Caesarea, where he was raised. His coming from the West is a recurring designation in the panegyrics.

\textsuperscript{23} Referring to Armenia and the Caucasus in general, to the north and east of the Taurus chain.

\textsuperscript{24} Referring to the Armenian people, believed to be descended from Togarmah (Arm. T'orgom; Gen 10:3), who begot Hayk, the legendary ancestor of the Armenians (Movses Khorenats'i, History of Armenia [Հայաստանի պատմություն], 1.5, 9, 12 (M. Abebyan and S. Harut'ianyan, eds., Tiflis: Martirosiants'ts', 1913, 19, 32, 42; Eng. trans., R.W. Thomson, Moses Khorenats'i, History of the Armenians [Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies 4], Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978; 74, 84, 92). The claim, however, is not original with Khorenats'i, for Togarmah / T'orgom is identified as the progenitor of the Armenians in Agat'angeghos, History of the Armenians, 16. Linking the Armenians with the descendants of "Thorgama" (LXX) seems to have originated among Greek writers such as Hippolytus, an early 3rd-century bishop of an unknown see whose Chronicle survives partly in Greek and wholly in Latin and Armenian (Werke, ed. A. Bauer and R. Helm [Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 46], Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955, 12); for other Greek writers, see Thomson, Agathangelos, 453-454 §16 n. 1). The identification derives from references to the House of Togarmah in Ezek 27:14 and 39:6, along with Jer 51:27 (28:27 LXX): "Summon against her these kingdoms: Ararat, Minni, and Ashkenaz." Because of the
dwelling in darkness;  
will ing to die for them, brave shepherd,
you offered yourself courageously, like the Lord upon the cross.  
You took upon yourself the agony of tortures, twelve in number,\(^{25}\)  
corresponding with the cardinal sins of all humanity.  
You dwelt in the serpent-infested dungeon for 
six-times-two-plus-one symbolic years.\(^{26}\)  
You neutralized the deadly venom of the snake.  
Disembodied, you ruled over the snakes there.  
Beseech the heavenly Father that we may be cleansed from the 
 venom of the tortuous dragon;  
to grant His gift of atonement and grace of mercy 
to the rational flocks, the children of men, we plead.

[O] 53-67

To the children of men abiding in darkness,  
from a dark region you shone, a shining light, intelligible and sunlike,\(^{27}\)  
a cure for the torments of demons and a healer of our souls.  
You ascended into the ranks of the incorporeals,  
you were set apart and were given for our redemption.  
You brought the king back from his irrational nature, changed him to a 
man.\(^{28}\)  
You brought the princes, together with the elders and the troops,

combined reading of these prophetic passages and owing to Gen 10:3, where Ashkenaz is an 
elder brother of Togarmah, a confusion seems to have arisen that led to a parallel tradition 
claiming that Armenians are descended from Ashkenaz. Both traditions are attested in this 
work of Narekats’i (see further below, n. 30, on “the grandchildren of Ashkenaz” at line 93).

\(^{25}\) On the twelve tortures of the Saint, culminating in his being thrown into the pit or dungeon 
of Khor Virap, see Agat’angeghos, History of the Armenians, 69-122.

\(^{26}\) A play on numbers replete with allegorical significance, as in Hellenistic Jewish numerology 
found in the works of Philo of Alexandria and adopted by the Church Fathers. See A. Tertian, 
“A Philonic Fragment on the Decad,” in F.E. Greenspahn et al., eds., Nourished with Peace: 
Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel (Scholars Press Homage Series 
9), Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984, 173-182 [Ed.— repr. in the present volume, pp. 289-
300].

\(^{27}\) On St. Grigor as “sun”, see below on “the fullness of the sun” at line 108.

\(^{28}\) King T’rdat’s punishment as a wild boar is described in Agat’angeghos, History of the Armen-
ians, 211-225.
to their senses.
You freed from demonic powers all the inhabitants of the land,
consigning them to the heavenly Father as children of light,
By your own blood and the travail of your ordeals,
you appropriated a people to yourself.
Would you earnestly beseech Jesus, the Hope of everyone
and Lord of all,
to grant His gift of atonement and grace of mercy
to the rational flocks, the children of men, we plead.

[R] 68-87
Good teacher, thoughtful mentor,
proclaimer of the Word of Life, lord Saint Grigor,
renowned in your fine progress, bearer of good tidings to Zion,
recounting of the unreachable things and revealer of those not found:
You revealed the infinite God to the nation gone astray,
the union of the Three Persons, along with the nature of the Divinity,
by whom the totality of things was wrought.
You taught ignorant people in darkness
about the descent of the Son into a body,
the One whose birth is without when and where.
You made the uninformed knowledgeable.
You talked about eternal life and the second death,
about His death on the cross for the human race.
You preached about becoming heirs of God and brother[s] of Christ
through resurrection after death.
By the grace of the Spirit, by whom you were renewed,
you summoned again, in a glorious fashion, Adam and his progeny.
Please beseech with heartfelt love the
grace-imparting Spirit of God to be with us daily,
to grant His gift of atonement and grace of mercy
to the rational flocks, the children of men, we plead.

[I] 88-105
Truly called from on high, with a specific decree,

29 Alluding to Rom 8:17; Gal 3:29; etc.
you were appointed patriarch and bridegroom
of the Church of Christ, lord Saint Grigor,
distributor of the graces of the Holy Spirit to all [your] children,
to whom you gave birth, children of the daughter of Zion,
spread like a flowing river through the land of Armenia.
You cleansed, enlightened and perfected
the grandchildren of Ashkenaz.  
Those alienated, as those at home, and those distant,
as those who are near,
you led to Jesus’ door, to the Spirit’s home,
and to the Father’s bosom;  
bringing, like a father, your children to God,
nurturing with milk, like a mother,
the countless children born through your travail.
The One who once died and who is alive forevermore,
you offered as Eucharistic gift for the reconciliation of men to God,
as He offered Himself on the cross.
You went into seclusion at the end of your life;  

---

31 A mystic progression may be detected here, corresponding to the tri-partite church architecture, from the entrance to the altar.

32 Echoing Rv 1:18.
at the end of it all, you were taken to the Father’s bosom
by the grace of Christ’s love.
Beseech the One to whom you are intimately close, the Three
Persons and One Divinity,
to grant His gift of atonement and grace of mercy
to the rational flocks, the children of men, we plead.

[106-129]

Appearing in superior purity,
you shone on the children of Zion, lord Saint Grigor,
rising in the fullness of the sun — more than that of the stars;³⁴
universal preacher, greater than the band of the Eleven,
superior to the patriarchs who followed them,
brave and courageous shepherd.

You obtained your flocks through your own blood,
O great among the confessors
and altogether incomparable among those who were
crowned with blood,

³³ Agat’angeghos, History, 858, 861, 888, on the Saint’s seclusion on Mount Sepuh (today’s
Kara Daghi, height 3,030 meters, in the north-eastern Taurus chain).

³⁴ In the Panegyric attributed to St. John Chrysostom, St. Grigor is said to have been given this
appellation, “Sun of Righteousness”, by the Lord himself; for unlike the Twelve Apostles who
divided the world for evangelism among themselves, the Armenian Saint alone was privileged
to preach universally (Armenian Books IV:31; trans., Selection II); however, later in the same
work the Saint is said to be “the brightest light that arose after the Sun of Righteousness” (p.
79) and enlightened the world from East to West (pp. 80-81; cf. the Panegyric by Hovhannes
Sarkawag Vardapet, (Armenian Books V:9), where the Saint is a spiritual beam of the intelligible
Sun; and the Panegyric by Vardan Vardapet Arevelts’i, where at one time Christ is referred
to as “Sun” and at another time the same word, aregak, is used for the Saint (Armenian
Books V:42, 81). In (Ps.-) Hovhannès Mamikonian, History of Taron [qmddri|pi|cu
Swpovny], “Sun of righteousness” is an epithet of Christ (p. 41) as well as of St. Grigor (p.
123; Arm. text: ed. A. Abrahamyan, Erevan: Haypethrat, 1941; Eng. trans.: L. Avdoyan,
Pseudo-Yovhannès Mamikonian: The History of Taron [Occasional Papers and Proceedings:
Columbia University Program in Armenian Studies 6], Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993, 59, 94).
The common, universal imagery of the sun serves as a fitting symbol in the transition from
Zoroastrianism to Christianity in ancient Armenia, as J.R. Russell observes: “The image of the
Sun of Righteousness would have been familiar to Armenian proselytes from Zoroastrianism”
(“Here Comes the Sun: A Poem of Kostandin Erznkats’i,” Journal of the Society for Armenian
you, who knew the mystery of Jesus more than the Prophets, 115
even leader and head of ascetic clerics,
heavenly man and earthly angel,
Seraph of clay and corporeal Cherub,
corporeal seat and resting place for the will of the Great God: 
I plead earnestly with you to appeal to the Lord on behalf of all earthly humanity:
For patriarchs, right doctrine; 120
for bishops and priests, impeccable share of grace;
for deacons, readers, and all dedicated children of the Church, sanctity, holiness, and righteousness;
for kings and princes, courage and just judgment;
for soldiers and commanders, and for all men and women, 125
health and true confession;
for those asleep, rest and resurrection unto life.
Please, remember and have mercy upon those fallen asleep in the hope of the resurrection, we pray.

[A] 130-131
Moreover, 130
grant us [to abide by] the admonitions to love
and [to do] good deeds, we pray.

[N] 132-133
To rededicate ourselves and one another,
to submit ourselves to the Lord God Almighty, we plead.

[Dz] 134-158
With entreaturing voice, tearful pleading,
we ask you, Lord of All, Holy Trinity, 135
Creator of all creatures that came into existence from nothing,
Fashioner of our nature from two constituents made into one: corporeal and incorporeal, spiritual body, in your image and form, provident Provider, Restorer of the immaterial and the material, Reviver of our fallen nature and Redeemer of the first man, Adam, Merciful, Lover of mankind, generous Benefactor:

35 These three lines contain common attributes of the Virgin Mary in patristic literature.
Through the intercession of the truly blessed Mary, the bearer of God, mother of the incarnate Word, Through the intercession of John the Forerunner, The baptizer of your Son, hearer of the Father’s voice, seer of your Spirit in the form of a dove, through the entreaties of the blood of Stephen the Protomartyr, who saw you at the right hand of the Father, through the intercessory perseverance of Saint Grigor, who is commemorated today, through the petitions of the Apostles and the Prophets, and the brave and blessed martyrs made perfect, through the constantly outstretched arms of the pure, ascetic bands of hermits, grant peace to the world and stability to the Church, guidance to leaders and sanctity to priests, and atonement and mercy to all people.

And now, may the Lord our God have mercy on us according to His great mercy.

145
150
155

37 Allusion to Acts 7:55-56.
38 The bidding of these four by name: the Virgin Mary, St. John the Baptist, St. Stephen the Proto-martyr, and St. Grigor the Illuminator is standardized in the liturgy of the Armenian Church, not only in the Morning Office but also in the pre-festal services of major feast days (the maght’ank’ part in the nakhatonank’). Narekats’i’s ode is an early attestation to this usage. On St. Grigor’s feast-day, first mentioned at line 2, see above, n. 5.
39 Lines 151-153 are echoed in the "K’aroz on the Holy Cross" by Narekats’i; see K’yoshkeryan, Hymns and Odes, 218, lines 79-84.
Saint Grigor of Narek on the Human Nature

"As if I had a secret compartment in my soul
filled with your life-giving relics"
(Prayer 83.5)

Introductory Note

The THEOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY of St. Grigor of Narek is invariably informed by the Genesis account of the creation of man and conditioned by the perceived consequences of the fall of the forebears in the Garden of Eden. Attendant to this biblical perspective, however, there are countless notions of the human nature in early Christian thought that derive from classical philosophy — thanks to Hellenistic Judaism and the adoption of the anthropological views of Philo of Alexandria by the Church Fathers.¹ In his interpretation of the double account of man's creation as a single, composite creation, Philo equates the image of God (Gen 1:26-27) and the inbreathed divine spirit (Gen 2:7), taking them for the human mind: that divine, incorruptible element or the rational part of the soul whereby the earthborn man is able to contemplate di-

vine things and attain the virtues (especially wisdom) that bring the soul to happiness and immortality. Philo’s anthropological views seem to be dominated, nonetheless, by the apparently traditional understanding of the dual creation of man as two distinct creations (following the Platonic doctrine of the ideas), even in instances where he sees both accounts as suggestive of the dual nature of the earthborn man: one corporeal, earthly, and corruptible; the other spiritual, heavenly, and incorruptible.

More immediately than that of Philo, however, Narekats‘i’s views on the creation and fall of man are imbued with the theology of the Cappadocian Fathers: Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzos (the Theologian), and Gregory of Nyssa, whose writings were much cherished in the Armenian patristic tradition. The Armenian translation of the latter’s On the Creation of Man appears to have been well known to Narekats‘i, as were also Basil’s Hexaemeron and On the Nativity of Christ and the Theologian’s Orations; so too Apollinaris of Laodicea’s On the Incarnation of the Logos — once attributed to Athanasius. Though these Fathers embrace the Philonic interpretation of the divine image and breath in man, they elaborate on the Genesis passages Christologically, especially in light of the Pauline hymn in Col 1:15-18 equating Christ with “the image of the invisible God”. Thus for the Fathers Christ is “the archetypal image”. Moreover,

2 Among the numerous passages in Philo, see especially Legum allegoriae 1.36-38; Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat 86-90; De Abrahamo 72-80.


4 See R.W. Thomson, A Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature to 1500 AD (Corpus Christianorum), Turnhout: Brepols, 1995, 57.

5 Ibid. 38.

6 Ibid. 56-57.

7 Ibid. 33, 36-37.

8 Among other passages on the “image” theme, see Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 4:4; Heb 1:3; 1 John 3:2. Equally significant is John 20:22, the risen Lord imparting the Holy Spirit by breathing on his disciples (using the same verb as in Gen 2:7 [LXX]).

9 The Pauline hymn itself is anticipated in Hellenistic Judaism as in Philo’s equating the eikon tou theou with the logos tou theou. Of the numerous passages in Philo, see, e.g., Legum alle-
these Fathers departed from the Philonic / Origenist deterministic notions of sin and salvation as they systematized their understanding of man's fall and redemption through Christ. In their view, sin is more a product of human weakness in succumbing to constant temptation than the result of original sin — since the ontological origin of man is not found in his biological being but in his being "in Christ".

Before I focus on Narekats'i's views on the human nature, a few remarks on method are appropriate. 1) Our author has no treatise on the human nature to enable us to read his central argument on the subject. This short study is limited to his prayer book, the title of which, Matean Oghbpergu'tean, has been variously translated but simply means Book of Penitential Prayers. Yet the book is large enough for us to discover therein his assessment of human life, to point at least to "where he's coming from" — if I may use the vernacular. 2) While I dwell on the central theme of the image / breath of God in the prayer book so as to underscore Narekats'i's views on the human nature, I also discuss closely related themes in his magnum opus. Admittedly, the author's views on the subject cannot be explicated merely through his use of biblical iconic / pneumatic metaphors. I underscore them simply because they are fundamental to his understanding of the human condition. 3) I then treat the central theme and its cognate themes in Prayer 46, where they are found simultaneously. The study may thus be seen as an indirect commentary on this four-part prayer.

The Image of God in Man

The paradox of man as a rational animal is deftly explained in the Genesis account on the creation of man in the image and likeness of God, the logoslehre of Classical philosophy, and the allegorical embellishments of Hellenistic Judaism as found in Philo of Alexandria. In the exegetical nuances of the latter, the image and breath of God in man were given identical interpretations as references to the logos, the nous, or the pneuma, the faculty of reason in man — that divine or sovereign element in human beings. Thus the human soul (psyche) has, in addi-

goriae 3.96; De confessione linguarum 97,147; Quis rerum divinarum heres sit 231; De fuga et inventione 101; De somniis 2.45.

tion to its animating principle, the spirit (pneuma) which distinguishes it from that of irrational creatures. Accordingly, the human body was perceived as a holy temple for the rational soul, the most god-like of images — the mind. The divine image is the prototype/archetype of the human nous; it is the universal nous after which the human mind is patterned. Herein lies the human advantage whereby man is considered kin to heavenly beings. This was the received tradition of the Church Fathers in whose rank and file Narekats’i stands:¹¹

You [mighty God of all] made me in your glorious image, favoring a weak being like me with your sublime likeness, adorning me with speech, burnishing me with your breath, enriching me with thought, cultivating me with wisdom, establishing me with ingenuity, setting me apart from animals, endowing me with a thinking soul, embellishing me with that sovereign element, giving birth as a father, nurturing as a nurse, caring for me as a guardian (5.2).¹²

Commenting on man’s privileged place in the cosmic order of things, Gregory of Nyssa notes: “the fact that our nature is an image of the Nature which rules over all things, means nothing else than this, that from the start our nature was created sovereign.”¹³ He then asks: “In what does the human greatness lie?” And he replies: “Not in his likeness to the created world, but in the fact he is made in the image of the nature of the Creator.”¹⁴

For Narekats’i, this human kinship with the divine is further underscored by the privilege we have in worshiping God’s name (35.1). It is a cherished kinship for which he prays:


¹² Throughout this study, I have initially followed Samuelian’s dynamic translation of Narekats’i, augmenting it in every quoted instance so as to convey the literal meaning.


¹⁴ Ibid. 16 (PG 44: 180 A). For a broad discussion of this view, see J. Zachhuber, Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 46), Leiden: Brill, 2000.
And now, God of light of all; do not let iniquity rule this your royal image, which is of the kingdom above; do not let the haughty rebel steal away the adornment of your graceful breath from your likeness in this creature (49.1).

In another prayer addressed to Christ, he pleads:

Do not snatch away the breath of the all-blessed Spirit; do not erase the incensed stamp of your majestic image ... do not sever the tie that binds me to you with steadfast love (78.3).

He sees a further bond in his kinship with Christ through the rite of chrismation with the holy myron, of which he says:

And may this spiritual oil, full of bliss and heavenly glow, shine your sign [of the cross] upon my face [made] in your image (93.23).

The theological anthropology of Narekats’i is as extremely personal as it is exceedingly spiritual and Christocentric:

Lord Christ, blessed on high, breath of our nostrils, and the strength of our comeliness (76.1).

“Our comeliness” is simply an allusion to the divine image in us. The breath breathed into our face is Christ the Lord, who in his goodness gave us the breath of life (93.8); that is, a part of himself. Christ is thus the archetype of the divine “breath” as he is of the divine “image” in us.

The Fallen State of Man

It is an act of divine condescension to choose such lowly beings as those born of the womb to share in his image. On one occasion Narekats’i addresses God as follows:

You who call those born of the despicable womb partakers of your image (63.2).

Such lowly beings, susceptible to all kinds of diseases and no better than the Arabian wolves — described in some detail — are unworthy of being considered part of creation (69, 70.1). Yet the image of God in fallen man is not eradicated
and it remains as incomprehensible as its archetype. Similarly, contemplating the unfathomable image of God in fallen man does not contribute to a better understanding of God, who is of his very nature incomprehensible. The dictum of Gregory of Nyssa stands: since God is unknowable, his image in man is also unknowable.  

Like Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, our author believes in the absolute incomprehensibility of God's essence: an incomprehensibility obscured by all that can be known in creatures. Narekats'i is a devout follower of the so-called “negative” or apophatic theology of Ps.-Dionysius, according to whom God is beyond all that exists; and to approach him it is necessary to renounce all that is inferior to him, i.e., all that which is. And so in Narekats'i we read:

Now let me elevate the course of this discussion from the lowly things of earth — not be considered among existences that came to be — to the higher things (70.1).

The continuation of his prayer is about the total incapacity of even the best of human beings (the opposite of those described in 69), the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles or the martyrs to save anyone (salvation for our author is absolute union with God, the ultimate experience of his presence, the apprehension of his existence). Abraham could not provide a drop of water to the rich man who suffered in the parable of the rich man; Moses could not save the man gathering sticks on the Sabbath; Aaron himself needed an intercessor; David was not blameless; Peter showed his weakness when left to himself; and many others who are among the eternally blessed have their deficiencies (70.2). At best, these blessed ones are inspiring examples for us as we aim for our salvation by coming

15 On the Creation of Man 11 (PG 44: 156 AB); cf. R. Leys, L'image de Dieu chez Saint Grégoire de Nyse: esquisse d'une doctrine, Bruxelles: Desclée de Brouwer, 1951, 77-78.
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to Christ “by faith”, understandably, through mystic contemplation. Drawing near to God so as to experience his presence is the bound of happiness.\(^{18}\)

Existentially speaking, in Narekats’i’s creatively organized patterns of thought, in his imagination, we ought to discern not only the plight of humanity but also his way of coping with likely dissonance and tensions in his personal life. He is at a loss for words to describe his sinful condition:

And now, O wretched soul of mine, what appropriately revolting words shall I use to describe you in this book of woes, my testament of prayers? You who are so completely discredited that I am at a loss for words to answer, unworthy to commune with God and the saints (9.1).

The effects of the fall on him are variously told in each prayer, their gravity reaching the point of eradicating the divine image in him (71.4), for he considers himself sinful from his mother’s womb (83.3), afflicted by “the age-old bile” stored in him (77.2). By one count, he uses more than a hundred analogies in his prayers to illustrate his sinfulness.\(^{19}\) In one passage, for example, he employs three biblical allusions to the stretching out of the arm, in an attempt to show the effects of the fall on his soul:

In your name, Almighty, I extend the shriveled arm of my soul, so you will make it whole as before (Matt 12:10-13), as in the luxury of the Garden, when I was about to pick the fruit of life (Gen 3:6). The misery of my incorrigible soul, bound up, infirm, bent over, is like the stricken woman, bowed by sin, her gaze on the ground, in Satan’s tyrannical chains, kept from receiving your

---

\(^{18}\) Cf. Prayer 10.2: “I will build an edifice of faith; for one of our forefathers (i.e., Enoch), armed with faith, was instantly transported to the realm of immortality above, through the balm of repentance, thus bequeathing us the promise of incorruption on earth (Gen 5:24), perhaps more so than those [others] to whom the Apostle points, those who obtained the perfect prize on earth, believed the hoped-for-things of the future and of heaven, and were filled with the abundance of the unseen things” (Heb 11:1); cf. 11.3, where Enoch is the herald of eternal life for us mortals. For Narekats’i “faith” is confident conviction of intuitive reason.

heavenly salutation (Luke 13:11-13). (18.3; note the contrasting parallel between Eve’s reaching for the fruit and the hemorrhaging woman reaching to touch Jesus.)

The far-reaching effects of the fall on human nature are variously described later in the book, especially in Prayer 86:

But since we strayed from the commandments of this your covenant, and declining like animals, given our earthly lowliness, we were bound downward to the earth: in some instances by disease, and others by cruelty, some by decadence of gluttony; as if a ravenous beast is joined to our nature (part 1).

Here his words are akin to those of Gregory of Nyssa, according to whom such characteristics and others similar to them, like the passions, “through an animal-like mode of generation entered man’s composite being.”20 Narekats’i goes on to elaborate:

Sometimes one of the four [primary elements] lunges forward and with uncontrollable speed misbehaves savagely. And though warmed by the fervor of our love for you, by the particle of your spark in us, the coldness that is its constant companion extinguishes it, disrupting the good. And although we ascend to you with the airy ways of angels, the weight and density of our first element, this earth, pulls us down and stifles us (86.1).

Through transgression, Adam not only tarnished the image of God in him but also lost the greatest gift, the breath of eternal life (93.2). In his other allusions to Gen 2:7, Narekats’i reminds us that without the divine breath man is but dust (32.3; 37.1). Unlike the Greek Fathers, in his description of the effects of the fall Narekats’i makes no mention of the “garments of skin” (Gen 3:21) that symbolized the transformation of man’s divinely-woven “rational” attire into a “non-rational” mode of existence.21 For him “the true image of wretched humankind” is symbolized by the barren fig tree (Luke 13:6-9), “decorated with useless foliage, devoid of fruit” (81.1). This could be an allusion to — if not a play on — the guilty pair covering themselves with fig leaves (Gen 3:7). Nonetheless, because of the divine element in him, though jeopardized through the fall of Adam, man

20 On the Creation of Man 18 (PG 44: 192 BC).

21 On this subject, see Nellas, Deification in Christ, 43-91.
is constantly seeking union with the divine mind, pleading for the restoration of the image tarnished by sin.

The Restoration of the Divine Image in Man

Salvation is the restoration of the divine image in man, the image nearly effaced by sin.

And now I plead that with your divine miracle-working power, O compassionate One, you restore my decomposed and shattered earthen vessel. I entreat that you recast your image, worn by sin, in the crucible heated by the spark of your word. The shaken structure of my body, this reliquary of my soul, cleanse for your habitation, an altar for your repose, I beseech you, O doer of good (19.1; cf. 83.5).

The portrayal of God as potter, smith, and builder is noteworthy. Elsewhere he exclaims:

Save my physical altar, son of bitterness that I am (35.4).

Renew in my soul the image of light revered with the greatness of the glory of your mighty name. Increase the glow of your grace upon my face and upon the perception of my mind, an earthbound creature (40.3).\(^\text{22}\)

Revive me, affectionate One, by breathing again into this image of mine created by you, sheltering my most sinful soul in that restoring breath of pure, enlightening grace (82.5).

The very purpose of the Incarnation was to bring about this restoration. Paradoxically, God who had created man in his image has now come in human likeness.

\(^{22}\) Possible allusion to Rom 8:15-17, contemplated along with baptism and chrismation: baptism indicating the renewal of the divine image, and chrismation the renewal of the glow the human body was believed to have had before the fall.
He came to restore my worn-out image. Taking our likeness in its essence, he united it in himself with the reality of the likeness of the great God, in indispensible blend (67.1).

Hence Narekats'ı prays:

Lord Christ... who alone became human like us for our sakes, so that you might make us like you for your sake (19.1).

Ultimately then, salvation is tantamount to deification or — more accurately — Christification of humanity, the human destiny in Christ otherwise known as theosis. For man, "the realization of his being in Christ constitutes a journey from the 'in the image' to the image itself, or from the iconic to that which truly exists."23 Suffice it to say that here again Narekats'ı's thought is in keeping with patristic teaching that sees salvation as deification (or Christification),24 made possible through the mystery of the Incarnation, the hypostatic union of Creator with creation.

**Mystical Union as Restoration**

Ever since the expulsion from Paradise because of sin, the desire of humankind has been to return to that "fatherland". As for Narekats'ı, he has found the mystic way to soar to this truly ancestral place. It is this ascent, the return to heavenly places through mystical contemplation that characterizes his penitential prayers. The fact that man was created in the image of God makes man simultaneously earthly and heavenly, transient and eternal, constantly inclined toward God despite the fall.

Now, we who have henceforth become one in upright purity, it was truly granted to us from of old to be able to ascend back from there (i.e., from the fall). Thus, flying on wings of light, I shall arrive in heaven (75.1).

The "we" here are the like-minded mystics who have discovered the way to that heavenly joy, those who are perpetually inclined toward God, those who have

---

23 Nellas, *Deification in Christ*, 41.

been thus inspired by him in their realization of what it means to be “in Christ”. The journey begins through spiritual rebirth from the baptismal font, from the holy womb of the Church personified in Man:

She performs miracles, even undertaking to perfect and to restore us again by re-etching the image of the glorious light upon us (75.8).

How the Church, “this spiritual mother”, accomplishes this is elaborated further in the prayer (75.12 in its entirety). The Church, then, is the locus for this mystic contemplation, “the gate of heaven” (75.13). The hermeneutical gist of this designation of the Church from the words of Jacob, following his dream of the ladder (Gen 28:17) looms large in Narekats’i’s mystical ascent:

Lead me across this desirable bridge which neither hinders nor causes us to stray on our upward journey, upon this heaven-bound ladder (Gen 28:12-19) marked by the footsteps of the saints (92.11)

— indeed of Christ himself who descended that ladder “to take me up, on my journey there” (93.5). 25

Prayer 75 is a substantial chapter of Narekats’i’s ecclesiology and anticipates Prayer 80, itself a chapter of his Mariology. When read together, these prayers show that his mystic ascent is somewhat realized when he contemplates Mary (80.1), the new Eve (80.2). His closeness to her is tantamount to being back in Paradise, for She ameliorates his separation from God by her conciliation, saves him from condemnation by her living light, restores his shattered person by her medicine for life (80.3). Narekats’i is in his celestial home when in the church, the locus for begetting children of God and aptly “consecrated in the name of the radiant Mother of God” (75.12), an allusion to the fact that nearly all churches in ancient Armenia were named after the Theotokos (Astuatsatsin or Astuatsamayr).

Besides the Marian role in Narekats’i’s bonding with the divine, there are several passages in his prayers where he seeks union with Christ through the Spirit, the bond of all divine relationships. Speaking to Christ he pleads:

---

25 Jacob’s dream of the ladder and the nuptial chamber of the Song of Songs are foremost among the common loci in mystical literature. Others include the ascension of Enoch and the translation of Elijah, Moses’ ascent of Mount Sinai, Isaiah’s and Ezekiel’s visions of the throne of God, the transfiguration of Jesus, and his enthronement “at the right hand”.
Accept and introduce me, a manifold debtor, forgiven and cleansed, to your Holy Spirit, your equal in honor, O living Word; so that reconciled through you, the Holy Spirit might return to me . . . that I may with him and through him always be bound with grace to you, inseparably united with you through the salutation of my breath (24.4).

The shared divine breath is the common grounds for the union sought:

Through your boundless kindness I will be joined to you, your image of light sketched upon my soul (27.9);

and again:

May your mercy, O Creator, toward me, and the breath of my soul toward you, be united inseparably as one (90.5).

A distinction, however, must be made between this personal (mystical) union sought through contemplation and the collective (eschatological) gathering of the faithful at the second coming of Christ, as contemplated in 1 John 3:2: "Now we are children of God, and what we will be has not yet been made known. But he knows that when he appears, we shall be like him." In this vein of thought, in Prayer 81, a major meditation on angelology, Narekats’i prays in the first person plural:

May we await the blessed command of your life-giving will, Creator of all, to be united with God inseparably, in cherubic virtue (part 2).

**Prayer 46 as a Key Passage**

The prayer begins with a declaration of the author’s utter sinfulness, illustrated with diverse images including that of a shepherd of desert goats, to whom the imagery of the shepherd’s tent in the Song of Songs aptly applies (1:7). The first part of the prayer concludes with an apophatic rejection of all that is known:

... for I have neither known nor ever understood by whom, in whose image, or for whose sake I was created.

As I have indicated earlier, this “negative” theology attributed to Dionysius the Aeropagite, which assumes total ignorance, is requisite for launching into the
divine darkness as one approaches God. The oracular, divine response constitutes the remaining three parts of the prayer:

Behold, you were formed like an angel, one with the [divine] counselors, on two feet that take and bring you; with elevated, uplifted arms, as if in flight on two wings, to gaze upon the [heavenly] fatherland. O fool, why did you stray on earth, always preoccupied with the here and now, reckoned with the wild asses of the desert. On the lamp stand of your body, like a lamp-stand with many vessels, your rounded head was placed, so that you might not stray from the grace of this symbol, to see God and to analyze what is everlasting. You were doubly endowed in the womb of reason so that you might speak with an unfettered tongue of victory of the good part given you. To oversee the management of practical things, as an associate of God, by virtue of having something in common with his all-giving right hand, you were called god . . . . And the mystical interpretations of these are portrayed on you, as on an indestructible monument, my wretched soul (part 2).

Narekats'ı goes on to explain the 360 parts and five senses of the human body in cosmic terms. He draws an analogy between the human body and the ecclesial body comprising many members, and the pain suffered in both bodies in case of amputation. He adds:

And though you [my enslaved soul] be found robbed of that original likeness, as in the transgression of the commandment in the garden of life, yet by the luminous grace of the baptismal font the breath of the Spirit is received and you are [restored] in the likeness of the image (part 3).

In the concluding part of the prayer Narekats'ı longs for refuge in God, that mystic ascent that is characteristic of such content.

---

26 Cf. Gregory of Nyssa's argument that the hands minister to reason, On the Creation of Man 8 (PG 44:144BC), a common description of "those called upward" (e.g., Philo, De plantatione 23.17).
27 Allusion to Col 3:2.
28 Allusion to Job 39:5.
29 Allusion to Ps 81:6.
30 Cf. the detailed description of the parts of the human body in Gregory of Nyssa's On the Creation of Man 30 (PG 44: 240C-256C).
And now, why did you lose the heavenly glory like the original man did the Garden of Eden for the earthly? Why did you yourself close heaven and lock the door to ascent? Why did you mix the clean water\textsuperscript{31} with impurities of bitter tears? Why did you soil the washed cloth of your garment with filthy deeds? Why did you cloak yourself with the fabric of sin, cover yourself with the robe of wrongdoing . . . ? Why did you get caught on the fishhook of deception, you who share the body of the Life Giver? But again, relying upon him, call to him, the redeemer in whom I seek refuge . . . (part 4)

In this four-part prayer we have all the elements found in the traditional interpretation of the iconic and pneumatic metaphors of Gen 1:26-27 and 2:7 discussed hitherto in this short paper: the interchangeable use of the divine image and breath with which humans are privileged as rational beings, the obliteration of the divine image because of willful sin, the restoration of the image through divine grace, the economy of grace imparted by the Church and human endeavor, mystic contemplation that culminates in reunion with God.

Conclusion

The theological anthropology of Narekats’i and its attendant pneumatology are keenly personalized, thus making his thoughts on the creation and constitution of man all the more comprehensible. Curiously enough, he extends this divine-human infusion of the Spirit — an incarnation of a sort — to his literary composition as he claims inspiration for his prayer book (3.5).\textsuperscript{32} However unique our author, there is that common terminology and realm of basic ideas in medieval mystical writings which are closely interconnected among themselves, each helping us in understanding the others.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31} Allusion to the baptismal font in the preceding part; the immediate following context is likewise suggestive of baptismal imagery (cf. Rom 13:14; Gal 3:27).

\textsuperscript{32} Cf. Prayer 78.3: “Do not deprive me of the powerful art of speech. Do not weaken the ability of my right hand to distribute the particles of your light” (referring, as Samuelian observes, to “the Eucharist, or perhaps his writings”; Speaking with God from the Depths of the Heart, 753 n. 202).

When interpreting Narekats'ı, the antecedent heritage of Scripture and the associated tradition of interpretation, from Hellenistic Judaism to the Church Fathers, is a must. Thus, the interpretative understanding of the Genesis passages on the divine image and breath is foundational for discerning his mystical theology of sin and penitence, suffering and atonement, divine power and divine grace, dissolution and the world to come — the great issues of theology that hinge on one another. In Narekats'ı we find exceptionally profound articulation of or theologizing on all of these interrelated subjects, and the ease with which a mystic theologian moves from one to the other, internalizing each of these human experiences — and more, since the mystic is in effect living the life of realized eschatology, as if the dilemmas of the human condition are exchanged for paradisiacal bliss once it is recognized that the telos of human existence is the apprehension of God. In Narekats'ı's own words:

And seeing with my mind's eye in the distance the resplendent things to come,  
I observe in advance the day of light, the hope of the saints (40.2).

In him the image is restored and the divine breath is alive and well.
Philo and the Stoic Doctrine of Ἐυπάθεια

That Philo of Alexandria both knew and made use of the Stoic contrast between the passions (πάθη) and the so-called "proper emotions" (ἐυπάθεια, the "rational" equivalents of the passions in the psyche of the Stoic sage) is not disputed. Philo's fullest account of the Ἐυπάθεια, however, at Quaes. Gen. 2.57, which should be of considerable doxographical interest, has come down to us in such a state that it is virtually incomprehensible as it stands. It is the concern of this note to straighten it out for the record.

In the case of the Quaestiones in Genesim, as with a number of other works of Philo, we are in the less than satisfactory position of having only a medieval (late 6th century CE) Armenian translation. The Latin translation of Aucher and the English translation of Marcus are often inadequate for making detailed judgments, and in this case they both fail us when faced with the technical Stoic distinction between πάθη and Ἐυπάθεια. At various points in his notes Marcus confesses his uncertainty as to the true meaning, but at no stage does his trans-


2 J.B. Aucher, Philonis Judaei paralipomena Armena, Venice: San Lazzaro, 1826; R. Marcus, Philo; Loeb Classical Library Supplement I.

3 The Latin and English translations from the above cited works (n. 2) are given for comparison: Aucher renders, "Ad mentem vero, reptilia imitantur foeda, vitia; munda autem, gaudium: apud enim affectum concupiscentiae erunt gaudium et lactitia; apud desiderium voluntas et consilium; apud tristitiam punctio et compunctio; et apud aviditatem timor" (p. 140). Marcus, relying on Aucher, renders, "But as for the deeper meaning, the passions resemble unclean reptiles, while joy (resembles) clean reptiles. For alongside sensual pleasures there is the passion of joy. And alongside the desire for sensual pleasure there is reflection. And alongside grief there is remorse and constraint. And alongside desire there is caution" (p. 143).
lation of the passage in question give any indication that he understood the underlying philosophy.

Émile Bréhier was the first to draw attention to the passage and to discern its correct form, but he did not pause long enough over it to present a fully corrected version with further comments. It seems worth doing this since the passage, properly rendered and rightly understood, not only merits inclusion in SVF (between 3.432 and 433), but also reveals a significant modification in basic Stoic doctrine.

The crucial part of the Armenian text reads as follows:

To retranslate this passage into Greek, we need to give special consideration to the underlined words. The word ρεβρημιδεῖω, which occurs twice here and again, in plural form, in the last part of the passage (here omitted), occurs nowhere else in the Armenian version of Philo. That this word is a rendition of both εὐτάθεω, and χαρᾶ may be shown from the following examples: εὐτάθεω καὶ χαρᾶ in Abr 201 and Leg All 1.45 is rendered as χυνινιδέω καὶ μυρινι-
δέω and ψυμίνιδεω καὶ μυρινιδζέω, respectively. It is noteworthy that χυμινιδέω which is a synonym of ρεβρημιδεῖω, is the equivalent of εὐτάθεω in the first instance and of χαρᾶ in the second. It would also appear that ρεβρημιδεῖω, μυρινιδζέω is a rendition of one word, namely, χαρᾶ. Very

4 Bréhier, Les idées philosophiques, 254, n.7.
often, the Armenian translator of Philo rendered a Greek word with two or more words. 6

ὑπερήφανος, ἐνεργοτητος also appears to be a rendition of one word, namely, ὑπερήφανος or ὑπερήφανης; e.g., τὰ βουλήματα in Prov 2.29 is rendered as ὑπερήφανος ὑπερήφανος and τῶν βουλήματων in Spec Leg 1.333, ὑπερήφανη ὑπερήφανη.

ὑπερβαθιτίκον, ἐν ὑπερβαθιτίκον also appears to be a rendition of one word: δημιουργος in Leg All 2.84 is rendered as ἑπερβαθιτίκον, which is a compound of parts of the two words.

The Greek equivalent of the last underlined word, ὑπερβαθιτίκον, is πάθος, as in Vita Cont 35, 48, 68, etc. A corruption of the word φόβον may be suspected in the Greek exemplar. It may also be possible that the Armenian translator deliberately departed from the text in order to avoid doubling, since the Armenian equivalents of φόβος and εὐλάβεια have the same root and are sometimes interchangeably used (cf. Abr 14; Spec Leg 1.330; Prov 2.26; etc.).

All the other words have one-to-one equivalents in Philonic works extant in both languages and need no special consideration.

In the light of the preceding observations, a rough version of the original Greek of this passage would be:

... τὸ δὲ πρὸς διάνοιαν οὕτως τὰ πάθη ἔσοκεν τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐρπετοῖς, τοῖς δὲ καθαροῖς ἡ εὐλάβεια παρὰ γὰρ τὸ πάθος τῆς ἡδονῆς ἐστιν ἡ χαρὰ παρὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἡ βουλήσεως παρὰ δὲ τὴν λύπην ὁ δημιουργὸς παρὰ δὲ τὸν φόβον ἡ εὐλάβεια.

The section then may be most accurately translated as follows:

Why does (Scripture) say, “Every reptile that lives shall be to you for food”? (Gen 9:3)

The nature of reptiles is two-fold. One is poisonous, and the other is tame. Poisonous are those serpents which in place of feet use the belly and breast to crawl along; and tame are those which have legs above their feet. This is the literal meaning. But as for the deeper meaning, the passions resemble unclean reptiles, while proper emotions [resemble] clean [reptiles]. For alongside the passion of Pleasure there is Joy. And alongside Desire there is Will. And alongside Grief

6 R. Marcus, “An Armenian-Greek Index to Philo’s Quaestiones and De Vita Contemplativa,” Journal of the American Oriental Society LIII (1933) 252. Such occurrences are more frequent than Marcus seems to realize.
there is Compunction. And alongside Fear there is Caution. Thus these passions threaten souls with death and murder, whereas proper emotions are truly living, as He Himself has shown in allegorizing, and are the causes of life for those who possess them.

It will be recalled that the Stoics, while rejecting the passions root and branch, were prepared to recognize certain "rational" equivalents of them (VF 3.431). In place of ἱδώνη there was χαρά; in place of φόβος, εὐλάβεια; in place of ἐπιθυμία, βούλησις. Only for Grief, λύπη, was there declared to be no rational equivalent (ibid., 437). In this passage, however, as we have seen, there is an equivalent for λύπη, namely, δημίος.

Although this modification is first encountered in Philo, a passage in Plutarch, Moralia 449A (SVF 3.439) would suggest that some such equivalent for λύπη was floating about. In the cited passage Plutarch gives examples of the shifty euphemisms which the Stoics employ to recognize the passions in fact, while seeking to banish them in theory. It is best to give the passage in full:

... ὅταν δὲ διακρύσεις ἐλεγχόμενοι καὶ τρόμοις καὶ χρόας μεταβολαῖς ἀντὶ λύπης καὶ φόβου δημίους τινας καὶ συνθροήσεις λέγωσι καὶ προθυμίας τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ὑποκορίζονται, σοφιστικὰς δοκοῦσιν οὐ φιλοσόφους διακρόσεις καὶ ἀποδράσεις ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων μηχανάσθαι διὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων. (Emphasis supplied.)

Here we might seem to have, on the face of it, a term provided by Plutarch as the εὐπάθεια corresponding to λύπη. He throws doubt on this, however, by having συνθροήσεις instead of εὐλάβεια in conjunction with φόβος and by following this in 449B (SVF 3.439) with a list of Stoic εὐπάθεια which comprise only the usual three (χαρά, βούλησις, εὐλάβεια). It is obvious that he recognizes neither δημίος nor συνθροήσεις as official εὐπάθεια. The pairing of δημίος with λύπη, however, cannot be accidental.

The recognition of this fourth εὐπάθεια could be due to the speculations of Stoicizing Platonists, e.g., Platonists who, while in general siding with the Stoa on ethical questions against Aristotle, were moved in this case to soften the rough edges of the Stoic ideal by allowing for a rational form of Grief. Since Philo

---

7 The following is W. Helmbold's translation: "But when, convicted by their tears and tremblings and changes of colour, in place of grief and fear they call these emotions 'compunctions' and 'perplexities' and gloss over the desires with the term 'eagerness', they seem to be devising casuistic, not philosophic, shifts and escapes from reality through the medium of fancy names." (LCL 6, 65)
reflects this position, we may reasonably place these Platonists in Alexandria in the last few decades BCE. It happens that this position agrees very well with that of Eudorus, a Platonist of Alexandria who flourished at about this time, and of whose Pythagorean and Stoic tendencies we know a certain amount. Whether or not this modification in basic Stoic doctrine be due to Eudorus or to another, it is encountered only in Philo, and that on the basis of a correct rendition of Quaes Gen 2.57. An echo of this formula, carried perhaps from its developmental stage, is found in the above-quoted lines of Plutarch.


9 (Ed. — John Dillon later revised his opinion, as explained in the following "Appendix" to the article: "Professor David Winston, of the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, has kindly brought to my notice a passage of Cicero (Tusculanae Disputationes 3.83) which I had overlooked, and which puts a new complexion on the question of the origin of δημιος as an equivalent of some sort, on the rational level, for λυπη. Cicero, in outlining the various types of consolatory discourse put out by (Stoic) philosophers, makes the point that they all involve the purging of Αεγρυτον (λυπη) from the soul. The passage runs as follows:

Hoc detracto, quod totum est voluntarium, aegritudo erit sublata illa maerens, morsus tamen et contractiunculae quaedam animi relinquentur. ('By the removal of this, which is totally a product of will, that mournful distress will be done away with; though there will be left behind a "bite" and certain contractions of soul.')

Morsus is, plainly, a translation of δημιος, even as contractiunculae quaedam is a cautious rendering of συστολη (translated as contractio, e.g., Tusculanae Disputationes 1.90; 4.14). This passage indicates that Stoic philosophers known to Cicero (no doubt in the first instance Posidonius, but probably earlier ones also) were prepared to speak of δημιος, not as an official rational equivalent to λυπη, but rather as a term for the insignificant physical symptoms that even a fully operative Stoic sage might feel. The evidence of Plutarch quoted in the article confirms this impression.

On consideration of this, I think that I would withdraw my suggestion that the passage in Quaes Gen 2.57 implies any formal elevation of δημιος to the status of a fourth ευπαθεια, among, say, Stoicizing Platonists in Alexandria. It may very well be simply an ad hoc development by Philo to produce symmetry in this passage. Philo is loose enough elsewhere in his use of technical terminology to be open to suspicion here. The passage nonetheless remains interesting, I think, and the translation of the Armenian needed cleaning up."
The Implications of Philo's Dialogues for His Exegetical Works

PHILO'S TWO DIALOGUES with his renegade nephew, Alexander, better known as Tiberius Julius Alexander,¹ are among the least studied works of our best representative of Hellenistic Judaism. This state of Philo scholarship is due to several factors, not the least of which is the fact that there are no reliable translations of these works.² De Providentia (Provid) I-II and De animalibus


(Anim), like the Quaestiones, are extant only in a “classical” Armenian translation dating from the 6th century CE. The syntactical difficulties of this translation, which maintains the word order of the Greek, are not fully resolved by its Latin translator, J.B. Aucher. Consequently, his version has at times misled the few, more cautious translators of certain of these works.

E.R. Goodenough rightly declares, “We shall know Philo only when we accept him as a whole, and on his own terms,” and goes on to add, “To do any special study of Philo without at least a sense of his writings as a whole is extremely dangerous.” The lack of such an approach in Philo studies necessarily added to the neglect of the dialogues. It is regrettable that not all of Philo’s works are extant. It is even more regrettable, because remediable, that the corpus of his extant works is not currently available in any modern language; indeed, not treated even in the two well-known indices to his works, which exclude the works that survive only in Armenian.

Philo’s dialogues were further neglected because of the unwarranted verdicts of those who declared them, along with De aeternitate mundi (Aet) and Quod omnis probus liber sit (Quod Omn), “youthful works”, “belonging to his early life”. Philo, they said, must have graduated from these “purely philosophical” “school exercises” into the theological maturity demonstrated in his exegetical works. Thus, proponents of these long-held views attempted to construct a

---

3 See the preceding note; also Philonis Judaei paralipomena Armenia: libri videlicet quatuor in Genesis, libri duo in Exodum, sermo unus de Sampone, alter de Jona, tertius de tribus angelis Abraamo apparentibus, Venice: San Lazzaro, 1826.

4 In addition to the translations cited in n.2, the Quaestiones were translated into English with some reliance on Aucher’s Latin translation by R. Marcus, and were published as two supplementary vols. to the LCL edition of Philo [PLCL] (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953).


chronological order of the works, dividing them into three groups: philosophical, exegetical, and historical or apologetic. While this is not the place to discuss the chronological order of the works, especially those of the second and largest division, which in turn is subdivided into three groups or major works on the Pentateuch, suffice it to say that the divisions are acceptable, but their sequence and possibly the “philosophical” designation are not.

We shall endeavor to show that Philo’s dialogues belong to the closing years of his life, and that they are more closely related to his exegetical works than is generally supposed. Admittedly, the implications of our findings may prove to be broader than a paper of this length can probe.

Before pointing out the internal evidence for a late date for the composition of Philo’s dialogues, we shall consider their authorship. We shall also consider the misinterpretations influencing the traditionally-held view that Philo wrote these treatises at an early date.

P. Wendland gives overwhelming evidence of the genuineness of Provid I-II by showing philosophical, linguistic, and stylistic affinities between these books and the rest of the works of Philo. Likewise, the numerous parallels between Anim and the Philonic passages cited in a recent, as yet unpublished commentary by the author, suggest more than just a common literary heritage or use of sources. The affinities between the dialogues, however, are stronger, so

VII), München: Beck, 1920 (6th ed.), 627-631. With the publication of G. Tappe’s De Philonis liber qui inscribitur Ἀλέξανδρος ἣ περί τοῦ λόγου ἐγχεῖν τὰ ἀλογὰ ἴσα qwaestiones selectae (Diss., Götingen, 1912), especially 3-6, the placing of Anim at the very beginning of Philo’s works tends to become customary. W. Bousset, Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom. Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments nF 6), Götingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1915, 137-148 ascribes the dialogues with Alexander to the days of Philo’s philosophical training. H. Leisegang, “Philon,” PRE XXXIX (1941), cols. 6-8, likewise lists Anim first, as does also A. Lesky, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, Bern: Francke, 1957-1958, 729; et al.

8 This was correctly perceived by H. Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, VI, Götingen: Dieterischen Buchhandlung, 1868 (3d ed.), 257-312.


10 See above, n.2.
much so that the authorship of one can hardly be considered apart from that of the other.

Philo's opponent throughout these dialogues is his apostate nephew, Alexander. There is also a thematic relationship between *Provid I-II* and *Anim*: the latter deals with a certain aspect of providence and thus complements the theme of the former (providence and the question of animal intelligence are linked in *Provid I* 51-53). In a broad sense, the workings of providence range throughout the universe: from the majestic cycles of heavenly bodies to the minutest anatomical details of insects. Moreover, both treatises are developed with a wealth of stock illustrations commonplace in Academic-Stoic controversies regarding divine providence and the rationality of animals. In both works Philo systematically supports the Stoic position against the Academic criticism that he attributes to Alexander. The Alexandrian origin of both treatises is certain (*Provid II* 55 and *Anim* 13 and 28 refer to Alexandria in Egypt, and *Anim* 7 alludes to a mixed assembly of Romans and Alexandrians). Besides, both titles have the testimony of Eusebius who cites them conjointly in his list of Philo's works.

The parody of an opponent's imagined speech is a common literary device. Interestingly enough, a selection of Alexander's arguments (*Provid II* 3) is introduced by Eusebius as a statement by Philo himself of the objections that opponents might adduce. There can be little doubt about Alexander's cherishing

11 Epict. *Diss* i.16.1-8; Origenes *Cels* iv.54; etc. See also Hadas-Lebel, *De Providentia I et II*, 52.

12 Note that Chrysippus wrote *On Providence* (*περὶ προοδείας*, Hans von Arnim, *Stoicorum Vitae Fragmenta* [SvF], III, *Chrysippi Fragmenta, Fragmenta Successorum Chrysippi*, Stuttgart: Teubner, 1903, App. II, p. 203) and Antipater of Tarsus wrote *On Animals* (*περὶ ζώων* *SvF* III, Ant. 48). Among later Stoics and others, note Cicero, in Book III of *De finibus*, which derives from traditional Stoic sources, and Book II of *De natura deorum*, which provides the closest parallels to *Provid II* and which may be traced to Posidonius, its likely source; Seneca, in Book I of *Dialogi*, in the various *Epistulae*, and in the preface to *Naturalis historiae*; Epictetus in his *Dissertationes*; etc.

13 Numerous examples of his supporting the Stoic against the Academy can be cited. In defending divine providence the distinction was made between God's primary works and the secondary or consequential effects (*Provid II* 100); e.g., eclipses are consequential effects, not God's primary intentions (79). Moreover, Philo is at one with the Stoics in the fundamental position that the irrational creation exists for the sake of the rational.

14 *Historia Ecclesiae* ii.18.6; cf. Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 11.

15 *Praeparatio Evangelica* viii.14.386, "After stating these and a host of others on the negative side he [Philo] next proceeds to refute the objections as follows."
the Academic questions attributed to him in *Provid I-II* and *Anim*. In answering him Philo, like the Stoics before him, finds himself in a predicament and, in search for answers, sometimes contradicts himself (cf. *Provid II* 32 and 102; 105 and 110). Some of the questions purportedly raised by Alexander in these dialogues are not even dealt with in Philo’s replies.\(^\text{16}\) The composition of the treatises, however, may be taken with fair certainty to be Philo’s. Colson makes this observation on *Provid I-II*: “Philo was able to manipulate, even if he did not entirely invent, the part which Alexander plays, and he does not seem to have treated his opponent fairly.” (Loeb Classical Library IX, 449) The single authorship of *Anim* is to be seen in its structure, patterned after the first part of the Platonic *Phaedrus* (227A-237A).

With regard to the speakers in the dialogues, there can be no doubt about the identity of Philo and his apostate nephew; however, the identity of Philo’s interlocutor in *Anim*, Lysimachus, has been confused. The confusion arises from certain parts of the introductory and transitory dialogues between Philo (1, 75) and Lysimachus (72), where both of them refer to Alexander as “our nephew”. This common reference to Alexander by Philo and Lysimachus led to an erroneous identification of Lysimachus as a brother of Philo, taking him to be either Alexander the Alabarch, Philo’s notoriously wealthy brother and father of Tiberius Julius Alexander,\(^\text{17}\) or another, younger brother.\(^\text{18}\)

Such an identification of Lysimachus distorts his true identity, clearly stated in §2, where, speaking of Alexander, he says: “He is my uncle (lit., mother’s brother) and my father-in-law as well. As you are not unaware, his daughter is engaged (lit., promised by a betrothal agreement) to be my wife.”

---

\(^{16}\) See Colson’s note to the Eusebian line between *Provid I* 3 and 15 (LCL IX, 458). In *Anim*, several of Alexander’s arguments are not answered in specific terms but in sweeping generalities.

\(^{17}\) It is to be suspected that from a mistaken interpretation of these passages, the name Lysimachus has been added to the name of Alexander the Alabarch in the 11th century Ambrosian MS of Josephus (*AJ* xix.276; cf. xviii.159-160, 259-260; xx.100-103; *Bellum Judaicum* [B] v.205); see M. Pohlzen, “Philon von Alexandria,” *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, nF I,5 (1942) 413. A. Schaut notes: “Der zweite Name Λυσίμαχος in A 19 276 ist zweifelhaft.” K.H. Rengstorff, ed., s.v. Αλέξανδρος (no. 7) [Λυσίμαχος] Alabarch von Alexandrien,” in: *Namenswörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus. A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, Supplement I, Leiden: Brill, 1968, 8. This erroneous association of the names is quite common.

\(^{18}\) Tappe, Αλέξανδρος, 4-5. This equally misleading identification has influenced a host of scholars (including Wendland, Tappe’s major professor, and his associates) down to the present.
Aucher translates these lines correctly: *Avunculus enim est, ac simul socer: quoniam non es nescius, quod filia ejus mibi iuxta suam etiam promissionem desponsata uxor est.* However, being puzzled by Philo’s and Lysymachus’ calling Alexander “our nephew”, he leaves the question of relation unresolved.19 G. Tappe, who insists that Lysimachus is a brother of Philo and of the Alabarch, on the authority of a certain Andreas declares the text of this passage to be corrupt and goes on to provide the following translation: *Avunculus enim sum ac simul socer: quoniam non es nescius quod filia mea ei iuxta meam etiam promissionem desponsata uxor est.*20 There is no basis for these forced emendations. Moreover, if Lysimachus is a brother of Philo and of the Alabarch (Alexander’s father) and at the same time Alexander’s “mother’s brother”, then the Alabarch would have married his own sister.

The absolutely clear relationship indicated in §2 must stand, and the references to Alexander as “our nephew” by Philo (I, 75) and Lysimachus (72) must be explained — especially the latter. Two possible solutions are proposed: 1) Just as Philo in §§1 and 75 refers to Alexander as “our nephew”, using a plural of modesty, likewise Lysimachus in §72 refers to Alexander as “our nephew” out of respect to his interlocutor, Philo. Note that Lysimachus’ reference to “Alexander, our nephew” comes immediately after addressing Philo as “honorable” (ὁ τῷ Φθων), an address used earlier, in §2. 2) A possible corruption of “your nephew” to “our nephew”, either in the Greek ὁ ἀδελφός ὑμῶν ὁ ἀδελφός ὑμῶν or in the Armenian քրեժիրայարի ձեր քրեժիրայարի ձեր may be suspected in §72 (the possibly confused letters are underlined).

Adding to the confusion that led to the traditional view of ascribing the dialogues to Philo’s early life are the references to Alexander as “the young man” (ὁ νήπιος, *Anim* 8, 75). These are not to be taken literally as denoting age but rather metaphorically or derogatorily, denoting inexperience or ignorance.21 After all, time must be allowed for Alexander’s maturity and familiarity with the authorities and the arguments he is made to cite in *Provid I-II* and *Anim*. Note that in *Provid II* he is referred to as ὁ ἀνήρ (1) and addressed as ὁ γεννάε (31, 62), ὁ θαυμάσε (55), ὁ φίλε (56), etc.

There are two datable events recorded in *Anim* (27, 54). The celebrations spoken of in 27 were given by Germanicus Julius Caesar probably in 12 CE,

---

19 *Sermones tres*, p. xi, n.1.

20 Tappe, *Αλέξανδρος*, pp. 4-5.

21 Numerous examples of the metaphorical use of the term can be cited from classical and bibli- cal literature.
when he entered on his first term of consulship. The account, however, is taken from a literary source used also by Pliny (Naturalis Historia [NH] viii.4) and Aelian (De natura animalium [NA] ii.11). Some time, therefore, must be allowed for the period between the event and its literary description on the one hand and for the period between that literary composition and its use by Philo on the other hand. The embassy to Rome spoken of in 54 is presumably the Alexandrian Jewish embassy to Gaius Caligula in 39/40 CE. This delegation of five was headed by Philo himself and probably included his brother, Alexander the Alabarch.  

It now seems that Tiberius Julius Alexander accompanied his uncle and, perhaps, his father on this delicate mission described in Philo’s Legatio ad Gaium (Gaium) and Josephus’ Antiquitate Judaeorum (AJ) (xviii.257-260). The second of these two datable events is to be taken as determining the terminus post quem and not the first as is generally supposed. Thus, the terminus post quem of Anim has to be advanced by about thirty years.

Two other accounts in Anim (13, 58) can be dated by way of their datable parallels in Pliny. J. Schwartz  

sees certain similarities between Anim 13 and NH x.120-121, where Pliny tells of a raven taught to salute by name first Tiberius, then Germanicus and Drusus, the sons of Tiberius — the first adopted — and says that a talking thrush, a starling, and nightingales were owned by Agrippina, Claudius’ fourth wife and niece, and the young princes: Britannicus, his son from a previous marriage, and Nero, her son from a previous marriage. Schwartz goes on to suggest “un nouveau terminus post quem, de toute façon encore fort éloigné de la vraie date.” His observation suggests a post 48 CE date for the composition of Anim — after Claudius took Agrippina as his fourth wife. The horse-race account in Anim 58 is found also in Pliny NH viii.160-161, where the event is said to have occurred during the secular games of Claudius Caesar, i.e., in 47 CE.  

Several other internal evidences indicate a late date for Anim. The introductory and transitory dialogues (1-9, 72-76) portray an old man conversing with a young relative, Lysimachus, who twice addresses Philo as “honorable” (ὡς τίμας Φιλόμαχος, 2, 72). Alexander had a daughter, probably in her teens, betrothed to her cousin, Lysimachus. (2) Granting that Alexander was born early in the reign of Tiberius (ca. 15 CE), whose nomen and praenomen he bears, was married in ca. 35

\[\text{He was imprisoned on Gaius’ orders and later released by Claudius. Jos. AJ xix.276 suggests, though it does not positively require, the arrest to have taken place in Rome.}\]

\[\text{“Note sur la famille de Philon d'Alexandrie,” 595, n.1.}\]

\[\text{C.H. Rackham’s note, PLCL III, 112.}\]
CE at the age of twenty, he would by ca. 50 CE have been in his mid-thirties, with a teenage daughter. Moreover, Alexander seems to have held some public office (3-4) and, probably, was beyond Philo's reach. His apostasy, spoken of by Josephus in AJ xx.100, saying that "he did not persevere in his ancestral practices" (τοις πατρίως οὐ διέμενεν ἐθεσιν), is clearly reflected in the citation of oysters as fit for food — contrary to Jewish dietary laws (31; cf. Provid II 92).

In Provid II we find three indications suggestive of a late date for the dialogues: an allusion to Philo's failing eyesight (1); another clear indication of Alexander's apostasy (92) where, contrary to Jewish dietary laws, he is made to cite the hare with animals fit for food (cf. Anim 31); and a reference to one of Philo's pilgrimages to Jerusalem (107).

The often-quoted passage seemingly favoring the traditional view that Philo grew out of philosophical writings into logical maturity and exegetical writings, De congressu eruditionis gratia (Congr) 73-80, has been misconstrued. The passage, rightly understood, shows Philo's concurrent interest in philosophy and theology / anthropology. Note that in the introductory and transitory dialogues in Anim, thought to be a purely philosophical work, he calls himself an "interpreter" (ἐρμηνεύς, 7, 74) — if by that he is to be understood as an interpreter of Scripture. Moreover, in a passage never before considered, Provid II 115, Philo speaks of philosophy as his life interest (in response to Alexander's asking for time to hear more from Philo): "I always have time to philosophize, to which field of knowledge I have devoted my life; however, many and diverse yet delightful duties that it would not be fair to neglect summon me." This conflict between political duties and personal endeavors expressed at the end of a philosophical treatise is reminiscent of that expressed at the beginning of an exegetical treatise, De specialibus legibus (Spec Leg) III 1-6.26

We must note that no use is made of Scripture in either of the two dialogues; instead, the arguments appear within the context of Academic-Stoic polemics. This, however, does not rule out the existence of a possible biblical background. H. Leisegang27 observes that by arguing for the rationality of animals


26 Goodenough in his brilliant interpretation of Spec Leg III 1-6 shows that "Philo's literary career as an interpreter of the Bible was a function of his life after he had gone into political affairs, carried on as a hobby or escape from politics," The Politics of Philo Judaeus, 66-68; cf. Colson's comment in PLCL VII, 631-632. The bulk of Philo's writings does not make this supposition impossible. Hadas-Lebel cites the example of Cicero (De Providentia I et II, p. 39).

27 "Philon," col. 7.
Alexander is opposing not only the Stoic but also the Judaco-biblical doctrine that only man is endowed with the rational spirit. We may add that by emphasizing the irrationality of animals and thereby sanctioning their unilateral use by humans, Philo is perhaps defending the anthropocentric view of the cosmos reflected in Gen 1:26-28; 2:19-20; 9:2 — man’s dominion over the irrational creation. We may likewise observe that in Provid I-II, Philo is perhaps defending the biblical view of teleology, including the necessity of evil for the ultimate good — as found in numerous accounts in Genesis and Exodus.\(^{28}\) In view of these observations, the dialogues with Alexander may be treated as apologetic literature; indeed, the apologetic thrust of Provid II seems to have been recognized by Eusebius.\(^{29}\) Philo’s dialogues thus seem to fall in line with the rest of his works, which are more or less colored by an apologetic overtone; moreover, they may have influenced Christian apologists in their manner of responding to pagan opponents, as seen in the appeal to Stoic philosophy rather than to Scripture.\(^{30}\)

To add to the validity of the foregoing observations, we shall revive a meritorious thesis put forward by M. Adler,\(^{31}\) who observes in Philo’s works comprising the allegorical commentary a gradual departure from the biblical text: whereas the earlier works (Legum allegoriae [Leg All] I-III, De Cherubim [Cher], De sacrificiis Abelis et Caiini [Sacr], Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat [Quod Del], De posteritate Caiini [Post], De gigantibus [Gig], Quod Deus immutabilis sit [Quod Deus], De agricultura [Agr], De plantatione [Plant], De ebrietate [Ebr]) show close attachment to the text, gradually breaking into free composition, the later works (De sobrietate [Sobr], De confusione linguarum [Conf], De migratione Abrahami [Migr], Quis rerum divinarum heres sit [Heres], De congressu eruditionis gratia [Congr], De fuga et inventione [Fuga], De mutatione nominum [Mut], De somniis [Somm] I-II) are almost altogether free from such attachment and more philosophical. Following his thesis on Philo’s method, Adler suggests that the philosophical writings are of later development. These concluding remarks can in turn be substantiated by our demonstration of the late date of Anim and strengthened by our elaborations on Leisegang’s observations.

Having demonstrated that the dialogues with Alexander belong to the closing years of Philo’s life and that his philosophical interest concurs with his

---

29 Praep Evang viii.14.386, quoted above, n.15 (see its context).
30 See Hadas-Lebel, De Providentia I et II, 75.
theological interest,\textsuperscript{32} we are led to conclude that perhaps most of Philo's literary career belongs to the closing years of his life, to the period following the political turmoils described in \textit{In Flaccum [Place]} and \textit{Legatio ad Gaium [Gaium]}. Moreover, his works, written over a comparatively short period of time, seem to be carefully structured compositions that progress not from philosophical into more theological writing but rather from a midrashic type exposition into a more apologetic approach, conceivably climaxing in his dialogues.

\textit{Synopses of Philo's Dialogues}

The interlocutory setting is destroyed in \textit{Provid I}. The book opens with a statement on the subject under consideration and an introduction to the syllogistic method employed in the reasoning (1-5). There follow three main discussions, each ending with a recapitulation of the workings of Providence. The first of these discussions is on the eternity of the world: its creation, governance, and destruction (6-36); the second, on the problems of natural catastrophes, protection, and retribution (37-76); and the last, on the absurdities of astrological fatalism (77-88). A summary of the arguments is given in conclusion (89-92).

The dialogue form is far better preserved in \textit{Provid II}. It begins with Alexander's early visit to Philo to resume the discussions of the previous day (1-2). Parts of the first two discussions of Book I receive further consideration: the problem of retribution (3-44) and that of the cosmos — its creation (45-58), governance (59-84), and natural phenomena (85-112). In the epilogue Philo

\textsuperscript{32} Among others who have challenged the arguments for the traditionally-held view that Philo wrote the philosophical works \textit{Aet} (if that is indeed Philonic), \textit{Prob}, \textit{Provid I-II} and \textit{Anim} before he undertook the expository works on the Pentateuch, see E. Schürer, who observes that \textit{Anim} belongs to Philo's later works, the embassy to Rome being already contemplated: \textit{Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi}, III, Leipzig: Hinrich, 1909 (4th ed.), 685; H. Leisegang, "Philons Schrift über die Ewigkeit der Welt," \textit{Philologus} XCII (1937) 156-176, argues against Wendland that \textit{Aet} belongs to the later years of Philo's life, to the time when he defended the Stoics on the notion of divine providence. Although the Philonic authorship of \textit{Aet} is doubtful, most of Leisegang's arguments could be claimed for \textit{Provid I-II} and \textit{Anim}, which he elsewhere (see above, n.7) places at the beginning of Philo's works. After establishing the identity of the speakers and the right date of \textit{Anim}, Pohlenz argues that both the philosophical and the exegetical works belong to the same period, to the closing years of Philo's life ("Philon von Alexandriea," 412-413); Turner, in due consideration of the events of Alexander's life, observes, "Philo cannot have written these dialogues before A.D. 40-50." ("Tiberius Iulius Alexander," 56)
thinks he has given satisfactory answers to Alexander's difficulties and goes on to invite further questions, but Alexander politely declines (113-116).

*Anim* falls into two parts, each preceded by a short dialogue between Philo and his interlocutor, Lysimachus (1-9, 72-76), a nephew of Alexander. Alexander's discourse on the rationality of animals, purportedly read in his presence, comprises the first part (10-71) and Philo's refutation of Alexander's premise, the second (77-100). Alexander begins his polemical discourse with sweeping denunciations of man's appropriation of reason to himself (10-11). He attempts to show among the brutes instances of the *προφορικὸς λόγος* the reason which finds utterance and expression (12-15). Then follows a lengthy argument for their possession of the *ἐνδιάθετος λόγος*, the inner reason or thought (16-71). Some talking and singing birds constitute the examples for the first kind of reason; but the examples for the second kind of reason are far more numerous, including not only such stock examples as spiders, bees, and swallows (22), but also several performing animals (23-29) and a large number of others in whom demonstrations of virtues and vices are believed to exist (30-71). Philo, haphazardly and with some lack of kindness to his opponent, argues that animals do not possess reason. He ascribes the seemingly rational acts of animals to the reasoning of nature (77-100). By emphasizing the rationality of animals, Alexander argues for a moral and juridical relationship between man and animals (10, his opening remarks). This Philo rejects by insisting that there can be no equality between man, who is privileged with reason, and animals devoid of it (100, his concluding remarks).
A Critical Introduction to Philo’s Dialogues

Introductory Remarks

PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA, our best representative of Hellenistic Judaism, continues to attract readers and researchers from a broad spectrum of disciplines. The cumulative scholarship accurately reflects the diversity of interests and opinions among those attracted to this literary giant of the 1st century. We

* Abbreviations:

Authors and titles of Greek classical works are abbreviated in the forms given in H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968 (9th ed. by H.S. Jones, revised with a supplement by E.A. Barber), xvi-xxxviii; and those of Latin classical works, with the exception of Pliny (the “Elder”), in the forms given in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982, ix-xx. Titles of Philonic treatises are abbreviated in the forms listed in *Studia Philonica* I (1972), 92; with some additions, they are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abr</td>
<td>De Abrahamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>De aeternitate mundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>De agricultura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anim</td>
<td>De animalibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apol Jud</td>
<td>Apologia pro Iudaeis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cher</td>
<td>De Cherubim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf</td>
<td>De confusione linguarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congr</td>
<td>De congressu eruditionis gratia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>De Decalogo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deo</td>
<td>De Deo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebr</td>
<td>De ebrietate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flacc</td>
<td>In Flaccum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuga</td>
<td>De fuga et inventione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaium</td>
<td>Legatio ad Gaium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gig  De gigantibus
Heres  Quis rerum divinarum heres sit
Jos  De Iosepho
Leg All I-III  Legum allegoriae I-III
Migr  De migratione Abrahami
Mut  De mutatione nominum
Num  De numeris
Op  De opiscio mundi
Plant  De plantatione
Post  De posteritate Caini
Praem  De praemiiis et poenis
Provid I-II  De Providentia I-II
Quaes Ex I-II  Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum I-II
Quaes Gen I-IV  Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim I-IV
Quod Det  Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat
Quod Deus  Quod Deus immutabilis sit
Quod Omn  Quod omnis probus liber sit
Sacr  De sacrificis Abelis et Caini
Sobr  De sobrietate
Somn I-II  De somniis I-II
Spec Leg I-IV  De specialibus legibus I-IV
Virt  De virtutibus
Vita Cont  De vita contemplativa
Vita Mos I-II  De vita Mosis I-II

have extant over forty books of his composition, and nearly half as many are known to have been lost. Consequently, the Philo scholar faces more than the commonplace, already overwhelming problems connected with the study of voluminous writers. These and other problems set forth below lie behind the often inconclusive and conflicting studies that comprise the bulk of our bibliographies.

Philo's two dialogues with his renegade nephew Alexander, better known as Tiberius Iulius Alexander, are among his least-studied works. This state of Philo


scholarship is due to several factors, not the least of which is the fact that there are no reliable translations of these works. 3 De Providentia (Provid I-II) and De animalibus (Anim), like most of the Quæstiones, are extant only in a "classical" Armenian translation dating from the 6th century CE. 4 Of the original Greek, there are considerable fragments of Provid II and scant fragments of Anim. 5 The Armenian translation, to be sure, is complete; however, the text 6 reflects occasional corruptions not only in its transmission but also in the lost Greek, such as the destroyed interlocutory setting throughout Provid I. 7 Moreover, the Armenian maintains the word order of the Greek, thus giving rise to syntactical difficulties that are not fully resolved in the Latin version rendered by J.B. 8


5 See especially the two recent editions cited above, n.3.

6 No critical edition of the Armenian text as yet exists. For a catalogue of the Armenian mss and their textual relationships, see the author's Philonis Alexandrini de Animalibus, 14-25.

7 In its present form Provid I is not a dialogue but a sort of exposition on the subject of providence. From its opening paragraphs H. Diels, Doxographi Graeci, Berlin: Weidmann, 1879 (repr. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1929), 4 concluded that it must have been dialogical in form. This is further substantiated by the opening paragraphs of Provid II, as it is rightly observed by P. Wendland, Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der nacharistotelischen Philosophie, Berlin: R. Gaertner, 1892, 38 and 85.
Aucher. Consequently, his version has at times misled the few, more or less cautious translators who have relied on it.

It is regrettable that not all of Philo’s works are extant. It is even more regrettable, because remediable, that the corpus of his extant works is not currently available in any modern language; indeed, not treated even in the two well-known indices to his works, which exclude not just the works that survive only in Armenian but even the Greek fragments of these works. The resulting partial study and use of Philo’s works, coupled with the partial interest of those attracted to him, have left much to be desired in Philo scholarship. It is against such partial focusing on Philo that E.R. Goodenough rightly warns, “We shall know Philo only when we accept him as a whole, and on his own terms,” and goes on to add, “To do any special study of Philo without at least a sense of his writings as a whole is extremely dangerous.” The lack of such an approach in Philo studies necessarily added to the neglect of the dialogues.

The dialogues were further neglected because of the unwarranted verdicts of those who declared them, along with the enigmatic Aet and Quod Omn, “youthful works”, “belonging to his early life”. Philo, they said, must have graduated from these “purely philosophical”, “commonplace school exercises” into the theological maturity demonstrated in his exegetical works. Thus, proponents

---


10 An Introduction to Philo Judaicus, 19.

11 For a survey of the questions surrounding this work, see the recent perceptive study by D.T. Runia, “Philo’s ‘De aeternitate mundi’: The Problem of Its Interpretation,” Vigiliae Christianae XXXV (1981) 105-151.

of these views attempted to construct a chronological order of the works, dividing them basically into three groups: philosophical, exegetical, and historical or apologetic (the second and largest division in turn is subdivided into three groups or major commentaries on the Pentateuch). While this is not the place to discuss the chronological order of the works, suffice it to say that the divisions and subdivisions are acceptable, but their "established" sequence and possibly the "philosophical" designation are not.

In the course of a critical introduction to the dialogues, we shall provide synopses, survey the philosophical background, clarify the identity of the speakers, raise the question of authorship, and in discussing the date of composition we shall ascribe the dialogues to the closing years of the author's life. Moreover, by pointing to Philo's concurrent interest in philosophy and theology, the comparatively short period of his literary career, his tendency toward gradual departure from the biblical text even in the commentaries on the Pentateuch, and the apologetic thrust of his works in general, we shall endeavor to show that the dialogues are more closely related to the rest of his works than is generally supposed.

Synopses

In Provid I-II Philo maintains belief in the providential sustenance of the world, and his apostate nephew, Alexander, propounds disbelief. In Anim Alexander argues for the rationality of animals, and Philo for their irrationality. Philo expresses displeasure with Alexander's philosophic position in both works.

Provid I lacks the interlocutory setting of Provid II. The book opens with a statement on the subject under consideration and an introduction to the syllogistic method employed in the reasoning (1-5). There follow three main discussions, each ending with a recapitulation of the workings of Providence. The first

---

6) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1915, 137-148, ascribes the dialogues with Alexander to the days of Philo's philosophical training. H. Leisegang, "Philon," PW, XXXIX (1941), cols. 6-8, likewise lists the dialogues first as does also A. Lesky, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, Bern: Francke, 1957-1958, 729; et al.

13 This was correctly perceived by H. Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, VI, Göttingen: Dieterischen Buchhandlung, 1868 (3rd ed.), 257-312, as was also the correct order of the subdivisions.

14 The author's reconstruction of the chronological order of Philo's works will appear in a forthcoming book: From Biblical Exposition to Apologetics: Literary Tendencies in Philo of Alexandria.
of these discussions is on the eternity of the world: its creation, governance, and destruction (6-36); the second, on the problems of natural catastrophes, protection, and retribution (37-76); and the last, on the absurdities of astrological fatalism (77-88). A summary of the arguments is given in conclusion (89-92).

Provid II maintains the form of a dialogue. It begins with Alexander's early visit to Philo to resume the discussions of the previous day (1-2). Parts of the first two discussions of Book I receive further consideration; the problem of retribution (3-44) and that of the cosmos: its creation (45-58), governance (59-84), and natural phenomena (85-112). In the epilogue Philo thinks he has given satisfactory answers to Alexander's difficulties and goes on to invite further questions, but Alexander politely declines (113-116).

Anim falls into two parts, each preceded by a short dialogue between Philo and his interlocutor, Lysimachus (1-9, 72-76), a nephew of Alexander. Alexander's discourse on the rationality of animals, purportedly read in his presence, comprises the first part (10-71) and Philo's refutation of Alexander's premise, the second (77-100). Alexander begins his polemical discourse with sweeping denunciations of man's appropriation of reason to himself (10-11). He attempts to show among the brutes instances of the προφορικός λόγος the reason which finds utterance and expression (12-15). Then follows a lengthy argument for their possession of the ἐνδιάθετος λόγος the inner reason or thought (16-71). Some talking and singing birds constitute the examples for the first kind of reason; but the examples for the second kind of reason are far more numerous, including not only such stock examples as spiders, bees, and swallows (16-22), but also several performing animals (23-29) and a large number of others in whom demonstrations of virtues and vices are postulated to exist (30-71). Philo haphazardly and with some lack of kindness to his opponent, argues that animals do not possess reason. He ascribes the seemingly rational acts of animals to the reasoning of nature (77-100). By emphasizing the rationality of animals, Alexander argues for a moral and juridical relationship between man and animals (10, his opening remarks). This Philo rejects by insisting that there can be no equality between man, who is privileged with reason, and animals devoid of it (100, his concluding remarks).

The Philosophical Background

Platonism and Stoicism have long been regarded as being of major importance in molding Philo's thought, which nonetheless remains exceedingly religious in
tone and determined by its Jewish outlook. The strength of the Stoic influence is clearly seen in the responses to Alexander in *Provid I-II* and *Anim*. While Philo’s frequent use of Stoic terms with a meaning not at all Stoic may be true of several of his other works, it certainly is not true of these treatises, for there are major arguments as well as points of detail in which his thought, terminology, and phraseology are explicable by the Stoic background. Note that selections from about half of his responses to Alexander in these treatises are included in H. von Arnim’s *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* [SVF]. Certainly, there seem to be more Stoic views expressed by Philo than von Arnim has admitted into his compilation.

Philo’s cosmology in the dialogues owes not so much to Plato’s *Timaeus* as to a Stoic interpretation of that work. Likewise, his views on free will, deliberation, voluntary and involuntary acts, and responsibility for virtue and vice — views broadly developed in the dialogues — owe not so much to Aristotle’s

---

15 C. J. De Vogel, *Greek Philosophy III: The Hellenistic-Roman Period*, Leiden: Brill, 1963, 81, finds in *Provid II* a systematic exposition of the objections against providence and their refutation by the Stoics. The same could be said of Book I and *Anim*. On Philo’s Stoicism, see especially M. Pohlenz, *Philon von Alexandria* (Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, n.F. 1, 5), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1942, 409-487. Numerous examples of Philo’s supporting the Stoa against the New Academy can be cited throughout his responses to Alexander. In defending Divine Providence the distinction was made between God’s primary works and the secondary or consequential effects (*Provid II* 100); e.g., eclipses are consequential effects, not God’s primary intentions (79). Moreover, Philo is at one with the Stoics in the fundamental position that the irrational creation providentially exists for the sake of the rational (see below, nn. 23-24). In *Provid I* 122; II 48, 74 (SVF I, 85, 509, 548) he cites Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus by name. While no such names occur in *Anim*, two of the illustrations can be traced to Chrysippus (45-46, 84 [SVF II, 726], 88; see also SVF II, 1163, 1165; d. 714-737). Much of the discussion in the latter treatise centers around uttered reason or speech (λόγος προφορικός) and mental reasoning or thought (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος). The distinction between these two kinds of reason, implied in Plato (*Theaetetus* 189E; *Sophista* 263E) and Aristotle (*Analytica Priora* 76b24), was emphasized by the Stoics in their debates with the New Academy: *SVF* II, 135, 233, etc.; for a fine discussion, see M. Pohlenz, *Die Begründung der abendländischen Sprachlehre durch die Stoa* (Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, n.F. 1.3), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1939, 151-198. Subsequently, the distinction was employed by Philo (see especially *Anim* 12, 98-99 [SVF II, 734]; cf. *Quod Dec* 40, 92, 129; *Muct* 69; *Aeb* 83; *Vita Mos* II 127-130; *Spec Leg* IV 69) et al.; see M. Mühl, “Der λόγος ἐνδιάθετος und προφορικός in der älteren Stoa bis zur Synode von Sirmium 351,” *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* VII (1962) 7-56.

**Ethica Nicomachea** as to Stoic ethical thought surrounding Aristotle's morals. Although like the Stoics Philo believed in a cosmic destiny that could override man's choice, his belief in a personal, predestinating God differed sharply from the impersonal fatalism inherent in the Stoic doctrine of providence. And it is not so much that he is siding with the Stoics against Epicurean and Academic denial of providential care by the gods as perhaps arguing indirectly for a biblical understanding of Divine Providence.\(^\text{17}\)

The arguments attributed to Alexander in the dialogues were doubtless taken over by Philo from the arguments used by the opponents of the Stoics in the New Academy.\(^\text{18}\) Chief among the opponents was Carneades of Cyrene, who flourished as head of the Academy in the middle of the 2nd century BCE. Like Epicurus, Carneades insisted that the world's omnipresent imperfections militate against the Stoic belief in providential design in the world, the main example of which was claimed to be man himself — providentially endowed with reason and equipped for a virtuous life. Man's possession of reason, Carneades argued, speaks against providence rather than for it, since its actual use is determined by man's free will. And what about evidences of reason among the brutes as seen in their movements or actions? These and other questions raised by Carneades and his predecessor, Arcesilaus, greatly challenged the Stoic philosophers from Chrysippus to Posidonius — to whom the cumulative Stoic reply may be traced.\(^\text{19}\) Like most other arguments, those against providence and the irrationality of animals led the Stoics to create an arsenal of counter arguments which Philo, like later Stoics and others, exploits.\(^\text{20}\) His ingenuity in putting

---


\(^\text{18}\) Cicero, *De natura deorum*, III.66-85; *De fato*, II.23-28; SEP, I.62-77.


both the Academic criticism and the Stoic responses to good use appears in *Provid I-II* and *Anim*, where he reiterates the Stoic position against the Academic criticism he attributes to Alexander.

It is indeed difficult to discuss any aspect of Stoic doctrine without considering the interconnected mosaic of the whole philosophy — and that in the light of the fragmentary evidence. No doubt the questions of providence and the nature of man and animals and their relationship to the rest of nature are among the problems in Stoicism. In a broad sense, the workings of providence range throughout the universe: from the majestic cycles of heavenly bodies to the minutest anatomical details of insects. In support of their doctrine of providence the Stoics brought forward evidences of design throughout nature. They attributed to the workings of providence not only cosmic phenomena but also the peculiar characteristics of the various creatures: their inclinations or dispositions to move in a particular direction or act in a certain way as a result of some inherent quality or habit. They argued that the apparent evidences of reasoned action shown by animals are not due to reason but to their natural constitution; the universal, causal reason is at work and not that of the animal. We regret that it is not possible to discuss briefly that broad conception of nature or universal reason inherent in the Stoic monism.

As to the relationship of animals to humans, the Stoics argued that the irrational creation providentially exists for the sake of the rational, that animals were created for the sake of humans — just as humans were created for the sake of the gods. This anthropocentric teleology, which finds its strongest proponent

vides the closest parallels to *Provid II*; Seneca, in Book I of *Dialogi*, in the various *Epistulae*, and in the preface to *Naturales questiones*; Epictetus in his *Dissertationes*; Pliny in Books VIII and IX of his *Naturalis historia*; Plutarch in three of his works “De sollertia animalium” (*Moralia* 959A-985C), “Bruta animalia ratione uti” (985D-992E), and “De esu carnium” I-II (993A-999B); Aelian in *De natura animalium*; Oppian in *Cynegética*, Origen in *Contra Celsum* (esp. Book IV); Porphyry in *De abstinencia* (esp. Book III); in certain of the extant works of the Peripatetic Alexander of Aphrodisias: Περὶ ψυχῆς I, Περὶ ἐμπρέμνης, et al.

21 *Provid I* 51-53; Epictetus, *Diss* I.16. 1-8; Origen, *Cels IV*.54; etc. See also M. Hadas-Lebel, *De Providentia I-II*, p. 52.

22 *SVF* II, 714-737, 988; on the totalizing value given to nature, see 1106-1186. For a good discussion see J. Christensen, *An Essay on the Unity of Stoic Philosophy*, Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1962.

23 *SVF* II, 1152-1167; cf. the selections from *Provid II* in 1141-1150.
in Chrysippus,\(^\text{24}\) characterizes the whole cosmology of the Stoics. It is well known that they studied the cosmos primarily to understand man’s place in the realm of things.\(^\text{25}\) They explained a creature’s self-consciousness and relationship to its environment by formulating the doctrine of affinity or endearment (οἰκεῖωσις),\(^\text{26}\) which was held as a natural principle of justice. Among animals this principle is seen in their longing for self-preservation, in their love for offspring, and even in the association of different species for their mutual advantage; moreover, it is attested through its opposite, the natural aversion or antipathy (ἀλλοτρίωσις) between certain species.\(^\text{27}\) With humans, however, this relationship is so intimate and peculiar that it would be unjust to extend it to lower animals. The Stoics explained man’s self-consciousness in terms of his rationality and his affective relationships, beginning, naturally, with relations according to propinquity and moving on to the rest of mankind.\(^\text{28}\) To this fraternity of rationals as a civitas deorum atque hominum lower animals do not belong, for they are unequal in that they do not possess reason. Therefore, the Stoics maintained, there is no such thing as a justice which can obtain between humans and animals. Man cannot be charged with injustice when he makes unilateral use of

\(^{24}\) Chrysippus went so far as to say that the pig was made more fecund than other animals in order to be a fitting food for man or a convenient sacrifice to the gods, horses assist man in fighting, wild animals exercise man’s courage; the peacock is created for his tail and the peahen for accompanying symmetry, the flea is useful to prevent oversleeping, and the mouse to prevent carelessness in leaving the cheese about (Porphyry, De abstinencia III.20 [SVF II, 1152]; Plutarch, Mor 1044C-D [SVF II, 1163]; Porphyry adds that Chrysippus’ views were criticized by Carneades [ibid.]; Plutarch reiterates similar views in 1065B [SVF II, 1181]: the serpent’s venom and the hyena’s bile are useful in medicine). Philo reflects similar views (Provid II 84 [SVF II, 149], 91-92, 103; Vita Mos I 60-62; Spec Leg IV 119-121). M. Pohlenz thinks such anthropocentricism is alien to Greek thought and hence must be of Semitic origin: Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung, I, Göttingen: Vandenhoek and Ruprecht, 1964, 100.

\(^{25}\) DL, VII.88; cf M Ant, IV 23; X 6.


\(^{27}\) See the passages cited under “De primo appetitu et prima conciliatone,” in SVF III, 178-189.

\(^{28}\) In addition to the Ciceronian passages in the reference above, see the numerous other references in S.G. Pembroke’s excellent article, “Oikeiósis,” especially 121-132; cf Mut 226; Vita Cont 70.
animals, for it is to this end that animals are providentially made or naturally equipped.  

The Stoa became vulnerable to the attacks of the New Academy for cherishing these and other views, particularly those on the role of sense-perception which is also shared by creatures without reason — in the acquisition of knowledge. The Academics seem to have argued that animals cannot make use of sense-perception without some knowledge or understanding. But it was not so much improvidence and the rationality of animals that the opponents of the Stoics wanted to emphasize as man's free will and the denial of the possibility of knowledge or the existence of any positive proof or criterion for truth. They wanted to maintain an attitude of suspended judgment and thus utilized among other arguments the questions of improvidence in the world and evidences of rationality among the brutes. To support their major arguments they often made use of material gathered by the Stoics themselves. Philo uses these arguments and counter arguments systematically, placing them in a dialogue setting.

The Speakers

With regard to the speakers in the dialogues, there can be no doubt about the identity of Philo and his apostate nephew; however, the identity of Philo's interlocutor in Anim, Lysimachus, has been confused. The confusion arises from certain parts of the introductory and transitory dialogues between Philo (1, 75) and Lysimachus (72), where both of them refer to Alexander as "our nephew". This common reference to Alexander by Philo and Lysimachus led to an erroneous identification of Lysimachus as a brother of Philo, taking him to be either


30 Ibid.

31 Plutarch, Mor 960D-961B.


33 For a discussion on the use of sources, see M. Hadas-Lebel, De Providentia I-II, 65-67 and the author's Philonis Alexandrini de Animalibus, 53-56.
Alexander the Alabarch, Philo's notoriously wealthy brother and father of Tiberius Iulius Alexander, or another, younger brother.

Such an identification of Lysimachus distorts his true identity clearly stated in §2 where, speaking of Alexander, he says: "He is my uncle (lit., mother's brother) and my father-in-law as well. As you are not unaware, his daughter is engaged (lit., promised by an [betrothal] agreement) to be my wife." J.B. Aucher translates these lines correctly: \textit{Avunculus enim est, ac simul sucer: quoniam non es nescius, quod filia eius mihi juxta suam etiam promissionem desparsata uxor est.} However, being puzzled by Philo's and Lysimachus' calling Alexander "our nephew", he leaves the question of relation unresolved. G. Tappe, who insists that Lysimachus is a brother of Philo and of the Alabarch, on the authority of a certain Andreas declares the text of this passage to be corrupt and goes on to provide the following translation: \textit{Avunculus enim sunt ac simul sucer: quoniam non es nescius quod filia mea ei iuxta mean etiam promissionem desparsata uxor est.} There is no basis for these forced emendations. Moreover, if Lysimachus is a brother of Philo and of the Alabarch (Alexander's father) and at the same time Alexander's "mother's brother", then the Alabarch would have married his own sister.

The absolutely clear relationship indicated in §2 must stand, and the references to Alexander as "our nephew" by Philo (I, 75) and Lysimachus (72) must be explained — especially the latter. Two possible solutions are proposed: 1) Just as Philo in §§1 and 75 refers to Alexander as "our nephew", using a plural of modesty, likewise Lysimachus in §72 refers to Alexander as "our nephew" out of respect to his interlocutor, Philo. Note that Lysimachus' reference to "Alexander, our nephew" comes immediately after addressing Philo as "honorable" (ω τίμω

\[34\] It is to be suspected that from a mistaken interpretation of these passages, the name Lysimachus has been added to the name of Alexander the Alabarch in the 11th century Ambrosian MS of Josephus (\textit{AJ} XIX.276; cf. XVIII.159-160, 259-260; XX.100-103; BJ V.205); see M. Pohlenz, \textit{Philon von Alexandrea}, 413. A. Schaut notes: "Der zweite Name Λυσίμαχος in A 19 276 ist zweifelhaft." K.H. Rengstorff, ed., s.v. Άλεξανδρος (no. 7) [Λυσίμαχος] Alabarch von Alexandrien, in \textit{Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus. A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus}, Supplement I, Leiden: Brill, 1968, 8. This erroneous association of the names is quite common.

\[35\] G. Tappe, Άλεξανδρος, 4-5. This equally misleading identification has influenced a host of scholars (including P. Wendland, Tappe's major professor, and his associates) down to the present.

\[36\] \textit{Sermones tres}, p. xi, n.1.

\[37\] Άλεξανδρος, 4-5.
Φιλων, an address used earlier in §2. 2) A possible corruption of "your nephew" to "our nephew", either in the Greek ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν to ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν or in the Armenian Երիտասարծ ծիր to Երիտասարծ եղեր, may be suspected in §72 (the possibly confused letters are underlined).^38

The genealogical table below is based on Anim 1-2, 72, 75, and the passages in Josephus.^^39

**PHILO**

Alexander the Alabarch

| Marcus (betrothed to Berenice, daughter of Agippa I) | Tiberius Iulius ALEXANDER Daughter |

Daughter betrothed to LYSIMACHUS

Considering the social status of the family of Lysimachus and his relation to Alexander, it is very likely that he too pursued a political career. He might be the same Iulius Lysimachus mentioned in Publications de la Société Fouad I de Papyrologie, ed. O. Gueraud et al., Cairo, 1939, III, 21, 8, whose three representatives appear among the nine magistrates with Tuscus the Prefect at the tribunal in the Great Atrium to hear grievances from veterans (dated Sebastos 7 of Nero's 10th year [September 5, CE 63]).^40

**The Question of Authorship**

P. Wendland gives overwhelming evidence of the genuineness of Provid I-II by showing philosophical, linguistic, and stylistic affinities between these books

---

^38 The confusion of the Armenian letters in these pronouns is as common as those in the Greek pronouns.

^39 AJ XVIII.159-160, 259-260; XIX.276-277; XX.100-103; BJ V.205 (cf. 44-46, II.220, 223, 309, 492-498; VI.236-243, on Alexander's career in Roman service).

and the rest of the works of Philo.  Likewise, the numerous parallels between *Anim* and the Philonic passages cited in a recently published commentary by the author, suggest more than just a common literary heritage or use of sources. The Jewish authorship is clearly indicated in *Provid I* 22, 84; II 106-107. While no such indication is found in *Anim*, its authorship can hardly be considered apart from that of *Provid I-II*.

Philo's opponent throughout these dialogues is his apostate nephew, Alexander. *Provid II* is linked with *Provid I* at the outset, where Philo remarks on Alexander's coming "to go over what is left on Providence" (1). Likewise, *Anim* is linked with *Provid I-II* by a reference to Philo's rejecting Alexander's "former courtesies" (3). There is also a thematic relationship between *Provid I-II* and *Anim*: the latter deals with a certain aspect of providence and thus complements the theme of the former (providence and the question of animal intelligence are linked in *Provid I* 51-53; cf. II 91-92, 103-108). In a broad sense, the workings of providence range throughout the universe — from the majestic cycles of heavenly bodies to the minutest anatomical details of insects. Moreover, both treatises are developed with a wealth of stock illustrations commonplace in Academic-Stoic controversies regarding divine providence and the rationality of animals. In both works Philo systematically supports the Stoic position against the Academic criticism which he attributes to Alexander. The Alexandrian origin of both treatises is certain: *Provid II* 55 and *Anim* 13 and 28 refer to Alexandria in Egypt, and *Anim* 7 alludes to a mixed assembly of Romans and Alexandrians. Besides, both titles have the testimony of Eusebius, who cites them conjointly in his list of Philo's works.

The parody of an opponent's imagined speech is a common literary device. Interestingly enough, a selection of Alexander's arguments (*Provid II* 3) is introduced by Eusebius as a statement by Philo himself of the objections which

41 Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung, written primarily in response to L. Massebieau, who doubted the Philonic authorship of *Provid I*: "Le classement des oeuvres de Philon," *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études, Sciences religieuses* 1 (1889) 87-90. See also Hadas-Lebel, *De Providentia I et II*, 26-28, 357-361.

42 See above, n.3.

43 F.H. Colson wrongly observes: "There are no allusions to the OT, and no mention of Moses; the one and only fact which suggests that the writer is a Jew is the personal allusion to his visit to Jerusalem via Ascalon (5 64) [II 106-107]." (PLCL IX, 448)

opponents might adduce. There can be little doubt about Alexander's cherishing the Academic questions attributed to him in Provid I-II and Anim. In answering him Philo, like the Stoics before him, finds himself in a predicament and, in search for answers, sometimes contradicts himself (cf. Provid II 32 and 102; 105 and 110). Some of the questions purportedly raised by Alexander in these dialogues are not even dealt with in Philo's replies. The composition of the treatises, however, may be taken with fair certainty to be Philo's. F.H. Colson makes this observation on Provid I-II: "Philo was able to manipulate, even if he did not entirely invent, the part which Alexander plays and he does not seem to have treated his opponent fairly."

H. Diels was the first to suspect a tampering with Provid I. He based his doubts about the originality of this book on two observations: its form differs from that of Provid II and the list of philosophical opinions in it corresponds with that in the De placitis epitome, a work which was once attributed to Plutarch but now to Aetius, and which must be at least a hundred years later than Philo. Diels’ valid observations, however, led to erroneous conclusions, especially his thought that the present form of Provid I follows the pseudo-Plutarchian Placita. The differences between Provid I and II and the similarities between Provid I and the Placita call for another, perhaps more accurate, interpretation. First, the composition of Provid I-II does not necessarily require an identical form throughout. Philo could have followed different forms in each of the two books, just as he did follow still another form in Anim. Examples of different forms even within single books abound in classical literature. Second, Philo and Aetius after him must have made use of the same Peripatetic source which is found also in Stobaeus’ Elogiae and which may be traced ultimately to Theophrastus’ Περὶ φυσικῶν δοξῶν.

The single authorship of Anim may be demonstrated through its structure, patterned after the first part of Plato's Phaedrus (227A-237A). Moreover, there seems to be further reliance on Plato's thought as expressed in the Phaedrus. Since the Greek of Anim no longer exists, the following parallels between the introductory and transitory dialogues preceding and following Alexander's discourse in Anim (1-9, 72-76) and the introductory and transitory dialogues pre-

45 Praeparatio Evangelica VIII.14.386, Ταῦτα εἰς ἁνασκευὴν καὶ μυρία ἄλλα πλεῖον τούτων εἰπὼν, ἔχθει επιλέσται τὰς ἀντιθέσεις διὰ τούτων. “After stating these and a host of others on the negative side he [Philo] next proceeds to refute the objections as follows.”

46 PLCIL IX, 449.

47 Doxographi Graeci, 1-4.
ceding and following Lysias’ discourse in the *Phaedrus* (227A-230E, 234D-237A) are most conveniently given in English translation:  

**Philo’s De animalibus**

(1) PHILO: You remember the recent arguments, Lysimachus, which Alexander, our nephew, cited in this regard, that not only men but also dumb animals possess reason.

(2) LYSIMACHUS: Admittedly, honorable Philo, some differing opinions have been amicably presented to the speaker three times since then, for he is my uncle, and my father-in-law as well. As you are not unaware, his daughter is engaged to be my wife. Let us resume the discussion of this long, difficult, and wearisome subject and its absurd interpretation which does not appeal to me since it affects the clear light by distorting the obvious evidence.

(3) PHILO: With regard to clever sophistries, it is agreed that one ought to listen to them carefully, for nothing else seems to be so helpful to good learning as to critically examine what the propagator is declaring. Had he truly wished to continue learning, he would not have allowed himself to become occupied with other concerns. Tell me, why would he leave his other affairs and come merely to entertain a relative with useless words designed to tickle the ears? Such an action would be

**Plato’s Phaedrus**

And meeting the man who is sick with the love of discourse, he was glad when he saw him, because he would have someone to share his revel (228B).

He said the same thing two or three times, as if he did not find it easy to say many things about one subject, or perhaps he did not care about such a detail (235A).

Well then, my dearest, what the subject is, about which we are to take counsel, has been said and defined, and now let us continue keeping our attention fixed upon that definition (238D).

What was your conversation? But it is obvious that Lysias entertained you with his speeches (227B).

Believe this of me, that I am very fond of

---

48 The translation of Plato’s *Phaedrus* is that of H.N. Fowler, LCL 1, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914, 412-449, including the Greek text *en face*. 
considered neither kind nor appropriate by that person who has already rejected his former courtesies. Therefore do not anticipate receiving a particularly significant response to your request. You will not get very far with your request.

(4) LYSIMACHUS: Is not his want of leisure, Philo, the reason? You are not unaware of how many things are involved given relatives and social and community affairs at home.

(5) PHILO: Since I know that you are interested, indeed that you are always eager to hear new things, I shall begin to speak if you will keep quiet and not always interrupt my speech by making forceful remarks on the same matter.

(6) LYSIMACHUS: Such a restrictive order is unreasonable. But since it is expedient to seek and to ask for instruction, your order must be complied with. So here I sit quietly, modestly, and with restored humility as is proper for a student; and here you are seated in front of me on a platform, looking dignified, respectable, and erudite, ready to begin to teach your teachings.

I concede your point, for I think what you say is reasonable. So I will make this concession: I will allow you to begin (236A).

(7) PHILO: I shall begin to interpret, but I will not teach, since I am an interpreter and not a teacher. Those who teach impart their own knowledge to others, but those who interpret present from others information through accurate recall. And they do not do this just to a few Alexandrians you, but when Lysias is here I have not the slightest intention of lending you my ears to practice on. (228E)
But when the lover of discourse asked him to speak, he feigned coyness, as if he did not yearn to speak; at last, however, even if no one would listen willingly, he was bound to speak whether or no (228C). What Lysias, the cleverest writer of our day, composed at his leisure and took a long time for (228A).

So now that I have come here, I intend to lie down, and do you choose the position in which you think you can read most easily, and read (230E).

I know very well that I have never invented these things myself, so the only alternative is that I have been filled through the ears, like a pitcher, from the well springs of another (235C-D).
and Romans — the eminent or the excellent, the privileged, the elite of the upper class, and those distinguished in music and other learning — gathered at a given place.

(8) The young man entered in a respectful manner, without that overconfident bearing that some have nowadays, but with a modest self-reliance that becomes a freeman — even a descendent of freemen. He sat down partly for his own instruction and partly because of his father's continuous, insistent urging.

(9) Eventually one of the slaves, who was sent to a place nearby, brought the manuscripts. Philo took them and was about to read.

(The MS of Alexander's discourse is brought forth and read §§10-71). I know very well that when listening to Lysias he did not hear once only, but often urged him to repeat; and he gladly obeyed (228A).

At last he borrowed the book and read what he especially wished (228B).

(The MS of Lysias' discourse is brought forth and read [230E-234C]).

What do you think of the discourse . . . ? (234C)

(72) LYSIMACHUS: These are the matters, honorable Philo, that Alexander, our nephew, presented and discussed when he came in.

(73) PHILO: Wonderful Lysimachus; time is longer than life! These matters may interest not only the peasants, but also those trained in philosophy. Now it is not as though I was not taught the things referred to; in fact I was nurtured with such instructions throughout childhood, on account of their certainty, intriguing names, and easy comprehension. And it is not that I studied them thoroughly, but surely I do know them well. Nor are you ignorant, as expressed by the tone of your

Is it not wonderful . . . ? More than that . . . (234D)

I have not at all learned the words by heart; but I will repeat the general sense of the whole . . . in summary (228D).

Now I am conscious of my own ignorance (235C).
voice and indicated by the constant nodding of your head. Since you were
listening to what was being read, what else would you need? You seemed to be ab-
sorbed like bacchanals and corybants, whose self-proclaimed revelations are not
consistent with the reports of researchers and interpreters. On the one hand, there is
a diction which results from the up and down movements of the tongue and ter-
minates at the edges of the mouth; on the other hand, there is that which stems from
the sovereign part of the soul and, through the marvelous employment of the vocal
organ, makes sensible utterances.

(74) The affection of a father or of a mother for their children is unequaled.
Even honest, wise, and knowledgeable parents blend with their words an inde-
scribable affection when they relate their experiences to those who listen. They add
quite a few nouns and verbs. That is fine and appropriate, you say. But from the
interpreter's point of view, I admire your method. You appeared to
present the subject much as the author himself would have presented it by read-
ing. It seems to me that you have not omitted anything.

(75) As for the recent questions which the young man raised, the new and diverse
sophistries, and the terms used to delineate everything that is being disclosed, I am not
persuaded by them as the fickle minded, whose habit is to be easily attracted by any
fascinating thing. But I will thoroughly examine the truth, as one accustomed to
As I looked at you, I saw that you were delighted by the speech as you read. So,
thinking that you know more than I about such matters, I followed in your train and
joined you in the divine frenzy (234D).

He has omitted none of the points that belong to the subject, so that nobody could
ever speak about it more exhaustively or worthily than he has done (235B).

He appeared to me in youthful fashion to be exhibiting his ability (235A).
do so, and will make it known to everyone after analyzing it critically. I must not always be impressionable to persuasive argumen-tation; otherwise what our nephew has already written, which is contrary to sound learning, would be readily believed.

If you want to concern yourself with these matters, I will discuss them right now; but if you want to wait, let us agree to defer them to some other time.

You shall hear, if you have leisure to walk along and listen (227B).

(76) LYSIMACHUS: Do you not realize Philo, that I hold in low esteem all other duties for the sake of my love for learning and hunger for truth? If you wish to teach these matters now, I would be most pleased.

Don’t you believe that I consider hearing your conversation with Lysias “a greater thing even than business,” as Pindar says? [Li.2] (227B)

(Clearing of conscience at the beginning and at the end of the refutation [$77, 100]).

(Clearing of conscience at the end of the refutation [242C-243E]).

The Date of Composition

Adding to the confusion that led to the traditional view ascribing the dialogues to Philo’s early life are the references to Alexander as “the young man” (ὁ νηπίος, Anim 8, 75). These are not to be taken literally as denoting age but rather, metaphorically or derogatorily, denoting inexperience or ignorance. After all, time must be allowed for Alexander’s maturity and familiarity with the authorities and the arguments he is made to cite in Provid I-II and Anim. Note that in Provid II he is referred to as ὁ ἄνθρ (1) and addressed as ὁ γενναῖ (31, 62), ὁ ἀναμνάσε (55), ὁ φιλι (56), etc.

There are two datable events recorded in Anim (27, 54). The celebrations spoken of in §27 were given by Germanicus Iulius Caesar probably in CE 12,

49 Numerous examples of the metaphorical use of the term can be cited from classical and bibli-cal literatures.
when he entered on his first term of consulship. The account, however, is taken from a literary source used also by Pliny (NH VIII.4) and Aelian (NA II.11). Some time, therefore, must be allowed for the period between the event and its literary description on the one hand and for the period between that literary composition and its use by Philo on the other hand. The embassy to Rome spoken of in §54 is presumably the Alexandrian Jewish embassy to Gaius Caligula in CE 39/40. This delegation of five was headed by Philo himself and probably included his brother, Alexander the Alabarch. It now seems that Tiberius Iulius Alexander accompanied his uncle, and perhaps his father, on this delicate mission described in Philo’s Gaium and Josephus’ AJ XVIII.257-260. The second of these two datable events is to be taken as determining the terminus post quem and not the first as is generally supposed. Thus, the terminus post quem of Anim has to be advanced by about thirty years.

Two other accounts in Anim (13, 58) can be dated by way of their datable parallels in Pliny. J. Schwartz sees certain similarities between Anim 13 and NH X.120-121, where Pliny tells of a raven taught to salute by name first Tiberius, then Germanicus and Orusus, the sons of Tiberius — the first adopted — and says that a talking thrush, a starling, and nightingales were owned by Agrippina, Claudius’ fourth wife and niece, and the young princes: Britannicus, his son from a previous marriage, and Nero, her son from a previous marriage. Schwartz goes on to suggest “un nouveau terminus post quem de toute façon encore fort éloigné de la vraie date.” His observation seems to indicate a post CE 48 date for the composition of Anim — after Claudius took Agrippina as his fourth wife. The horse-race account in Anim 58 is found also in Pliny NH VIII.160-161, where the event is said to have occurred during the secular games of Claudius Caesar, i.e., in CE 47.

Several other internal evidences indicate a late date for Anim. The introductory and transitory dialogues (1-9, 72-76) portray an old man conversing with a young relative, Lysimachus (see the genealogical table above), who twice addresses Philo as “honorable” (ὁ τίμε Φιλον 2, 72). Alexander had a daughter, probably in her teens, betrothed to her cousin, Lysimachus (2). Granting that

---

50 He was imprisoned on Gaius’ orders and later released by Claudius. Josephus, AJ XIX.276 suggests, though it does not positively require, the arrest to have taken place in Rome.

51 “Note sur la famille de Philon d’Alexandrie,” 595, n.1.

52 C.H. Rackham’s note, Pliny, LCL (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940), III.112. It may be that in both cases Pliny has adapted the same source(s) used also by Philo. On such tendencies see the author’s Philonis Alexandrini de Animalibus, 53-56.
Alexander was born early in the reign of Tiberius (ca. CE 15), whose nomen and praenomen he bears, was married in ca. CE 35 at the age of twenty, he would by ca. CE 50 have been in his mid-thirties, with a teenage daughter. Moreover, Alexander seems to have held some public office (3-4) and, probably, was beyond Philo’s reach. His apostasy, spoken of by Josephus in AJ XX.100, stating that “he did not persevere in his ancestral practices” (τοῖς πατριῶς οὐ διέμενεν ἔθεσιν), is clearly reflected in the citation of oysters as fit for food, contrary to Jewish dietary laws (31; Provid II 92).

The following life sketch of Alexander should prove to be of some help in establishing the tentatively-drawn dates for his birth, marriage, and betrothal of his teenage daughter. The events mentioned in Animal 54 and 2 are underscored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Age (Appr.)</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca. CE 15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>was born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. CE 35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>was married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 39/40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>participated in the Alexandrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish embassy to Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>entered Roman service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Epistrategos of the Thebaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 46-48</td>
<td>31-33</td>
<td>Procurator of Judaea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. CE 50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>daughter betrothed to Lysimaschus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 66-70</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>Prefect of Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>proclaimed Vespasin Emperor before the Alexandrian troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Chief of Staff under Titus during the siege of Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only (and indirect) reference to Alexander’s age is found in BJ V.46, where Josephus remarks on Alexander as a counselor in the exigencies of war.

54 See the authorities cited above, n. 2, especially E.G. Turner’s article.
during the siege of Jerusalem by Titus in CE 70: "he was well qualified both by age and experience." When Josephus' *AJ* appeared in about CE 93/94 with the offensive remark on Alexander's renegadism (XX.100), Alexander may have been either dead or politically inactive.

In *Provid II* we find three indications suggestive of a late date for the dialogues: a possible allusion to Philo's failing eyesight (1); another clear indication of Alexander's apostasy (92), where, contrary to Jewish dietary laws, he is made to cite the hare with animals fit for food (cf. *Anim* 31); and a reference to one of Philo's pilgrimages to Jerusalem (107).

The internal evidence for a late date for the composition of the dialogues is overwhelming indeed. Consequently, they are to be ascribed to the closing years of the author's life (ca. CE 50) and placed at the end of the corpus of his works.  

The Implications of the Dialogues for the Exegetical Works

The often-quoted passage seemingly favoring the traditional view of Philo's growing out of philosophical writings into theological maturity and exegetical writings, *Congr* 73-80, has been misconstrued. The passage, rightly understood, shows Philo's concurrent interest in philosophy and theology. Although phi-

---

55 Elsewhere Josephus describes Alexander's position as πάντων τῶν στρατευμάτων ἄρχων κριθείς and πάντων τῶν στρατευμάτων ἐπάρχοντος (*BJ* V.46; VI.237). For the rest of Josephus' references to Alexander, see above, n.39.

56 Among others who have challenged the arguments for the traditionally held view that Philo wrote the philosophical works *Aet* (as that is indeed Philonic), *Quod Omnim, Provid I-II* and *Anim* before he undertook the expository works on the Pentateuch, see E. Schürer, who observes that *Anim* belongs to Philo's later works, the embassy to Rome being already contemplated: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, III, Leipzig: Hinrich, 1909 (4th ed.), 685: H. Leisegang, "Philons Schrift über die Ewigkeit der Welt," *Philologus* XCII (1937) 156-176, argues against P. Wendland that *Aet* belongs to the later years of Philo's life, to the time when he defended the Stoics on the notion of Divine Providence. Now that the Philonic authorship of *Aet* is certain, most of Leisegang's arguments could be claimed for *Provid I-II* and *Anim*, which he elsewhere (see above, n.12) places at the beginning of Philo's works. After establishing the identity of the speakers and the right date of *Anim*, M. Pohlenz argues that both the philosophical and the exegetical works belong to the same period, to the closing years of Philo's life, *Philon von Alexandria*, 412-415; E.G. Turner, *Tiberius Julius Alexander*, 56, in due consideration of the events of Alexander's life, observes, "Philo cannot have written these dialogues before CE 40-50."

losophy is presented as the servant of wisdom (i.e., the Torah, the Mistress), it is not so much the subordination of the one to the other that is emphasized as the constant relationship of the one with the other. Commenting on this and other related passages, D. Winston observes, "far from subordinating philosophy to Scripture, Philo is rather identifying the Mosaic Law with the summit of philosophical achievement." 58

Philo's concurrent interest in philosophy and theology may be seen in his dialogues. In a passage never before considered, Provid II 115, Philo speaks of philosophy as his life interest (in response to Alexander's asking for time to hear more from Philo): "I always have time to philosophize, to which field of knowledge I have devoted my life; however, many and diverse yet delightful duties that it would not be fair to neglect summon me." This conflict between political duties and personal endeavors, expressed at the end of a philosophical treatise, is reminiscent of that expressed at the beginning of an exegetical treatise, Spec Leg III 1-6. E.R. Goodenough in his brilliant interpretation of the latter passage shows that "Philo's literary career as an interpreter of the Bible was a function of his life after he had gone into political affairs, carried on as a hobby or escape from politics." 59 In due consideration of Provid II 115 and the date we have ascribed to the dialogues, we may add that Philo never fully retired from political life. We may also add that his concurrent interest in philosophy and theology and the interrelation of his works as a whole suggest that his works were written at the end of his political career and over a comparatively short period of time. The bulk of his writings does not make this supposition impossible. 60

In the introductory and transitory dialogues in Anim, thought to be "a purely philosophical work", he calls himself "an interpreter" (ἐρμηνεύς 7, 74) — if by that he is to be understood as an interpreter of Scripture. We must note that no direct use is made of Scripture in either of the two dialogues; instead, the arguments appear within the context of Academic-Stoic polemics. This, however, does not rule out the existence of a possible biblical background. H. Leisegang

58 "Was Philo a Mystic?" Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers, ed. P.J. Achtemeier, Missoula, Montana, 1978, I.164. In the same volume, see the author's article, "The Implications of Philo's Dialogues for His Exegetical Works," 184, where a similar understanding of the passage is arrived at independently. [Ed. — repr. in the present volume, pp. 249-259.]


60 M. Hadas-Lebel cites the example of Cicero (De Providentia I et II, 39); one may also cite the example of Plotinus.
observes that by arguing for the rationality of animals Alexander is opposing not only the Stoic but also the Judaeo-biblical doctrine that only man is endowed with the rational spirit. 61 We may add that by emphasizing the irrationality of animals and thereby sanctioning their unilateral use by humans, Philo is perhaps defending the anthropocentric view of the cosmos reflected in Gen 1:26-28; 2:19-20; 9:2 — man’s dominion over the irrational creation. We may likewise observe that in Provid I-II Philo is perhaps defending the biblical view of teleology, including the necessity of evil for the ultimate good — as found in numerous accounts in Genesis and Exodus. 62 In view of these observations, the dialogues with Alexander may be treated as apologetic literature; indeed, the apologetic thrust of Provid II seems to have been recognized by Eusebius. 63 Philo’s dialogues thus seem to fall in line with the rest of his works, which are more or less colored by an apologetic overtone; moreover, they may have influenced Christian apologists in the manner of responding to pagan opponents, as seen in the appeal to Stoic philosophy rather than to Scripture. 64

We may cite for example Philo’s Quad Omn, another of his mostly philosophical and more apologetic works, wrongly ascribed to his youth and thought to show by its numerous secular illustrations the truth of the Stoic paradox that the wise man alone is free. 65 In contrast, there are but five allusions to or quotations from the Pentateuch (29, 43, 57, 68-69 — all in the first half of the treatise); yet more than defending the Stoic paradox in this treatise Philo stresses that true freedom lies in following God (19-20, 160). Interestingly enough, Ambrose in his 37th letter, which to a large extent is a paraphrase of Quad Omn, observes after noting §19 that David and Job said the same thing before Sophocles; after noting (§§38-40) that masters, like purchasers of lions, become enslaved by their slaves, Ambrose cites Prov 17:2 (LXX); and after noting (§§92-97) the story of the Indian Calanus and his firm resistance to Alexander, he points out that the Indian’s heroism is surpassed by the Three Young Men and the Maccabean martyrs. Ambrose’s awareness of Philo’s apologetic concern in

61 Philon, col. 7.
63 Praep Evang, VIII.14. 386, quoted above, n.45 (see its context).
65 Quad Omn and the lost twin treatise mentioned in §1, Every Bad Man Is a Slave, are generally believed to be from Philo’s youthful days. See F.H. Colson’s introduction, PLCL IX, 2-9.
Quod Omn is all too obvious. This concern, reflected throughout the treatise, becomes all the more obvious in the treatment of the Essenes in §§75-91.

In an earlier treatise, "De nobilitate" (Virt 187-227), Philo stresses not so much the Stoic paradox that the virtuous man alone is noble as the biblical doctrine that everyone is to be judged by his conduct and not by his descent (226-227). However, unlike his marked departure into more apologetic thrust in Quod Omn, and more so in the dialogues, Philo illustrates this doctrine entirely from the Pentateuch — more in keeping with his tendency in the exposition of the Law or the third commentary on the Pentateuch, of which "De nobilitate" seems to be an integral part.

To add to the validity of the foregoing observations, we shall revive a meritorious thesis put forward by M. Adler, who observes in Philo’s works comprising the allegorical commentary a gradual departure from the biblical text: whereas the earlier works (Leg All I-III, Cher, Sacr, Quod Det, Post, Gig, Quod Deus, Agr, Plant, Ebr) show close attachment to the text, gradually breaking into free composition, the later works (Sobr, Conf, Migr, Heres, Congr, Fuga, Mut, Somn I-II) are almost altogether free from such attachment and more philosophical. Following Adler’s thesis on Philo’s method, one is compelled to conclude that the more philosophical writings are of later development. Such a conclusion can in turn be substantiated by our demonstration of the late date of the dialogues and strengthened by our elaborations on Leisegang’s observations noted above.

The view that Philo’s more philosophical works are of later development gains added support from a forthcoming study where we shall demonstrate through internal evidence the primacy of the Quaestiones among the allegorical commentaries on the Pentateuch. We may note in passing that in the Quaestiones Philo manifests his closest attachment to the frequently cited biblical

66 I owe much of this observation to F.H. Colson, *ibid.*, 5-6, n.c.
68 A discussion on how this treatise is related to the other three in Virt is not within the scope of this study. Suffice it to say that the four treatises comprising Virt were thus known to Clement of Alexandria (Stromates, II.18) and that there is a thematic relationship between this fourth treatise and Praem ("On Rewards and Punishments"), the following and last treatise in the exposition of the Law.
70 This will appear in the author’s forthcoming book cited above, n.14.
text, from which midrashic form of exposition he clearly moves to a more artistic expression and a more Hellenized presentation of biblical philosophy.

Having demonstrated that the dialogues with Alexander belong to the closing years of Philo's life and that his philosophical interest concurs with his theological interest, we are led to conclude that perhaps most of Philo's literary career belongs to the closing years of his life, to the period following the political turmoils described in Flacc and Gaum. Moreover, his works, written over a comparatively short period of time, seem to be carefully structured compositions that progress not from philosophical into more theological writing but rather from a midrashic type of exposition into a more apologetic approach, conceivably climaxing in his dialogues.
A Philonic Fragment on the Decad

In the course of translating some of Philo's works that survive only in Armenian, it became necessary to develop an Armenian-Greek glossary based on his works that are extant in both Greek and Armenian versions and which can therefore be compared. But the Armenian text of Philo published by the Venetian Mekhitarists\textsuperscript{1} needed dividing into sections and enumeration of sections following the Greek text. While I was thus working on the Armenian text, I came to the two pages reproduced below for which there was no Greek parallel.\textsuperscript{2}

Text and Translation\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Σωμάτης ἰσορροπουμένως ἰνεργείαν ἀποτελεῖν, ὄντων Ὀρθόνομής ἢ τῆς ἱσορροπίας ἀνεξαρτητικός...}
\textit{...διαμαρμαρώσων ὑποτέλεσθαι. Ἡ ἀναγεννησύς ἢ ἀνεξαρτητικός...}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1} Works of Philo Judaeus Translated by Our Ancestors, the Greek Original of Which Is Extant [Φιλόν τῶν ἰδρυμάτων Ἑλληνικά ἀρχαία. Θεολογικά έργα, όπου Ζητούμενα. Σωμάτων ἐνώπιον]. Venice: San Lazzaro, 1892. According to the postscript (p. 286), the editorial work was supervised by F.C. Conybeare.

\textsuperscript{2} From ibid., 222.8-223.17, where an asterisk indicates the omission of these lines in the Greek text.

\textsuperscript{3} The underlining indicates additions in this passage when compared with a strikingly similar passage in Anatolius 39.21-40.19, reproduced below from Heiberg's edition (see n. 22 below); the underlining in the comparable Greek text of Anatolius indicates omissions in the Philonic passage (and vice versa). Parentheses ( ) are used to indicate interpolations; brackets [ ] for editorial additions in the course of translating; braces { } for variant readings in the respective texts; and angular brackets $<$ > to indicate emendations.
10 թաք որը զանգակացելով, սուրբ մայրնս: Սիբ կար 
բազմ վճարվելու տասն, եւ որ գիտե աշխարհի: 
զիջելու, ու զոհեր սահման կը զարգարդանալու են: 
սուրբ դե. ս. ու զարգարդանալու սահման կը: 
15 քեռի եփերը պետք քարանդաշտանալու առա 
տեմ զարգարդանալու ու կար 
քեր զարգարդանալու մայրմայր զար 
քերը և եկեղեցին, զարգարդանալու կա 
ճերի է ճեր, ճերմակիր է, ճեղմակիր է, ե 
թաք որը զարգարդանալու սահման կը: 
20 հետ քերե, քերե քեռ ռազմակարգադրանալու սա 
հայ քերե, զարգարդանալու մայրմայր զա 
քերը և եկեղեցին, զարգարդանալու կա 
ճերի է ճեր, ճեղմակիր է, ճեղմակիր է, ե 
թաք որը զարգարդանալու սահման կը: տ 
30 քեր և քեր կար ճեր, քեր ու քեր: զե 
քեր եփերը և քեր եփերը և քեկ եփերը 
քեր եփերը և քեր եփերը և քեր եփե 
քեր եփերը և քեր եփերը և քեր եփե 
35 անգամ զարգարդանալու առա 
տեմ զարգարդանալու ու կա 
ճերի է ճեր, ճեղմակիր է, ճե 
թաք որը զարգարդանալու սահման կը:
The number generated by the sum of the decad is 385 which of itself is marvelously beautiful. First, it is constituted of the sum of doubles and triples taken successively, in the following manner: the doubles 1, 2, 4, 8 make 15, and the (threefolds)\textsuperscript{5} triples 1, 3, 9, 27 equal 40, and when added up, these make 55, which Plato mentions in the Timaeus with reference to the construction of the soul, beginning thus: "He took one portion from the whole," and what follows this.\textsuperscript{6} Second, [as] the number 55 is the sum of the decad, 385 is the product of the decad: for if you multiply every [number] from 1 to 10 [by itself and] add up [the products], the number obtained [will be] 385—and 385 is the sevenfold of 55. Third, 55 is a triangular [number] — like the [number] 6 or the decad itself.\textsuperscript{7} Fourth, if you add up the numerical value of the letters in [the word] ἑω,\textsuperscript{8} you will discover what amounts to the sum of the decad,\textsuperscript{9} [namely], 55. Fifth, the most productive [number], 6, when multiplied by itself, generates 36 — of which it is the square root. The factors of this\textsuperscript{10} are generated in the following manner: by 2 = 18, by 3 = 12, by 4 = 9, by 6 = 6, by 9 = 4,

\textsuperscript{4} The text here has numeral words. The use of numeral letters, however, is more frequent in the fragment. Such interchangeable use of numerals is common in the Armenian corpus of Philo's works; cf., e.g., the notes of R. Marcus on \textit{Quaer Gen} 1.83 (\textit{Philo Supplement} I [Loeb Classical Library], Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press / London: Heinemann, 1979, 51-52), which has much in common with the opening lines of this fragment.

\textsuperscript{5} A modified duplicus.

\textsuperscript{6} Plato \textit{Timaeus} 35B: \textit{mian} apthele \textit{(ho theos) to prōton apo pantos moiran, kil.} Note the omission of \textit{to prōton} here and in the comparable Greek text of Anatolius (at 40.2); nonetheless, the Philonic passage with its Armenian text is closer to the text of the \textit{Timaeus}.

\textsuperscript{7} For illustrations of triangular numbers, see Colson, PLCL VI.607; Marcus, PLCL \textit{Suppl.} I.52 and n. 18; quadrangular numbers are those which can be arranged in the form of a square.

\textsuperscript{8} The Armenian text is meaningless at this juncture, since it translates the Greek word which means "one" and omits \textit{en grammasin} (cf. Anatolius 40.8).

\textsuperscript{9} Although omitted in Anatolius 40.9, "the decad" appears in a certain ms of Ps. Iamblichus' \textit{The arithm} (see n.10 in the apparatus of the Greek text below).

\textsuperscript{10} The comparable Greek text has "the 7 factors of this" (40.10).
by 12 = 3, by 18 = 2, by 36 = 1. The sum of the {8} factors is the number 55.\textsuperscript{11} Taken successively, 5 triangular [numbers] generate 30 55 (likewise, 5 quadrangular [numbers], taken successively, generate 55),\textsuperscript{12} as follows: 3, 6, 10, 15, 21 make 55; likewise, 5 quadrangular [numbers], taken successively, generate 55, as follows: 1, 4, 9, 16, 25 make 55. For out of the triangles <and the 35 quadrangles>\textsuperscript{13} is everything generated.\textsuperscript{14} Out of the parallel equilateral triangles three {elements} are contrived: {fire, moisture},\textsuperscript{15} and the octahedron;\textsuperscript{16} for there is a figure for fire, a figure for air, and a figure for water. Whereas out of the quadrangles, the cube, is the figure for earth.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{The Locus of the Fragment}

Throughout the Armenian manuscript tradition of the Philonic corpus there is a certain disruption at \textit{De specialibus legibus} (\textit{Spec Leg}) \textit{III} 7: it is followed by this fragment and the \textit{De Decalogo} (\textit{Dec}) before the text of \textit{Spec Leg} \textit{III} 8-63 is resumed. Judging from the fragmentary condition of the \textit{De specialibus legibus} in the Armenian version (\textit{I} 79-161, 285-345; \textit{III} 1-7, 8-63), the transposition of the \textit{De Decalogo} into the third book of the latter work, and other partial translations of Philo's works, it would seem that this fragment was part of a poorly preserved Greek exemplar from which the Armenian translation was made. The two-page

\textsuperscript{11} As of this line, the two texts differ considerably. In keeping with the preceding note, the Greek has "7" instead of "8"; omits the last of the eight divisions (thus falling short of generating 55) and the word "factors"; and adds the ordinal "sixth" before the next statement (40.13).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} Clearly an error of doubling (cf. lines 32-33).\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} The omission is due to homoioiteleuton (cf. Anatolius 40.15).\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{14} The comparable Greek text adds "according to Plato" (40.16).\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} D.T. Runia, with whom I shared a preliminary translation of this fragment, perceives a corruption here on the basis of the parallel passage in Anatolius: "The word puramis was thus split into pur and atmis, which accounts for the unexpected 'moisture' in the translation." See his \textit{Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato} (Diss.: Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, 1983) 255. Consequently, the word eikosaedron was dropped from the text lest there be four "elements" (i.e., stoicheia instead of schēmata).\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{16} I.e., air; see Plato \textit{Tim} 55C; cf. \textit{Quaest Gen} 3.49.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Plato \textit{Tim} 55E, 56A.
fragment is the equivalent of a loose, transposed folio, and because it deals with the decad, it was inserted immediately before the De Decalogo — itself a transposed book. The latter — whether before or after our fragment was placed before it — was inserted immediately after Spec Leg III 7 since the section deals with the decalogue: Philo is about to begin his discussion of the second five of the ten commandments. The words ten and five in a context dealing with the decalogue on the one hand, and the De Decalogo on the other, created a logical place for the insertion of the loose folio with its emphasis on ten and fifty-five (the apparent digression into discussing the number fifty-five, triangles, and quadrangles, is but an elaboration on the essence of the decad). It is therefore understandable how the fragment was interpolated into the text and how it was transmitted unnoticed by the translator, who was not fluent in Greek and depended systematically on a Greek-Armenian lexicon.  

The ascription of this arithmological “loose-leaf” to Philo becomes more certain when we probe beyond its locus of discovery in a disjointed and mutilated Philonic codex, written in Greek and dating from before the fourth quarter of the 6th century — the date of the Armenian translation. A closer look at the passage itself leaves no doubt about its Greek authorship: 1) the Greek syntax awkwardly maintained by the translator 2) the numerical significance of the Greek word hen in lines 19-21, which are altogether meaningless in Armenian and 3) corrupt readings behind the Armenian translation which could occur only in the Greek text, such as noted on line 37. Moreover, the fragment cannot be ascribed to any extant Armenian translation from Greek, particularly to a work translated by the so-called Hellenizing School of the Early Middle ages, which is noted for its strict adherence to the Greek syntax as is readily discernible in the Armenian corpus of Philo’s works and other philosophical writings translated from Greek. And since the fragment cannot be ascribed to any of

---


20 For a catalogue of these works, see the pages in the preceding note.
Philo’s known works, its ascription to one of his lost works becomes very tempting indeed. Of such works the Peri arithmōn (De numeris), on which more will be said later, seems to be the most likely. But before any such identification of the fragment, we must consider the possibility of its belonging to one of the arithmetical compilations extant in Greek literature.

The Non-Philonic Origin of the Fragment

The quest for comparable passages in non-Philonic works leads to later arithmetical compilations by Peripatetic and Neoplatonic writers, whose works abound with common Neopythagorean speculations on numbers punctuated with occasional, dogmatic references to Plato’s Timaeus. From among these compilations a strikingly similar passage is found in Anatolius’ account on the decad (39.21-40.19) which dates from the third century CE and is utilized in Pseudo-Lamblichus’ Theologoumena arithmeticae (86.10-87.11) along with a compilation of the same name attributed to Nicomachus of Gerasa (ca. 50-150 CE). The comparable passage in Anatolius, with a critical apparatus showing certain variants in Ps.-Lamblichus’ Theol arithm, is reproduced here from Heiberg’s edition.

---

21 A list of such writers and their works is found in K. Stachle, Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandria, Leipzig / Berlin: Teubner, 1931, vi, and a survey in his introduction, 1-18. For a survey of ancient scholarship on the Timaeus see the excellent discussion by Runia, Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato, 27-39; see also the exhaustive notes by H. Cherniss to Plutarch’s De animae procreatione in Timaeo (Mor 1012B-1030C) in LCL. On the question of sources, see below, n. 29.


23 Edited by V. De Falco, Leipzig: Teubner, 1922.

39.21 ἔτι ἡ δεκάς ἀριθμὸν γεννᾷ τὸν ε’ καὶ ν’ θαυμαστά περιέχοντα κάλλι(η)15 πρῶτον μὲν συνέστηκεν ἐκ τοῦ διπλασίου καὶ τοῦ τριπλασίου τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς συντιθέμενων. <διπλασίων μὲν>16 α’ β’ δ’ η’ (ταύτα17) δ’ ἐστὶ ιε’ τριπλασίων δ’18 α’ γ’ θ’ κζ’, ἀπερ ἐστὶ μ’ ταῦτα

40.1 συντιθέμενα <ποιεῖ τὸν1> νε’. ὄν καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Τιμαίῳ2 μ(έ)νηται τῆς psycheγονιας ἀρχῆς ὑμῖν ἰδίως μιὰν ἀπὸ παντὸς μοιρᾶν καὶ τὸ ἐξῆς, δεύτερον <δ’> μὲν νε’ ἀριθμὸ(δε) δεκάς ἐστὶ σύνθεσις, ὁ δὲ τπε’ τῆς

5 δυνάμει δεκάς ἐὰν γὰρ ἀπὸ μονάδος ἀρχή δεκάς πολυπλασίασης, συνθήσεις2 τὸν προερημένον6 ἀριθμὸν <τὸν7> τπε’ τοῦ νε’ τὸ ἐπταπλάσιον. τρίτον δὲ νε’ τριγώνον ἐστι. τέταρτον ἐὰν ἴδης τὸ ἐν ἐν γράμμασιν, εὐρύσκει τὸν κατὰ σύνθεσιν τὸν νε’. πέμπτον ἦν γονιμωτάτα ἡ ἐξῆς ἀφ’ ιε’ αὐτὴν


15 τετράγωνοι ε’ οἱ κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς α’ δ’ θ’ ια’ κ τ’17 γίνονται18 νε’ ἐκ δὲ τριγώνου καὶ τετραγώνου ἦ τοῦ ὅλου γένεσις κατὰ Πλάτωνα19. ἐκ μὲν γὰρ ἰσοπλεύρων τριγώνων τριὰ σχῆματα20 συνισταται, πυραικε21 οκτάεδρον, εἰκοσάεδρον, τὸ μὲν πυρὸς σχῆμα, τὸ δὲ ἀέρος, τὸ δὲ ὑδάτος, ἐκ <δ’22> τετραγωνὸν ὁ κύβος, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ σχῆμα γῆς ἐστίν.


A comparison of the Armenian fragment with the above passage in Anatolius shows a number of substantive differences. There are eighteen deviations obtaining between the two texts. With reference to the Armenian text, there are nine additions (two of which are due to scribal errors), in lines 5-6, 7, 14, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 26, 27, 29-30; six omissions, in lines 20, 24, 32, 35 (two), 38; and three substantially different readings, in lines 27 and 37 (two). Only one of the seven legitimate additions underlined in the Armenian text is unquestionably warranted, i.e., line 26, where in the corresponding Greek line (40.12) the eighth division is omitted and, consequently, the number of the factors is reduced to seven (which, when added up, fail to yield the sum of the decad). Of the six additions underlined in the Greek text, all but one are warranted (40.10): the alphabetic number seven, which pertains to the problem just mentioned. Also pertaining to the same problem is the variant reading of "eight" in the Armenian text (line 27), versus "seven" in the Greek (40.13). The remaining two variants are certainly in favor of the Greek text, as indicated in the notes on line 37 (cf. 40.17-18).

Among other differences is the enumeration of the statements on the decad and its sum. Whereas the last enumerated statement in the Philonic passage is the fifth (line 21; cf. 40.9), the comparable passage in Anatolius goes on to enumerate the sixth (40.13; cf. line 34; the original source probably had ordinal numbers before every statement). Notwithstanding the inherent problems of the Armenian text, it retains a better reading of the quotation from Plato's Timaeus (35B): it has the exact equivalent of apheile in separate words (lines 10-11; cf. 40.2-3). But the same lines in both texts, and in others as well, omit to próton — leaving no doubt about their derivation from a secondary source. In the closing lines of the fragment and in a context of allusions to Tim 53C-57D, the Armenian text omits Plato's name, which the Greek text maintains (line 35; cf. 40.16).

In light of these departures, the Armenian fragment cannot be a translation of the passage in Anatolius, nor can the latter be dependent on the Greek of the

25 The Greek reads: "the 7 factors of which are generated in the following manner: by 2 = 18, by 3 = 12, by 4 = 9, by 6 = 6, by 9 = 4, by 12 = 3, by 18 = 12, the 7 [factors] make the number 55."

former; rather, they seem to depend on a common, independently transmitted
arithmological source. On a smaller scale, both texts may be described as wit-
tnesses to two separately evolved textual traditions. That Philo and Anatolius et
alii utilized common arithmological sources can be demonstrated also through
Anatolius' remaining statements on the decad and his treatment of the other
numbers as well. There are parallels in Philo for everything on the decad in Ana-
tolius: in the lines preceding our passage, Anatolius speaks of the decad as peras
(39.5; cf. Congr 90); kamptēr (39.6; cf. Op 47; Plant 125); horas (39.7; cf. Op 47;
Dec 27); and pantelēs (39.13; cf. Spec Leg I 178). 27

The prominence of Plato's Timaeus throughout the fragment is equally
noteworthy: the Platonic quotation with reference to the construction of the
soul in the opening lines, and the allusion to the Platonic theory of the primary
elements and the shapes of their derivation in the closing lines. This theme in
the writings of Philo happens to be the subject of a recent study by Runia (Philo
of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato), who observes: "Philo's references to
Plato's elemental theory occur only in arithmological contexts." 28 Revival of
interest in Plato's Timaeus, and Neopythagorean speculations on numbers seem
to have had a profound influence on Philo's thought, as may be concluded from a
similar observation made by Moehring with reference to the number seven in
the writings of Philo. After listing the purely arithmological statements on the
number, Moehring remarks on the list: "Philo almost certainly took it over
from some Neopythagorean work." 29 Furthermore, there is hardly anything on
the number seven in Anatolius (35.5-38.5) that could not be found in Philo.
Certain passages appear even in the same sequence in both writers; e.g., both cite

27 Cf. panteleia with reference to the decad in Op 47; Abru 244; Vita Mos 2.79; and Dec 20. On
Philo's treatment of the decad, see Staehle, Die Zahlennystik bei Philon, 53-58; M. Alexan-
dre, PM, 16.242-44.

28 For publisher and date of publication, see above, n. 15; the quotation is from p. 255. The
author is to be commended for the thoroughness of his work.

29 H. Moehring, "Arithmology as an Exegetical Tool in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria,"
SBL Seminar Papers (1978/1), 191-227, especially 202-4. For more on the question of arith-
mological sources in Philo, see F.E. Robbins, "Posidonius and the Sources of Pythagorean Ar-
ithmology," Classical Philology XV (1920) 309-22; idem, "The Tradition of Greek Arithmol-
y, "ibid. XVI (1921) 92-123; idem, "Arithmetic in Philo Judeus," ibid. XXVI (1931) 345-
61; also Staehle, Die Zahlennystik bei Philon von Alexandrea, 11-18. Staehle objects to Rob-
bins' efforts to locate Philo's arithmological sources in the early commentaries on the Ti-
mæus and insists that they must be sought in early arithmological works.
consecutive passages from Solon and Hippocrates — obviously from a secondary source (Op 104-105; Anatolius 37.5-38.5).

This part of the discussion may be concluded by stating that we here possess a Philonic fragment with contents that are not original with Philo, as is the case with all of his arithmological statements apart from biblical application. The word "Philonic" does not necessarily mean original with Philo or thought up by him; it includes his utilization of sources. There are no good reasons why the "authorship" should be denied to Philo.

**Ascription of the Fragment to Philo's De numeris**

Assigning the fragment to a lost part of the Philonic corpus must be done cautiously. Runia, with whom I shared a preliminary translation of the fragment, suggests that it may belong to a missing part of the *Quaestiones.* Although the compositional characteristics of the latter are absent in the fragment, one finds similar, lengthy arithmological passages in the *Quaestiones.* However, when we consider the reconstructed scriptural coverage of the original six books of the *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim,* we cannot find a verse with reference to the number ten that is not accounted for in the Armenian translation. The same holds true for the *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* — notwithstanding its many missing parts. When we take into consideration the scriptural coverage of the original six books, we do not find a passage there with reference to the number ten that is not accounted for in the Armenian translation. There are three references to the number ten in those parts of Exodus that extend beyond the reconstructed coverage of the original *Quaestiones*: 34:28, the ten commandments; 37:1 (MT 36:8), the ten curtains; and 37:10 (MT 38:12), the ten

30 Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato, 170.
31 E.g., *Quaes Gen* 1.83, 91; 3.56; etc.
33 See the treatment of Gen 24:10 and 22 in *Quaes Gen* 4.92 and 110. Philo does not treat the words "ten days" of vs. 55 in *Quaes Gen* 4.131; he also omits the words "ten years" of Gen 16:3 in *Quaes Gen* 3.121; and Gen 18:32 with its reference to ten righteous people is not used in the *Quaestiones.*
34 Royse, "The Original Structure of Philo's *Quaestiones,*" 61-62.
35 See Philo's brief remarks on Ex 26:1 in *Quaes Ex* 2.84. He does not treat Ex 26:16; 27:12.
pillars and their ten sockets. All three references have earlier occurrences in the book of Exodus. The ten commandments in Ex 20:2-17 are not part of the Babylonian parashiyot and hence do not belong to the Quaestiones \(^{36}\) (the absence of the word “ten” in the chapter would have posited no hindrance to Philo). The ten curtains are mentioned earlier in Ex 26:1, on which Philo remarks:

Many a time has much been said about the number ten in other places, which for those who wish to prolong the discussion it would be easy to transfer here. But brevity of speech is liked by us, and sometimes a reminder of what has been said is as effective and sufficient (Quaes Ex 2.84).

And the ten pillars with their sockets are likewise mentioned earlier, in Ex 27:12, on which he does not comment.

Possible dependence on the contents of this fragment may be discerned in Quaes Gen 1.83: “The ten [digits] added one by one — 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 . . . make 55” (cf. lines 1, 12, 21). In the same passage Philo makes similar use of double, triangular, tetragonal, pentagonal, hexagonal, and heptagonal numbers. The first two of these: 1, 3, 6, 10, etc., and 1, 4, 9, 16, etc., have parallels in lines 31-34.\(^ {37}\) Besides looking for such progressions of numbers in the Quaestiones, we ought to consider also the relationship of this fragment to Philo’s theory of the primary bodies, such as propounded in Quaes Gen 3.49.\(^ {38}\) Note his remarks on the numbers 6 and 36 (cf. line 21, the hexad as “the most productive number”, as in Op 13) and his perception of the geometrical forms of the elements not simply as triangles and squares but as pyramids and cubes (cf. lines 34-40; note his play on the resemblance between puramis and pur).

Philo’s extensive use of arithmology in the Quaestiones and, to a lesser extent, in the other commentaries has been observed repeatedly by those who have studied the arithmological tradition in his works.\(^ {39}\) This comprehensive use of numbers is due in part to his earlier compilation of an arithmological handbook, the lost Peri arithmon (De numeris), in preparation for his exegetical study of the Pentateuch. Philo refers to it specifically in Quaes Gen 4.110, 151; Quaes Ex

---

\(^ {36}\) Royse, “The Original Structure of Philo’s Quaestiones,” 61.

\(^ {37}\) Similar use of numbers may be observed in Vita Mos 2.79; Dec 20-21, and elsewhere; see also the passages cited by Runia, Philo of Alexandria and the Timeaus of Plato, 169.

\(^ {38}\) For a discussion see ibid., 252-255. See also his discussion of the composition of the cosmic soul, in Op 48 and 91, pp. 167-170.

\(^ {39}\) See above, n. 29; also Marcus, PLCL Suppl. I, x.
2.87; and *Vita Mos* 2.115.\(^{40}\) The extensive and systematic use of numbers in the extant works of Philo was enough for Staehle to try to reconstruct this treatise in broad outlines.\(^{41}\) It is only logical to ascribe our fragment to this lost and earliest work of Philo — after having described the present *locus* of the fragment in the Philonic corpus and having eliminated the possibility of its belonging to the *Quaestiones* or being a translation of some extant arithmological work in Greek literature.

---

\(^{40}\) Marcus in the PLCL Supplements fails, like Aucher before him, to recognize the direct references to the *Peri arithmon* at the end of *Quaes Gen* 4.151 and in *Quaes Ex* 2.87. Cf. the allusions made to it in *Quaes Gen* 3.49 and *Spec Leg II* 200. The proposed discussion in *Op* 52 points to sections 93-100, and not to another treatise.

\(^{41}\) *Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandireia*, 1-18. Staehle is correct in his understanding that the *De numeris* was a *catena* of extracts from earlier writers and served as a source-book for Philo’s own use.
Some Stock Arguments for the Magnanimity of the Law in Hellenistic Jewish Apologetics

The predominantly apologetic literature of Hellenistic Judaism developed as a response to anti-Jewish slander from without and disenchantment with traditional religion from within. Further encounters with Hellenism and proselytizing endeavors brought new dimensions in the understanding of the Law and underscored its importance for the self-consciousness of the Jewish communities — especially in the Diaspora. Whether with an apologetic or a missionary thrust, Judaism was presented in a way that could be understood in terms of Greek rationality. Consequently, arguments for the magnanimity of the Mosaic Law and the high morality of the Jews were formulated in accordance with Greek jurisprudence and its attendant allegory, aimed at showing that the end of the Law is philanthropy.

There were stock arguments in defense of Judaism as a philosophy, a political constitution, or a code given by a divinely inspired legislator. A major argument for the universal significance of the Jewish Law was that it has God for its starting point, or that it begins with creation — due emphasis being placed on its supernatural origin and superiority because of its antiquity. As will be shown, however, when specific commandments were cited to illustrate the excellence of

---

1 V. Tcherikover, “Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered,” Eos XLVIII, fasc. 3 (1956) 169-193, attempts to show that the earlier writings were specifically directed at Jews. While his arguments make a good case for the inclusion of Jewish readers among the intended audience(s), they fail to negate the traditional understanding that the same literature was directed also at Gentiles (see infra n. 6). Cf. idem, ed., Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum, I, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957, 41-43.


3 Typical of this development is Philo’s tractate on philanthropy (Virt 51-174), a virtue illustrated at its best through the legislation of Moses. Cf. the description of Wisdom as philanthropos in Wis 1:6; 7:23 and “that the righteous man must be humane” (12:19).

the Law, those pertaining to dietary regulations were foremost among the examples given, especially those about unclean birds (Lev 11:13; cf. Deut 14:11-20) and, to a certain extent, that on the bird’s nest (Deut 22:6-7). The magnanimity of the Law was demonstrated through the lesser as well as “the least of the commandments” — as the rabbis later referred to Deut 22:6-7. To establish these early topos, or common and concise arguments, we shall begin with a pair of somewhat problematic passages in two particularly apologetic works, Philo’s Hypothetica or Apologia pro Iudaeis and Josephus’ Contra Apionem, and shall conclude with a central passage in Aristeas to Philocrates.6

A curious halakhah in Philo’s Hypothetica reads as follows: “Do not render desolate the nest under your roof or make the appeals of the creature of none effect when they seem to fly to you for help as they sometimes do.” (7.9)7 He introduces it as the only example of “little things of casual occurrence” contained in the Law, and adds, “These things are of no worth at all, you may say, yet great

5 Y Kidd 1 (61b58); Deut R 6:2; cf. Lam R 1:9:37, all attributed to R. Abba b. Kahana (late 3rd century); cf. also the earlier dicta ascribed to Tanna Judah Hanasi in Hull 12:5b and Ab 2:1. See the recent article by my colleague R.M. Johnston, “The Least of the Commandments: Deuteronomy 22:6-7 in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity,” Andrews University Seminary Studies XX (1982) 205-15, which was a sequel to this paper at an earlier stage of the study.

6 V. Tcherikover, “The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas,” Harvard Theological Review LI (1958) 59-85, warns against bringing into the concerns of Ps.-Aristeas, who wrote for Jewish readers, the apologetics of Philo and Josephus, who wrote primarily for Gentile audiences; or, against reading into the favorable conditions for the Jews under the Ptolemies in mid-2nd century BCE Alexandria the later defense of Judaism against the anti-semitism that characterized the end of the Hellenistic and the beginning of the Roman period.

There are, however, anachronistic elements in Aristeas that reflect conditions subsequent to the Hasmonan revolt (cf. infra n. 22). Moreover, contrary to Tcherikover’s assumption that the author’s “attitude toward Greeks is full of respect and praise” (ibid., 63) and that “no attempt is made to emphasize the moral and religious depravity of paganism” (ibid., 69), one finds in the discourse attributed to Eleazar (128-171) criticism of the pagan religions (134-138, 152) and possible responses to charges of separatism (139-143) and misanthropy (148; cf. infra n. 25).

We therefore persist in the understanding that these apologists wrote for mixed audiences and that they stood in the mainstream of a certain halakhic and literary tradition. This is to be seen not only in the well-known passages where Philo shows familiarity with the text of Aristeas, and Josephus acknowledges his dependence on it (see infra n. 23), but also in the overwhelming theological influence of Aristeas on Philo and Josephus.

7 Apud Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica VIII.7.9.
is the Law which ordains them and ever watchful is the care which it demands." (ibid.) Similarly, Josephus' *Contra Apionem* has, "Creatures which take refuge in our houses like suppliants he has forbidden us to kill; he would not suffer us to take the parent birds with their young." (2.213) He introduces it as an example of a most thorough lesson in "gentleness and philanthropy", adding: "Thus in every detail, he [i.e., our legislator] had an eye on mercy." (2.214)

Each of the above passages consists of two parts, the first part of the one corresponding with the second part of the other. In other words, the passages under consideration show a conflation of related *halakhot*, handed down in reversed order. Thus, the first part of the Philonic passage, "Do not render desolate the nest under your roof," corresponds with the second part of the passage in Josephus, "He would not suffer us to take the parent birds with their young." Commenting on the first part of the Philonic passage, Colson rightly observes: "The allusion is clearly to Deut xxii.6, where anyone who finds a bird's nest 'in the way or on a tree or on the ground' may take the eggs, but not the mother bird." The parallel passage in Josephus leaves no doubt about the identification of the law with Deut 22:6-7.

As for the law alluded to in the other part of each of these passages, it is somewhat elusive. In a note to the second part of the Philonic passage, "[Do not] make the appeals of creatures of none effect when they seem to fly to you for help as they sometimes do," Colson invites attention to the parallel passage in Josephus, "Creatures which take refuge in our houses like suppliants he has forbidden us to kill," and admits, "I do not understand what is meant." In an extended note in the Appendix Colson goes on to say: "The statement seems to me remarkable and I should like to meet with some illustration of it or a comment on it particularly in the form given it by Josephus. When is it that animals enter our houses as suppliants?" Likewise, in a note to the passage in Josephus,

---

8 Porphyry, following Josephus, states in *De Abstinentia* 4.14: "They were likewise forbidden not only to refrain from eating, but also from killing animals that fled to their houses as suppliants" (see 4.11, where he refers to Josephus); cf. 3.19: "sparrows and swallows who nest in the roofs of houses."


Thackeray declares, "Not in the Law."  

The somewhat elusive law is to be identified with the legislation which pro-
scribes the killing or slaughtering of unclean birds for food (Lev 11:13-19; cf.
Deut 14:11-20). This is strongly suggested by the reference to birds in the sec-
ond part of the passage in Philo ("creatures . . . fly") and more so by the state-
ment that disallows killing in the parallel part of the passage in Josephus ("crea-
tures . . . he has forbidden us to kill"). The identification of the law may be fur-
ther substantiated by two passages found in Philo's dialogues with Alexander,
his renegade nephew. Alexander argues in De Providentia that Providence, if it
existed, would not have allowed edible birds to flee to deserts and "swallows and
crows which are of no profit to build their nests in human dwellings and cities."
(2.92) To this Philo responds, "If swallows live with us there is nothing to be
wondered at for we do not attempt to catch them. . . . But birds which we like to
eat will have nothing to do with us because they fear our designs against them
except in cases where the law forbids that their kind should be used as food."
(2.106) Again, in De animalibus, speaking of the swallow or house martin, Al-
exander postulates, "Fleeing from the menace of vultures, it appeals to man first
of all and seeks shelter like those who take refuge in temples." (22)  

Notwithstanding the inherent difficulties of the two passages, it may be
noted that both parts of the passage in Josephus are more suggestive of the un-
derlying laws than are the parallel parts in Philo. Also, in light of the supporting
passages from Philo's dialogues, we may be able to narrow down Lev 11:13-19 to
v. 15 (cf. v. 14 in Deut 14: 11-20).

The combination of the law of the nest with the law of the unclean birds and
the resultant halakhic conflation may be explained by the fact that Deut 22:6-7
is a kind of dietary law concerning birds and, as such, it is invariably related to
the dietary laws in Lev 11 and Deut 14, and several of the remaining laws in Deut
22 have likewise acquired moral, ethical, or humanitarian — if not anthropocen-

---


13 The swallow or house martin is considered unclean; in addition to the Pentateuchal passages cited above, see Hull 63a-b, 65a.

14 The thought is based on the universal right of asylum granted to suppliants in a temple. Much of the description of the swallow in De Animalibus 22 is indebted to Aristotle; see the ancient authorities cited by D'Arcy W. Thompson, A Glossary of Greek Birds, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936 (rev. ed.), 314-325; also, Plutarch, Moralia 984d on swallows taking to houses for security, and Plato Leges 814b, on birds taking refuge in temples.
tric — dimensions in the more apologetic realms of interpretation. While it will be worth considering the various interpretations of these other laws, and this seems to be a promising line of investigation to enhance the discussion, we shall refer to some of them only in passing. For unlike these other laws, the law of the nest and that of the birds of prey appear to have acquired greater significance in arguments for the magnanimity of the Law.

The shift from dietary laws to ethical concerns is reminiscent of the parenesis a minori ad maius, "from the lesser to the greater", better known as R. Hillel’s kal vahomer, "light and heavy", as one of the seven middot or hermeneutical rules for the Torah. Philo and Josephus use this hermeneutical principle, which is based on the presupposition that upon careful search nothing base or unworthy of the oracles of God could be found in them. Philo refers to this principle as "forbidding from afar" or "teaching by implication" (makróthén or porróthén; e.g., Spec Leg III 48, 63, 117; 4.104, 203, 218; Virt 21, 116, 137, 160). The extent of the usefulness of the method in allegorical interpretations of some parts of the Mosaic legislation may be demonstrated by the following example: to the injunction in Ex 22:26-27, "If ever you take your neighbor’s garment in pledge, you shall restore it to him before the sun goes down; for that is his only covering, it is his mantle for his body," Philo posits the interpretive question: "Does the Creator and Ruler of the universe speak of himself as compassionate in regard to so trivial a matter, a garment not returned to a debtor by a lender of money?" (Somn 1.93)

Such anthropocentric teleology is commonplace in the allegorical interpretation of commandments concerning animals. The special injunctions of kind-

---

15 See, in particular, Spec Leg IV 100-131, on Lev 11 and Deut 14; and 4.203-18 and Virt 125-47, on Deut 22.

16 The origin of the concept may be traced to Hellenistic jurisprudence, as suggested by I. Heinemann, Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung, Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1932, 493 with n. 6, and D. Daube, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," Hebrew Union College Annual XXII (1949) 239-264.


18 Note the similarity with Paul’s treatment of Deut 22:10 in 2 Cor 6:14-15 and Deut 25:4 in 1 Cor 9:9-10. In later Talmudic tradition there is a protest against this allegorizing of laws which deal with seeming trivialities. In reference to Deut 22:6, Ber 33a reads: "Whoever says, 'Do God’s mercies extend to the bird’s nest? Can God concern himself with such trivial things?' is to be silenced."
ness to them (and to plants) are interpreted to mean that through kindness to
the irrational creation one learns to be kind to rational beings (*Virt* 81, 116, 123-
60; cf. *Spec Leg* II 69; 4.205-6, 226-29). The commandment forbidding the mating
of the different species (*Lev* 19:19) is to admonish men and women against un-
lawful intercourse (*Spec Leg* III 46-48; 4.203). It was to train his people in frugal-
ity and against the sin of covetousness that Moses forbids the enjoyment of
pork, scaleless aquatic species, and the fat of sacrificial animals (*Spec Leg* IV 101,
124). The reason for the law forbidding the eating of carnivorous animals is to
save men from beastly behavior (4.103-4). Likewise, the legislation against eat-
ing animals that have been torn by wild beasts (*Deut* 14:21) teaches that "a man
ought not to have table fellowship with savage brutes" (*Spec Leg* IV 119); the
same prohibition is extended to "what one should feel with regard to human
enemies." (4.121) The prohibition against sacrificing a mother animal and her
young on the same day (*Lev* 22:28) leads to outlawing the sacrifice of pregnant
animals and finally to proscribing the execution of pregnant women (*Virt*
134:139; it may be noted that Deut 22:6-7 is also related to the law of prohib-
iting the slaughter of a mother animal and her young on the same day.

Along with the rest law, Josephus has a whole cluster of similarly ex-
pounded halakhot whereby he endeavors to emphasize the humanity of the Law
(*Ap* 2.259-260). In the *Antiquities* he promises to explain in a proposed future
work why certain animals are forbidden for food and certain others permitted
(3.259). Unfortunately, he fails to fulfill this promise. From what can be gath-
ered from elsewhere in his writings and the commonplaces of Hellenistic Juda-
ism, however, it seems likely that he would have interpreted the dietary laws as
more than a mere discipline of temperance. The social implications of the dietary
laws may be sensed in the following lines:

Starting from the very beginning with the food of which we partake from in-
fancy and the private life of the home, he left nothing, however insignificant,
to the discretion and caprice of the individual. What meats a man should ab-
stain from, and what he may enjoy; with what persons he may associate ... for
all this our leader made the Law the standard and rule. (*Ap* 2.173-174)

Inevitably, observance of the dietary laws became a determining factor in
communal association. The resultant separatism intensified with the historical

---

19 The connection between dietary laws and interpersonal relationships may be seen in the
broader concept that observance of the commandments is directly connected with social jus-
tice; see, e.g., *Aristeas* 168-69; *Sir* 19:20-24; etc.
situation of foreign domination and the concerns of the Diaspora Jews with those parts of the Law that differentiated them as a people; for example, the Sabbath, circumcision, and the rules governing foods. The daily observance of these latter laws of purity, more than other peculiar observances of everyday life, became the hallmark of Jewish religious identity during the Second Temple period. Even in the rabbinic traditions before 70 BCE, as Neusner observes, "approximately 67% of all legal pericopae deal with dietary laws, ritual purity for meals and agricultural rules governing the fitness of food for Pharisaic consumption. Observance of Sabbaths and festivals is a distant third." Neusner bases his understanding of the early history of the Pharisees on this observation, which seems to suggest the initial reason for Pharisaic separatism — though certainly they were not alone in seeing food laws in terms of separation from others.

Important for our consideration is Aristeas to Philocrates, to which a date ca. 150-100 BCE is generally given and the Alexandrian provenance of which cannot be doubted. Moreover, at various places Philo shows familiarity with the text, and Josephus acknowledges his dependence on it. The central part of the document, Eleazar’s apology for the Mosaic Law (128-171), is often eclipsed by the overall account dealing with the translation of the Septuagint. The main


22 For the upper limit, see E. Bickermann, "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft XXIX (1930) 280-296; favored by Tcherikover, supra n. 1, at 60, n. 9; an earlier date in the 2nd century BCE is maintained by E. Van ’t Dack, “La date de la lettre d’Aristée,” in Antidorum W. Peremans sexagenario ab alumnis oblatum, ed. L. Gerfaut et al. (Studia Hellenistica 16), Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1968, 263-278. For the lower limit, see H.G. Meecham, The Letter of Aristeas: A Linguistic Study with Special Reference to the Greek Bible, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935; cf. A. Momigliano, “Per la data e la caratteristica della lettera di Aristeas,” Aegyptus XII (1932) 161-172. M. Hadass, Aristeas to Philocrates, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951, 9-54, favors 130 BCE as a hypothetical date, though he seems to be overwhelmed by the major arguments for a later date.

23 Besides Philo’s enormous theological indebtedness to Aristeas (e.g., infra n. 28), see his account of the translation of the LXX in Vita Mos 2.25-44. M. Hadass (supra n. 22, at 22) thinks "it is altogether possible that Philo used an independent tradition, perhaps indeed the same tradition which Aristeas himself used." As for Josephus, see Ant 12.11-118. Cf. Aristeas 9:46, 51-81, 172-187, 292-305, 308-321.
argument, however, centers around dietary laws and is developed as an answer to what pseudo-Aristeas considers a pressing issue, expressing what seems to have been a most common question addressed to Jews and a usual objection given to their faith: "For I believe that most men feel some curiosity concerning passages in the Law dealing with food and drink and animals regarded as unclean," and "Why was it that, creation being one, some things are regarded as unclean for food and some even to the touch?" (128-29) Eleazar's purported answer contains several of the apologetic elements hitherto observed in Philo and Josephus. After a general statement on the distinctiveness of Jewish piety, the reply to the above inquiries and to implied slanders begins as follows:

When therefore the lawgiver, who had been endowed by God with insight into all things, had considered all these matters, he fenced us about with im-pregnable palisades and iron walls, in order that we might not in any way mix with the other nations, remaining pure in body and soul, free of vain opinions, revering the one and almighty God above the whole of creation. Hence the priests, who are the guides of the Egyptians, having looked closely into many things and being conversant with such matters, have called us "men of God" . . . . The rest are men of food and drink and raiment . . . . Among our people, however, these things are reckoned as nothing, but throughout the whole of life their meditation is on the lordship of God. And lest we should be polluted by anyone or be perverted by associating with worthless persons, he fenced us about on all sides with prescribed purifications in matters of food and drink . . . . There is a profound logic for our abstinence from the use of some things and our participation in the use of others. For the sake of illustration I will run over one or two details and provide you an explanation (139-143).

It is significant that the "one or two" detailed illustrations which Eleazar

---

24 Such was the argument of the Cynic teacher Diogenes, according to Diogenes Laertius (6.73; cf. Porphyry De Abstinencia 1.42). Cf. also the Stoic-Middle Platonic doctrine in the 1st-century CE writer Musonius Rufus, who argues that food restrictions are for ascetic reasons; C.C. Lutz, "Musonius Rufus, 'The Roman Socrates'," Yale Classical Studies X (1947) 115-119.

25 See the notes of M. Hadas, supra n. 22, at 157-159, on sections 142, 144, 148.

26 Cf. Matt 6:31-33: "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek . . . . But seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness . . . ."
wishes to give as examples of the magnanimity of the Law, as the immediately following sections indicate (147-150), begin with the legislation forbidding the eating of birds of prey (Lev 11:13-19; cf. Deut 14:11-20), which is interpreted to mean

that those for whom the legislation was drawn up must practice righteousness in spirit and oppress no one, trusting in their own strength, nor rob anyone of anything, but must guide their lives in accordance with justice, just like the gentle creatures among the birds. (147)

Eleazar concludes his exposition of the passage on the birds of prey, which may well be the earliest extant example of what had become commonplace argumentation from a minori ad maius in Hellenistic Jewish apologetics, with these words: "Wherefore all the rules which he had laid down with regard to what is permitted in the case of these [birds] and other animals, he has enacted with the object of teaching us a moral lesson." (150)

The High Priest goes on to talk about "the other animals" and the allegorical meaning of "the parting of the hoof and the chewing of the cud" (Lev 11:3-7; cf. Deut 14:6-8) as separation from the rest of mankind and the processes of memory that lead to right reason and justice. (150-62) In his explanation of these "symbols" he refers to the precepts on tefillin and mezuzot, (Num 15:38; Deut 22:12 and 6:4-9, 11:13-21) since they too represent the same meaning: "remembrance of God" and

that every action must be carried out with justice and that we must retain remembrance of our composition and above all fear of God. He [i.e., our legislator] bids us to meditate upon God (158-160).

This explains why in the above excerpt Eleazar interjects his remarks on the observance of the dietary laws with the statement (introduced by an adversative correlator) that "throughout the whole of life their [i.e., his countrymen's]

---


28 The allegorical meaning of these "symbols" is echoed by Philo in Agr 131-45; Spec Leg IV 106-108, 136-142.
meditation is on the lordship of God.” (141)

It is noteworthy that in conjunction with the dietary laws in the panegyric of the Law, the High Priest in Aristeas refers only to the precepts on tefillin and mezuzot. These laws together seem to constitute the two extremes of the continuum of Jewish Law — at least in Hellenistic Jewish thought: from the least of the commandments (on what to do with birds) to the greatest (on divine meditation), both of which are encompassed in Deut 22:6-12. Moreover, among the commandments concerning animals, particularly the dietary regulations, are found the enactments that may rightly be termed “the least of the commandments”, and in the apologetic aspect of the allegorical meanings are seen “the weightier matters of the Law” — to use the language of the New Testament.29 An overwhelming burden of Hellenistic Jewish apologetics is to show that there is no difference between the vastly dissimilar categories of the Mosaic Law: the least are as significant as the greatest. They all are intended to teach justice and humanity.

29 Mt 5:19; 23:23; cf. Philo, Gaium 211.
The Priority of the Quaestiones among Philo’s Exegetical Commentaries

RALPH MARCUS IN HIS BRIEF introduction to Philo’s Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim et in Exodum invites attention to the problem of their place within the Philonic corpus. Thinking that the Allegoriae, the long allegorical commentary on Genesis which constitutes the bulk of Philo’s works, was written first, Marcus notes:

That the Quaestiones is later than the Allegoriae is indicated by the fact that in the former Philo occasionally refers to the larger commentary. e.g. in Quaest Gen ii. 4, Quaest Ex ii. 34. 113. Schürer (GJV iii. 3rd ed. 501) believes that the Quaestiones is partly earlier, partly later than the Allegoria. That is possible.¹

More recently, V. Nikiprowetzky² and S. Sandmel³ have expressed some doubt about the validity of one or another of the passages cited by Marcus while apparently agreeing somewhat with Schürer, who in his later editions seems to rely on the questionable views of L. Massebieau and E. Bréhier.⁴ Various other


⁴ L. Massebieau and E. Bréhier, “Essai sur la Chronologie de la vie et des oeuvres de Philon,” Revue de l’Histoire des Religions LIII (1906) 1-3. In this methodologically very questionable study, arranging the works of Philo in accordance with the political turns of the time, the Quaestiones in Exodum and the first two books of the Quaestiones in Genesim are placed with
arguments whereby the Quaestiones are assigned to a primary, secondary or some ambivalent place among Philo's major commentaries on the Pentateuch have been raised by others in earlier decades.\(^5\)

Establishing the proper place of this segment of Philo's commentaries alongside the Allegoriae and the Expositiones\(^6\) is crucial for understanding his exegetical method and perhaps also for discerning other literary and apologetic tendencies in his works — if not a development in his thought. Thus, the specific passages cited by Marcus, and other passages as well, call for serious consideration. Notwithstanding the seemingly insoluble difficulties of determining the chronological sequence of Philo's major commentaries and his works in general, we shall methodically examine the internal evidence in the commentaries so as to ascertain whether the Quaestiones are the earliest of his exegetical undertakings. In the course of treating all passages ever brought to bear on this subject, we shall deal with hitherto unresolved textual complexities not only in the Armenian version but also in the Greek. The disentanglement of such complexities would be our primary task in this renewed inquiry into the matter.

---

5. August Ferdinand Dähne, "Einige Bemerkungen über die Schriften des Juden Philo, angeknüpft an eine Untersuchung über deren ursprüngliche Anordnung," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* VI (1833) 984-1040; here, 1037, places the Quaestiones at the end of the corpus; so also Christian Grossmann, *De Philonis Judaei operum continua serie et ordine chronologico commentatio*, Leipzig: G. Staritz, 1841-1842. II.14-17; H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Göttingen: Dieterich, 1858 (2nd ed.), VI.270-271, argues that the Quaestiones are first because of their brevity and because they are presupposed in the later, amplified works; Leopold Cohn, *Einteilung und Chronologie der Schriften Philos* (Philologus Supplbd. 7.3), 1899, 387-435; here, 391, relies on Eusebius (*Hist Eccl* 2.18.1) in placing them after the Allegoriae.

6. Whereas the designation *Exposition of the Law* is commonplace in Philo scholarship, we prefer the plural *Expositiones* to distinguish between the *Allegoriae* and the subsequent works beginning with *De Opificio* and ending with *De Praemiis*. 

---

A note on the tripartite division of Philo's major biblical commentaries is deemed necessary in view of Nikiprowetzky's following conclusion in his *magnum opus* on Philo:

Nous pensons que Philon a écrit en réalité non pas trois commentaires de l'Écriture, mais seulement deux. La série des *Quaestiones* forme l'un de ceux-ci avec son caractère et ses problèmes particuliers; l'ensemble du *Commentaire allegorique* et de l'*Exposition de la Loi* constitue le second.

But much of the material Nikiprowetzky presents in the preceding pages and in their corresponding notes negates his hasty and sweeping conclusion. Note particularly the very passages he employs to establish his view (*Vita Mos* 2.46-47 and *Praem* 1-2); these passages indicate the Scriptural divisions underlying the *Expositiones* as a separate commentary. Note also the arguments he brings to distance *De opificio* from the *Allegoriae*. There is, to be sure, a structural continuity not only between the *Allegoriae* and the *Expositiones* but also between the *Quaestiones* and the *Allegoriae* — if not also between some of the rest of Philo's works and the exegetical commentaries as a whole. Nevertheless, the tripartite division of these commentaries is justifiable on the basis of the passages mentioned and there is no good reason to depart from the traditionally accepted view. In the final analysis, neither view is pertinent to the immediate issue of determining the place of the *Quaestiones* chronologically within the Philonic corpus.

---

7 Nikiprowetzky, *Commentaire de l'Écriture*, 202; cf. 241-242. Elsewhere he calls this second division "le *Commentaire allegorique - l'Exposition de la Loi*", "le Grand *Commentaire*", or, simply, "le *Commentaire*" (232).


The Internal Evidence in the Quaestiones

A. Quaes Gen 2.4 (on Gen 6:14)

Accordingly this ark [i.e., of Noah] is overlaid with bitumen inside and out for the beforementioned reason. But that (other ark) in the temple, which is overlaid with gold, is a likeness of the intelligible world, as is shown in the treatise concerning this subject. (tr. Marcus)\(^\text{10}\)

In recent years, a substantial Greek fragment containing most of Quaes Gen 2.1-7 was located in Codex Vatopedinus 659 and published by I. Paramelle.\(^\text{11}\) Although the fragment has omissions immediately before, in the middle and immediately after the lines quoted above, it preserves the crucial last line in its entirety: ως εν τοις περι αυτης λόγοις δεικνυται. The line in question agrees with the Armenian word for word. Paramelle translates it as follows: "comme il est montré dans le textes qui en traitent," and hastens to observe very perceptively:

Le présent δεικνυται est sans doute a interpréter comme un futur, l'auteur annonçant le sujet qu'il se prépare a développer plus loin, tandis qu'il emploie le même verbe à l'aoriste pour renvoyer à un ouvrage antérieur: De specialibus legibus II 224... καθάπερ εν τοις ἰδίας περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγοις ἔδειξα, allusion qui vise... .De Decalogu 106-120.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{10}\) The Armenian of this passage shows no inherent difficulties and has been harmoniously translated since Aucher's edition of the text. "Haec ergo area bitumine linitur ob dictam causam intrinsecus et extrinsecus. Quae vero in Sanctis (sanctorum) auro linitur, intelligibilis mundi similitudo est, sicut in sermone de ilia declaratur" (tr. J.B. Aucher; Philonis Iudaei paralipomena Armenia... nunc primum in Latinum fideliter translata, Venice: San Lazzaro, 1826). "Cette arche-ci est donc enduite de goudron à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur pour la raison qui a été dite. Mais celle qui, dans le Temple, est enduite d'or, est l'image du monde intelligible, comme le montre le traité qui la concerne" (tr. Ch. Mercier, Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesis I et II e versione armeniaca [PAPM 34A, Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1979]).


\(^{12}\) Ibid., 144-147 and n. 23.
The tense of the verb δείκνυται is clearly a present of anticipation — of what is immediate, likely, or certain. Quite justifiably, the cognate verb ἐπιδείκνυμι in its present tense is at times rendered with a sense of the future in the German, English, and French translations of Philo. One such instance, Sobr 9 (where Philo contrasts Ishmael, the sophist, with Isaac, the sage), shows striking syntactical similarities when compared with the passage in question; it reads: ως... ἐν τοῖς ιδίας λόγος ἐπιδείκνυμεν, translated as “wie wir in einer eigenen Abhandlung, wann wir beide charakterisieren werden, zeigen wollen” (tr. Adler); “as we propose to shew in the special treatise” (tr. Colson); and “comme nous le montrerons dans un traité spécial” (tr. Gorcz).

We may also observe that very rarely does Philo use λόγος or λόγοι in the sense of σύνταξις, the usual word for treatise, which he employs repeatedly when referring to a work as a whole — often in conjunction with its title. A more common meaning of λόγος or λόγοι in contexts such as the above is subject, discourse, discussion, an account, or a passage, that is, as part of a treatise. In the

---


14 Quod Det 41; Sobr 9; and Spec Leg I 205.

15 Alluding either to Mut 201-263 or, less likely, to the lost On Isaac. Adler notes: “Eine solche Charakteristik Ismaels und Isaks lesen wir bei Philo De mutat. nomin. §201-263. Wahrscheinlich verweist hier Philo aber auf das uns nicht erhaltene Leben Isaaks” (Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung [PCH], ed. L. Cohn, I. Heinemann et al., 7 vols., Breslau / Berlin: 1909-1964 V.82 n. 2). On the questionable translation of λόγοι (better rendered as “Ausführungen”, “discussion”, and “commentaire” in Spec Leg II 224, referring to Dec 106-120), see below and n. 16.

16 For example, in Quod Omn 1, λόγος alludes to the lost treatise Every Bad Man is a Slave; in Op 15 and 52 it alludes to the lost treatise Περὶ ἀριθμῶν; on the meaning of λόγοι in Sobr 9, see the preceding note.

17 Plant 174, ref. to treatises collectively; Heres 1, ref. to a lost work on Gen 15:1; Mut 53, ref. to the lost Περὶ Διαθήκης; Abr 2 and 13, ref. to De opificio; Vita Mos 2.1, ref. to Vita Mos 1; Dec 1, ref. to the preceding treatises of the Expositiones; Spec Leg I 1, ref. to De Decalago; Spec Leg II 1, ref. to Spec Leg I; Spec Leg IV (title), ref. to the whole of the four books; Virt 52, ref. to Vita Mos 1.2; Virt 101, ref. to De specialibus legibus collectively; and Praem 3, ref. to the preceding treatises of the Expositiones. Cf. Nikiprowetzky, Commentaire de l’Écriture, n. 179: “Surtout, dans l’usage de Philon, le terme de σύνταξις designe invariablement un traité et un seul.”
light of these observations, a more accurate translation of the last line in the above quote (ὡς ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτῆς λόγοις διεκνυται) would be: "as is to be shown in the discussion regarding this subject."

Marcus is equally misleading in his annotation, where he points to Ebr 88-90 as the earlier treatment which is referred to here. Instead, we are compelled to consider the passage in question as follows: having envisaged the scope of his immediate work, Philo is referring to the Quaestiones in Exodum, the only place where the subject of the ark of the tabernacle is fully discussed, especially in 2.53-68, and where no further reference is made either to a previous or to a forthcoming discussion of the subject.

B. Quaes Ex 2.34 (on Ex 24:7)

Concerning the divine covenant we have already spoken in detail, so that it is not proper to discuss the subject again at the present time. (tr. Marcus)

Marcus notes: "Philo here apparently alludes to his (lost) work Περὶ Διαθηκῆς in two books, see De Mutatione Nominum 53." This lost work, an exposition of Gen 6: 13-9:19, belongs to the Allegoriae and falls between Quod Deus and De Agricultura. The work is mentioned explicitly in Mut 53, the latter book being an exposition of Gen 17:1-22.

---

18 See, for example, Leg All II 65; 3.54, 139; Quod Det 13; Agr 107; Plant 149, 177; Conf 14; Mut 53; Op 15, 52; Abr 276; Vita Mos 2.105; Spec Leg I 189; II 223-224, 243; IV 130; Quod Omn 16. Another common usage of the term(s) is with reference to the Holy Scriptures: the scriptura sacra in general, a locus biblicus in particular, or a named book in the Pentateuch.

19 Cf. the translation of καθαρεύ ον τοις ίδια περι αυτοῦ λόγοις έδικα (Spec Leg II 224, referring to Dec 106-120) in PCH, PLCL and PAPM, respectively: "wie ich in den ihm eigens gewidmeten Ausführungen gezeigt habe" (tr. Heinemann); "as I have shewn in the discussion devoted to this in particular" (tr. Colson); and "comme je l'ai montré dans un commentaire que je lui ai consacré spécialement" (tr. Daniel). On the questionable translation of λόγοι as "Abhandlung", "treatise", and "traité" in ος... ἐν τος ίδια λόγοις ἐπιδείκνυμεν (Sobr 9, referring to Mut 201-263), see above and n. 12.

20 Marcus, Questions and Answers on Genesis, 1.72 n. f. See the criticism of this in Nikiprowetzky, Commentaire de l'Écriture, 231-232 n. 216; idem, "L'exégèse de Philon," 67.

21 "De Divino Testamento certius accuratusque jam dictum fuit, ita ut vix oporteat nunc temporis replicare" (tr. Aucher). No textual difficulties are discernible here.

22 Marcus, Questions and Answers on Genesis, 2.76 n. a.
More than suggesting a work by name or a whole treatise devoted to a specific subject, the allusion in Quaes Ex 2.34 seems to point to an immediate discussion. The Armenian of the first line above reads: մաքես մաքեր զավարական, քարան թե մաքեր, the Greek equivalent of which would be περὶ τῆς διαθήκης θεοῦ ἡκριβώσαμεν πρῶτον, which Marcus translates correctly. Note the singular διαθήκης, "covenant". As for ἡκριβώσαμεν, "we have spoken in detail" or "we have investigated accurately", it is often used by Philo when referring to any previous discussion of some length.\(^{23}\) There are a number of such references in the extant Quaes Ex, several of which have the same phrase that we find in 2.34 — e.g., 1.12 (alluding to 1.10); 2.12 (alluding to 2.11), 23 (alluding to the preceding biblical verses), 37 (alluding to 2.29, 33 and 37 itself), 47 (alluding to 2.45), 49 (alluding to Quaes Gen 1.25; 2.14; 4.154), 81 (alluding to 2.73-80), and 100 (alluding either to a lost part of Quaes Ex or to the lost Περὶ ἡκριβωμὸν).\(^{24}\)

It seems that in Quaes Ex 2.34 (on Ex 24:7) Philo is alluding either 1) to some lost part of Quaes Ex (possibly on Ex 6:4-5, the only other reference to divine covenant in those parts of Exodus covered by the original six books of Quaes Ex)\(^{25}\) or 2) to the covenant between God and Abraham as interpreted in considerable detail in Quaes Gen 3.40-60, treating Gen 17:1-22 (as in De mutatione nominum). There is good reason to favor the second of these two possibilities since it is inconceivable that Philo would have devoted more detailed discussion by way of questions and answers to Ex 6:4-5 than to Gen 17:1-22 (it should be observed that Gen 17 contains as many references to the covenant as the entire book of Exodus). Moreover, equally important for the argument against Marcus is the fact that in Quaes Gen 3.40-60 no allusion is made to any previous work on the covenant(s) — neither to the lost Περὶ Διαθήκην nor to De mutatione nominum. One would expect at least a passing allusion to either of these treatises (especially the latter, which treats the same scriptural passage) if the Allegoriae already existed when Philo was writing the Quaestiones.

\(^{23}\) See the various uses of the verb in Migr 176; Heres 125, 215; Fuga 87; Mut 69; Somn 1.4, 133, 172, 197; 2.8, 155, 206; Vita Mos 2.46, 115; Dec 18, 82; Spec Leg I 269; II 200. At times ἡκριβώσαμεν refers to a whole treatise; see, e.g., Abr 2: Dec 1; Spec Leg I 1; II 1.

\(^{24}\) Cf. Quaes Ex 1.1, 8, 18; 2.51, 77, 84, 92, 94, 97, 99, and 113.

C. Quaes Ex 2.113 (on Ex 28:20)

As I have said, there is between them [i.e., the four rows which make up the annual seasons in the zodiac] an intervening space and interval of clear and pure ether. (tr. Marcus)\(^{26}\)

The Armenian ɲɨğ-ų ɯwʒhų has as its Greek equivalent ὡς ἔλεγον, which may be taken either as first person singular or as third person plural. The Armenian translator wrongly opts for the third person plural, leaving the reader with the impression that here Philo is endorsing what others have said. Marcus, like Aucher, prefers the first person singular reading, erring, however, in thinking that here Philo is alluding to the Allegoriae.\(^{27}\) Rightly understood, the reference is to what has just been said in the preceding lines of the same section. The form of the statement has a number of parallels in the same Book. For example, in Quaes Ex 2.37, "the divine essence, of which I have spoken earlier," refers to section 33; in 2.77, "as has been said," refers to section 76; in 2.81, "as I said a little while ago" refers to sections 73-80. Sandmel rightly remarks on the passage in question: "I do not see the aptness of the citation of Quaes Ex 11, 113."\(^{28}\)

We may conclude that the three passages cited by Marcus are not convincing; the references they contain seem to point to the Quaestiones themselves.

There still remains another passage in the Quaestiones which, together with Spec Leg I 269 (treated below, Part III), has given rise to some misunderstanding about the extent of the commentary. We ought to consider this passage as the last bit of internal evidence from the Quaestiones with some implications for our subject.

D. Quaes Gen 4.123 (on Gen 24:36)

What is here said as a blessing of Reuben stands first, and (then) that of Judah. But it is for him alone, while the other is as a part, for he is placed above with

---

\(^{26}\) The first "and" is supplied by Marcus and should therefore be parenthesized. The text, however, does not require a conjunction at this juncture where a comma and an indefinite article would make better sense. "Ut dixi, est inter illas intervallum spatiumque purissimi ac nitidissimi aetheris" (tr. Aucher).

\(^{27}\) Marcus, as in the "Introduction" (Questions on Genesis, 1.x, n. a), gives no specific reference in the translation notes.

\(^{28}\) Sandmel, Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction, 181 n. 82.
the sole and elder. But what the principle of these things is will be explained when we inquire into the blessings. (tr. Marcus) 29

Partly because of the inherent difficulties of the passage, these last lines of the section were misunderstood by Marcus, as his ambiguous translation and puzzling notes at this juncture indicate. Following the second period he observes: "This obscure statement may refer to Judah's being associated with Reuben, or to Judah's entering into his people (Deut. xxxiii. 7) or to Simeon's being included with Levi (Deut. xxxiii. 8)." At the end of the section he notes: "These Pentateuchal passages, Gen. ch. xlix and Deut. ch. xxxiii, are not discussed in the extant text of the Quaestiones." 30 It is obvious that Marcus in his perception of this passage is dependent on Aucher, whose equally ambiguous translation is followed with the note: "Sed desideratur locus promissus." 31 Following the reference to Deut 33:6 and 7, and perhaps also the accompanying note by Aucher, Massebieu 32 and Cohn 33 were quick to conclude that Philo intended to have his Quaestiones cover the whole Pentateuch. We shall say more about the original extent of this commentary in our discussion of Spec Leg I 269 below; but first, we shall provide a revised translation of the passage under consideration with a comment.

What is said (as) a blessing for Reuben [Deut 33:6] stands first, then that (said) for Judah [v. 7]. But his [i.e., Judah's] is a whole (blessing), whereas the other's [i.e., Reuben's] is as a part. Thus he [i.e., Judah] is placed above the other [i.e., Reuben], even the elder. And what the principle of these things is will be explained when we inquire into the blessings.

29 "Haec autem prolat a Rubeni, benedictio, imprimus est de Judae: verum illi, ut soli; hic autem, ut pars; super enim ponitur cum altera majori. Quae vero ratio sit istorum, dicitur, quam beneficia examinemus" (tr. Aucher). "La bénédiction qui a été dite pour Ruben est première, puis (celle) de Judah, mais pour celui-là elle est pour lui seul, et pour celui-ci, (elle est) comme une partie, car il est placé au-dessus avec un autre plus grand. Et comment ces (choses) sont conformes à la raison, ce sera dit lorsque nous examinerons les bénédictions" (tr. Mercier).

30 Marcus, Questions on Genesis, 1.408, n. b.

31 Aucher, Paralipomena, 2.341 n. 3.

32 Massebieu, "Le classement," 7 n. 5.

33 Cohn, Einteilung und Chronologie, 403.
While commenting on Gen 24:36b in the first part of this section, Philo presents Abraham as giving a blessing to Isaac; that is, nature granting a ready gift to the self-taught, contrasted with "whatever over a long period of time teaching enables one to acquire" by way of hearing. There seems to be a contrast here between Isaac, the self-taught, and the unnamed Ishmael, who in Philo's allegory stands for "hearing" and "one taught" by others. Now it is possible to trace Philo's thought in what follows, for we find him contrasting the greater blessing the younger brother receives with the lesser blessing the elder brother receives. Accordingly, he refers to the brevity of the blessing given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben and compares it with the lengthier, more complete blessing given to the tribe of Judah (Deut 33:6,7). Then, by placing the younger brother above the elder, he seems to be drawing an analogy between Judah and Reuben on the one hand and the unnamed Jacob and Esau on the other (Gen 27:27-29, 39-40). Moreover, since the section is primarily on Isaac, the self-taught or the one taught by God, who is contrasted with Ishmael, the one taught by hearing others, Philo would be thinking of the complementary symbolism represented by Jacob, the one taught by training or practice, and Esau, who exemplifies folly or ignorance. Thus, the promised treatment of the subject of blessings appears to be that of Gen 27, and not of Gen 49 and / or Deut 33. In Quaes Gen 4.196-242 Philo apparently fulfills the commitment he makes in section 123.

Thus far we may conclude that there is neither reference nor allusion in the Quaestiones, as we have them, to either the Allegoriae or any of Philo's other extant works.

34 Quaes Gen 3.59, 88; 4.91, 122, 127, 129, 144; Congr 36; Abr 52; etc.
35 Quaes Gen 3.32, 59; 4.147, 245; Fuga 208; Mut 201. Elsewhere Ishmael represents the sophist: Quaes Gen 3.33; Cher 8; Sobr 9.
36 A similar pattern of thought is discernible in the earlier books, in the treatment of Abel and Cain (Quaes Gen 1.59, 61) and the sons of Noah: Shem, Ham, and Japheth (Quaes Gen 2.79).
37 Quaes Gen 4.162-244 passim; often in contrast with Esau (see note below).
38 Quaes Gen 4.161-238 passim; Leg All III 2, 88; Sacr 17, 120, 135; Quod Det 45; Ebr 9; Sobr 26; Migr.153; Heres 252; Congr 61, 175; Fuga 39.
The Internal Evidence in the Allegoriae

A. Leg All III 139

Some possible evidence for the priority of the Quaestiones may be seen in Leg All III 139, in the reference to a previous discussion having to do with the four passions. The line in question has been mistranslated:

as has been mentioned in a treatise specially devoted to that subject (ὡς τις κατ’ ἐξαιρέτων λόγος μεμνημαι). (tr. Whitaker)

In spite of the compounded error in the accompanying note, “This treatise was never written or is lost,” 39 a likely allusion to the Quaestiones is discernible here.

The problem is similar to that noted above, in our observations on Quaes Gen 2.4 and the use of λόγος or λόγωι with reference to writings. 40 Here again, the word “treatise” in the above periphrastic translation is both unnecessary and misleading, giving rise to unwarranted speculation. A more literal translation with less grounds for conjecture would be “as has been mentioned regarding this subject in particular” — or, as I. Heinemann translates and notes, “wie die besondere Lehre von ihnen [i.e., die Lehre von den vier Affekten] ergibt.” 41 While previously in Leg All II 8, 102 and III 113 Philo speaks of the four passions (and the allusion could be to these passages), in the Quaestiones he devotes more attention to the subject, speaking repeatedly of sensual pleasure, desire, grief, and fear — whether separately or in combination — e.g., Quaes Gen 1.72, 76; 2.56-57; 3.9-10; 4.15-19, 51-53, 197-198, 230; Quaes Ex 1.15, 22; 2.21-22 and 51.

B. Sacr 51

The following is a more decisive passage:

With good reason then is Abel who refers all that is best to God called a shepherd, while Cain who refers them to himself and his own mind is called a tiller

39 PLCL 1.394 n. d. After providing a similar translation, Cl. Mondésert dependently observes: “Traité dont on ne peut rien dire de plus: peut-être perdu, peut-être jamais écrit” (PAPM 2.250 n. 1).

40 See above, n. 16.

41 PCH 3.130 n. 1.
of the soil (γῆς ἐργάτης). But what is meant by a tiller of the soil? (Gen iv. 2) I have shown in earlier books (τι δὲ ἐστι τὸ γῆν ἐργάζεσθαι, διὰ τῶν προτέρων βιβλίων ἑξηλύσαμεν). (tr. Colson) 42

Colson goes on to note in the Appendix to the Sacrifices of Abel and Cain that "No such passage in the earlier books survives. But in De Agr. 21 ff. a 'tiller of the soil' is explained as one who lives to satisfy the wants of the body." 43 Obviously, Colson limits himself to the earlier books of the Allegoriae and, at this point, seems to rely on H. Leisegang, who observes: "Die Stelle über den Ackerbau, den Kain treibt, ist uns in den vorausgehenden Büchern wahrscheinlich verloren gegangen. Im Buche De agricultura §§21-25 jedoch findet sich eine Erörterung über 1 Mos. 4,2, die die Lücke hier vollständig ausfüllt." 44 Likewise, in the French translation of Sacr 51, A. Méasson follows Leisegang and Colson: "Il est bien difficile de savoir à quel ouvrage Philon fait allusion ici. On peut seulement citer Agric 21 s., où il définit le travailleur de la terre par opposition au cultivateur." 45 Yet the above passage abounds with clues that lead to the Quaestiones. But reluctance to use Aucher’s Latin translation has somehow caused Colson and the early German translators, on whose annotations he often relies in his explanatory notes, to ignore this third of the Philonic corpus. In fact, the Quaestiones are referred to but twice in the footnotes of the first ten Loeb Classical Library volumes 46 and rarely in the appendices. 47

The passage poses no difficulties; on the contrary, it is very clear even in its allusion to the Quaestiones. The plural “books” seems to be a fitting designation

42 “So wird Abel, der das Beste auf Gott bezieht, ein Hirte genannt, Kain aber, der es auf sich selbst und seinen eigenen Geist bezieht, ein Ackerbauer. Was es aber heiße, den Acker zu bebauen (1 Mos. 4,2), haben wir in den früheren Büchern erklärt” (tr. Leisegang). "Aussi est-ce à juste titre qu’Abel, celui qui rapporte à Dieu les choses les meilleures, est appelé ‘pasteur’ tandis que Cain, qui les rapporte à lui-même et à son propre esprit, est appelé ‘travailleur de la terre’. Or, qu’est-ce que travailler la terre? Nous l’avons montré dans des ouvrages antérieures (Gen. 4:2)” (tr. Méasson).
43 PLCL 2.490-491.
44 PCH 3.235 n. 4.
45 PAPM 4.117 n. 3.
46 PLCL 3.470, n. b; 4.370 n. a; cf. 7.254.255 n. c — merely mentioned.
47 PLCL 3.486, 511; 5.608; 6.605; 7.615; 8.450; and 9.512.
for these writings\footnote{Cf. \textit{Virt} 16-17, where Philo employs the same word (plural) in referring to earlier works where he had “dealt fully with each of the rules which promote simplicity (ἀνωτέρω).” These “scattered precepts which appear in different places” seem to be his directives against “vanity” (τοῦτος). At best, they are to be found in the allegorical interpretation of circumcision in the \textit{Quaestiones} (Quaes Gen 3.46-52; Quaes Ex 2.2; see also Quaes Gen 2.24; 3.25, 30, 56; 4.15, 19, 28, 48, 100, 133, 142, 149, 156, 161, 224, 237; Quaes Ex 1.6, 13, 15; 2.14, 25, 37, 54; quite often, the Armenian text allows the substitution of “vanity” for “arrogance” or “pride”, and “simplicity” for “humility”) and, to a lesser extent, in the \textit{Allegorites} (Migr 92; Somn 2.25; see also Cher 42; Ebr 124; Fuga 25, 35; Somn 2.40, 47, 63-64, 95, 139-140) and the prior works in the \textit{Expositiones} (Spec Leg I 8-11; see also Abr 104; Vita Mos 2.96; Dec 4-6, 162; Spec Leg I 309). Elsewhere, and with reference to his own writings, Philo employs the singular; \begin{greek}{\textit{πίστις}}\end{greek} in \textit{Plant} 1, referring to \textit{De Agricultura}; and \begin{greek}{\textit{πίστις}}\end{greek} in Ebr 1, referring to \textit{De plantatione}. The designation is otherwise reserved for the Scriptures.} and suggests the possibility of having the meaning of “tiller of the soil” explained in more than one book. Moreover, the scriptural reference (Gen 4:2) and the names of Abel and Cain make the search in the \textit{Quaestiones} very compelling.

Surely, in \textit{Quaes Gen} 1.59 (on Gen 4:2) Philo compares the work of the shepherd, Abel, with that of the tiller of the soil, Cain:

For one of them labors and takes care of living beings even though they are irrational, gladly undertaking the pastoral work which is preparatory to rulership and kingship. But the other occupies himself with earthly and inanimate things.\footnote{The Greek fragment, cited in Marcus 1953, 2.184-185, shows a paraphrased conflation of this passage with \textit{Quaes Gen} 2.66; Fr. Petit omits it in PAPM 33.56.}

Again, in \textit{Quaes Gen} 2.66 (on Gen 9:20), Philo compares the work of the planter, Noah, with that of the tiller of the soil, “the fratricide”, of whom he says: “For symbolically the body is called ‘earth’ (since) by nature our (body) is earthly, and it works basely and badly like an unskilled hireling,” and adds that “the worker-mind of the body, in accordance with its bodily (nature), pursues bodily pleasures.”\footnote{Cf. \textit{Agr} 5, 21-25.} A similar explanation of “what is meant by a tiller of the soil” is found in \textit{Quaes Ex} 1.6 (on Ex 12:4): “One’s own labor in tilling the soil is a measure of moderation in the things necessary and useful for bodily life.” (The word γῆ) is variously rendered as “soil”, “ground”, or “earth”, and this should help us to comprehend the derivation of the word “earthly” and the further derivation of “body” and “bodily” in these passages.)
It may be stated with fair certainty that "the earlier books" mentioned in Sacr 51 are the Quaestiones.

C. Sobr 52

Equally overwhelming evidence for the priority of the Quaestiones may be seen in this line:

We have said before that Shem bears a name which means "good" (ἦφαμεν πάλαι, ὅτι Σήμα ἐπώνυμος ἐστιν ἀγαθοῦ). (tr. Colson)\textsuperscript{51}

Commenting on where Philo had said this before, Colson notes: "probably, as Adler suggests, in the lost discourse on Noah's nakedness".\textsuperscript{52} What leads to such a conclusion is discernible in Colson's further remarks on this passage in the Appendix to De sobrietate: "The interpretation of 'Shem' as = 'name' and thence, as the best of names, 'the good,' does not appear elsewhere in what we have of Philo."\textsuperscript{53}

Colson and others would have been correct had we been limited to the Greek corpus of Philo's works, for indeed in the two instances where the name Shem appears in treatises of the Allegoriae which precede De sobrietate (Leg All II 62 and Post 173) it is without the given meaning. In the Quaestiones, however, the name Shem occurs twice with the meaning "good": in Quaes Gen 1.88: "These names [i.e., of the three sons of Noah] are symbols of three things in nature — of the good, the bad, and the indifferent"; and in 2.79 (following several allusions to Shem and what his name represents in the immediately preceding

\textsuperscript{51} "Wir haben schon früher einmal gesagt, daß Sem vom Guten benannt ist" (tr. Adler). "Nous avons dit plus haut que Sem est le nom qui sert à désigner le bien" (tr. Gorez).

\textsuperscript{52} PLCL 3.471 n. 4; for more on this lost work, see ibid., 308-309; Maximilian Adler, Studien zu Philon von Alexandrien, Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1929, 1-8, especially 3; cf. idem, PCH 5.93 n. 4: "Weder in der Schrift Ü. d. Nüchterheit, in dem Abschnitten über die ὑμνότης, der Bibelvers Gen. 9.23 behandelt und bei dieser Gelegenheit die allegorische Deutung Sens gegeben war, auf die sich nun Philo hier bezieht." Colson is, in turn, followed by J. Grez in PAPM 11-12.150-151 nn. 4-5: "Peut-être dans le passage perdu sur la nudité de Noé... Sem, dans ce seul passage de Philon [Sobr. 52], est l'équivalent de 'nom'."

\textsuperscript{53} PLCL 3.512; so also J. Gorez in PAPM 11-12.150 n. 6: "Sem, dans ce seul passage de Philon, est l'équivalent de 'nom'."
sections, 65-78): “Shem, Ham, Japheth . . . these three, the good, the bad, and the indifferent.”

The last two of these references from the Allegoriae add considerably to the little yet sufficient evidence for the priority of the Quaestiones.

The Internal Evidence in the Expositiones

The following two passages in the Expositiones have commanded much attention in previous studies dealing with the chronology, the classification, and the extent of Philo’s exegetical commentaries. With the treatment of these two we complete our task of accounting for all the passages ever brought to bear on the subject.

A. Op 52

There are several other powers of which 4 has the command, which we shall have to point out in fuller detail in the special treatise devoted to it (ας ἀκριβέστερον και ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτῆς ἄδικον λόγω προσυποδικτέον). (tr. Whitaker)\(^54\)

In all previous considerations of this passage, the promised discussion pertaining to the tetrad is taken as an allusion to the lost arithmological treatise Περὶ ἄριθμον, with the understanding that this work was not yet written at the time when Philo wrote his De opificio; whereas in Quaes Gen 4.110, 151, Quaes Ex 2.87, and vita Mos 2.115 he mentions the Περὶ ἄριθμον as a written work.\(^55\) The inevitable conclusion, then, is that the Quaestiones and De vita Mosis are posterior to De opificio, and that the latter treatise is to be separated from the rest of the Expositiones (of which De vita Mosis is a part).

---

\(^{54}\) “Noch viele andere Bedeutungen hat die Vierzahl, die genauer in einer besonderen Abhandlung erörtert werden sollen” (tr. Cohn; he notes: “Diese auch sonst von Philo zitierte Abhandlung ist verloren gegangen” [PCH 1.44 n. 2]). “La tétrade jouit de beaucoup d’autres propriétés, dont il nous faudra faire l’exposé avec plus de précision dans le traité qui lui sera consacré” (tr. Amaldez; he notes: “Traité perdu” [PAPM 1.174 n. 1]).

\(^{55}\) The direct references to the Περὶ ἄριθμον in Quaes Gen 4.151 and Quaes Ex 2.87 were not noticed by Aucher, Marcus and Mercier in their respective translations. For more on this work, see Karl Stachle, Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandria, Leipzig / Berlin: Teubner, 1931, 1-18.

\(^{56}\) Nikiprowetzky, Le Commentaire de l’Ecriture, 217 n. 154, 232; on the place of these works within the Expositiones, see p. 197.
Before considering \textit{Op} 52, however, it is imperative that we consider the completely overlooked and somewhat conflicting allusion to the lost \textit{Περὶ ἀριθμῶν} in \textit{Op} 15:

We must recount as many as we can of the elements embraced in it [i.e., in the “one”]. To recount them all would be impossible. Its pre-eminent element is the intelligible world, as is shown in the treatise dealing with the “One” (ἀς ὁ περὶ αὐτῆς λόγος μυνὼν). (tr. Whitaker)

Following Whitaker’s reliable translation, we see an equally clear allusion to the same lost treatise and an apparent contradiction between \textit{Op} 15 and 52. Moreover, the allusion made in \textit{Op} 15 is in keeping with all the other allusions and direct references to the long-lost work as an existing document at the time when Philo was writing his respective works. Cohn was probably aware of the contradiction within \textit{De opificio} and apparently tried to resolve it by translating \textit{Op} 15 as follows (\textit{Op} 52 had already gained much attention in Philo scholarship because of its inflated chronological significance; therefore, it was easier — if not necessary — it seems, to twist the meaning of \textit{Op} 15):

\begin{quote}
Von dem Inhalt (dieses Tages) müssen wir das anführen, was wir zu sagen imstande sind; denn alles sagen ist unmöglich. Er ist nämlich vor allen bevorzugt und umfasst die Schöpfung der gedachten Welt, wie der Bericht (der Bibel) über ihn besagt.\textsuperscript{57}
\end{quote}

The minor translational differences aside, Cohn’s taking τὸν νοητὸν κόσμον ἐξαφέτον as the antecedent of αὐτῆς is not grammatically justifiable, whereas Whitaker’s taking μιαν or τὴν μονάδος as the antecedent of the feminine pronoun is correct. Moreover, Whitaker’s translation is consistent with the immediate context, which is about the first day of creation (τὴν πρώτην); not so with Cohn’s translation. Consequently, Whitaker’s translation of \textit{Op} 15 must stand and \textit{Op} 52 must be reconsidered in the light of the latter passage.

Except for the last word in ἀς ἀκριβέστερον καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτῆς ἰδίῳ λόγῳ προσυποδεικτέον, the German, English, and French translations of \textit{Op} 52 are

\textsuperscript{57} Unfortunately, Arnaldez (PAPM 1) follows Cohn to some extent in translating this passage as follows: “Il faut noter la plus grande partie possible de ce que renferme ce jour, puisqu’il n’y a pas moyen de tout dire; il enferme, en effet, le monde intelligible séparé, comme le dit le passage qui en parle.”
basically correct. To amplify our point, however, some grammatical and lexical observations on the last four words of this crucial line are necessary. The antecedent of the pronoun αὐτῆς is τετράς, *the tetrad*, or *the number four*. The first of the next two words, ἰδοὺ λόγος, points to a locus in a *particular*, *special* or *specific* work or treatise. In our above treatment of *Quaest Gen* 2.4 and *Leg All III* 139 we dealt with the recurring problem of rendering λόγος as “treatise” instead of “discussion”, that is, part of a treatise (Philo had no special treatise devoted entirely to one number or another). But it seems proper to render λόγος as “treatise” in arithmetological contexts such as the above since we are certain of such a work by Philo, to which, as noted above, he refers several times by its title. The last Greek word, προσυποδείκτεον, is a compound, impersonal verb which occurs but once in the extant Philonic corpus: only here; and, curiously, Liddell and Scott give only one example of its use: our very passage, with “one must show besides” as its meaning. As for its various parts, the usual meaning of the prepositional προσυπ- is *beyond*, *besides*, or *in addition*; that of δεικνύμι, as observed in several of the above passages, is “to show”; and the impersonal construction with -τέον is equivalent to δει, meaning *it is necessary, it is possible, one must, one could*, etc. We notice that the sense of *beyond*, *besides*, or *in addition* has been dropped from the various translations of προσυποδείκτεον in *Op* 52. The common error stems from an early misreading of this extremely rare word, the mistranslation of which has been perpetuated in the various translations of Philo. We prefer its fuller meaning given in Liddell and Scott and would therefore translate the lines in question as follows (retaining as much as possible of Whitaker’s translation given above):

There are several other powers of which four has the command, which could be pointed out besides those detailed in the special treatise devoted to it.

Our translation of *Op* 52 1) resolves the seeming contradiction between it and *Op* 15 2) renders both passages harmoniously with all other passages in which the Περὶ ἀριθμῶν is mentioned — whether directly or indirectly and 3) does

---

58 If taken as “discussion”, λόγος in *Opif* 15 could refer to all that precedes on the number one, and in *Opif* 52 to all that precedes on the number four (cf. our translation of the latter passage further below).

justice to the immediate context and to the rhetorical overtones of the passage — as Philo goes on to cite a few additional examples of the powers of four and to prolong his comments on “day four” (Op 52-61).

We maintain that the significance of Op 52 has been inflated and consider all chronological conjectures based on this passage alone (including the separation of De opificio from the remainder of the Expositiones) rather unfounded.

B. Spec Leg 1 269

An equally problematic passage is Spec Leg 1 269, the misinterpretation of which has had a substantial effect on misunderstanding the Quaestiones, especially the extent of their coverage. We shall focus on the problem posed by the passage and shall then suggest a solution.

What these things [i.e., pertaining to the offering of the heifer, Num 19:1-9] symbolically indicate has been described in full elsewhere where we have expounded the allegory (τινα δὲ δίὰ τούτων ως διὰ συμβολὸν αινίττεται, δι’ έτέρων ἡκριβώκαμεν ἄλληγοροιτε). (tr. Colson)

In view of the fact that the biblical passage commented on here does not occur elsewhere in Philo, and that any mention of it in the missing sections of Quaes Gen and Quaes Ex is unlikely, Cohn concluded that Philo is alluding to Quaestiones that extend beyond Exodus, namely, the supposed Quaestiones et solutiones in Numeros. Recently, however, J. Royse has convincingly reaffirmed the original extent of the Quaestiones through Genesis and Exodus and has clarified for the record the problem surrounding four lemmata introducing, in one of the manuscripts of the Sacra Parallelela (Vaticanus gr. 1553), excerpts purportedly derived from Quaestiones extending beyond Exodus. Royse’s illuminating study

60 Was aber hierdurch symbolisch angedeutet wird, haben wir an anderer Stelle in allegorischer Erklärung ausgeführt” (tr. Heinemann). "Ce que ces choses-là représentent symboliquement, nous l’avons dit ailleurs en détail, dans nos interprétations allegoriques” (tr. Daniel).

61 Cohn, Einteilung und Chronologie, 403. Colson notes: “No such account survives. Heinemann suggests that it belongs to the Quaestiones of which we have nothing beyond Exodus” (PLCL 7.255 n. c, referring to PCH 2.86 n. 1: "Wahrscheinlich in der verlorenen Forschungen der Quaestiones et Solutiones"). S. Daniel adds: "Sans doute dans un traité qui ne nous a pas été conservé" (PAPM 24.171 n. 6).

helps us interpret the passage under consideration even though he remarks: "Philo could have brought in a discussion of Num 19:1-9 at various places in the missing sections of the allegorical exposition, since his ability to connect texts and topics of the most disparate sorts is well known." 63

But the above quoted lines, especially the Greek, do not necessarily imply that Num 19:1-9 has been expounded elsewhere. The reference is to the symbolism rather than to the scriptural passage; that is, Philo is alluding to the symbolic significance of offering a heifer rather than to a previous discussion of Num 19:1-9. We shall therefore suggest that in Spec Leg I 269 Philo is referring to Heres 100-236, where he allegorizes at length on Abraham’s offering a heifer among other animals (Gen 15:9-11). A shorter discussion of the same scriptural passage is found in Quaes Gen 3.3-8. While it is tempting to think that the reference in Spec Leg I 269 could be to the Quaestiones, the lengthier discussion in the Allegoriae is more in keeping with the inherent meaning of the text.

Summary and Conclusion

Textual arguments that do not allow the Quaestiones to stand at the beginning of Philo’s exegetical commentaries can no longer be maintained. The three passages cited by Marcus from the Quaestiones as referring to the Allegoriae are better understood as referring to the Quaestiones themselves: Quaes Gen 2.4, on the basis of the anticipatory present tense, refers to Quaes Ex 2.53-68; Quaes Ex 2.34 refers to Quaes Gen 3.40-60; and the reference in Quaes Ex 2.113 is to the preceding lines of the same section. Moreover, the closing lines of Quaes Gen 4.123 allude to Gen 27 and not to Gen 49 or Deut 33; thus, they point to sections 196-242 of the same book and not to some missing or other contemplated Quaestiones on the rest of the Pentateuch. So also Spec Leg I 269: after a discussion of Num 19:1-9, it seems to allude to a lengthy discussion of Gen 15:9-11, and thus points to Heres 100-236 rather than to some projected Quaestiones on Numbers. Furthermore, three puzzling passages in the Allegoriae, hitherto regarded as referring to lost works, are explained as referring to the Quaestiones: Leg All III 139 seems to point to the more than twenty remarks on the four passions in the Quaestiones — if not to some such passages earlier in Leg All (II 8, 102 and III 113); Sacr 51 refers to the meaning of “tiller of the soil” given in Quaes Gen 1.59, 2.66, and Quaes Ex 1.6; while Socr 52 refers to the meaning of the name “Shem” given in Quaes Gen 1.88 and 2.79.

63 Ibid., 43.
Except for the references to the lost treatise Περὶ ἀριθμῶν in Quaes Gen 4.110, 151, and Quaes Ex 2.87 (see the discussion of Op 52, above), Philo is altogether silent in the Quaestiones about his other works. We would expect a passing reference to one or another of his numerous biblical treatises had either of the lengthier commentaries, the Allegoriae and the Expositiones, existed at the time when he was treating the same scriptural passages in the Quaestiones. Conversely, we find more than possible allusions to the Quaestiones in the Allegoriae (and to the Allegoriae in the Expositiones — as in Spec Leg I 269). However few these references, the cumulative internal evidence seems sufficient for us to conclude against Marcus and others that the Quaestiones are the earliest of Philo’s exegetical commentaries. We find no evidence to the contrary.
Strange Interpolations in the Text of Philo: The Case of the Quaestiones in Exodum

EDITORS AND TRANSLATORS OF PHILO must have been at times perplexed and at other times amused by some of the interpolations encountered in the text. However vexing or entertaining, not all identifiable interpolations were recognized by the early editors and translators. A number of these hitherto unrecognized additions, at least in the Quaestiones, seem to derive from a single hand, the hand of a not-so-serious scribe who was apparently unable to withhold his immediate and often misguided reaction to the text.

Having worked my way repeatedly through the text of the De animalibus and that of the Quaestiones in Exodum, I was struck by the realization that the three interpolations in the first treatise and five of the eight interpolations in the second contain a prevalent thought-pattern and thus seem to belong to the same hand. Judging from the odd Armenian syntax, which throughout the Philonic corpus is but an imitation of the Greek, these interpolations must have been part of the Greek text as it lay before the Armenian translators of the late 6th century.

To underscore the peculiarity of these earlier interpolations, we shall first consider the three later insertions of Armenian origin in the Quaestiones in Exodum (2.24, 32 and 45, determined by their smooth syntax). Then, we shall focus on the characteristics of the five interpolations of clearly Greek derivation in the same fragmentary treatise (2.76, 101, 117, 119 and 121, determined by their syntactical awkwardness), comparing them with those in the De animalibus. Since those of Armenian origin are sequentially prior to those by a Greek hand, it is convenient to treat all eight passages in the order in which they ap-

---

pear. Insofar as it is textually possible, we shall follow the translation by Marcus to facilitate the perusal of these passages in the Loeb edition of Philo (PLCL).

**Quaes Ex 2.24**

Aucher discerns the hand of an Armenian glossator in the middle of Philo’s comment on Ex 23:28: “I will send the wasp before thee and I will drive out thine enemies.” Note the interpolation in italics:

And so, from the very beginning help is not to be cut off, inasmuch as much harm is to be inflicted upon the enemy by the smallest (creatures), one ought not to reject the help of God even though it be small, especially when God commands, thereby enabling the weakest (of men) to be strong and to form an invincible army.

Greek fragments of this section, both from the beginning and from the end, are found in the extensive comments of Procopius of Gaza (ca. 475-ca. 538) who, unfortunately, paraphrases the central part of the section quite liberally. While we do not find in his paraphrase an equivalent to the Armenian sentence in question, the famous exegete reflects some thoughts akin to the Armenian line. His thoughts, however, seem to have been suggested by the text itself rather than being drawn from this additional line. Marcus attributes the gloss to an Armenian interpolator on the grounds of not finding its equivalent in Procopius.

**Quaes Ex 2.32**

Aucher again discerns an interpolation in the middle of the comment on Ex 24:5b, on the calves offered as whole-burnt-offerings by the young men sent by Moses to sacrifice. Painstakingly, Philo shows that these offerings were not sin-offerings, but whole-burnt-offerings and salutary offerings:

---

2 Auxilium Dei non oportet rejecere, etsi exiguum quiddam sit, etc., 485 n.1.


5 Sic prosequitur: peccatum, quod contrarium est Deo, non erat ibi, 491-492 n. 4.
Therefore the youths who in their prime vigor perform the sacrifice offer sacrifices of whole-burnt-offerings and salutary offerings — not the third (kind of offering, namely) the sin-offering, inasmuch as that place does not admit of any transgression at all because of the visible appearance of the Father. In that place there is nothing inimical (to Him) — sin, which is inimical to God, was not to be found there — for when the sun rises, darkness disappears and everything becomes filled with light.

The interpolation is a mere repetition of the statement preceding it, floundering at the end with the use of the past tense instead of retaining the contextual present. Marcus too attributes the line to an Armenian hand.6

Quaes Ex 2.45

Unnoticed by Aucher, this last of the Armenian interpolations is found near the middle of the comment on the descent of the glory of God on Mount Sinai (Ex 24:16a). Note the clause in italics:

And the notion of glory is twofold. On the one hand it denotes the coming of the powers, for the armed force of a king is also called “glory”. On the other hand, (it denotes) only a belief in and reliance on the divine glory, so as to produce in the minds of those who happen to be there an appearance of the coming of God, who was not there, as though He were coming to affirm the things about to be legislated.

Marcus observes that the questionable Armenian clause is attested in neither the Catena nor Procopius;7 however, he retains it in the text.

Now and then, Aucher classifies as “gloss” marginal notations from one manuscript or another. For example, at Quaes Ex 2.71 he invites attention to a cluster of three marginal “glosses” defining terms somewhat related to context: magic, mid-point, and the units of a talent. He translates these three in a note.8

---

6 PLCL Suppl. II.73 n. a.
7 PLCL Suppl. II.90 n.c.
8 1) “Sicut oculorum delusores mira quaedam apparentia figurant, sic et luminaria invisibiliter demutant elementa mundi: nec non Verbum divinum prae manibus gerens universum, sicut auriga habenas" 2) “Punctum terminus est, unumquodque elementum secundum propriam
Elsewhere, at 2.118, he points to a repetitious paraphrase of the allusion to Plato *Tim* 75d-e. Curiously, the "gloss" is an attempt to remove the difficulties of the awkward syntax.

All of the above interpolations of Armenian derivation are explanatory notes affirming the text. They are quite unlike the interpolations of Greek origin, as we shall see in what follows.

Quaes Ex 2.76

While not recognizing the possibility of a gloss here, Marcus notes the Armenian translator's predicament when rendering the words Καρπατέλως . . . κηροττεν. Marcus' observation is a further attestation to the fact that the interpolation existed before the text was translated into Armenian. Note the italicized lines below:

And He likens the shape and nature of the zodiacal signs to those of a nut (καρποσεχος), perhaps because a nut first sends out a bud and afterwards flowers. It seems that (this comparison is made) also because harmonious sounds are set in motion, for I am not unaware that the name of the nut is mentioned in (the festival of) Artemis (Καρπατειας), for its shell is wont to make a sound of rattling (κηροττεν) . And (the bowls) are modeled in the form of spheres, since whatever is in heaven is wholly spherical, being given a perfect form just as is the world. And the lily (is mentioned), perhaps because of its whiteness — since it is luminous, and the stars, moreover, are brilliant — perhaps also because there are radiant axes around a lily — since each of the stars gives radiance.

The italicized part is clearly a secondary etymological explanation. Moreover, it is doubtful that while demonstrating the merits of the Jewish cult Philo would have resorted to referring uncritically to a pagan festival.

---

movetur naturam, leve sursum, et grave deorum 3) "LX. mna talentum est, et unumquadque talentum, XII. myrias mensurae. (Addit Georgius Doctor.) Vel ita: mna, XXV siclus est; siclus didrachma, itaque mna est L. drachma, talentum autem est MMM. drachma" (523 nn.1-2; 524 n.1).

9 He gives the Armenian without translation, 545 n.2. "Plato says that the mouth is an instrument of two things: an inlet for the mortal (i.e., for food) and an outlet for the immortal (i.e., for reason)."

10 PLCL Suppl. II.125 n. r.
Quaes Ex 2.101

Philo gives three reasons for not offering as sacrifice any of the seven other horned animals permitted for food: gazelle, deer, wild goat, buffalo, white-rumped antelope, oryx and giraffe. There appears to be an interpolation at the outset of the third reason:

In the third place, (this is said) symbolically, for in place of offensive weapons He has given a crop of horns to animals which grow horns. Just as those to be sacrificed, (namely) the ram, the ox and the goat, repel their enemies with their horns, so also did He wish to rebuke the impious who presume to offer sacrifices, by teaching that the divine Logos boldly repels the enemies of truth, goring every soul as if with horns and exposing in their nakedness its unclean and unworthy deeds, which at times it had been concealing.

This hitherto unrecognized and contextually conflicting gloss, suggesting the defensive use of horns by the animals named earlier, seems to go counter to the offensive use of horns underscored in the passage (the adjective in the gloss is of the same root as the two subsequent verbs: “repel” and “repels”).

Quaes Ex 2.117

This is perhaps the most obvious of all the glosses in this fragmentary book. It comes at the conclusion of Philo’s comment on the double-hyacinthine stole being called also “undergarment” (Ex 28:27 [31]). We here give the section in its entirety:

They say that since the double-hyacinthine stole is a symbol of the air, because the air is somewhat black, it was rightly called “undergarment”, since it was under the garment which had upon it the breast-(piece), for the air is placed below heaven and the ether. But I wonder at and am struck with admiration by the theologian’s allegorizing of his philosophical views. For he has likened the whole heaven to the breast-(piece), wherefore in his statements he has adorned the breast-(piece) of the high priest with the two emerald stones placed on his shoulders, and with the twelve stones of the Logeion, arranged in four rows of three. Now, (he indicates) the air by the double hyacinthine stole (called) “undergarment”.
"But where," one might ask, "O theologian, is the head of the world? Teach us, for having arrived at the breast-(piece) you have likened its description to that of heaven." It seems to me, however, that he would answer with silence, for it is plain to those who are not foolish but are accustomed to benefit their minds systematically. But should there be someone slow to understand, let him listen. The eternal Logos of the eternal God is the head of all things, under which, as if it were his feet or other limbs, is placed the whole world, over which he passes and firmly stands. Now it is not because Christ is Lord that he passes and sits over the whole world, for his seat is with his Father and God, but because the world is in need of the divine Logos for its most necessary care (and) management, for its perfect fullness and for its own utmost piety, just as living creatures (need) a head, without which it is impossible to live.

Although at times Philo calls the Logos "son of God", there can be no doubt about the Christian interjection here. Aucher treats the italicized part rather uncritically, inviting attention to Armenian scholia which refer to this passage as a Philonic testimony for Christ. Marcus, on the other hand, treats the passage cautiously, allowing for some authentic elements while questioning the whole: "The whole passage has here been bracketed to warn the reader that some part of it, perhaps all, has been revised by Christian hands."

Quaes Ex 2.119

This gloss, at the end of the remarks on the pomegranate-shaped tassels around the hem of the high-priest's robe (Ex 28:29 [33]), has not been recognized previously.

That the undergarment was a double hyacinthine (robe) and in the likeness of air has been shown. And as water is lower than air, the pomegranate-shaped (tassel) was rightly (placed) in the lowest part of the undergarment, as was the flower of the pomegranate ( póss), which is (so) called from 'flowing' (πόσις or πεύν). What else is primarily in flux and pourable but water?

11 For example: Conf. 146-147; cf. 41. See also Leg. All III 175 (H.F.A. von Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta. [SVF] Leipzig: Teubner, 1903-1905 2.334); Quod. Det. 118; Migr. 6; Heres. 205; Fuga 101; Somn. 1.75, 215, 230; etc.

12 See his note, 545 n. 1, and treatment of the scholia touching Philo's testimony for Christ, p. x.

13 PLCL Suppl. II.168 n. i.
While not negating Philo's allegorical identification of the pomegranates with water, the question at the conclusion of this section seems to be intended to disparage the drift of his allegorization. One cannot help but sense a sarcastic remark here.

Quaes Ex 2.121

The following is Philo's first comment on the golden plate on the high-priest's turban (Ex 28:32 [36]). Here, as in the previous instance, the disparaging interpolation comes at the end of the answer to the question.

The leaf has a fine construction and also lacks depth, and so it appears to be a surface. Now, a surface is incorporeal. And may it not be that it is called "leaf" (πέταλον) from "flying" (πετεσθαι), so that it may be a symbol of incorporeal and intelligible forms of substance? That which is always borne upward becomes winged and never turns toward a downward course. Wherefore he has also called it "pure", as being unixed and luminous, for sense-perceptible things are mixtures which are brought together from many things. *For in weaving unrelated ideas there is innocence (or purity) like that of a lamb, even the white wool of a lamb, wool with neither black nor any other color (in it).*

Having come close to the end of the book, and the Quaestiones in general, the scribe seems to be venting his frustration with extreme allegory. Only the latter half of the interpolation is noted by Aucher as a gloss, and he cites it in a note. As for Marcus, he seems to have been puzzled by these lines, judging from 1) his mistranslation at this juncture (“For the forms which weave together things not [previously joined] with one another also have purity, being like a lamb”), following Aucher’s text which ends with the first comma, and 2) his note: “The sense escapes me. Perhaps the last phrase ‘being like a lamb’ is a scribal addition.”

Unlike the affirmative interpolations of Armenian origin in the first three instances, those of the last five instances show that the Greek glossator is taking issue with the text, which he tends to undermine by invidious comparisons. These additions are somewhat reminiscent of the three interpolations, unnoticed by Aucher, that I have identified in the De animalibus (20 and 22, twice in

---

14 Ut albae agnae pili, non habentis nigrum pilum, vel diversi coloris, 547 n.4.

15 PLCL Suppl. II.174 n.a.
the latter section; enclosed in square brackets in my translation). In the first (Anim 20) the interpolator takes issue in the midst of the argument on the intelligence of bees demonstrated in their production of honey: he brings in the human construction of hives and utilization of these creatures. The remark runs counter to the argument attributed to Alexander and interrupts the flow of thought. There are similar trivializing remarks on the intelligence of swallows in the next two instances (Anim 22). Whereas the textual emphasis is on the swallows' nesting, the interpolator brings in their upward flight and their chasing of mice.

Thus far we have seen all of the identifiable interpolations in two of Philo's works. While the observations made here may not be sufficient to establish a glossator's Tendenz, they are enough to alert us to the possible existence of similar interpolations in the remainder of the Quaestiones and the Dialogues — if not also in the rest of the Philonic corpus. For example, at the beginning of the De Providentia, we find the glossator castigating Alexander in a reactionary fashion and consequently interrupting the prologue. Beginning with the statement at the end of 1.1: "This is the argument," §2-4 seem to be an interpolation of a similar sort. The interpolation reads like the beginning of a scholion on the two-book treatise and it might have been derived from an early elucidation. Or, possibly, the scribe started copying a scholion and then switched to copying the work itself without further comments — not an uncommon feature in Philonic scholia. Still, there can be little or no doubt about §2-4 being an interpolation — regardless of its source. The above observations on the interpolator's tendency to dialogue with the text compel us, however, to consider it as another such instance perhaps by the same hand. The initial statement (the last sentence of 91)


17 The proverbial affirmation in the latter part of the second interpolation appears to be by an Armenian hand; ibid., 138.

18 It may be that only such absurd interpolations are identifiable, whereas those more subtle and in keeping with Philonic thought are difficult to detect!

19 These very sections, together with the omission of the interlocutors' names in Provid I, have in the past roused suspicion regarding its authenticity; see L Massebeau, "Le classement des œuvres de Philon," Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences religieuses I (1889) 87-90; it was primarily against Massebeau that P. Wendland wrote his Philos Schrifte über die Vorschung, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der nacharistotelischen Philosophie, Berlin: R. Gaertner, 1892.
and the questions and answers which follow through §2-4 appear to have been inspired by the dialogue itself — if not by the immediately following line challenging the studious person to ask questions (the beginning of section 5; note the resumption of the prologue at this point). Such a lengthy interpolation, as we have seen, is not without parallel in the Armenian corpus of Philo.

Nor can we rule out the possibility that these peculiar interpolations by a Greek hand are the work of an early scribe who penned down some evanescent thoughts while copying his exemplar. This is demonstrable through the occasional length of these insertions: some of them call for linear space in the course of copying. They are quite unlike marginalia which eventually creep into the text as conflagrations by subsequent scribes.

The extent to which interpolations similar to those of Greek derivation appear in the rest of Philo’s extant works remains to be seen. Observations made in this article may pave the way for a similar search, with an eye out for the propensity of our peculiar scribe, in the Cohn-Wendland edition (PCW). Judging from the latter interpolations pointed out in this article, one is tempted to conclude that the text of the Quaestiones in Exodum — if not also the rest of Philo’s text — seems to have fallen into the hands of a somewhat frivolous scribe early in the history of its transmission. Fortunately for us, this scribe has left a rather recognizable trail.
Two Unusual Uses of *Aın* in the Armenian Version of Philo's *Quaestiones*

Numerous departures from normative grammatical structures in Classical Armenian are discernible in translations from Greek, especially in translations attributed to the so-called Hellenizing School.1 Aside from syntactical peculiarities and new derivations of compounds that follow Greek patterns, there seem to be unusual derivations of participial noun forms. One such derivation is *aın* in the translation of Philo's *Quaestiones et solutiones*. In one instance, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim 1.27,2* *aın* or *aın* is used in lieu of *aț armoghn*, and in another instance, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum 1.1,3* *aț arm* is used in lieu of *aț armumn*. While the derivation of participial nouns from infinitives is not uncommon with the use of the article, rarely do we find such shorter derivations as *elkʰ* from *elanehn* or *elum*; *ertʰ* from *erțaln* or *erțumn*, etc. But *aın* from *alenehn* or *alumn* is rather unusual and extremely rare.

Such use of *aın*, to my knowledge, is limited to the two instances in the Armenian translation of *Quaestiones et solutiones*. However fragmentary, these works of Philo survive primarily in Armenian. Fortunately, however, there is a Greek fragment of the first of the two passages with which to compare the Armenian translation. The Greek fragment has indeed facilitated the modern translations of the first passage. But as for the second, its puzzling obscurity has persisted to the present. In the final analysis, there can be no other meaning given to the word except for that conveyed by the context and substantiated by the usage of the word *aın* in the first instance. I shall give the respective lines with previous translators' comments, and shall then provide a revised translation of the second passage for which there is no Greek fragment.


3 Ibid., 446.
1) Quaes Gen 1.27: ἥν ἐπὶ φησινηγάτῳ, ἐπὶ Ἡρὶ ἀβραὰμων ἐπινήθη ἔναντίωσεν, ὡς ῥέθη ἐπὶ αὐτῷ ὑμῖν.

τὴν δὲ μετελθοῦσαν, ἢ τοῖς σπειρασί τιμῆν παρείχε, τῷ λαβόντι δίδοναι.

R. Marcus translates the sentence thus in the Loeb Classical Library edition of Philo, rightly taking ain to mean “he who has taken”:

But one (i.e., the woman) who has made a change should give to him who has taken her the honour which she showed those who begot her.

C. Mercier provides an equally correct translation in the French edition:

Quant à celle qui a changé de demeure, (il convient) quelle donne à celui qui l’a reçue l’honneur qu’elle accordait à ceux qui l’ont engendrée.

He observes in a note: “Par une distraction de taille, Aucher a pris ain pour le datif <viro> de ayr, alors que c’est air, <a reçue>, aoriste de airmul avec l’article.”

Without the benefit of the Greek fragment, it would be very tempting to take ain as a derivative from ayr, as Aucher does. Not so surprisingly, ain does at times translate Gk. ἀνδρός, as in De Abrahomo 90. But it is inconceivable that that is what we have in these two instances. In this particular instance there can be no question about aynm or ain being a rendition of τῷ λαβόντι. In preferred Classical Armenian, this would be un անհատու, here given in a periphrastic manner instead and without the agent suffix. Elsewhere in the Armenian corpus

---

4 Ibid., 48-49.
7 Charles Mercier, Quaestiones in Genesim I-II e versione armeniaca (PAPM 34a), Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979, 93.
8 Ibid., 93, n. 1.
9 Works of Philo Judaeus, translated by our ancestors, the Greek originals of which have come down to us [Φιλόν Ἰουδαεός Λαβαρίσια φιλοσοφημάδως ἐπιθυμῶν διδάσκαον αὐτόν οὖν τύχῃ προσφορὰς ἐνδόν ὑμῖν], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1892, 57.
of Philo, however, we find both of the usual renditions of ὀλυμπάνεν, ἀνὴρ and Ἐθνοὶ, used interchangeably (passim).

2) *Quaes Ex* 1.1: ἀνὴρ ὁ θεὸς ἀνὴρ ἄτιμος, περὶ πνεύματος παραμβαίνει, ὃσα ἐν ψυχῇ ἡμῶν ἰπτῶμαι ἱλιπτώμοις. ¹⁰

The sentence has been translated thus by R. Marcus in the Loeb Classical Library edition of Philo:

For at the command of the Lord, wherever it was arranged that they should change their dwelling from Egypt. . . . ¹¹

He goes on to explain in a note: "The Arm. reads at ain jayn, lit., 'at the voice of the man', but I have ventured to amend ain 'man' to teain 'Lord'." ¹² At this point Marcus is influenced first by Aucher's taking at ain dzayn as "et enim ad hominis (Moysis) vocem", and then by a glossator's remark translated by Aucher in a note as follows: "Sicut vox Dei ad ver operavit, sic et vox Moysis ad populum, ut migraret ex Aegypto." ¹³ This unusual use of ain seems to have perplexed even a medieval reader. But there is no need for any emendation here once we see ain, as in the previous case, as a derivative from arnel or ainul and used for aineln or, more accurately, ainumn. The sense would therefore be:

Upon hearing (lit., upon receiving) the sound, whereupon they were to have moved their dwelling from Egypt. . . .

However rare, the two occurrences eliminate the possibility of erroneous textual transmission in both instances. The Greek fragment of the first passage is especially noteworthy, as is also the consistent witness of the Armenian manuscripts containing the *Quaestiones et Solutiones*. Consequently, neither Aucher's surmising that ain in both passages is derived from ayr nor Marcus' emendation of ain to teain in the second passage can be maintained. It is only by way of see-

---

¹⁰ Aucher, Philonis Judaei paralipomena, 446.
¹¹ PLCL Suppl. II. 6.
¹² Ibid., 6, n. d.
¹³ Aucher, Philonis Judaei paralipomena, 446, n. 1.
ing *ain* as a derivative from *ainel* or *ainul* that one can do justice to these passages.
Creation in Johannine Theology

The marked similarity between the opening words of Genesis and those of the Gospel of John is readily recognizable. Not so readily recognizable is the sustained parallelism between John 1:1-5 and early Jewish interpretations of Gen 1:1-5. However one views the literary development of the Prologue of John (1:1-18), beneath the literary elements common to it and the first chapter of Genesis lies a vast difference in cosmological perceptions explicable by the Hellenistic Jewish background. As Thomas observes: "The physical categories of Gen 1 have become the spiritual dimensions of John 1." That the Evangelist made use of Hellenistic Jewish perceptions of creation is demonstrable by more than his use of the term λόγος. That he made use of a Christianized Jewish hymn to Wisdom / Torah is likely. As we shall see, however, these early interpretations of certain elements from Gen 1 have been reinterpreted at the outset of the Gospel and amplified in subsequent chapters — especially those that deal with the healing miracles on the Sabbath (chs. 5 and 9). Or, conversely, the Son’s ability to grant life and light in these chapters appears to have been summed up in the opening verses of the Prologue.

Creation in Johannine theology is here discussed in three parts: 1) the theme of creation in the Prologue and the role of the Logos in particular 2) the amplification of the theme through the notions of life and light expressed in conjunction with the healings on the Sabbath and 3) a summary highlighting

---

4 I disagree with J. Painter’s hypothesis: “Because the Prologue was one of the later strata added to the Gospel, the evangelist has not introduced new motifs which appeared in his sources into the body of the gospel. Some of these, though suited to the theme of creation, were not readily applicable to the gospel story.” (The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community, Edinburgh: Clark, 1991, 107).
some of the observations made primarily in the light of Jewish sources from the Hellenistic period.

**Creation and the Logos**

Like all of God's acts and revelations recorded in the rest of the Pentateuch, creation in the Hellenistic Jewish interpretations of Genesis is attributed to the Logos who is at once the intermediary of God (Philo, *Op* 20, 24-25; *Leg All III* 96; *Quod Deus* 57; *Migr 6*; *Heres 140*) and God (Philo, *Somn I* 229). The emanation of the Logos from God and their inseparable relation — if not their oneness or identity — appear to be theological derivations from an exegetical understanding of God's voice or his spoken word in Gen 1 (vv. 3, 6, 9, 14, 20, 24; cf. Ps 33:6). As for Philo's Logos doctrine, it may be deemed an amplification of an earlier tradition in Judaism where the Logos is seen more than literally as the "word" that God speaks ("And God said") before every creative act. A fragment of Aristobulus, for example, has this comment on the opening verses of Genesis:

> For it is necessary to take the divine "voice" not as a spoken word, but as the establishment of things. Just so has Moses called the whole Genesis of the world words of God in our Law. For he continually says in each case, "And God spoke and it came to pass." (Fr. 4:3; d. Philo, *Quaes Gen I.1-2*)

Whether God's voice or his spoken word, Gen 1 seems to have provided the biblical grounds for the Hellenistic Jewish modified adoption of the Logos concept prevalent in Platonic and Stoic cosmology, a concept much elaborated upon in the Middle Platonism of New Testament times.

---

5. A comparable view on the instrumentality of God's voice is found in a fragment of Attapatus, according to whom God remains in the background when dealing with the patriarchs except for occasional miraculous manifestations in the "divine voice" (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep Evang* IX.27.21, 25-26, 36; cf. Philo, *Migr 47-49*, on "seeing the voice" in Ex 20:18, 22 and Deut 4:12 [LXX]). An equally significant perspective is found in Irenaeus' denial of any intermediary role for the Logos who, as God, has no need of instruments to create (*Adv Haer* II.2.4-5, against the Gnostic view of the demiurge). On the latter, see P. Perkins, "Ordering the Cosmos: Irenaeus and the Gnostics," in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, ed. C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986, 234-235.

6. J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: A Study of Platonism*, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977, 160-166; cf. such New Testament passages as Heb 1:2; 11:3; Col 1:16; 1 Cor 8:6. A complex subject such as Philo's Logos cannot be treated fully in a short study, especially in one not fully devoted to the matter. Suffice it to say that Philo transmits
As in Hellenistic Judaism, the intermediation of the Logos in the Prologue of John is perceived in terms of the self-extension or the outreach of a transcendent creator who is, nonetheless, immanently present. The Logos is more than the supreme intermediary of God in creation. Divine agency and divine presence are here equated, following an established tradition in Judaism, leading to the belief of beholding God in the Logos.  

From a common and conceivably early understanding of the role of God’s spoken word in creation seems to derive the notion that the written word or the Torah, or personified Wisdom according to Prov 8:22-31, had likewise been with God since the beginning, and that he employed Wisdom as an instrument of creation (1QH 1.14, 20; Wis 9:1-4, 9; Odes Sol 7:8; 2 Enoch 30:8; Hel Syn P, 3:19; 4:7, 38; 12:36; cf. Tg Ps-J to Gen 3:24; Gen R 1:1, 8; 8:2; M Abot 3:14). The identification of Torah with Wisdom early in the post-exilic period is attested in Ezra 7:14 and 25 (cf. Sir 24:8-9; T Levi 13:1-9). The same conceptual relationships were dwelt upon in the apologetics for the universality of Jewish Law in the Hellenistic period. Hengel observes: “An important preparation for several traditions regarding the Logos. Of special interest is his schematic understanding of God and His two principal powers: the creative power or God (ἡ πωτική, called θεός, the power responsible for creation and bestowal of divine blessings) and the royal power or Lord (ἡ βασιλική, called κύριος, the ruling power). The schema recurs in several passages (e.g., Quaes Gen II.16, 51, 75; III.39; Quaes Ex 11.62; Leg All I 95-96; III 73; Heres 166; Mut 11-31; Abr 107-132, on God’s visit and apparition to Abraham — cf. Quaes Gen IV. 2, 8, 30; Deo 1-4; Spec Leg I 307). More elaborate descriptions of the two powers with the Logos situated in their midst are found in Quaes Ex II.6, Cher 27-28, and Fuga 94-105. E.R. Goodenough has this preface to his remarks on the schemata: “We must bear in mind that Philo has definitely warned us against conceiving of them as anything but aspects of God’s unity” (By Light, Light, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1935, 27-30). See also the brief survey in D. Winston, Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985, 9-25, 59-64.  

7 Or, beholding the Father in Jesus (cf. 12:45; 14:9; 15:24; 17:24). For more on this subject see below, n. 18.

the encounter of Jewish wisdom teaching with Greek thought was that it had become more and more bound up with the doctrine of creation."9 We see this in another fragment of Aristobulus where, after alluding to Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31, he goes on to relate it to the seventh day and the sevenfold principle (λόγος) of creation (Fr 5:11-12). Commenting on the fragment, Yarbro Collins notes:

Thus wisdom and Logos have similar functions. Wisdom is the source of light in which all things are contemplated. Through the sevenfold principle, we have knowledge of human and divine matters.... These reflections of Aristobulus are important for anyone seeking to understand the role of the Logos in Philo's thought or in the Gospel of John.10

The Biblical concept of God's word being inseparable from him has led to a similar development in the Targums, the Aramaic paraphrases of the Hebrew Scriptures, where the most common designation for God is "the Memra [i.e., Word] of the Lord." The same is used synonymously with reference to God's name for himself and alongside other rare names for God that are often left untranslated.11 Where the Hebrew has "the voice of God", for example, the Targums render "the voice of the Memra of God", to safeguard divine transcendence and to avoid anthropomorphic and anthropopathic suggestions. In addition to underscoring the transcendence of God, his invisibility and inaudibility, the Memra is employed to convey several other attributes of God: his power or omnipotence, his presence, his omniscience, his ways and various activities.12 The use of the word memra in the Targums is certainly more than a translational phenomenon. Hayward observes that the Memra conveys a distinctive theology

---

9 Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, I, 156.


of the Divine Name and Presence; "when He acts in or by means of His Memra, God is there, actively present with men." Or, as Muñoz Leon suggests, the Memra doctrine seems to be directed against the widespread belief in angelic mediation, a belief current in 1st-century Jewish circles (the same could be said of the Johannine Logos doctrine; cf. 1:51). Moreover, in a substantive study Hamp concludes that the Memra is not an entity apart from God and therefore not an intermediary, in a strict sense of the word, between God and his creation (it could likewise be said that the Johannine and the Philonic Logos is as indistinguishable from God himself as is the Memra in his relation to God in the Targums). Although the Memra does not appear in the Targums to Gen 1-2, McNamara invites attention to the use of the term in Targum Neofiti to Ex 12:42, which draws on the imagery of Gen 1:1-3: "The first night when the Lord was revealed over the world to create it... and the Memra of the Lord was there, and there was light, and it shone..." There can be little or no doubt about the


14 Muñoz Leon, Dios-Palabra, 125-140. Cf. the polemic in Heb 1-2, possibly aimed at such tendencies.


16 The divine name Elohim in the first account of creation (Gen 1:1-2:4a) and wherever it refers to God is rendered by the Tetragram YHWH, lest the plural connotation of Elohim should lead to acquiescence in polytheism; but when the divine names YHWH Elohim (usually translated "Lord God") appear in conjunction, such as in the second account of creation (Gen 2:4b-25), they are left untranslated.

17 McNamara, "Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum, Exodus 12:42," 115-117. There is no need, however, for McNamara's emendation of the text; his point stands with the text as is (see Hayward, Divine Name and Presence, 135).
Evangelist's familiarity with the Memra theology which helps clarify the mediatory role of the Logos and his identity with God in the Johannine and Philonic writings. These three sources do not allow for a hypostasis, a distinct entity apart from God, such as formulated in early Christian apologetics.18

The Johannine statement, "All things came into being through him" (v. 3a), like the corresponding statement, "the world came into being through him" (v. 10), is an interpretation of "God created the heavens and the earth" (Gen 1:1). The amplification that follows, "apart from him not one thing came into being" (v. 3b), is a further interpretation of Gen 1:1 and its sequel traditionally understood as referring to all things visible and invisible (e.g., Heb 1:2; 11:3; Jos Asen 12:2). The Johannine verse also echoes a much-debated issue within Judaism in general and Hellenistic Judaism in particular, where, in an attempt to absolve God from responsibility for evil, only the good things were attributed to him and, to some extent, to his Logos, and the rest was ascribed either to the Logos or to the lesser divine powers who stand hierarchically below the Logos and who are variously called λόγοι, ἄγγελοι or δυνάμεις (Philo, Op 72-75; Leg All

---

18 The incarnation of the Logos (1:14) and his relation to God, creation and humankind in the Prologue are best explained in terms of the post-Biblical Jewish circumlocutions for God and his manifestations in the Old Testament, such as his Presence or Glory; see L. Bouyer, La Bible et l’Évangile. Le sens de l’Écriture: du Dieu qui parle au Dieu fait homme, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958 (2nd ed.), 202, 249; also Hayward, Divine Name and Presence, 134-136 (his assessment of Philo's Logos, 137-139, is dependent on H.A. Wolfson’s unwarranted emphasis on Philo’s originality in Philo, Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962, I, 226-289, 325-332; for a better treatment, see N.A. Dahl and A.F. Segal, "Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God," Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period IX [1978] 1-28). In a profound study, L.W. Hurtado, One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988, underscores the common belief in Judaism of a divine mediator and goes on to show that the earliest Christian departure from Judaism came about as Christians began to worship the mediator. This came about, it seems, because the Logos was perceived as indistinguishable (or nearly indistinguishable) from God himself, and the Gospel of John may be viewed as the earliest Christian apology for this fundamental belief. On the continuity of these views in rabbinic Judaism, see H. Bietenhard, "Logos-Theologie im Rabbinate: Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Worte Gottes im rabbinischen Schriftentum" (Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, II.19.2), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1979, 19.2, 580-618. The later dogmatic argument that the Word is distinct from the Father could be traced to Justin, Dial 56.11; 62.2-3; 128.4; cf. Apol 129.4.
The same sources, however, acknowledge that this does not altogether absolve God from responsibility for everything; he is still the creator of all, both the beneficial and the harmful (Philo, *Leg. All. III* 75-76; 1QS 3.25; cf. Plato, *Laws* 896 D-F). The Johannine use of the singular Logos only, and the equating of the Logos with God, implies that the Logos is more than an intermediary who is somewhat responsible for the lesser, inferior creation; he is, as noted above, the creator of “all things” or an extension of him (cf. vv. 1 and 18). By stressing “all things”, the Evangelist seems to be adhering to the traditional biblical view whereby God is perceived as being over and above all, both good and evil (e.g., Job 19:8; 30:26; Ps 139:12; Is 45:7; Amos 3:6; cf. 4:13; 5:8; 9:3-4), a view later supported by adopting the teleological rationalizing of evil in Stoicism.

The sovereignty of the Logos over the forces of evil is reaffirmed in v. 5, in the inability of the acknowledged darkness to overpower the light; and this, in turn, is an interpretation of Gen 1:2 (LXX): “. . . darkness was over the deep, and the Spirit of God moved over the water” (cf. 6:16-21, Jesus walking over the stirred up sea in the dark).

To the Logos is ascribed the best of the divine attributes: “In him was life,” defined as “the light of all people” (v. 4) and further explained as “the true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world” (v. 9; cf. 5:26a, the Father as life; 1 John 1:5, God as light; and 5:26b; 6:57; 11:25; 14:6; 1 John 5:11, 20, Jesus as life; 3:19; 8:12, 9:5; 12:35-36, 46, Jesus as light). The twin notions of light and life, as will be demonstrated, owe more to the creation parable of Gen 1:2 than to passages beyond Genesis that speak of God as the giver of life (Job 10:12; 27:3; 32:8; 33:4) and light (Job 29:3; Ps 118:27), and others that speak of

---

19 Cf. the Son’s superiority over the angels in Heb 1:2; also the task of the inferior agents in the creation according to Plato (*Tim. 42D-E; Rep. 379A, 380D, 617E*). Typical of the general attempt to absolve God from evil is Sir 15:11: “That which he hateth made he not” (cf. *Wis. 11:24: “If you had hated anything you would never have fashioned it”).


21 The imagery of light and darkness is widespread in post-biblical Jewish literature; e.g., 1QH 9:26-27; 1QS 3.13-4.26; T Jos 19:3; Jos Asen 8:10; 15:13; T Ab B7; 3 Bar 6:13; 2 Enoch 30:15; Odes Sol 18:6; etc. Water as the habitat of demonic or evil powers is a consistent Biblical motif; e.g., Job 41:1-11; Ps 74:12-17; 104:24-26; Isa 27:1; etc. Of the Synoptic parallels to Jesus walking on the sea (Matt 14:22-33; Mark 6:45-52), Matthew’s account culminates with Peter’s failed attempt to walk likewise.
him as light (Ps 84:11; Isa 6:19-20; Mal 4:2; cf. Rev 21:23). Of some interest are the psalms where life and light appear in conjunction (27:1 — “The Lord is my light and my salvation . . . . The Lord is the stronghold of my life”; 36:9 — “For with you is the fountain of life; in your light we see light”; 56:13 — “For you have delivered my soul from death, indeed my feet from stumbling, so that I may walk before God, in the light of life”; cf. Job 33:28; Prov 6:23).

In a comprehensive article on the biblical motif of light and darkness, Achtemeier observes,

In the first chapter of Genesis, God creates the light before he creates the sun and moon and stars. This first light (Gen 1:3) is the result of the creative word of God: it exists independently of the heavenly bodies, and of all the works of creation it alone is singled out as “good” (Gen 1:4). The order of the creation is called “good” in Gen 1:10, 12, 18, 21, 31 — but the light itself, created by the word of God, is called good. In thinking of Jesus as the light of the world, it is with this original light that we have to deal.

Consequently, Achtemeier goes on to relate “the true light” of John 1:9 to the original light of Gen 1:3: “Jesus Christ is the incarnate Word of God, that creative Word through whom all things were made (John 1:3). He is the Word which was first spoken when God said, ‘Let there be light’ (Gen 1:3).” She then quotes 2 Cor 4:6 as conveying the same thought: “. . . God, who said, ‘Light shall shine out of darkness,’ is the One who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ.” The Johannine and Pauline passages show clearly how both authors employ the language of Gen 1:3: while they relate the Logos (or Christ) to that pre-celestial light, they hasten to equate him with the Word that preceded the creation of that light.

A closer look at the Hellenistic Jewish interpretations of Gen 1:3 reveals a similar pattern of thought regarding the Logos. Following Aristobulus (Fr 4:3, quoted above), Philo presents the Logos as the initial expression of divine creation, the noetic world or the pattern for subsequent material creation (Op 7-22). He then sums up his views, adding, “It was with a view to that original intellec-

---


tual light, which I have mentioned as belonging to the order of the incorporeal
world, that he created the heavenly bodies of which our senses are aware” (55; cf.
Mig. 40: “Wisdom is God’s archetypal luminary and the sun is a copy and image
of it”). In another passage, significant for its clarification of relationships, he
declares,

He [God] is not only light, but the archetype of every other light, nay, prior to
and high above every archetype, holding the position of the model of a model.
For the model or pattern was the Word which contained all his fullness —
light, in fact; for, as the lawgiver tells us, “God said, ‘let light come into being.”
(Somn 1.75; cf. 238-241)

Colson notes on this passage, “The Logos is light, for if God said ‘let there be
light,’ this was a λόγος in the sense of a saying.” There is, however, a deeper
sense attached to the Logos in this passage than that indicated by Colson: as the
model or the archetype for all subsequent light, the Logos is hardly distinguish-
able from the model of the model or the archetype above every archetype because
of the commonality of light obtained between them and owing to the insepara-
ability of the “saying” from the one who speaks. As Philo remarks elsewhere, “He
himself is his own light. For the eye of the Absolutely Existent needs no other
light to effect perception, but he himself is the archetypal essence of which myri-
ads of rays are the effluence” (Cher 96-97). Hence, the initial role of the Logos is
to be seen in terms of the self-extension of the Absolutely Existent by way of
light prior to that archetypal, pre-celestial light created by him or through his
Logos. A strong parallel to the Johannine notion and one clearly reflective of a
widespread understanding of primordial creation in 1st-century Judaism is found
in Odes Sol 41:14: “And light dawned from the Word that was before time in
him.”

Time (χρόνος) began with the creation and the movement of the heavenly
bodies on the fourth day of creation (Gen 1:14-19). Before then there was eter-
nity (ἀόων), a synonym for “the beginning” (ἀρχή), in the light of which the
opening words of the Prologue ought to be further interpreted (Philo, Op 13-16,
26-35; cf. Leg All I 20; Quod Deus 31-32; Heres 165; Mut 267; Aet 52-54).

25 F.H. Colson, Philo (Loeb Classical Library) [PLCL], Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
Press, 1934, V, 337. Elsewhere, Philo explains, the Logos is neither unbegotten like the Cre-
tor nor begotten like the creature, but stands midway between the two (Heres 205; cf. Somn
II.188).
Without overlooking the dominant cosmological language in the rest of the Prologue and other specific elements suggestive of creation, such as the ability of the Logos to bring forth children of God (vv. 12-13), elements to which we shall return, we shall trace the theme of creation as it unfolds through the notions of life and light (v. 4).

Creation and the Sabbath

Taking the Prologue in its present form as reflecting summarily the theology of the Gospel of John, we are compelled to consider the elaborations on creation in terms of life and light in the central passages devoted to these notions. It is noteworthy that the main discourses on life and light (chs. 5 and 9) are developed around the only two healing miracles in John that occur on the Sabbath — a further reminder of the creation week in Genesis. These healings on the Sabbath with their emphases on life and light constitute a clear continuity of the theme of creation stressed in the Prologue, where the two notions are introduced in conjunction. Unlike the healings on the Sabbath in the Synoptics, those in the Gospel of John are peculiar to the Johannine tradition and are invariably related to the theme of creation. Together with the Prologue, they furnish the most substantial Christological arguments to affirm not only the divinity of the Logos but also his identity with God, the giver of life and light (cf. 5:17-20; 10:30-38; 17:5, 11, 21-24 and the “I am” sayings, especially in ch. 8). The significance of the twin notions is underscored, though somewhat over-

---

26 Of interest is Borgen’s chiastic outline of the Prologue, demonstrating how vv. 6-18 constitute a regressive amplification of vv. 1-5 (Philo, John and Paul, 93-96).

27 These miracles are also set around two pools in Jerusalem, one to the north and the other to the south of the Temple area. J. Jeremias invites attention to the sick and the blind gathered at the Temple gates and, by analogy with Acts 3:1-10, assumes that the conversation between Jesus and the paralytic in ch. 5 was occasioned by a request for alms (cf. 9:8) (Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, tr. F.H. and C.H. Cave, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969, 118).

28 In the Synoptics the Sabbath day is indicated before the healings, as a challenge for Jesus to heal on that day (Matt 12:9-14 [and par. Mark 3:1-6, Luke 6:6-11] and Luke 13:10-17; 14:1-6); in John the day is indicated after the healings (5:9-10, 16; 9:14). Moreover, the two miracles in the Synoptics that resemble the two Johannine miracles under consideration (the healing of the paralytic in Matt 9:1-8 [and par. Mark 2:1-12, Luke 5:17-26] and of the blind man in Mark 8:22-26) do not occur on the Sabbath. Those in John seem to illustrate, albeit unintentionally, the couplet in Ps 146:8: “The Lord opens the eyes of the blind. The Lord lifts up those who are bowed down.”
emphatically, by Bouyer: "Ces deux images associées, de la 'lumière' et de la 'vie', sont comme les clefs de toute la pensée johannique."29

The healing miracles in these chapters are presented as divine acts of creation: the first is effected through the spoken word (5:8; cf. v. 19, where this act is related to God's activity) and the second by handling the dust of the earth (9:6; cf. v. 32, where another hint is given to relate this miracle to "the beginning of time"). The first is anticipated in 4:34: "My food is to do the will of him who sent me, and to accomplish his work" (cf. 5:30, 36) and the second is introduced in 9:3-5: "... in order that the works of God might be displayed.... We must work the works of him who sent me, as long as it is day; night is coming when no one can work. While I am in the world, I am the light of the world." The Son's ability to impart life to those who hear his voice is emphasized in both instances (5:19-29, to the opponents following the healing of the paralytic; 10:10-18, to the opponents following the healing of the blind). Together, these accounts pave the way for that ultimate miracle of giving life to the dead Lazarus (ch. 11), whose resurrection is only a sequel to the theme of the Son's ability to grant life (11 cf. 5:21, 28-29) and light (11:9-11; cf. 8:12; 9:5), a theme both summed up and introduced in the Prologue (v. 4). The sustained continuity of this theme allows the Evangelist to place the most elaborate discourse on the Son's ability to impart life following the miracle at Bethesda instead of after the miracle at Bethany. The first mention of a healing miracle on the Sabbath becomes a logical locus for the insertion of the main discourse. By way of further continuity, the raising of Lazarus is prefaced by similar statements as those introducing the healing of the man born blind: "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God" (11:4); "Are there not twelve hours in the day? Those who walk during the day do not stumble, because they see the light of the world. But those who walk during the night stumble, because the light is not in them" (vv. 9-10; cf. 9:3-5). A further and direct connection between the healing of the blind man and the raising of Lazarus comes at 11:37: "Could not this man, who opened the eyes of him who was blind, have kept this man also from dying?" More importantly, the repeated admonition in the above passages to do God's work "as long as it is day" or to walk "during the day" or "while you have the light" (9:4; 11:9; 12:35) recalls the time of creation in Genesis, beginning with the calling forth of light.

In his defense for healing on the Sabbath, Jesus introduces two basic argu-

29 Bouyer, La Bible et l'Évangile, 199.
ments: one propounded in 5:17, where he justifies his act in terms of the Father's working on the Sabbath, and the other in a later resumption of the debate over the same controversial healing in 7:19-24, where he refers to the law allowing circumcision on the Sabbath. Both of these arguments are explicable within the Judaism of Jesus' day.

In the first of these arguments the Johannine Jesus seems to be siding with a widespread apologetic movement within Judaism concerned with absolving God from charges of idleness or inactivity on the Sabbath lest it should be concluded that there is no divine providence at work on that day. We learn the following from Philo:

And therefore Moses often in his laws calls the sabbath, which means "rest", God's sabbath (Ex 20:10; etc.), not man's . . . . For in all truth there is but one thing in the universe which rests, that is God. But Moses does not give the name of rest to mere inactivity. The cause of all things is by its nature active; it never ceases to work all that is best and most beautiful. God's rest is rather a working with absolute ease, without toil and suffering. (Cher 87; cf. Leg All I 5-7)

Here Philo is elaborating on what seems to be a commonplace Alexandrian Jewish understanding of God's resting on the Sabbath, as attested in a fragment of Aristobulus:

It is plainly said by our legislation that God rested on the seventh day. This does not mean, as some interpret, that God no longer does anything. It means that, after he had finished ordering all things, he so orders them for all time. . . . For, having set all things in order, he maintains and alters them so [in accordance with that order]. (Fr 5.11-12)\(^{30}\)

God's providential care for his creation is described elsewhere by Philo as follows:

For it stands to reason that what has been brought into existence should be cared for by its Father and Maker. For, as we know, it is a father's aim in regard

\(^{30}\) Cf. Ps-Aristotle, Mundo 398b23: "God does not take upon himself the toil of a creature that works and labors for itself, but uses an indefatigable power, by means of which he controls even things that seem a great way off."
of his offspring and an artificer's in regard of his handiwork to preserve them, and by every means to fend off from them aught that may entail loss or harm. He keenly desires to provide for them in every way all that is beneficial and to their advantage. (Op 10; cf. 170-171; Quod Deus 30; Migr 186; Spec Leg III 189)

The Biblical grounds for the tradition about God working on the Sabbath can be traced to the inherent difficulties of Gen 2:3, where the Hebrew text has God resting from all the work which "he created to make" (LXX: "he began to do"). As in Hellenistic Judaism, this progressive view of creation is well amplified in the Targums, where the Creator is said to have rested from all his work which "he had created and was to do" (Tg Ps-J and Onq to Gen 2:3). The tradition about God working on the Sabbath persists in other early rabbinic speculations on this verse, and on the fourth commandment as well (Ex 20:11 and 31:17). In a saying attributed to R. Akiba it is stated that God works on the Sabbath because the whole world is his domain, and that he is not restricted in any way whatsoever: "He carries things on the sabbath anywhere throughout his worlds" (Pesikta Rabbati 23:8). 31

In the resumption of the controversy at John 7:22-23 the issue of circumcision is introduced thus: "Moses has given you circumcision . . . and on the Sabbath you circumcise a man. If a man receives circumcision on the Sabbath in order that the Law of Moses may not be broken, are you angry with me because I made an entire man well on the Sabbath?" To be sure, rabbinic halakhab has ample provisions for circumcision on the Sabbath (M Shabbat 18:3-19:4; M Nedairim 3:11; B T Shabbat 131b, 132a, 133b; B T Yoma 85a-b; the rationale may be detected from Pesikta Rabbati 23:4: circumcision, like the Sabbath, was ordained before the Ten Commandments were given), though not for healing on that day (M Shabbat 14:3-4). The response of Jesus is based on the Hellenistic jurisprudential argumentation a minori ad maius, the inference "from the lesser to the greater", later known as one of R. Hillel's seven middot or hermeneutical

31 Later in the same section of the piska the following question is raised: "How could R. Akiba have spoken as he did . . . ? Does not Scripture say, 'And on the seventh day he ceased from work and rested' [Ex 31:17]?" R. Phinehas explained in the name of R. Hoshaiya: "Even though it is written 'Because that in it he rested from all his work' [Gn 2:3], you must understand that the verse means he rested from the work of creating his world, but that he did not rest from [his concern about the] deeds of the righteous or the deeds of the wicked, and makes both the former and the latter see themselves for what they are."
rules for the Torah. The response implies a halakhic inconsistency which is well reiterated — if not rectified — in B T Yoma 85a: “If circumcision, which attaches [or, pertains] to one only of the 248 members of the human body suspends the Sabbath, how much more shall [the saving of] the whole body suspend the Sabbath!” The acknowledged inconsistency in rabbinic Judaism reflects the commonness of the argument — if not the obvious polemics in the Gospel of John.

In the second healing miracle on the Sabbath the reader is carried back to the most discussed notion in the Prologue, that of light, and on to the creation week in Genesis, which begins with the creation of light and culminates with the Sabbath. Jesus’ spitting on the ground, making clay, and placing it on the eyes of the blind man (John 9:6) carry reminiscences from the creation of man in Gen 2:7. Following the heated polemic and the denunciations in John 8:31-59, Jesus is about to create a new entity as children of Abraham or children of God. The thought is not remote from the Baptist’s declamation in the Synoptics, “Do not suppose that you can say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham for our father’; for I say to you that God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham” (Matt 3:9; cf. Luke 3:8). Such an act of creation by Jesus is commensurate with his appeal in ch. 3 to be “born again” or “from above”, that is “of the spirit”, and his repeated “I am” declarations in ch. 8, especially v. 12: “I am the light of the world; whoever follows me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life” (cf. 12:36 — “While you have the light, believe in the light, in order that you may become children of light”). The miracle, with the blind man’s proclaiming his faith in the Son of Man (9:35-38) affirms the statements made in the Prologue, that “the true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world” (v. 9) and that “as many as received him, to them he gave the right to become children of God” (v. 12; cf. 17:1-9; 1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; also Philo, Conf 41, 145-148; Odes Sol 31:4). The notion of the Logos begetting “children of light” or “children of God” is stressed again near the end of the Gospel, with the risen Jesus breathing (ἐνεῴσησεν) on his disciples when im-

---

32 On the Hellenistic origin of this principle, see I. Heinemann, Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung, Breslau: Marcus, 1932, 493 and n. 6; also D. Daube, “Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric,” Hebrew Union College Annual XXII (1949) 239-264. On Philo’s use of this principle, see F.H. Colson, PLCL VIII, 432-434.

parting the Holy Spirit to them (20:22; cf. 1:33). This final act of Jesus is related to God's breathing (ἐνεφύσησεν) the breath of life into the earth-born man, whereby man becomes a living being (Gen 2:7 [LXX]; the same verb is used in Ezek 37:9 and Wis 15:11 to describe the creation of man). Commenting on 20:22, Dunn observes: "John presents the act of Jesus as a new creation: Jesus is the author of the new creation as he is of the old (1:3)." In Hellenistic Judaism, following the Septuagint, the breath of life (πνεῦμα θεοῦ) or the image of God (ἐπικόν θεοῦ) in humans, that divine light or the rational element (λόγος) in them whereby they resemble their maker. The λόγος in humans is what distinguishes them from other creatures and draws them into the realm of the divine — a notion that owes much to certain other meanings of λόγος in Greek philosophy (cf. 10:34-36, quoting Ps 82:6). In this regard, the Johannine equation of Jesus with the in-

34 Cf. the Pauline notion of children of God in the Spirit: Rom 8:9-17; 1 Cor. 3:16-17; 6:12-20; Gal 2:15-21; 4:1-7; Phil 2:1-11; Col 3:5-11.
36 The double account of the creation of humans in Gen 1:26-31 and 2:4-7 receives ample and diverse treatment in Philo's works, especially in his *De Opificio*, where the first passage is variously taken to suggest the creation of the idea of man or a paradigmatic exemplar of man (24-25), the earthborn man with his rational and irrational faculties (69), and, more broadly, "an idea or type or seal, an object of thought, incorporeal, neither male nor female, by nature incorruptible", compared with the earth-born man contemplated in the second account (134-135). However, the two accounts in Philo's earlier commentaries on the opening chapters of Genesis are interpreted as two creations: one of the heavenly and the other of the earthly man (*Quaes Gen* 1.4, 8; II.56, 59; *Leg All* I 31-32; III 96, 161); and in the passing references to these passages a single creation is seen in both accounts: that of the earth-born man with his rational and irrational faculties. In the interpretation of the double account as a single creation, the image of God (Gen 1:27) and the inbreathed divine spirit (Gen 2:7) are equated and taken for the human mind, that divine, incorruptible element or the rational part of the soul whereby man is able to contemplate divine things and attain the virtues (especially wisdom) that bring the soul to happiness and immortality (*Quod Det* 80-86; *Plant* 18-20; *Heres* 56, 164, 231; *Fuga* 71-72; *Somn* 174; *Spec Leg* I 81). T.H. Tobin (*The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*, Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 1983, 20-35) relegates to Philo's predecessors the traditional distinction between the heavenly man of Gen 1:27 and the earthly man of Gen 2:7 and attributes to Philo the more homogeneous understanding of these two accounts as a single creation.
dwelling Spirit or the Paraclete is noteworthy: it may be seen in its relation to the Logos doctrine. A similar interrela is discernible in the words of Jesus which are said to be both spirit and life (6:63; cf. 12:50). 38

Moreover, the second instance of healing on the Sabbath is introduced by Jesus with a remark on his working "while it is day" (9:4). Here again we discern a common element with the first healing on the Sabbath, in the remark on his working as does the Father "until now" (5:17). The eschatological overtones of these remarks cannot be overlooked; they seem to be in keeping with the overall eschatology of the Gospel, where the end-time expectations are perceived as ongoing realizations. Also, there is a certain emphasis on judgment in the sequel to these controversial healings on the Sabbath (5:22-30 and 9:39).

Of interest is the fifth fragment of Aristobulus where the Sabbath is explained in terms of cosmic significance: "According to the laws of nature, the seventh day might be called first also, as the genesis of light in which all things are contemplated" (Fr 5:9; cf. Philo, according to whom the Sabbath marks "the birthday of the world": Op 89; Vita Mos I.207; II 210; 263-266; Spec Leg I 170; II 59, 70). Eschatological interpretations of the Sabbath as pointing to the Messianic Age owe somewhat to this traditional understanding of the seventh day as marking both an end and a beginning in Hellenistic Judaism. Besides, in Philo the Sabbath rest is symbolic of the rest in God, the uninterrupted peace of the soul that cannot be disturbed whether by war or by any other calamity (Fuga 174; Abr 28; Dec 96-105; Spec Leg II 56-70, cf. 71-139, his remarks on the sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee; and Hel Syn Pr 5). 39 The thought is reminiscent of the sayings of Jesus in John 14:27 and 16:33 (cf. Matt 11:28-29; Heb 4:8).

Over against the constant obsession with the religious dictates for the Sabbath, the Johannine Jesus translates Sabbath observance to a continuous concern for humanity (as in the Synoptics; cf. Mark 2:27). Consequently, the miracles of chs. 5 and 9 are conveyed as acts of philanthropy and come as a rebuke to those who seemingly observe the Sabbath while being continually inconsiderate toward the kind of people whom Jesus heals — thereby nullifying the very intent of Sabbath observance (cf. 7:19, where Jesus accuses the opponents of not keeping the Law, a charge based on their intention to kill him for — ironically


— having broken the Sabbath command as they perceived its observance to be). Here also the apologetics of Hellenistic Judaism provide the theological backdrop. Because of anti-Jewish slander from without and disenchantment with traditional religion from within, Jewish Law in the Hellenistic period was interpreted apologetically, to show that the end of the Law is philanthropy. The whole Law, from the least of the commandments on what to do with a bird's nest (Deut 22:6-7) to the Decalogue (Ex 20) and the precepts on tephillin and mezuzot (Ex 13:9, 16; Deut 6:8-9; 11:18-20), is said to teach humanity. Typical of this development are the Letter of Aristeas, especially the central part of the document (128-171, Eleazar's apology for the Law), and Philo's tractate on philanthropy (Virt 51-174).40

Summary

Beyond the obvious similarities between the beginning of the Gospel of John and that of the Book of Genesis, the theme of creation is sustained in the first five verses of the Prologue and is discernible in the notion of the Logos as the divine creator in whom there is life and light — two major motifs derived from the theme of creation and conveying further reminiscences from Genesis. There is a further unfolding of the theme, however, in John 5 and 9: one elaborating on life and the other on light. Both chapters are developed around the only two healing miracles done on the Sabbath — itself a reminder of creation. Moreover, both miracles are presented as divine acts of creation. The subsequent controversies are structured in terms of Hellenistic Jewish apologetics whereby creation is perceived as a process, with God still at work, and Sabbath observance, like all the laws of Torah, is shown to teach philanthropy.

Notwithstanding the essential differences between the Johannine, Philonic, and Targumic speculations on the Word, the former shares some common theological perceptions with the latter two. As regards creation, the Johannine Logos owes much to Hellenistic Jewish interpretations of Gen 1. These were conditioned by the belief in a transcendent and yet immanent God whose remoteness and nearness — both of which are attested in numerous scriptural passages — constantly called for explanation. The belief necessitated various circum-

40 Equally significant are the Synoptic sayings on "the least of these commandments" and "the weightier provisions of the law" (Matt 5:19; 23:23); see my essay, "Some Stock Arguments for the Magnanimity of the Law in Hellenistic Jewish Apologetics," Jewish Law Association Studies I: The Touro Conference Volume, ed. B.S. Jackson, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985, 141-149 [Ed. — repr. in the present volume, pp. 301-310].
locutions for God's presence and activity and the eventual removal of anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms from the Scriptures when translating first the Septuagint and then the Targums. The history of the doctrine of the Word within Judaism shows a decisive influence of Greek philosophy on Jewish theology in the Hellenistic period — whether in Alexandria or in the land of Israel.

The overriding burden of the Johannine Prologue, like the Christology of the rest of the Gospel, is to affirm not only the divinity of the Logos but also his identity with God, the giver of life and light. This is accomplished for the most part in the treatment of the healing miracles on the Sabbath and the ensuing discourses on life and light. The theology of chs. 5 and 9 and their sequel is summed up in the Johannine affirmation that God had made all things through his Logos, regarding whom it is said: "In him was life, and the life was the light of all people" (1:4).

In the polemical discourses following the two miracles, those who claim to observe the Sabbath and who advocate its observance are rebuked for their indifference and even hostility toward the kind of people whom Jesus heals. They are nullifying the philanthropic purpose for the Sabbath command by their misanthropy — even toward needy coreligionists just outside the Temple gates. They do not have the love of God (5:42); they do not see (9:39-41). Conversely, those who show concern for afflicted humanity and help alleviate human suffering are deemed true observers of the Sabbath because they fulfill its intent. Their acts of mercy extend life and light and are commensurate with God's ongoing, creative and restorative work.
Had the Works of Philo Been Newly Discovered

IN 1938 H.L. GOODHART AND E.R. GOODENOUGH published a monumental bibliography of Philonic scholarship,¹ and in 1940 Goodenough published his excellent Introduction to Philo, inviting the reader to a closer acquaintance with Philo’s works and thought.² Through these publications Goodenough sought to correct centuries of neglect and outright dismissal of Philo’s writings by Jews and non-Jews alike. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947 and the subsequent fascination with Qumran, however, took the wind out of the sails of Philonic studies. Consequently, in 1962, the second and revised edition of Goodenough’s Introduction to Philo contained this anonymous note — perhaps by Goodenough himself — on the flap of the jacket: “It is amusing to speculate on the fury which would have arisen in scholarly circles had the works of Philo been newly discovered instead of the Qumran scrolls.” The note continued: “For Philo was an exact contemporary of Jesus and Paul in Alexandria, where he was one of the leading Jews of the city, and from him we have the equivalent of twelve volumes in the Loeb Series, all interpreting Judaism.”

In the revised, second edition, Goodenough briefly surveys the major studies devoted to Philo since the manuscript of the first edition was sent to press.³ He invites attention to the general treatments of Philo by W. Völker in German, H.A. Wolfson in English, and J. Daniélou in French.⁴ These works, however, were inspired more by Goodenough’s By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of

Hellenistic Judaism\(^5\) than by the Introduction, which appeared five years later. Whether in his By Light, Light or in the Introduction, Goodenough’s assessment of Philo as primarily a mystic remains a classic in Philo scholarship. Völker, on the other hand, treats Philo as a much more complex author and goes on to stress his decisive place in the transition between Hellenism and Christianity, a place not altogether ignored by Goodenough. Wolfson, in a far larger treatment, magnifies Philo as a great philosopher of the rank of Plato and Aristotle, one who had an overwhelming influence on Christianity and Islam. Philo’s philosophical magnanimity in his work, often dubbed “Wolfson’s Philo”, has long been rejected by Philonists who nevertheless agree with Wolfson regarding the later, theological impact of Philo’s works. Daniélou, on the other hand, treats Philo as a Jewish believer at heart who is only outwardly a Hellenistic scholar.\(^6\) Still, the Introduction of 1940 remains a meritorious work, and its merits are seen anew in the recent reprinting of the work in the Brown Classics in Judaica series, with an introduction by J. Neusner.\(^7\) In search for a new generation of readers, Neusner invites attention to the importance of Philo and the enduring method of Goodenough as a historian of religion, especially as demonstrated through his monumental work Jewish Symbols in the Greco Roman Period.\(^8\)

As is well known, the Dead Sea Scrolls, which date from the latter part of the 3rd century BCE through the early decades of the 1st century CE and which were brought to light by treasure-hunting shepherds in the Judaean desert, were soon acclaimed as the greatest religious discovery of the 20th century. Students and lay people alike are still being reminded of the Book of Isaiah, including a partial scroll of the same Book, and the partial commentaries on Habakkuk, Genesis and Deuteronomy as well as the other sectarian writings spelling out rules of belonging, apocalyptic expectations, religious reforms, and hymns. The

---


6 In more recent decades, V. Nikiprowetsky (Le commentaire de l'écriture chez Philo d'Alexandrie [Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 21], Leiden: Brill, 1977) has given us a new assessment of Philo as primarily an exegete. Goodenough’s view is as tenable as that of Nikiprowetsky. In my opinion, however, Philo is primarily an apologist for Judaism.


Isaiah scrolls antedated the earliest extant copies of the Hebrew Scriptures by a thousand years. The biblical commentaries and the other sectarian works provided a link with the vast apocalyptic literature of the intertestamental period. These writings helped elucidate sectarian life in the time of Jesus — whether or not the nearby ruins at Khirbet Qumran are identified as the earliest known Jewish monastic settlement in Palestine and therefore the likely home of the scrolls. Quite understandably, the excitement surrounding the discovery of the Scrolls and the thousands of fragments found soon thereafter overwhelmed whatever enthusiasm Goodenough’s *Introduction* to Philo had generated, and it drained away — as it still does — the pool of scholars who otherwise might have devoted themselves to Philonic studies.

Concurrent with the Qumran discoveries and adding to the distraction from Philonic scholarship was the gradual surfacing of collections from the Nag Hammadi cache in Cairo — whether at the Coptic Museum or at the nearby antique shops (or even at the Jung Institute in Zürich). The surfacing of apocryphal gospels, with one deemed to be as old as the canonical ones, and a score of Gnostic *epistula* emerging to correct a century of scholarly speculations based on secondary and fragmentary sources in Patristic writers opposed to Gnosticism, swayed the 1st-century enthusiasts into the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The long awaited editions and translations of the Nag Hammadi “library,” together with the unresolved problems of definitions, sources, and origins of Gnosticism, have not allowed Early Church studies to lag far behind Qumran studies.

The avalanche of publications in the years following the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi Codices was expected to subside after a quarter of a century of Qumran and Gnostic studies. This, however, did not happen, as the much publicized controversy over the publication of the remaining fragments of the scrolls indicates. First came the not-so-mysterious resurfacing of the Temple Scroll in 1967, with a prolegomenon by Yadin and conflicting


accounts about its acquisition that could provide the necessary intrigues for a detective story. The enthusiastically retold stories of the early discoveries still sound like events of yesteryear rather than nearly fifty-year-old episodes. The scrolls continue to inspire new studies as unanswered questions persist and fragmentary reconstructions occasionally appear, such as the non-canonical Psalms and the Exodus scroll. These latest publications are about to mark with renewed excitement the end to half a century of Qumran scholarship — excitement equal perhaps to that which characterized the decade after the discovery. The same can be said for the piling up of Gnostica during these years — not to mention the countless conferences devoted to the subject.

In the meantime, the works of Philo remain mostly unstudied — judging from the comparatively few commentaries covering only a tenth of his surviving works. We need not speculate what the scholarly consensus might have been had the Philonic corpus been studied as much as the Dead Sea Scrolls. Even a more recent introduction to Philo by S. Sandmel seems to have attracted but few converts to Philonica. And although the annotated bibliography of the Philonic scholarship of the last fifty years by R. Radice and D.T. Runia shows an ever-increasing interest in the Alexandrian author, the interest is mostly indirect. Less than a fourth (401) of the 1,666 studies accounted for in this bibliography deal with Philonica directly; the greater portion focus on Judaica (344), the New Testament (245), philosophy (220), Paristics (184), classics (88), the-

ology (84), and Gnostica (43). The renewed attention to long-known medieval codices has not matched the excitement surrounding either the two thousand year old scrolls found in the Judaean caves or the worn-out Coptic codices from the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to speculate what Philo studies might have been were it not for the Qumran scrolls and the Nag Hammadi codices.

Sandmel's introduction to Philo was in turn overshadowed by J.H. Charlesworth's edition of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the mounting scholarly interest in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period. Scholars interested in Gnostica, however, have already discerned a link between Jewish apocalypticism and Christian Gnosticism — and between Philo and gnosis. It is high time for this sort of interest to encompass more of Philo. After all, the second volume of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha contains fragments of Hellenistic Jewish authors: Alexander Polyhistor, Philo the Epic Poet, Theodotus, Ezekiel the Tragedian, Aristabulus, Demetrius the Chronographer, Aristeas the Exegete, Eumpelemus, Pseudo-Euopelemus, Cleodemus Malchus, Artapanus, Pseudo-Hecataeus, and fragments of pseudo-Greek poets, including Orphica, and Hellenistic synagogal prayers. By the same token, Charlesworth could have added a third volume to his Old Testament Pseudepigrapha containing most — if not all — of Philo’s extant works. Or, there could have been yet another volume added to the Pseudepigrapha, containing the sectarian writings from Qumran. There is no good reason to leave out such writings from a collection of this sort. Perhaps the quest for the history of ideas in the formative periods of both Judaism and Christianity will compel us to a hitherto unparalleled interdisciplinary interest. This may well be the ultimate way (perhaps even the inevitable way) for scholarship devoted to Late Judaism and Early Christianity to pay some attention long overdue to Philo and his predecessors.

The French introduction by Daniélou seems to have yielded better results among French scholars than the English introductions by Goodenough and Sandmel have in the English-speaking world. Following the introduction by Daniélou, appearing in 1957 and at the height of Qumran studies, French schol-
ars launched an ambitious new translation of the complete works of Philo\textsuperscript{21} — the first and only complete edition of Philo's extant works in any language. This translation has in turn given a considerable impetus to Philo studies in Europe over the last thirty years.

Philo continues to be one of the most frequently quoted primary sources in the religio-historical study of the New Testament, and interest in the influence of haggadic and halakhic traditions on his exposition of the Pentateuch is not completely overlooked in Jewish studies. There are those who have taken note of the relationship between his *Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus* and the development of Midrashic type exegesis;\textsuperscript{22} his *Allegorical Commentary* and the development of haggadic traditions;\textsuperscript{23} and his *Special Laws* and the halakha.\textsuperscript{24} Nor is Philonic scholarship altogether dormant. One is compelled to disagree somewhat with the final and desperate pitch of the anonymous note in the flap of the jacket on Goodenough's *Introduction* referred to above: "Yet most Jews and Gentiles alike have tacitly united in ignoring him or in dismissing him at second or third hand. Such neglect of so strategic a figure has no parallel."

Historically, the deliberate neglect of Philo's works in Jewish circles resulted from the rabbis' unenthusiastic disposition to allegory in general and to the Christological implications of his highly developed *logos* doctrine in particular (even though it had no direct influence on the early development of the Christian dogma).\textsuperscript{25} Philo's fate in Judaism was inevitably tied to that of the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[25] W. Kelber, *Die Logoslehre von Heraklit bis Origenes*, Stuttgart: Verlag Uracchaus, 1958, 98-143. Philo transmits several traditions regarding the Logos. Of special interest is his schematic understanding of God and His two principal powers: the creative power or God (ḥē poiētikē, called *theos*, the power responsible for creation and bestowal of divine blessings) and the royal power or Lord (ḥē basilikē, called *kuriōs*, the ruling power). The schema recurs in several passages (e.g., *Quaestiones in Genesis* 2.16, 51, 75; 3:39; *Legum allegoriae* 195-96; 3:73; *Quis rerum divinarum heres* 166; *De mutatione nominum* 11-31; *De Abrahamo* 107-132, on God's visit and apparition to Abraham — cf. *Quaestiones in Genesis* 4.2, 8, 30; *De Deo* 1-3; *De spe-
Septuagint, which was abandoned to the Church as were also the works of Josephus. These Judeo-Greek writings were eagerly appropriated by the emerging Church and became useful in the later Christian polemics against Judaism, only to be further disowned by the parent faith in subsequent centuries. At the same time, not all of Philo’s works were equally palatable to the nascent Church. As Goodenough surmises, there is reason to suspect a deliberate loss of the treatise On Isaac because of its overly Christological suggestions, as one may gather from Philo’s treatment of the Patriarch elsewhere in his writings.26

Also adding to the neglect of Philo’s works is the fact that nearly a fourth of them survives only in a 6th-century Armenian translation: the four books of Questions and Answers on Genesis; the two books of Questions and Answers on Exodus; the substantial fragment On God (a commentary on Abraham’s encounter with the Lord at Mamre, Gen 17); and the three books comprising the two dialogues on Providence with Tiberius Julius Alexander, Philo’s apostate nephew — On Providence, in two books, and On Whether Dumb Animals Possess Reason. Thus, of the forty-eight books in the extant corpus of Philo’s writings (fifty books if Book IV of the Questions and Answers on Genesis is rightly divided into Books IV-VI), ten (or 12) survive only in Armenian. The Armenian corpus also contains several Philonic works the Greek of which is extant, thus enabling comparison for ascertaining the translational tendencies of the Armenian translator(s). Whether in part or in whole the Armenian translation of Philo’s works is accounted for in twenty-seven manuscripts (about twice the number of the extant Greek manuscripts). Besides, there are more than fifty medieval manuscripts of Armenian authorship which contain scholia on Philo. The comparatively large number of these manuscripts attests to a profound interest in Philo’s works throughout the Middle Ages in Armenia and Armenian Cilicia. It may be observed in passing that the total length of the works of Philo that survive only in Armenian is nearly equal to that of the hitherto published scrolls from Qumran.

The discovery of the Armenian Philo early in the 19th century is credited to the Venetian Mekhitarist priest J.B. Aucher (Awgerian), who found the works in a manuscript (Venice ms 1040, dated 1296) penned for King Het’um II of Armenian Cilicia (1289-1295) upon his retirement to monastic life. Aucher pub-

26 Goodenough, Light by Light, 155; cf. idem, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 143-145.
lished the works with a Latin translation in two volumes. The first volume contains De Providentia I-II and De animalibus, and the second Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim I-IV (VI), Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum I-II, and three Hellenistic Jewish homilies: De Sampone, De Jona, and De Deo (the last, as mentioned earlier, is a fragmentary Philonic treatise on Gen 17). Seventy years later supported by the distinguished Oxford Armenologist and New Testament scholar F.C. Conybeare, the Mekhitarist Fathers published the rest of the Armenian Philo — works of which the Greek original is extant. The latter volume, unbeknown to the anonymous editor(s), contained a page-long fragment belonging possibly to the earliest work of Philo, De numeris, on the power of numbers or numerology. The works extant only in Armenian may be remembered in pairs: the two Quaestiones, the two dialogues, the two substantial fragments, and the two pseudo-Philonic homilies (the Hellenistic Jewish authorship of which cannot be doubted).

Between the first two editions of the Introduction by Goodenough, we have the publication of the Quaestiones as two supplemental volumes to the ten-volume Loeb Classical Library edition of Philo. These were translated by R. Marcus of the Divinity School at the University of Chicago, at the time when others were busy producing the first translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Not yet available in English are the two books On Providence. This lengthy work, totaling more than two hundred paragraphs, is to be classified among the most interesting works of Philo. The thematic discussions on Divine Providence are carried on with his nephew, Tiberius Julius Alexander, an apostate who advanced to the highest military rank in the Roman army: Governor of the Thebaid in


29 Treatises of Philo Judaeus Translated by Our Ancestors, the Greek Originals of Which Are Extant [Φημιν ο λογισμοι Χωριν περιχωριων και η μοναχικη διαρκεια, οητι ζητείς ρωματικη σωφροσυνη πατριωτικης αθηναϊκης και ελευθεροτητης], Venice: San Lazzaro, 1892.

Egypt, Procurator of Judaea, Prefect of Egypt, Chief of Staff in the army of Titus during the siege of Jerusalem in 70 CE, and possibly Praetorian Prefect thereafter in Rome. In the two-part dialogue Alexander raises every conceivable question to deny the workings of Providence. Philo tries to answer each of the questions raised, leaving his interlocutor with the better argument.

The inherent value of these works within the larger Philonic corpus is underscored by the fact that the \textit{Quaestiones} are the earliest of Philo's three separate commentaries on the Pentateuch, and that they contain the most traditional elements of Midrashic exegesis transmitted by him. Their contents follow a uniform pattern of questions and answers, such as: "Why does Scripture say ..." followed by a biblical line or verse. The answers to these \textit{lemmata} are generally twofold: first the literal meaning is given and then the allegorical, and that without negating the literal. At times, however, the literal is said to be allegorical even as given by Moses. As for the two dialogues with Alexander, they are the only such writings of Philo and conceivably the last of his works. Their

33 For example, \textit{Quaestiones in Exodum} 1.16, on eating raw meat (Ex 12:9); 2.13, on God's angel leading Israel to the promised land (Ex 23:20); 27, on Moses ascending the mountain with Aaron and Nadab and Abihu (Ex 24:1); 34, on reading the book of the covenant to the ears of all the people (Ex 24:7); 82, on \textit{seeing} the pattern shown to Moses on the mountain (Ex 25:40); 117, on the high-priest's undergarment (Ex 28:31). Cf. Legum allegoricae II 19-21, on the creation of Eve (Gen 2:21); \textit{Quod deterius} . . . 13-16, on Jacob sending Joseph to look for his brothers (Gen 37:14); 94-95, on the children of Israel lamenting the death of Pharaoh (Ex 2:23); 150-155, on Cain hiding himself from God (Gen 4:14); 167, on the sevenfold vengeance to be taken on Cain (Gen 4:15); \textit{Quod Deus} . . . 21-22, on God's repentance (Gen 6:5-7); 131-133, on the priest's offering impure fire (Lev 14:34-36); \textit{De Pusteritate Caiini} 1-2, on Cain departing from the presence of God (Gen 4:16); 49-51, on the city of Cain (Gen 4:17); \textit{De plantatione} 32-35, on God planting a garden (Gen 2:8); 113, on the fruit being left for three years (Lev 19:23-25); \textit{De confusione linguarum} 134, on the Lord descending (Gen 11:5); \textit{De congressu} 44, on the descendants of Abraham's brother (Gen 22:23-24); \textit{De fuga et inventione} 121-122, on Lot's wife becoming a salty statue (Gen 19:26); \textit{De somniis} II 246, on the city of God (Ps 45:5).
mostly philosophical content makes them crucial for determining the relationship between theology and philosophy in his works and the extent of the Academic-Stoic controversies of the time.

One may ask: "What if only the Armenian works of Philo were newly discovered?" I presume there would be scores from among the devotees of ancient Judaism and early Christianity — perhaps also members of the American Oriental Society — who would be studying Classical Armenian. May I suggest that even though the whole of the Armenian Philo is already available in one or another modern language, it is not too late to devote oneself to the study of Armenian, one of the closest languages to Indo-European roots and at the same time the language of the first nation to embrace Christianity. I must quote Lord Byron, who had this to say after a brief remark on the thirty-eight letters of the Armenian alphabet (in a letter to Thomas Moore, dated 5 Dec., 1816): "It is a rich language, however, and would amply repay anyone the trouble of learning it." May I hasten to add that at the Mashtots' Library in Erevan, the capital of Armenia, there are over 20,000 mostly unstudied medieval manuscripts. Among them may still be found translations of long-lost works, whether from Greek or Syriac.

Perhaps the prevalent use of Latin titles for the works of Philo is detrimental for the discipline. Take for example the title De praemiis et poeniiis. It is not as suggestive as the English title, On Rewards and Punishments, a title not to be overlooked by anyone studying Jewish apocalypticism of the 1st century. This work contains most of Philo's apocalyptic views. No less interesting is Philo's De vita contemplativa (On the Contemplative Life), in which he describes the Therapeutae, an Essene-type sect in the vicinity of Alexandria. In another work, De Providentia (On Providence), he refers to one of his visits to Jerusalem (2:1067), leaving us to ponder the extent of his acquaintance with Palestinian traditions and sects, such as the Essenes of whom he speaks in Quod omnis probus liber sit (On Every Good Man Being Free) (75-91) and in the fragmentary Hypothetica or Apologia pro Judaeis (On the Jews).

A reader of the works of Philo cannot doubt the fact that they are a mine for New Testament interpretation and have much light to shed even on some of the most difficult passages. There is considerable scholarship on Philo and on the Epistle to the Hebrews, especially regarding Melchizedek, the high-priesthood.

---

of Jesus, intermediation, and the heavenly sanctuary. 36 To move away from familiar territory to a less charted one, let us take for example a couple of the "hard sayings" of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount and look at some Philonic elucidation. The familiar sayings following the remark on committing adultery in the heart, "If your right eye makes you stumble, tear it out, and throw it from you," likewise "If your right hand makes you stumble, cut it off, and throw it from you" (Matt 5:29-30 and parallels), have long taxed New Testament interpreters. Corresponding passages in Philo make it clear that behind these logia lies the Mosaic dictum in Deut 25:11-12 to cut off the hand of a woman who reaches out to strike a man in the genitals. In De somniis (On Dreams) II 68-69 Philo declares: "So then, O soul, that art loyal to thy teacher, thou must cut off thy hand, thy faculty, when it begins to lay hold of the genitals, whether they be the created world or the cares and aims of humanity. For he often bids us cut away the hand that has taken hold of the pair" (cf. Quod deterius... [On the Worse Attacking the Better] 175-176: "It is better to be made a eunuch than to be mad after illicit union" and Matt 19:12: "and there are eunuchs who made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.")37

As for the close affinities between Philo and the Fourth Gospel, there can be no doubt that they owe a debt to a common background.38 This is particularly true of the much emphasized logos doctrine in both writers. Suffice it to point out the Philonic affinities to the following familiar passage in John: "If any man is thirsty let him come to Me, and drink. He who believes in Me, as the Scripture


37 Likewise, in Matt 18, where these sayings are repeated (vv. 8-9), we have the saying against the would-be great in the Kingdom of heaven who cause the little ones to stumble as a result of judgmental censorship (v. 6). For people such as these, Philo has this to say: "But with men of windy pride, whose intensified arrogance sets them quite beyond cure, the law deals admirably in not bringing them to be judged by men but handing them over to the divine tribunal only" (De Virtutibus 171).

said, 'From his innermost being shall flow rivers of living water.'" (John 7:37-38; allusion to Isa 44:3; 55:1; 58:11) Here is a comparable passage from Philo: "The man who is capable of running swiftly it bids stay not to draw breath but pass forward to the supreme Divine Lord, Who is the fountain of Wisdom, in order that he may draw from the stream and, released from death, gain life eternal as his prize" (*De fuga et inventione [On Flight and Finding]* 97; cf. Matt 11:28-30). In the same book Philo goes on to equate "eternal life" with taking refuge with God (78). In an as yet unpublished paper, I have shown that all of the Johannine sayings on the Paraclete have Philonic counterparts with reference to conscience.39

More telling are the passages with Christological suggestions, such as those on Isaac, who was conceived at the time when God visited Sarah in her solitude (*De Cherubim [On the Cherubim]* 45). According to Philo, it was the Lord who begat Isaac, the self-taught, who was not the man Isaac, but the son of God, whose name means laughter or joy and who was given as a soothing and comforting presence to souls devoted to peace (*De mutatione nominum [On the Change of Names]* 131). Isaac, the self-taught or the direct learner from God, is in every deed divine, arising by no human will or purpose (*De fuga et inventione [On Flight and Finding]* 168. Accordingly Isaac was born perfect from the beginning. His marriage to Rebeccah, who like Sarah is Virtue, the giver of *logos*, results in the vision of God, Jacob, whose name Israel means "one who sees God" (cf. *De praemiiis et poeniiis [On Rewards and Punishments]* 43-46, *De posteritate Caini [On the Posterity of Cain]* 63, 92 and *De confusione linguarum [On the Confusion of Tongues]* 146). These and other such passages are crucial for understanding the origins of Christology.

Those who read Philo for the first time may become weary of his pedantries and almost endless allegory. There is, however, an occasional ring of modernity in his works. Take for example the end of Book II of *De somniis (On Dreams)*, which happens to be fragmentary. In the last fragment he discusses the phrase "lip of the river" (Ex 7:15) and notes that this phrase is found only in connection with the river of Egypt, not the Euphrates or any other holy river. To critics who might think that such observations are tantamount to hair-splitting, Philo reminds them that the subject is not "the lore of rivers" but the realities of life, compared to the current or flow of rivers (232). Or, as F.H. Colson para-

39 A. Terian, "The Johannine Paraclete and the Notion of Conscience in Philo," Paper read at the General Meeting of Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Aug. 11-15, 1986, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.
phrases, "Scripture does not mean to teach us geography but the realities of life." 40

Because the works of Philo have been with us for so long, we tend to take their existence for granted and focus our attention elsewhere. It may rightly be said that the works of Philo are as yet undiscovered by the majority of biblical scholars — whether those who do not follow the history of Hebrew Scripture interpretation through his works or those who ignore their pertinence for New Testament interpretation. The works of Philo continue to be overlooked also by the majority of those devoted to the study of the Second Temple Period and Early Christianity. Is this negligence explained by the fact that these documents were not "providentially" discovered either by a Palestinian nomad named Muhammad edh-Dheeb or by an Egyptian peasant named Muhammad 'Ali? It would not be outrageous to imagine that had the works of Philo been newly discovered, especially in some newsworthy manner, more of us would be studying Hellenistic Judaism, Classical Greek, and Classical Armenian. Unfortunately, Goodenough was not in a position to invent a tantalizing story similar to that possibly fabricated by C. Tischendorf when he somehow acquired the Codex Sinaiticus, claiming that he rescued it from the hands of a monk who was seen tearing a folio to kindle a candle. 41

The future of Philonic scholarship, however, is not bleak. Just as Qumran has disproportionately dominated the study of Early Judaism in recent years, so also has Nag Hammadi disproportionately dominated the study of Early Christianity. Scholarship, however, has a way of balancing itself, not as the pendulum of interests swings back and forth but as the scales of a balance come to a state of equilibrium. We see this happening in the renewed interest in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha that has brought some balance to the study of Early Judaism. Some balance is also emerging in the study of Early Christianity as a result of the burgeoning interest in the apocryphal New Testament. It could be argued with fair certainty that the renewed interest in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha was generated by Qumran studies, and that the interest in the Apocryphal New Testament was generated by the attention that Gnosticism com-


41 The official version at St. Catherine is that Tischendorff borrowed the Codex, which he never returned. A framed statement to this effect adorns one of the entrances to the St. Catherine library.
mands. Likewise, it seems, our ever-increasing interest in both Early Judaism and Christianity — regardless of how this interest came about — will lead us to the next inevitable stage of scholarly interest, namely, to the all-embracing Philo.

We will arrive at Philo not directly, as Goodenough had hoped to achieve through his Introduction, but inevitably, as interest in Early Judaism and Early Christianity keeps mounting — not in spite of Qumran and Nag Hammadi but rather because of them. Scholarship in Early Judaism and Christianity appears to be evolving in this direction; and unless some new and unexpected discovery comes to divert the inevitable course of interest, Philo is where the scholarly focus will be. Nearly half a century after the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi Codices, it is perhaps time to rediscover Philo.
Notes on The Transmission of the Philonic Corpus

It is a delightful task to comment on such well-researched, well-documented work. Although the volume at hand is a major contribution to Philonic and Patristic studies, one need not be a scholar in either of these fields to appreciate this book, for in the preliminaries Runia provides a basic introduction to the Philonic corpus and the themes it encompasses. There is even a chapter on Philo and the New Testament (pp. 63-86). Subsequent chapters methodically introduce the Patristic sources considered: both Greek (from the Apostolic Fathers through the Cappadocians and beyond, pp. 87-271) and Latin (from Tertullian through Augustine and beyond, pp. 275-332). Throughout, Runia maintains a fine balance between primary and secondary sources as he considers Philo in early Christianity, both in the East (including the Armenian tradition, pp. 5, 27) and in the West. It is not at all surprising that the coverage of the Latin Fathers is nearly a fourth of that devoted to the Greek Fathers among whom the legend of Philo Christianus originated. The book could have had another proof-reading, but this neglect is minuscule compared with the timeliness of the publication. Not since Goodenough have we seen such fascination with Philo as we are witnessing these days, and this volume will definitely add to the mounting interest.

Runia shows how the Philonic corpus might have travelled from Alexandria to Caesarea (thanks to Origen) and from there to Byzantium (thanks to the edition of Euzoios). In Constantinople certain of Philo's works seem to have become (for a short period at least) part of the Byzantine curriculum, and there they were translated into Armenian in the latter part of the 6th century. (Clement's remark that his Alexandrian predecessor's works constitute a handy manual for philosophical and theological understanding may have precipitated such use of certain parts of the Philonic corpus.) Runia seems to have some reservations regarding H. Lewy's reconstruction of this setting for the production of

the interlinear Armenian translation of Philo (p. 27). For my part, I have not found a better explanation for the Armenian corpus when considering it alongside other Armenian translations with similar characteristics and colophons suggestive of the time and place of this kind of translation. It is noteworthy that the Armenian translation of Philo precedes the coming of Stephen of Alexandria to Constantinople as head (oikoumenikos didaskalos) of the Imperial Academy (ca. 610), following the Christian takeover of the Neoplatonic School in Alexandria. Could the fate of the Greek text of Philo be linked to curricular changes in Constantinople at this time?

Runia does a good job of explaining the dissemination of Philo’s works both before and after Eusebius. Obviously, certain of Philo’s works were lost prior to Eusebius, and a few others since the 4th century. A brief explanation is given comparing the Eusebian list with the present corpus and the fragments which when combined account for six titles not found in the Caesarean Father. I agree with the conclusion that the line of transmission of which Eusebius is a witness may not have been exclusive. One of the works not accounted for by Eusebius is Book I of De Providentia, the Philonic authorship of which has often been questioned as a result of this omission besides obvious textual corruptions throughout. I am glad that Runia accepts the authenticity of this book without raising any of the objections voiced in past scholarship. Book I is apparently alluded to in the opening lines of Book II, where Philo remarks on Alexander’s coming “to go over what is left on Providence”. This seems to indicate, as do the opening lines in some other sequential works, resumption of the subject being discussed.

In his endeavor to show how widespread the legend of Philo Christianus was, Runia invites attention to the positive as well as the negative attitudes regarding Philo in Christian tradition — including the use made of him by Christian apologists in their anti-Judaistic polemics (as was made also of Josephus). A more significant factor in this development is the early Fathers’ fascination with Philo’s allegory. I agree with the author that Clement of Alexandria could well be the source of the Philo Christianus legend, a legend enhanced by Origen’s treatment of both Philo and Clement of Alexandria as forerunners in the exegetical tradition. This, no doubt, helped pave the way for the acceptance of Philo as a “Church Father honoris causa” (to use Runia’s term), an acceptance conditioned by the Ante-Nicaean Fathers’ awareness that allegorization helps

defend the Scriptures from rationalistic attacks. Understandably, the Philo Christianus legend is much stronger among the Greek-speaking Fathers than among the Latin-speaking Fathers. The latter group, ever-mindful of his Jewishness, had a much more guarded attitude toward him.

It is to be expected, perhaps, that I should say something about Philo Christianus in the Armenian tradition. As J.B. Aucher observes, the Armenian version of Philo comes with a "Preface" which seems to have belonged to a manuscript containing De Providentia. It begins with brief remarks on Philo's identity and summary statements on the opening sections of Quaestiones in Genesim and Quaestiones in Exodum as extant in the Armenian version, and concludes with briefer remarks on Philo's education and the dialogues On Divine Providence with Alexander. Judging from its syntax, it is clearly a piece of Armenian composition and not a translation from Greek. Runia paraphrases the content of the opening paragraph accurately and notes the fact that there is no study on this piece (p. 5). In the statements on Quaes Ex the anonymous author claims that Philo "mentions God's Anointed and confesses His divine authority with the Father" while allegorizing the things pertaining to the priestly robe (i.e., in Quas Ex 2.117-20). This preface, then, is an independent witness to an intermediate Christian attitude regarding Philo. Other legends on Philo Christianus are found in the Armenian scholia, including the one on his conversion at the hand of John the Apostle.

Guided by his stated methodology and Cohn's list of references to Philo in Christian literature (completed by Runia in an Appendix, pp. 348-56), the author proceeds admirably through the earliest Christian writings, the early Alexandrian Fathers, and those in the Alexandrian tradition. It seems that the toughest testing of the methodology comes when dealing with the Cappadocian Fathers. However, here too Runia is at his best, especially as he treats Gregory of Nyssa's De vita Mosis, for example, where there is so much reliance on Philo and yet the allusions to him are so very few and anonymous (a tendency epitomized in Procopius of Gaza). Moreover, the Cappadocian Fathers manifest overwhelming reliance on Philo in their hexaemera commentaries, especially on the twofold creation of man: the Philonic influence extends far into their mysticism as they proceed to deliberate on the image of God in man's reasoning faculty. One

---

2 Cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia's Treatise Against the Allegorists for Post-Nicaean attitudes.
4 Cf. the Acta Johannis of Ps.-Prochorus.
would have expected more on the subject of Philo's influence on Christian mysticism in the chapter on the Cappadocians than Runia has allowed (pp. 255-60). This could have been pursued without having to determine the extent to which Philo was or was not a mystic. Suffice it to say that for the Cappadocians, as for Philo, 1) the sacred text contained deeper meanings than those readily available to readers and 2) the vision of God — if not also union with God — was possible when pursuing the contemplative path. Thus, the chapter on the Cappadocian Fathers would have been the logical place not only to highlight the extent to which Philo figures in early Christian literature — even in instances where there are neither direct quotations from him nor specific references to him — but also to deal with the topic of mysticism, which touches on quite a few of the main Philonic themes discussed in early Christian literature. In keeping with his methodology, Runia points to secondary sources on Philo's influence on Christian mysticism.

The most telling use of Philo's works by the Fathers is perhaps that made by Ambrose. The affinities between Philo and the Bishop of Milan are so numerous that the pages allotted to the subject (pp. 291-311) could be doubled easily. Again, Runia makes up for this seemingly brief chapter by inviting attention to H. Savon's work. There is, as many agree, a twofold treatment of Philo in Ambrose: 1) outright utilization of his works and 2) reinterpretation of his allegory in sacramental terms. As for the latter, some go so far as to see substantial sacramental infusion into Philo's biblical interpretation in much of Ambrose. Be that as it may, what is more curious is the Bishop's personal assessment of Philo. Notwithstanding the use made of our exegete, there was a degree of uneasiness with him, a certain ambivalence, a hidden dissatisfaction with him mainly because of his absolute silence about Christ — if not also for the fact that he is an interpreter of the Torah, an apologist for Judaism. Ambrose tries to rectify these concerns by reinterpreting Philo sacramentally. There were other factors contributing to the Post-Nicean Fathers' somewhat negative attitude toward Philo. These include their generally anti-philosophical (and occasionally anti-allegorical) disposition and their anti-heretical vigilance that made them cau-

5 For a list of these themes see pp. 37-43; note especially those listed under "philosophical themes".


tious lest too much reliance on Philo should enhance Christological heresies — since by virtue of his voluminousness Philo could easily have become a quarry for heretical views (e.g., God’s Logos or deed being posterior to God himself). The negative sentiments regarding the often unnamed Philo were verbalized not so much by Ambrose as by his foremost admirer, convert, and best-known pupil: Augustine. After Augustine, interest in Philo subsided in the West. Subsequent references to him in Latin authors come from Rufinus’ translation of Eusebius’ Ecclesiastical History and, as Runia observes, for the most part these are references to the embassy to Gaius headed by Philo.

There are a number of wider implications of the book as well. Runia’s survey has numerous bearings on Wolfson’s hypotheses in Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947). To begin with, Wolfson’s glamorous view of Philo as a great philosopher alongside the giants of the classical tradition finds little support in the fact that there is but scant and comparatively late use made of our Alexandrian author in pagan sources. While Wolfson’s assessment of Philo’s influence on Christianity finds considerable support in Runia, Wolfson’s remaining hypotheses, regarding Philo’s influence on Judaism and Islam, are indirectly called into question. The relative obscurity of Philo’s works in Jewish and Islamic sources is explicable by the fact that his works were never translated into any Semitic language, whether Arabic, Syriac, or Hebrew in the medieval period. Resemblances between Philonic and certain elements of Jewish and Islamic thought appear to be coincidental, owing either to rudiments of common traditions — whether Jewish or Hellenistic — or to cross-currents in medieval times, resulting to a certain extent from contacts with Christianity.

It is paradoxical that the staunchest readers of Philo were neither of his intended audiences, whether Jews or pagans, but Christians. I am convinced that Philo wrote primarily — if not exclusively — for Jewish readers, lest his coreligionists yield to non-Jewish influences rampant in the Hellenistic world. His seemingly universalistic appeals are intended to rouse his people to guard and cherish their heritage zealously. Should a pagan happen to read him, that might be a bonus that could lead the individual to venerate Moses. It is equally paradoxical that those responsible for preserving Philo could also be deemed responsible for whatever is lost of his works.

In spite of the Fathers’ fascination with Philo and their diverse appropriations of his works ever since Clement of Alexandria, his Jewishness remained a dilemma for them and oftentimes they were unable to conceal their anti-Jewish prejudice. However, their reluctance to name the adopted “Church Father” in numerous utilizations of his works need not always be interpreted negatively, since such practices were common among writers in Late Antiquity and in the early Byzantine period. As a result of Runia’s definitive work, the conclusion may be drawn more emphatically than ever before that Philo was much admired for his exegesis and that the Fathers’ debt to him is truly immense.
Inspiration and Originality: Philo’s Distinctive Exclamations

To distinguish between tradition and originality in the works of ancient writers is not an easy task. Illustrative of the difficulty posed by the ancients is the following admonition in Menander the Rhetor regarding invented hymns: “First, they should not be separate from the whole but continuous with it, and this condition will be fulfilled if the invention is taken from the main subject and is not remote from it.”¹ The challenge of distinguishing between tradition and an author’s inventiveness is no less difficult as we approach Philo. Preoccupation with such a vexing and complex question marked the beginning of the activities of the Philo Institute, and the intricate problem was repeatedly highlighted in the Institute’s Annual.² The quest to establish the extent of Philo’s originality of thought vis-à-vis his dependence on the thoughts of others was pursued along the conventions of form criticism and rhetorical analysis. Yet the external controls imposed on the text, however valid, were of little help in delineating the intricacies of Philo’s allegory. These early

¹ This article combines two previous papers by the author: “Philo in the Spirit: The Use of the Vocative in Personal Pronouncements,” presented to the Philo of Alexandria Seminar at the 1989 Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, held in Anaheim, California, November 18-21; and “A Stratum of Originality in Philo,” presented to the Philo of Alexandria and Christian Beginnings Seminar at the 1993 General Meeting of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, held in Chicago, Illinois, August 9-13. Cited translations of Philo are from the Loeb Classical Library.


Occasional observations of Philo's use of the exclamatory $\omega$ with the vocative in contexts suggestive of inspiration, especially when addressing his mind, soul or understanding, compelled me to trace methodically his use of this word in all the passages indexed by Mayer.\footnote{G. Mayer, \textit{Index Philoneus}, Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 1974, 310.} There are 147 uses of the term $\omega$ in the Greek corpus of Philo,\footnote{Mayer gives 149 references. Not all instances, however, are indexed correctly. The following nine are incorrect: \textit{Leg All III} 7; \textit{Quod Deus} 149; \textit{Conf} 162; \textit{Migr} 84; \textit{Congr} 54, 113; \textit{Fuga} 149 twice; and \textit{Mut} 25. The following seven are not indexed: \textit{Leg All III} 10, 11, 74; \textit{Sacr} 20; \textit{Plant} 53; \textit{Migr} <219>; and \textit{Heres} <69>. I have supplied the term in two of these instances (indicated within angular brackets) where $\psi\chi\eta$ appears in the vocative.} and in more than a fourth of these occurrences (39 exactly) he enthusiastically addresses his mind, soul or understanding ($\omega$ $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omega\alpha$ or $\omega$ $\psi\chi\eta$). An equally important observation was made following a search for these formulaic phrases in the \textit{Thesaurus Linguae Graecae} database.\footnote{For the extensive coverage, see the compilation by L. Berkowitz \textit{et al.}, \textit{Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. Canon of Greek Authors and Works}, New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.} There it became evident that while the forms $\omega$ $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omega\alpha$ and $\omega$ $\psi\chi\eta$ are common in Philo, they are unique to him among the post-Socratic writers.\footnote{Among 5th-century BC authors, $\omega$ $\psi\chi\eta$ appears in Aristophanes \textit{Vespae} 757 (ed. D.M. MacDowell, \textit{Aristophanes: Wasps}, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), Euripides \textit{Fragmenta} 308 (\textit{Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta}; ed. Augustus Nauck, supplement by Bruno Snell, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1983.), and Sophocles \textit{Trachiniae} 1260 (\textit{Sophocle. Tome I. Les Trachiniennes, Antigone}, text, A. Dain; tr. P. Mazon [Collection Budé], Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1955); cf. the later \textit{Anthologia Graeca} 5.131 (ed. H. Beckby, [Tusculum-Bücherei Zweisprachige antike Taschenausgaben], Munich: Heimeran, 1958).} Except for altogether three uses of $\omega$ $\psi\chi\eta$ in two 2nd-century CE non-Christian authors (Marcus Aurelius and
Chariton) and two uses of the same phrase in two 4th-century CE non-Christian authors (Heliodorus, who had read Philo’s *De vita Mosis* at least, and Libanius), this phrase does not recur until its occasional use in Patristic writings of the 4th century and thereafter, and that more as a result of Philo’s influence than that of the LXX Psalter. As for ὀ διάνωκα, its 17 uses are limited to Philo among all ancient Greek writers (two uses of the phrase in John Chrysostom carry clear reminiscences from Philo).

---


10 Chrysostom *Eclogae i-xiii* ex diversis homiliis 709.41 (PG LXIII); *In illud: Si qua in Christo nova creatura* 27.49 (PG LXIV); in the next sentence, however, he has ὁ ἡργῇ, which he uses six times altogether (see the preceding note). It is not at all surprising to have a spirited orator and homiletic like Chrysostom next only to Philo with a total of ten such usages. Chrysostom is drawing from Paul and other biblical worthies the kind of inspiration Philo drew from Moses (see, e.g. the last reference given here: ὁ φιλοσόφα Παύλου! ὁ φρόνημα
His uses of the exclamatory ὡ with various other vocatives include direct addresses (e.g., ὡ γενναῖ, ὡ θαυμάσε, ὡ ὠτός) and prayerful utterances (ὡ δέσποτα, ὡ φιλόδωρο, ὡ θαυμασώτατε, ὡ ἱεροφάντα). But even in such instances, his uses of ὡ are not always conventional; these too are suggestive of his inspired inventiveness, as I shall point out in the sequel.11

In Philo, these formulaic exclamations seem to convey a certain originality of thought and the kind of emotion the anonymous author of the 1st-century CE treatise De sublimitate recommends for sublimity in writing.12 He cites five most important sources of sublimity, the first of which is “the power to conceive great thoughts” and the second, “strong and inspired emotion”.13 He then adds, with words reminiscent of the Platonic “divine madness” contemplated in the Phaedrus (245a): “I should myself have no hesitation in saying that there is nothing so productive of grandeur as noble emotion in the right place. It inspires and possesses our words with a kind of madness and divine spirit.” (8.14)

Elsewhere, the author recalls yet another Platonic literary consideration, this time reminiscent of the Socratic arguments in the dialogue Ion; namely, imitation and emulation of earlier writers as a means to sublimity: “The genius of the ancients acts as a kind of oracular cavern, and effluences flow from it into the minds of their imitators. Even those previously not much inclined to prophesy become inspired and share the enthusiasm which comes from the greatness of

---

11 See my comments on the following passages: Leg. All III 11, 17 (10, 22), 165 (179); Cher 52 (48); Sacr 20 (22, 32), 64 (55, 64, 70); Gig 44 (40). See also the following notes: 28, 29, 32, 33, 42, 45, 54, 60.

12 The treatise has been wrongly attributed to Cassius Longinus, a renowned statesman and critic of the 3rd century. The author must have had Roman and Jewish contacts; e.g., in 9.9 he quotes the first lines of Genesis. According to A. Rostagni, Introduzione a Anonimo del sublime, Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1947, xxv-xxxi, the anonymous philosopher referred to in the last chapter (44) is none other than Philo, whom the author met in Rome, hence also the similarities in their works; cf. D.A. Russell, Longinus on the Sublime, Oxford: Clarendon, 1964, xxix-xxx. This possibility is not ruled out by J.A. Arieti and J.M. Crossett, Longinus on the Sublime (Texts and Studies in Religion 21), New York: Edwin Mellen, 1985, 222, 254-256.

13 The other three are figures of thought and figures of speech, noble diction expressed in choice words and metaphors, and dignified and elevated word-arrangement (8.1).
others." He cites the example of Plato, "who diverted to himself countless rills from the Homeric spring" (13.2-4).14

Similar statements on literary inspiration are found also in Philo, in what he has to say about prophetic inspiration15 as well as about his own inspiration.16 In Vita Mos 2.188-191 he outlines a threefold understanding of prophetic inspiration: 1) when God speaks on His own initiative, using the prophet as an interpreter 2) when God responds to a question asked by the prophet and 3) when the prophet uses his God-given foreknowledge to reveal future events. In his elaboration on the first kind of inspiration, Philo insists that "interpreta-

---

14 Recitation of someone else's thoughts, according to Socrates in Ion, is not as meritorious as promulgating one's own thoughts; and the very nature of poetic inspiration is irrational. It was hence necessary to disclaim to be a teacher when repeating someone else's thoughts and to justify the rationality of inspiration by extending it to non-poetic writing, such as Plato's (cf. Socrates' refusal to call himself a teacher lest he be identified with the sophists; Plato Ap 33A-B).


16 See especially Ch 27-29, 49-50; Migr 31-35; Heres 69-70; Somn II 250-254; Spec Leg III 1-6.
tion and prophecy are not the same thing.” (191)\(^1\) It follows that when he interprets, he is not prophesying, since he is not an interpreter of God but of Moses.\(^2\) Philo would go so far as to claim to be an interpreter, as he declares in a seldom considered passage: “I am an interpreter and not a teacher. Those who teach impart their own knowledge to others, but those who interpret present through accurate recall the things heard from others.” (De animalibus 7)\(^3\) Yet prophecy and interpretation have one thing in common: they are prompted by “another” (De specialibus legibus I 65; IV 49). Philo attributes to the spirit the many lessons he has learned: “I hear once more the voice of the invisible spirit, the familiar secret tenant, saying, ‘Friend, it would seem that there is a matter great and precious of which thou knowest nothing, and this I will ungrudgingly shew thee, for many other well timed lessons have I given thee.’” (De somniis II

---

\(^1\) The second kind of prophetic inspiration is illustrated by examples in 192-245, and the third kind in 246-287. Cf. the three kinds of God-sent dreams in Somn I 1-2 and 2.12; see also Migr 190-191 and De Opificio Mundi (Opific) 70-71. The argument that “interpretation and prophecy are not the same thing” is somewhat akin to the view espoused by Paul in 1 Cor 14:26-40.


\(^3\) Fortunately, the Greek original of the last three lines survives in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiae 2.18.6 and is given in J.R. Harris, Fragments of Philo Judaicus, Cambridge: The University Press, 1886, 11 (included in my edition of De Animalibus [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981], 263; see my comments on this passage, 116-118; cf. Anim 74).
Moses, however, remains the prophet and teacher par excellence and a major source whence Philo drew much of his inspiration (Gig 54; Spec Leg I 59), as Plato did "from the Homeric spring".

The Platonic influence on Philo, however, is no less dominant than the Mosaic. M. Pulver observes, somewhat in the extreme, that Plato's theory of ecstasy is explicable only by the Platonic notion of "divine madness" and that it has nothing in common with its biblical counterpart. In a comprehensive study of the Philonic passages on ecstasy and enthusiasm, B. Belletti concludes persuasively that although these themes have much in common with the Platonic notion of "divine madness", they are equally shaped by the biblical theophanies.

On a related subject, J. Miller notes that "no Platonist of the Greco-Roman era observed the chorus of the stars with greater delight" than Philo. It must be said that Philo's addresses to his διάνοια or ψυχή are likely means of combining his mind or soul with the divine and cosmic Logos, and thus they are related to his prayerful utterances (ὁ δεσπότα, ὁ φιλόθεος, ὁ θαυμαστῶτας, ὁ ἐρωφάντα) and are analogous to corybantic exclamations suggestive of mystical experience seen in the soul's quest for knowledge and experience of God. As E.R. Goedenough remarks with reference to his By Light, Light, "I was interested in studying what I called the religiosity of Philo, and took as my chief guide the more elaborately allegorical writings, in which I was convinced, and still am, that Philo wrote more from the heart than in any other of his works." He goes on to explain: "he wrote here to expound his speculative and mystical aspirations,

---

20 The immediate context of this particular instance, dealing with the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem, apparently contains some thoughts that are original with Philo even though the etymology of the name, "vision of peace", is clearly traditional; see Grabbe, Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation, 167-168.

21 "Das Erlebnis des Pneuma bei Philon," Eratos-Jahrbuch XIII (1945) 126-132. Especially significant are Philo's four definitions of ecstasy or enthusiasm in Heres 249-266: madness, astonishment, trance, and inspiration.


which he repeatedly ranked above all his other interests. As we shall see, Goodenough’s observation is quite insightful. Indeed, there are more frequent uses of ὁ διάνοια and ὁ ψυχή in the early and more allegorical writings, and fewer uses of these exclamatory phrases in the less allegorical and later works.

The documentary claim to inspiration appears to be a literary feature, suggesting a degree of originality on the part of an author — a notion conceivably popularized ever since the Socratic corrective in Ion. Although there are but few passages where Philo claims to be inspired and where he goes on to describe the process, and fewer passages still where he claims inspiration for his commentaries, indirect references to his inspiration seem to abound in his use of the exclamatory ὦ with the vocative, especially when addressing his mind, soul or understanding. It follows that in the immediate contexts of these ecstatic exclamations and pronouncements we are apt to find certain of his own interpretations. This study therefore is an attempt to verify those instances in Philo’s writings where the originality of his thought could be pointed out with a degree of certainty, and this by tracing his use of the exclamatory ὦ with the vocative in context. Although the extant Greek corpus of Philo’s writings is more than sufficient for the purposes of this study, I have likewise taken into consideration the 24 instances of the exclamatory ὦ in the Quæstiones. Of these, two are in conjunction with ψυχή (Arm. nū 5 baptized): Quæs Gen 4.8, 21; and two are in conjunction with διάνοια (Arm. nū 5 baptized): Quæs Gen 4.138; Quæs Ex 2.51. These


26 The absence of ὁ διάνοια or ὁ ψυχή in the following chronologically sequential works is noteworthy: Agr, Plani, Ebr, Sobr, Conf (and Congr, separately) in the Allegoriae; and Abr, Jos, Vita Mot 1–2, Dec in the Expositiones. These works, however, contain other vocatives with ὦ and it cannot be said with certainty that they are the least original among Philo’s biblical commentaries. The absence of ὁ διάνοια or ὁ ψυχή in Flacc and Gaïum is explicable by the very genre of these works. According to Mayer’s Index, ὦ does not appear in Op, Praem, and Vita Cont.

27 Spec Leg III 6; cf. Leg All I 82: “So long as the mind supposes itself to be the author of anything, it is far away from making room for God and from confessing or making acknowledgement to Him. For we must take note that the very confession of praise itself is the work not of the soul but of God who gives it thankfulness.”

28 The others are somewhat direct addresses, in which he speaks for God, amplifying His word (Quæs Gen 1.45; 4.45 thrice, 49, 52), or for Abraham (Quæs Gen 3.57; 4.53), or even for the Sodomites (Quæs Gen 4.39); and to other exegetes (Quæs Gen 3.43 four times), to himself (Quæs Gen 4.138, in addition to ὁ διάνοια there; Quæs Ex 2.29), to the Philistines (Quæs Gen 4.191), and to Esau (Quæs Gen 4.245). Once ὦ appears in the biblical question (Quæs Gen 4.230), and twice as a gloss (Quæs Ex 2.83.117). It should be noted that elsewhere in the
four instances in the Quaestiones are treated after the 39 occurrences of ὁ διάνοια and ὁ ψυχή in the Greek corpus, following the sequence of the references in Mayer’s Index. I have also included two instances where ψυχή appears in the vocative case but without the usual exclamatory ὁ. These I have marked with angular brackets. The highlighted references are to passages where these phrases appear, and the parenthesized references are to their respective contexts.

The references to ὁ διάνοια and ὁ ψυχή in context

Leg All I 49, 51 (43-62)

The passage under consideration deals with Gen 2:8-9, God planting a Garden in Eden and the “tree of life” in the midst of the Garden. Philo identifies both the Garden and the “tree of life” with virtue and dwells on God’s act of planting (man is placed in the Garden “to tend it”, i.e., to give his whole mind to virtue). Man cannot plant virtue; “the mind that says ‘I plant’ is guilty of impiety.” Philo then bursts into a lengthy, twofold affirmation of his interpretation. The first affirmation begins with ὁ διάνοια (49) and the second with ὁ ψυχή (51). The twofold affirmation has an interesting correlate: two secondary passages to further substantiate the basic interpretation of the primary text are cited to emphasize God as the planter of Virtue: Deut 16:21, “Thou shalt not plant thyself a grove; thou shalt not make to thyself any ......” (48) and Ex 20:23, “Ye shall not make together with Me gods of silver, and gods of gold ye shall not make to yourselves.” (51)

The originality of Philo’s interpretation of this passage is to be seen not only in our ongoing demonstration of his similar use of the exclamatory ὁ with διάνοια or ψυχή but also by the fact that in the immediate context he refers to different interpretations by other exegetes:

But some say that it is the heart that is called the tree of life, since it is the cause of life and has been allotted the central place in the body, as it naturally would, being in their view the dominating principle. But these people should remember that they are setting forth a view worthy of the physician rather than of the

Armenian corpus of Philo’s writings ὁ διάνοια is at times rendered αὐτὸν πρὸ τοῦ πάντου (Leg All I 49; II 91, 106; but νῦν ἄνθρωπος in Spec Leg I 299) and ὁ ψυχή is once rendered αὐτὸν ἔνθελε (Leg All II 101; but νῦν ἄνθρωπος in Leg All I 51). As for the occurrences of ὁ (Arm. αὐτός) in the Dialogues, they have been set aside since they are generally direct addresses between the interlocutors.

such as the locust and the cricket (102-105). The first of these two passages is reconciled easily with the Genesis passage, by drawing on the distinction between “horseman” and “rider”; the one is in control of the passions whereas the other is carried away by them. The second passage is explained as follows: “For if serpentlike pleasure is a thing un-nourishing and injurious, self-mastery, the nature that is in conflict with pleasure, must be wholesome and full of nourishment.” The double reversal of symbolic interpretation at this juncture is noteworthy; the association of the locust-like, four-legged creatures with self-mastery instead of with the passions (as in the case of the horse), and the association of the serpent back with pleasure (as in the interpretations of Gen 3:1 and Ex 4:1-5) instead of with self-mastery (as in the case of Num 21:6-9 and Gen 49:16-18). 29

At the end of these alternating interpretations he addresses his understanding (ὡ διάνως) in a prayer-like utterance, in the course of which he brings back to focus the primary text, Gen 3:1: “the serpent is the most subtle of all beasts,” and denounces the things that cater to pleasure. He restates the theme of the serpent-fighter, conceivably an original with him besides the intricate structure of the whole (106-108).

Leg All III 11, 17 (1-27)

The first part of Leg All III is a lengthy commentary on Gen 3:8, Adam and Eve hiding from God. Philo rejects the literalness of the biblical verse, 30 since God is

---

29 As in Leg All II 94-105, Philo has a lengthy comparison between horseman and rider in Agr 67-77, where he gives a protracted comparison between “horseman and rider” and quotes Ex 15:1, 20-21, the “Song at the Sea”. Philo then speaks to critics (ὡ γινώσκω), presumably exegetes (overlooked by Hay, “Philo’s References to Other Allegorists,” 42-43), who might think that Moses is against the use of cavalry (86). Then, with reference to Jacob’s prayer for Dan (Gen 49:16-18), Philo counsels the reader (ὡ ὁτος) to be like the victor who does not hesitate to be defeated like the horseman’s fall in the prayer for Dan (111). He then puts words in the mouth of an imagined victor who addresses “spectators and stewards of the sports” (ὡ ἦσαν καὶ ἄδελφοι), then follows a speech (112-120).

30 Quite often Philo spurns the literalness of the biblical text: Quaes Ex 1.16 (on eating raw meat, Ex 12:9), 2.13 (on God’s angel leading Israel to the promised land, Ex 23:20), 27 (on Moses ascending the mountain with Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Ex 24:1), 34 (on reading the book of the covenant to the ears of all the people, Ex 24:7), 82 (on seeing the pattern shown to Moses on the mountain, Ex 25:40), 117 (on the high-priest’s undergarment, Ex 28:31); Leg All II 19-21 (on the creation of Eve, Gen 2:21), 3.55 (on the nakedness of Adam and Eve, Gen 3:10); Quod Det 13-16 (on Jacob sending Joseph to look for his brothers, Gen 37:14),
omnipresent, and correlates the concept of hiding from God with that of banishment from the divine company of the leper and the like (Num 5:2; Deut 23:2), the impious who shuns and avoids God. Contrary to such a man is the just individual who stands before God and avoids Him not (1-9). For such a just man Abraham prayed, “Destroy Thou not the just man together with the impious one” (Gen 18:22-23). Philo then prays (in the spirit of Abraham’s prayer): “O Master . . .” ((always δεσποτα) as he is about to consider the opposite of hiding from God; i.e., opening oneself to God, as did Moses when shunning Pharaoh, “the symbol of dispersion” (12-14), and Jacob when fleeing from Laban, “the friend of the senses” (15-26); the latter passage includes an imagined speech by Laban, chastising Jacob for his sudden departure, and a response in which Philo joins as Jacob’s advocate, ὦ . . . Ἀδαμ, 22). Philo addresses his soul (ὢ ψυχῆ) when about to cite the example of Moses (11), and his understanding (ὢ διάνοια) when citing the example of Jacob (17). He then concludes with a prayer (again in

94-95 (on the children of Israel lamenting the death of Pharaoh, Ex 2:23), 150-155 (on Cain hiding from God, Gen 4:14), 167 (on the sevenfold vengeance to be taken on Cain, Gen 4:15); Quod Deus 21-22 (on God’s repentance, Gen 6:5-7), 131-133 (on the priests offering impure fire, Lev 14:34-36); Post 1-2 (on Cain departing from the presence of God, Gen 4:16), 49-51 (on the city of Cain, Gen 4:17); Agr 131 (on the uncleanness of the camel, Lev 11:4); Plant 32-35 (on God planting a garden, Gen 2:8), 113 (on the fruit being left for three years, Lev 19:23-25); Conf 134 (on God coming down to see the Tower of Babel, Gen 11:5); Congr 44 (on the descendants of Abraham’s brother, Gen 22:23-24); Fuga 121-122 (on Lot’s wife becoming a salty statue, Gen 19:26); Somn I 93 (on God’s concern for a debtor’s garment, Ex 22:26-27), 2.246 (on the city of God, Ps. 46:5 [LXX 45:5]). For more on this subject see Nikiprowetzky, Le commentaire de l’Écriture chez Philon d’Alexandrie, 228-231; idem, “L’exégèse de Philon d’Alexandrie dans le Quod Deus,” in Two Treatises of Philo of Alexandria (Brown Judaic Studies 25), ed. D. Winston and J. Dillon, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983, 74-75.

31 Cf. Quod Det 150-155, on Cain hiding from God (Gen 4:14).

32 Cf. Heres 31: ὦ φιλοθεος (“O bounteous God”), Philo joining in the prayer of Abraham in Gen 15:2. On similar participation in prayer with Moses, see below, on Migr 169. In Spec Leg III 215-222 Philo talks about the festal character of the rite of presenting the basket of fruit (Deut 26:1-11), at which time the presenter recites a canticle which Philo paraphrases, giving its sense more than the words (217-219). Near the end of the canticle he addresses God as ὦ δεσποτα (“O Master”), thus joining in prayer.

33 Cf. Leg All III 192-196, where Philo, in a sublime speech and as an advocate of Jacob, addresses Esau (ὦ αὐτός), taking issue with him regarding the words “My blessing and my birthright hath he taken” (Gen 27:36).
the spirit of Abraham's prayer): "<O> Savior . . ." (εὐ, 
ο, ἀντὶ the beginning, quotes Gen 18:17, "Shall I hide from Abraham My servant that which I am doing?" (27) 35

Besides forming an inclusio, Philo's prayers at the beginning and at the end suggest that his soul is like Abraham's, "the soul to which God manifested Himself, and which He deemed worthy of His secret mysteries" (ibid.). His understanding of Gen 3:8 in terms of its opposite, openness to God, is arrived at by inspiration. 36

Leg All III 31, 36, 47 (28-48)

Philo continues to comment on the man who hides himself from God, the universal Mind, and to denounce the wickedness of such a man who takes refuge in himself, the individual mind. The contrast between the two orientations or mindsets, together with their ramifications, is presumably drawn by Philo himself. This may be gathered from his exclamation: "But thou perceivest, O my soul (ο γνώσθη), the difference of the two opinions." (31) Along the same line of thought, he cites Deut 27:15, the curse on one setting up in secret a graven or molten image, i.e., the evil of secretly holding false opinions. He then counsels his understanding (ο διάτυπος) not to fancy itself as one versed in science but to submit to healing its malady of ignorance (36). At the conclusion of his denunciation of man taking refuge in self, Philo draws on the example of Moses, who receives from God the tent of wisdom, in which the wise man "tabernacles and dwells", and to which "everyone that sought the Lord went out." Again he addresses his understanding (ο διάτυπος), advising it to go out and seek God (47). He concludes with a summation of his lengthy comments on man hiding from God.

34 The syntax does not allow emendation to ο. Apparently, the not-so-essential exclamation to follow with the vocative σωτηρ was not used, so as to avoid later orthographical confusion with εὐ.

35 On the use of this passage elsewhere, see Quaes Gen 4.21, treated below.

Leg All III 52 (49-55)

The next passage interpreted by Philo is Gen 3:9, God calling Adam; "Where art thou?" (ποῦ εἶ). This is generally taken as a summons to the mind, represented by Adam, with all its faculties, including sense-perception, represented by Eve — even though she was not called by name "because, being irrational, she has no capacity derived from herself to receive reproof." (49-50) Following this traditional understanding, Philo provides four other interpretations, two by taking the divine words as declarative (51-52) and two by taking them as interrogative (53-55). In the first declarative sense, ποῦ ("where") is taken as ποῦ ("in a place"), suggesting man's confinement to a place, whereas God is omnipresent. In the second declarative interpretation, the divine words are given the following dynamic equivalency: "Where hast thou arrived, O soul (ὤ ψυχή)," showing its degeneration. In this unusual usage of ὤ ψυχή God is addressing the human soul.37 The two interrogative interpretations are given by way of answering the question "where?": the first response is "nowhere", since the bad man is actually "placeless"; the second is that the bad man is with those who do not listen to God, who hide from Him, and who shun virtue. The latter is said to be the true meaning of "nakedness" (Gen 3:10), i.e., "that by which the mind is found unprovided and unclothed with virtue." (55) This was the meaning implied by the Prophet (Moses).

It is reasonable to suggest Philo's originality at this juncture. Amplifying the words spoken by God is invariably related to prophesying.38

Leg All III 74 (65-78)

After commenting on God cursing the serpent, i.e., pleasure, without allowing him to defend himself (Gen 3:14-15), and slaying Er, i.e., the body, without bringing an open charge against him as stipulated in Deut 19:17 (Gen 38:7), Philo addresses his soul (ὁ ψυχή) as a corpse bearer until perfected. Then, to the one wondering how the God of goodness came to create the serpent and Er, he speaks somewhat homiletically about the goodness or grace of God in creating.

Philo brings together two passages to emphasize the abominable nature of pleasure and its sly, sly lurking within the body — itself wicked by nature and a

37 For comparable, non-personal use of ὤ ψυχή, see Somn II 296 and Quaeis Gen 4.8; for a similar use of ὤ διάνοια, see Spec Leg I 299, all treated below.

38 Cf. Spec Leg I 210, treated below.
plotter against the soul. He then resorts to the Platonic dichotomy between the soul and the body, the eternal and the temporal realities of which he often speaks.

Leg All III 116, 158 (114-160)

The curse on the serpent is a curse on pleasure. “On thy breast and belly shalt thou go” (Gen 3:14) indicates the regions of pleasure in our soul, the head being the region of reason (114). There follows a two-part commentary, one on the breast (115-137) and the other on the belly (138-160). In the first part Philo begins by addressing his understanding (ὡς διανοια) to look for pleasure in its proper regions and not in the head, where reason, being at war with the passions, ought to prevail. He then refers to the Urim and Thummim (the Showing and the Truth) on Aaron’s breastplate (Ex 28:30; cf. Lev 8:8) as controls on high spirit and lust. In the second part, Philo concludes by referring to personal experiences at banquets and by addressing his soul (ὡς ψυχή) to bring reason to bear on all things, as Deut 23:13 suggests: to cover all excretion or unseemliness with the shovel, i.e., to bring reason “to bear upon the demands of the belly”. Philo’s use of ὡ is once more part of a framing device bracketing his interpretation of a biblical verse (the first ὡ at the beginning of his interpretation of the first part and the second ὡ at the conclusion of his interpretation of the second part). The serpent’s movement on the belly receives one final and brief interpretation as turmoil and lack of tranquility experienced by those who pursue pleasure. The argument is summed up in a series of short statements on the belly, leading to a fundamental conclusion:

The lover of pleasure moves on the belly; the perfect man washes out the entire belly; the man who is making gradual progress washes out the contents of the belly; the man who is just beginning his training will go forth without, when he intends to curb passion by bringing reason (figuratively called a shovel) to bear upon the demands of the belly (159).

Philo concludes that Moses disagrees “with those who say that pleasure is tranquil” (160).39

---

39 As Colson notes, Philo probably alludes to the Epicureans (PLCL I, 408 n. a, 483).
Leg All III 165 (161-181)

Philo is about to begin a new phase of interpreting Gen 3:14, emphasizing the last part of the verse: “Earth shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.” He begins by contrasting the earthly and the heavenly aspects of the human being (quoting Gen 2:7), the earthly food essential for the body and the heavenly food or manna (i.e., the words of God) essential for the soul. After referring to the daily gathering of manna (Ex 16:4), Philo exhorts his soul (ὡς ψυχή) to cross over from the passions and to sacrifice the Passover, “to take the forward step, whose symbol is the lamb, not without measure, for he says ‘each man shall reck on what suffices for him as a lamb.”’ (Ex 12:4) In addition to his play on the word “lamb” (πρόβατον, literally, “that walks forward”) and relating the “what suffices” of the latter verse to the sufficient gathering of manna in the previous verse, Philo extols the peculiarities of the divine word(s). He relates the hardening of the manna (Ex 16:14) to the solidification of the waves in the midst of the sea (Ex 15:8); the first leading to the amazement of those who inquire “What is it?” (Ex 16:15) that gladdens them, and the second to enable the soul to cross over from the passions to feast on the divine word (173). This feeding on manna is associated with Deut 8:3, God afflicting with hunger those whom He feeds with manna, thus indicating that “not on bread alone shall man live, but on every word that goeth forth through the mouth of God.” “This affliction is propitiation” and is in keeping with Lev 16:30. Those who do not know this word are those who clamor to return to Egypt (Num 14:4), that is “to passion”, instead of being fed by the word — even by a part of it (176).40

Concluding with lessons drawn from the lives of the patriarchs, Philo cites the example of Jacob, who “looking even higher than the word, says that he is fed by God himself” (alluding to Gen 48:15-16). This divine nurture extends to healing through the Angel, who is the Word, even when healing comes through medical science or the physician’s skill (178). This is quite contrary to what Joseph says to his father: “... and I will nourish thee there.” (Gen 45:9-11) In an imagined speech Philo has Jacob chide Joseph, addressing him ὃς ὁντος (179), and

40 The preceding section bears much resemblance to the Johannine discourse on the Bread of Life (John 6); for more on this subject, see P. Borgen, Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 10), Leiden: Brill, 1965.
reminding him that God will Himself satisfy those needs. Here Joseph commits the same mistake as did his mother Rachel when she demanded of Jacob “Give me children.” (Gen 30:1) Philo goes on to put similarly chiding words in Jacob’s mouth, who rebukes Rachel by inviting her to consider her sister Leah, whose womb the Lord opened (Gen 29:31), and by reminding her that God as husband opens the wombs of virtue (181).

Cher 29 (21-30)

Commenting on the two Cherubim and the Flaming Sword, Philo offers three interpretations. The first two of these, both cosmological, are presumably by others: 1) the two Cherubim represent the moving planets and the fixed stars, and the Sword the revolution of the whole heaven (21-24); 2) the two Cherubim represent the two hemispheres of the heaven, and the Sword the sun (25-26). The third, a theological interpretation, in the course of which Philo addresses his understanding (ο διάνοια) quite enthusiastically, is the one preferred by him: the two Cherubim represent the two chief Powers of God; His loving-kindness and His sovereignty, while the Sword is the Logos which unites the two (27-30). This last interpretation is apparently his own.

Cher 52 (40-52)

No such phrase as “Adam knew his wife” (Gen 4:1) appears in conjunction with the great patriarchy such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses, suggesting that their wives, unlike Eve, are virgin virtues that receive seed from God “the Father of all” and bear offspring to those men who possess them — a mystery too deep to comprehend (the examples of Sarah in Gen 21:1, Leah in 29:31, Rebecca in

---


42 All eight instances of ῥεῖ in Abr and Jos, e.g., are in contexts where Philo puts words in the mouths of the patriarchs as he amplifies a scriptural text.

43 For more on this theme and its dualism, see my complementary note on Quas Ex 1.23 in PAPM 34c, 277-278; also D. Winston, Philo of Alexandria: The Contemplative Life, the Giants, and Selections (Classics of Western Spirituality), New York / Toronto: Paulist Press, 1981, 23-24.

44 Cf. his similar interpretation of Gen 18:6-7 in Quaes Gen 4.8, treated below.
25:21, and Zipporah in Ex 2:22 are cited). But those initiated into the divine mysteries, like Jeremiah and Philo himself, could learn the full lesson. Philo addresses the initiates (ὦ μυσται, 48) ⁴⁵ and recounts his own experience:

I myself was initiated under Moses the God-beloved into his greater mysteries, yet when I saw the prophet Jeremiah and knew him to be not only himself enlightened, but a worthy minister of the holy secrets, I was not slow to become his disciple (49). ⁴⁶

Philo was astounded by “an oracle spoken in the person of God to Virtue”, which he found in Jer 3:4: “Didst thou not call upon Me as thy house, thy father and the husband of thy virginity?” This he relates to Abraham’s not consorting with Sarah “till she has ceased from all that is after the manner of women (Gen 18:11), and is ranked once more as a pure virgin.” (50) He concludes by addressing his soul (ὦ ψυχή) not to beget Cain, as did Adam when he knew his wife, but to live in virginity (51-52).

As often elsewhere, Philo’s ecstatic pronouncements here are contextually determined. Even in what follows (53-64), he begins a new section on the birth of Cain by asking the lawgiver (ὦ τεχνίτα, “O author”), “Who or what is this Cain?”, i.e., the offspring of the mind and the senses.

Sacr 20 (19-44)

Commenting on Deut 21:15-17, the law forbidding the disinheritance of the first-born by the hated wife (i.e., virtue) in favor of the younger child by the beloved wife (i.e., pleasure), Philo begins by evoking his soul (ὦ ψυχή) and goes on to allegorize very descriptively pleasure and virtue, the one a harlot and the other a chaste woman, pressing their claims upon the mind (20). In this parabolic dis-

---

⁴⁵ Cf. Leg All III 219: ὦ μυσται (“O initiates”), when speaking of the joy and laughter that accompany Sarah’s begetting Isaac (Gen 21:6), contrasted with Eve’s malediction (200-221, on Gen 3:16-19); Fuge 85: ὦ μυσται καὶ ἱεροφάνται θείων ὀργίων (“O initiates and hierophants of the divine mysteries”), speaking at the conclusion of a lengthy discussion on the flight to the cities of refuge (53-84, on Num 35), suggesting that such flight is for the initiates and hierophants of the holy mysteries, who truly understand the difference between the voluntary and the involuntary. See also, below, on Sacr 64 (52-71, esp. 60). Of a contrary spirit are the derogatory words to initiates in the pagan mysteries (ὦ μυσται) in Spec Leg I 320 (319-324).

⁴⁶ Cf. Quaes Gen 2.43, where Philo refers to Isaiah as “disciple of Moses”. On Philo’s quotations from the prophets, see Marcus, PLCL Suppl. II, 126 n. i.
course Philo has both women address the mind (ὡ ὀντος, 22, 32), one with enticing words and the other with cautionary words about the lures of the former.\(^\text{47}\) The section ends with a diatribe, with Philo and virtue blending their voices on the necessity of toil to attain the virtuous life (35-44).\(^\text{48}\) Their appeal is to be like the first-born worthy of such a perfect inheritance given by the Father, as were both Jacob and Isaac (Gen 33:11; 25:5), unlike the children of little worth born of the concubines Hagar and Keturah (Gen 25:6).

In spite of the several reminiscences from classical antiquity, Philo's inspired application of these traditional elements to the biblical text is apparently original with him. Here too is found that notoriously long, asyndetic list of 147 vices characteristic of the lover of pleasure, the longest vice list in all of classical literature (33).\(^\text{49}\)

\textit{Sacr 64 (52-71)}

Commenting on Cain's tardiness suggested in Gen 4:3, that he offered fruit "after some days", Philo gives a homily on timely service, addressing those (ὡ ὀντος) "with whom memory is dead and oblivion strong and living" (55) and reminding them through several texts to remedy their forgetfulness of God (Deut 8:12-14, 17-18; 9:5). He speaks of the "buried cakes" prepared quickly by Sarah during the theophany at Mamre (Gen 18:6) and by the Israelites at the time of the Exodus (Ex 12:39). He explains the "buried cakes" in terms of "inmost mysteries" and "the knowledge of divine rites" (60) and then appeals to his soul (ὡ ψυχή) to be quick like Jacob who had a ready answer to his father when asked (Gen 27:20), "What is this that thou hast found so quickly (i.e., knowledge imparted by God), my son (ὡ τέκνον)?"\(^\text{50}\) Philo concludes by having "someone" (τις) address as "fools" (ὡ μάταιοι) those who are slow to come to God for healing (70-71).

\(^{47}\) Cf. the fable attributed to Prodicus in which Vice and Virtue plead with Hercules as he hesitates at the crossroad of life (in Xenophon, \textit{Memorabilia} 2.1).

\(^{48}\) The diatribe abounds with Stoic overtones, apparently aimed at Epicurus.


\(^{50}\) For more on Philo's remarks on initiation in the divine mysteries, see above, on \textit{Cher} 52 (40-52, esp. 48); for a comparable treatment of the theophany at Mamre, see below, on \textit{Quaes Gen} 4.8.
Sacr 101 (98-101)

From Gen 4:4, Abel’s separating the first-born of his sheep for an offering to God, Philo moves to a secondary text: Ex 13:11-12, the admonition to set apart every firstling for the Lord in the land He swore to give to the patriarchs and to their descendants. As he dwells homiletically on the various phrases of the latter passage, Philo focuses on the verb “to separate”. Citing man’s misconceptions of God, ever described in human terms so as “to help our feeble apprehension”, Philo admonishes his soul (ὡς ἐξερχόμενος) to separate or to put aside all its misconceptions of God. The relating of the secondary passage to the primary and the lesson drawn are apparently original with him.

Quod Det 13 (1-31)

Commenting on “the plain” as “a figure of contest” between Abel and Cain (Gen 4:8), Philo cites the experiences of Jacob, Joseph, and Isaac in “the plain” (Gen 31:4-5; 37:12-17; and 24:63-65). Regarding Joseph, to whom the major part of this section is devoted (5-28), Philo wonders why Jacob did not dispatch one of his many servants instead of his beloved son to bring word about his other children. Before ruling out the literalness of the biblical passage and giving an allegorical explanation, Philo addresses his understanding (ὡς διώκων), pondering the blessings that come when searching the oracles of God:

If, O my understanding, thou searchest on this wise into the oracles which are both words of God and laws given by men whom God loves, thou shalt not be compelled to admit anything base or unworthy of their dignity.

Here he seems to underscore a basic necessity for allegorical interpretation. The ensuing interpretation that this was a summons for Joseph to leave “the halls of the body and the senses” and to aspire for “the spirit of steadfastness” and to pursue “justice and all virtue” is apparently his own; as is also the parallel interpretation of “the plain” as a contest between two opposing principles: the feminine or lower nature and the masculine traits, the higher calling to acquire knowledge. Three secondary texts are employed in this central part to underscore the progression from the lower to the higher nature: Lev 14:37-42; Deut 16:20;

51 For similar treatments of the biblical text by Philo, see above, on Leg All III 11,17 (1-27).
and Gen 18:11 (16, 18, and 28; cf. the three patriarchal examples employed to elucidate the primary text).

Equally noteworthy is Philo's derogatory allusion to other exegetes who claim that the man who found Joseph wandering in the plain is anonymous (Gen 37:15). Philo insists that there is no anonymity here: what better name is there than simply "man" and all that this name implies? This is "the most proper title of a mind endowed with reason", the "man" dwelling within us, the censuring conscience that sets us straight when we stray.

Post 35 (132-135)

Philo interprets Rebecca's offering water to Eliezer and drawing water for his camels (Gen 24:16-20) as true teaching. He describes her as "a virgin and a very beautiful virgin", like virtue, identified with Leah, the hated wife (Gen 29:31).

"For Leah, estrangement on the human side brings about fellowship with God, and from Him she receives the seed of wisdom . . . and brings forth beautiful ideas." Having come to this awareness, he then beseeches his soul (δ ῥυχή) to follow Leah's example.

Gig 44 (40-44)

Commenting on the latter part of Lev 18:6, "I am the Lord," Philo appeals to an imagined hearer (ὁ γεωργ) to weigh irrational pleasure, "the good as the flesh sees it", against "the mind of the universe, even God", "the good as it exists in the soul and in the All" (40). He then admonishes his soul (δ ῥυχή), "If any of the love-lures of pleasure invite thee, turn thysclf aside . . . Look rather on the genuine beauty of virtue . . . ." Evidently, the imagined hearer is Philo, speaking to himself.

Quod Deus 4 (1-19)

In his exegesis of Gen 6:4, on the angels of God and the daughters of men, Philo emphasizes the latter part: "begat for themselves . . . ." He contrasts those who beget for themselves with Abraham and Hannah, each of whom gives their only

52 Overlooked by Hay, "Philo's References to Other Allegorists," 42-43.
child to God (Gen 22:9-12; 1 Sam 1:24-28). These contrasts begin with Philo addressing his understanding (ὁ διάκονος) and end with him admonishing those who approach God with prayer and sacrifice to do so with a pure heart, knowing that they are bringing to Him what is His own (Num 28:2). After touching on what Isaac and Samuel represent allegorically, Philo brings in a further contrast: Onan, who out of selfishness refuses to beget for another (Gen 38:9). The comparisons between the respective groups and the relating of the biblical characters associated with the theme of begetting for another is apparently original with him.

Quod Deus 114 (111-116)

Philo contrasts Gen 6:8, “Noah found grace with the Lord God,” with Gen 39:21, Joseph “who found grace with the ruler of the prison,” the prison of the passions (86-110). Following this comparison, seldom considered alongside the major negative assessments of Joseph in Philo’s allegory (especially when he comments on the patriarch while in Egypt), he counsels those in the prison of the passions to avoid seeking the grace of their jailer and admonishes his soul (ὁ ψυχή) to seek “a life-purpose which is unchained and liberated and free”.

Migr 169 (148-172)

Commenting on Lot going with Abraham, Philo contemplates similar hindrances caused when the “mixed multitude” went out of Egypt with Israel and when Joseph was accompanied by the Egyptians to his father’s funeral (148-163). He then gives examples of good travelling companions: Abraham’s comrades in war, Isaac going with Abraham to sacrifice, and Moses ascending the mountain with Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and the seventy elders in response to the divine invitation in Ex 24:1: “Come up to thy Lord.” (164-168) The latter thought causes Philo to exclaim: “Come up, O soul (ὁ ψυχή) to behold the Existent One.” (169-170) He then quotes and amplifies the prayer of Moses (Ex 23:15): “If Thou Thyself goest not with me on my journey, lead me not up hence,” and concludes with the thought that God should be our fellow-traveler (171-172).54

53 But see Leg All III 218-219, where Abraham is in error for assuming that he begot Isaac, since Isaac is begotten by the Lord.

54 Cf. Plant 53; ὁ διάκονος ("O Master"), Philo praying in the spirit of the prayer of Moses in Ex 15:17-18. On similar participation in prayer with Abraham, see above, on Leg All III 11, 17 (1-27, esp. 10).
Migr <219>, 222 (216-223)

Contemplating Abraham's journey from Haran to Shechem or "shoulder" (Gen 12:6), Philo dwells on the patriarch's travel "through the country", i.e., the soul's search for wisdom. He then addresses himself: "Travel through man also, if thou wilt, O my soul (ὁ ψυχή), bringing to examination each component part of him." Philo spells out these components, culminating with "virtue generally and moral welfare" (219). He urges his soul to travel also "through the greatest and most perfect man, this universe, and scan narrowly its parts," however difficult the task may be. He quotes Gen 49:15, alluding to Issachar "submitting his shoulder to labor". This prompts Philo to address his understanding (ὁ διάνοια) to show neither weakness nor slackness in this pursuit, even as the oak of Shechem symbolically indicates.

Heres <69>, 71 (63-74)

In response to Abraham's question, "Who then shall be the heir?" (Gen 15:4) Philo presents the divine response as inducing inspiration, with Abraham assuming the role of a prophet (63-67). Philo interprets the words "He who shall come out of thee" in terms of the soul leaving the body (i.e., the land), the senses (i.e., the kinsfolk), and speech (i.e., the parental home). He urges his soul (ὁ ψυχή) to experience the same by becoming a fugitive and possessed with divine madness (68-70). He then implores his mind or understanding (ὁ διάνοια) to tell its experience of departure "from the first three" as did Abraham, and "the mind's confession" follows. Philo then begs his mind to depart from itself, which departure he explains as quitting its own thinking, purposing, and apprehending — another set of three (71-74). Philo is thus vacating his mind for divine inspiration.

Fuga 213 (202-213)

Philo concludes this treatise by commending his soul (ὁ ψυχή) for not failing to dip "deep into the school-lore knowledge" and to see reflected in that well (suggested by the fountain of wisdom by which Hagar was found by the angel, Gen 16:7) the Author of that knowledge. Although his use of the verb "to see" is conditioned by the emphasis he places on sight as superior to hearing in the
immediate context (note his etymology of “Israel”, 208), these concluding remarks seem to convey a reflection on the various “flights” contemplated throughout the treatise, for here he returns to the theme indicated at its beginning (1-2).

Mut 255 (252-260)

In response to Abraham’s prayer for Ishmael (Gen 17:18), God discloses to the patriarch that Sarah will bear him a son (verse 19): “Abraham asked for one thing, God gave him two.” Philo assures his soul (ὁ ψυχή, translated “O soul of man” by Colson in PLCL) that Sarah (i.e., virtue, the despised wife like Leah whose womb was also opened by the Ruler of all, Gen 29:31) will bear it a son — “the self-taught”; so will also Hagar (i.e., learning of the primary schools) bear it a son — “the creature of teaching”. In his monologue, Philo goes on to praise the greater gift, the self-taught Isaac nature, which is heaven-sent like the manna and the ready harvest of the sabbatical year, unlike the other aided by human attainment.  

Somn I 149 (146-149)

Philo comments on Jacob’s vision of the ladder (Gen 28:12), giving four possible explanations for the ladder (133-156). In the second of these explanations he identifies it with the soul on which the divine words move up and down (146-149). He concludes this explanation by exhorting his soul (ὁ ψυχή) “to become a house of God”. It appears that he favors this second explanation and that without ruling out the others — all of which may be attributed to him: the ladder symbolizes air, and thus, the habitation of unbodied souls; it represents the patriarch’s constant ups and downs; or, similarly, the oscillation of fortune in eve-
ryday life.

Somn II 68, 76 (68-77)

As sheaves are grasped by reapers, so arc luxuries grasped by those given to vain-glory symbolized by Joseph (31-67). This leads Philo to contemplate Deut 25:11-12, cutting off the hand of the immodest woman who seizes a man by his private parts, as he admonishes his soul (ὁ ψυχή) to cut off its hand or faculty when it reaches to base things, symbolized by “pairs” (68-69). Philo then contrasts the latter passage with Lev 2:1-2, presenting a handful of the firstfruit of grain, and concludes with another admonishment to his mind or understanding (ὁ δύναμις) to bring the firstfruit of its reaping from virtue’s land (75-77).

Somn II 176, 179 (164-180)

At the conclusion of a familiar interpretation of the vine as a symbol of true gladness (“this vine of which we could take but a part men aptly liken to gladness,” 172), based on the story of the twelve spies in Num 13, Philo applies the symbolic meaning of the vine to God: “and in this I have the witness of one of the ancient prophets who under inspiration said, ‘The vineyard of the Lord Almighty is the house of Israel.’” (Is. 5:7) He adds that God rejoices over Israel, those who pursue righteousness, and quotes Deut 30:9-10. He then addresses himself: “Dost thou wish, O mind (ὁ δύναμις), that God should be glad? Be glad thyself...” and goes on to justify the reality of God’s gladness by its opposite, His wrath, provoked by “those who live a life of guilt.” Consequently, he admonishes his mind (ὁ δύναμις), “Practice those things only by which thou shalt make God glad,” those things “stationed just beside thee,” as Moses exhorts in Deut 30:12-14.

Somn II 296 (296-299)

In his systematic and lengthy commentary on the two parallel dreams of Pharaoh (Gen 41:17-24), a commentary preserved only in part (215-302), Philo eventually comes to the words “upon the edge [or, lip] of the river”, the river symbol-
izing the flow of speech and the lip(s) the necessary control(s). Following a series of biblical passages that enjoin silence as well as speech, singing as well as oratory, he presents a second series of passages that have the word “lip”. The last of these is Lev 5:4-5, the law forbidding rash oaths, on which he elaborates: “The lawless soul which distinguishes with its lips to do well or do ill... shall proclaim its sin,” by addressing itself (ὁ ψυχή), “brimful of presumptuous folly”. One has to admit that such knowledge is “reserved for God alone, and for whoso is God’s friend.” He then quotes Deut 32:39. (This is the second instance of ὁ ψυχή where Philo is not addressing his own soul, mind or understanding — unless he is including himself among violators of the law forbidding rash oaths.)

Spec Leg I 210 (198-223)

At the conclusion of a detailed explanation of whole-burnt offerings presented to honor God, Philo invokes his understanding (ὁ διάνοια) as he thanks God for the universe with its various parts and humanity with its various people. Then follows a lengthy discourse with reflections on the various parts of sacrificial animals offered as peace offerings. At the beginning of the discourse Philo alludes to other exegetes whom he challenges to find more convincing interpretations (212-214), and at the conclusion he has God speak to the worshipper who deviates from the prescribed way of sacrificing: “Poor fool... who even in thy dreams hast caught no glimpse of what sacrifice means.” (Putting words in God’s mouth is tantamount to prophesying; cf. Cher 48, the remarks on Jeremiah, who out of his inspiration gave forth an oracle spoken in the person of God.)

Spec Leg I 299 (299-318)

At the outset of his homily on the moral lessons of the Law in Deut 10-13, Philo attributes his words to Moses who addresses (human) understanding (ὁ διάνοια) and goes on to exalt virtue. The clear implication of the opening line is that the

---

59 For comparable, non-personal use of ὁ ψυχή, see Leg All III 52, treated above, and Ques Gen 4.8, treated below; for a similar use of ὁ διάνοια, see Spec Leg I 299, treated below.

60 For other instances where Philo puts words in the mouth of Moses, see Quod Deus 61-62: ὁ οὗτοι...; Virt 127: ὁ γενναί... Cf. Cher 53: ὁ τεχνίτη (“O author”), Philo speaking to Moses; Fuga 58: ὁ πάνωσθε (“O thou wisest [of teachers]”), marveling at Moses’ declaration of life and death in Deut 30 (although Moses is unnamed, this epithet is used by Philo almost exclusively for him: Quod Det 126; Post 28, 169; Gig 56; Agr 20, 43; Plant 27; Migr 45, 76; Abr 13; Vita Mos 2.204; Spec Leg II 194; 4.69, 157, 175).
entire homily is given by inspiration. Philo's role as an interpreter of Moses is well illustrated here: he identifies himself so closely with Moses that he articulates the Prophet's mind! This is the only instance of ὁ διάνοιας in our examples where Philo is not addressing his mind directly; however, he probably considers himself to be foremost among the assumed addressees of Moses in this mostly imagined speech.61

Quaes Gen 4.8

In this commentary on Gen 18:6-7, part of the narrative on God's appearance to Abraham at Mamre, Philo begins with a simultaneous consideration of the literal and the allegorical meanings. He commends the patriarch and his wife for their hospitality, seen in their haste to serve the "three strange men", and goes on just as hastily himself to treat Abraham as "pure mind" and Sarah as "virtue", praising their swift cooperation in serving God and His two chief Powers.

In his numerological elaborations on the "three measures of wheat-flour" Philo contemplates the three traditional categories of existence (beginning, middle and end), the Homeric dictum that "all things are divided into three," (Iliad 15.139) the Pythagorean teaching on the triad and the right-angled triangle, the three Platonic stages of creation (intelligible, sense-perceptible and sublunary), and finally the divine triad (the Existent One with His Creative and Kingly Powers). For Philo, "God alone is the measure of all things" (cf. Migr 92-3), who in His Oneness is perceived as a triad by those unable to attain to the One, unlike Moses who asked to see God (Ex 33:13, the only secondary text quoted in this section).62 In what follows is found one of Philo's most profound explanations of the mystical apprehension of God. Moreover, in the immediately following phrase, "O thrice happy and thrice fortunate soul" (Arm. τρισευδάμον καὶ τρισμακάρα ψυχῇ), the word "thrice" seems to be contextually conditioned.63 At this point Philo is addressing the soul initiated into the divine mysteries, "in which God has not disdained to dwell and move and to make it His palace." Although here

61 For comparable, non-personal use of ὁ ψυχή, see Leg All III 52 and Somn II 296, both treated above; and Quaes Gen 4.8, treated immediately below.

62 Cf. Post 13, 16 and Mut 8, where the same passage is quoted.

63 These two superlative adjectives are likewise paired in Jos 20 and Spec Leg I 31; cf. Op 135, 172; Leg All I 4; Dec 104; Spec Leg III 178; and Praem 122.
he makes no direct reference to his own soul, his statement tends to include personal experience — akin perhaps to the experiences of Abraham and Moses.\textsuperscript{64}

As for the question of originality in his treatment of this passage, especially the interpretation of Abraham's experience at Mamre in mystical terms, we are apt to discern Philo's contribution — more so when we consider his other major treatment of the same passage in \textit{Abr} 107-132.\textsuperscript{65} In the latter, he gives the literal interpretation first (107-118), emphasizing both the hospitality and the piety of the host, and then the allegorical (119-132). Here he mildly criticizes those who ascribe the name "God" to the "two shadows" or "senior Powers" accompanying the Father of the Universe (120), while he himself applies the title "God" to one, the Creative or Beneficent Power, and the title "Lord" to the other, the Kingly or Governing Power.\textsuperscript{66} Following some details on the appearance of God sometimes as one and sometimes as three, or the single and triple apprehension of God in mystic contemplation, Philo emphasizes his contribution to the interpretive enterprise (126). He then has God speak "to those whose souls have ears" (τοῖς ἀκοῖς ἐχοστὶν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ) or to such as himself — as when he speaks to his soul (127-130). He concludes with the observation assumed at the beginning of \textit{Quaes Gen} 4.8, that the biblical text is at once literal and allegorical (131-132).\textsuperscript{67}

\textit{Quaes Gen} 4.21

In his commentary on Gen 18:17, a text that lends itself equally to mystical interpretation ("Shall I conceal from my servant Abraham what I do?"); Philo begins with the words "O happy soul" (Arm. \textit{μη βηδώνῃ ἡ σιγήν ὃ μακάρια} (or, \textsuperscript{64} For his non-personal use of ὡς ψυχή, see \textit{Leg All III} 52 and \textit{Somn II} 296; and for his non-personal use of ὡς διάνοια, see \textit{Spec Leg I} 299 — all treated above. His participation in the perceived mystical experiences of the patriarchs is borne also in the remaining three passages from the \textit{Quaestiones}. For a comparable self-understanding on his part, see \textit{Leg All III} 11, 17 (1-27), treated above.

\textsuperscript{65} The Genesis passage (18:6-7) appears among secondary texts in \textit{Sacr} 59-60, as part of the commentary on Gen 4:3; see my observations on \textit{Sacr} 64 (52-71), treated above.

\textsuperscript{66} Hay, "Philo's References to Other Allegorists," 42-43, overlooks this passage. For a similar interpretation of the cherubim covering the Ark of the Covenant, see \textit{Cher} 29 (21-30), treated above.

The wording here bears some similarity to the ecstatic exclamation in *Quaes Gen* 4.8, and the use of adjectives in conjunction with such exclamations to the soul is limited to these two instances in *Quaes Gen*. As in the latter, there is a longing for Abraham’s experience: to see nature in its entirety when God removes the veil so that the mind can see and comprehend the finest sight. “This is the consummation of the contemplative life,” declares Philo. The Genesis passage is treated similarly by him in *Leg All III* 27 and *Sobr* 56.69

**Quaes Gen 4.138**

The passage constitutes a response to a perceived mystical meaning in Gen 24:62 (“Isaac went through the wilderness by the well of Seeing”). Philo does not resort to his usual differentiation between literal and allegorical meanings here. Instead, and as one possessed by God, he immediately embarks on an ecstatic journey over a grand highway of divine contemplation suggested by the biblical text. He soars at the outset with the use of the exclamatory ὁ and followed by several vocatives. He then addresses his mind (Arm. *νυ θυμο πρὸς [ὁ διάυοια]*)70 and exhorts it to go on beholding the incorporeal realm which Isaac or “laughter” was able to behold at that well or source of all wisdom called “Seeing”.

The encounter between Isaac and Rebecca, who like Sarah represents Virtue and Sophia interchangeably, becomes an important springboard for Philo’s mysticism. This is seen in nearly all of his comments on the patriarchal couple in this book of the *Quaestiones*.71

**Quaes Ex 2.51**

This last of the ecstatic statements in the *Quaestiones*, like the previous three, appears in a response to a question that employs a biblical text suggestive of mys-

---

68 Arm. *ὑγωνοθή* is the equivalent of μακάρος in *Dec* 4 and *Quaes Gen* 2.54 (frag.), and of εὐδαιμον in *Vita Cont* 6 and *Spec Leg I* 329.

69 The first of these passages is treated above: see the comments on *Leg All III* 11, 17 (1-27).

70 Marcus notes the corresponding Greek as ὁ νοῦ (PLCL Suppl. I, 418 n. k; but see II, 98 n. e. noted below, n. 72); this form, however correct, is not found in Philo. Arm. *νυ θυμο πρὸς [ὁ διάυοια* is the exact equivalent of ὁ διάυοια (as in *Spec Leg I* 299; cf. *Leg All I* 49; II 91, 106).

71 For more on Philo’s treatment of Isaac see Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, 153-166; idem, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 143-145.
ticism. The text, Ex 25:8 (LXX 25:7: "Thou shalt make for Me a sanctuary, and I shall appear among you"), is allegorized as the appearance of God's Beneficent Power, seen in all of His creation. Whereupon Philo addresses his mind (Arm. ἀληθὴς [ὁ διάνοια]) to purify itself, to adapt itself to the vision of holiness, to become worthily initiated as a living temple so as to be able to see God when He appears in such a sanctuary.

Summary and Conclusions

Literary inspiration and thereby creativity, such as the kind described by the anonymous author of De sublimate, may be discerned in Philo's use of the exclamatory ὅ with the vocative — especially when addressing his soul, mind or understanding. His frequent use of the exclamatory ὅ with διάνοια or ψυχή proved to be peculiar to him and consistently suggestive of inspiration, thereby making it probable that we are dealing with an identifiable stratum of originality in his biblical interpretations. These formulaic exclamations may be taken as his personal imprint upon his work. His claims to inspiration, whether direct or indirect, seem to have a bearing on his literary output: they hold sufficient indicators of some originality of thought in their immediate contexts. This is not to say that only those parts of Philo's writings are genuinely his where he takes off under the impact of inspiration by addressing his mind or soul, but that of all that he has written, these passages seem to be the least questionable when considering the originality of his thought.

Philo's use of ὅ διάνοια and ὅ ψυχή introduces personal prayers, homilies, exhortations, amplifications of the biblical text and, most importantly, interpretations where he apparently differs from other exegeses. Generally speaking, his use of ὅ comes either at the beginning or, as in most cases, at the end of his interpretation of a given passage. When found at the beginning, the vocative is at

---

72 Marcus notes the corresponding Greek as ὅ νοον or διάνοια (PLCL Suppl. II, 98 n. e); cf. n. 70, above.

73 Although the use of ὅ ψυχή is attested among 5th-century BC authors (see above, n. 7), some biblical influence on Philo cannot be ruled out when considering the LXX Psalter; see, e.g., Ps 103:1, 2, 22 and 104:1, 35 (LXX 102:1, 2, 22 and 103:1, 35). Both psalms have "Bless the Lord, O my soul" (LXX: ἡ ψυχή μου) at the beginning and at the end; cf. Ps 42:5, 11 (LXX 41:6, 12 ψυχῇ); 43:5 (LXX 42:5 ψυχῇ); 62:5 (LXX 61:6 ἡ ψυχῇ μου); 116:7 (LXX 114:7 ἡ ψυχῇ μου); 146:1 (LXX 145:1 ἡ ψυχῇ μου). It would seem that such a vocative might have inspired Philo — even though the LXX employs the definite article instead of the exclamatory ὅ.
times in conjunction with a claim to inspiration whereby the ensuing interpretation is given; when found at the end, it is often in conjunction with a prayer of gratitude for and an affirmation of the given or revealed interpretation. Thus, whether at the beginning or at the end or in the middle, his enthusiastic outbursts with the exclamatory ὡ can be taken as indirect claims to inspiration. His prayerful responses to immediately preceding interpretations are contextually conditioned. As a rule, the admonitions to his soul or mind are structured around the contrast between the mind and the senses, the categories of virtue and vice. In most instances he evokes his spirit more than he invokes the Spirit. The two, however, are not unrelated. Thus, his use of ὡ with reference to his διάνοια or ψυχή comes as an expression of joy, a rejoicing over his discovery of the hidden meaning of the text — even that which Moses himself had presumably intended. In such instances, the derived meaning can be attributed to him with a degree of certainty.

The question of Philo’s personal inspiration is invariably related to his view of prophetic inspiration, and our topic overlaps with the larger subject of prophecy, enthusiasm, or divine madness. To be sure, a discussion of the scant references to προφητεία, ἐνθουσιασμός, and θεια ψυχή in their various forms and other such terms in his writings would be pertinent for our subject. The pursuit of these notions, however, will take us beyond the immediate intent for this short study. Suffice it to say that the form-critical study of Philo’s literary inspiration need not revolve around his view of prophetic inspiration. Moreover, while this form-critical study provides but a partial answer to a complex question such as the originality of his thought, his distinctive exclamations in terms of ὡ διάνοια and ὡ ψυχή invariably impinge upon a number of other related subjects, such as his spirituality and mysticism. His participation in the perceived mystical experiences of the patriarchs, well reflected in some of the above considered passages, is a dominant theme in much of his elaborately allegorical writings — including the Quaestiones. In light of these observations, one wonders whether our author has been fairly credited for his originality in much of his works.

The emerging patterns of the use of ὡ in Philo, especially in conjunction with διάνοια and ψυχή are systemic and suggestive of his inventiveness. His use

---


75 Earlier views that do not allow Philo any great measure of originality, e.g., E. Stein, *Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandria* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 51), Giessen: Riecker, 1929, are highly questionable.
of this exclamatory word seems to be more deliberate than spontaneous, even in passages where he addresses God in prayers and canticles of thanksgiving, passages where he speaks to imagined audiences in his homilies, and others where he puts words in the mouths of his biblical characters, amplifying their words in dramatic discourses and joining in their prayers. All these and more, including allegorists with differing interpretations, are encountered when pursuing the use of ὁ in his writings.

Philo's distinctive exclamations of ὀ διάνοια and ὀ ψυχῇ are especially significant in contexts where either he has disagreed with a given interpretation and follows it up with one of his own, or having agreed with an interpretation he still comes up with another of his own. These ecstatic utterances are affirmations of stated meanings as well as praise for what seems to have been perceived through divine inspiration. In several instances Philo is equally enthusiastic about prophetic insights (predominantly Mosaic) supposed to contain inherently the very understanding that he has and for which he thanks God with spiritual outbursts. Through these exclamations he seeks — it seems — to establish an affinity with the divine source, the universal Mind or Spirit. It is in the respective contexts of these ecstatic proclamations and exclamations where we are apt to find some significant elements of Philo's originality. This originality extends to instances of relating secondary texts to primary texts and to finding additional proof-texts to further substantiate interpretations that may or may not be altogether original with him.76

We may hence conclude that an identifiable stratum of originality in Philo is likely to be found in those contexts which include personal pronouncements suggestive of inspiration. More specifically, these include distinctively recognizable, formulaic exclamations (ὁ διάνοια and ὀ ψυχῇ) hitherto unidentified as peculiarly Philonic.

76 These observations lend some credibility to J. Cazeaux's more theoretical observations on Philo's originality, to be discerned in his ever-increasing and ever-unifying allegorization on a number of texts. Here, according to Cazeaux, is where Philo's originality as an interpreter lies, even if his work is part of a tradition which is in the process of consolidation: "Philo, l'allégorie et l'obsession de la totalité," in Études sur le Judaïsme hellénistique, Congrès de Strasbourg (1983) (Lectio Divina 119), ed. R. Kuntzmann and J. Schlosser, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1984, 267-320, esp. 268. Cf. Mack, "Philo Judaeus and Exegetical Traditions in Alexandria," according to whom Philo's work can be seen to be a repository for traditional exegetical accomplishments as well as a result of systematic efforts of his own (p. 227).
Back to Creation: The Beginning of Philo’s Third Great Commentary

There may be no better way to begin this essay than with a reference to Appendix I at the end of Runia’s elaborate and careful treatment of the Timaeus in Philo’s thought. There Runia invites attention to an overlooked and considerably difficult article by Nikiprowetzky, on the difficulties in establishing the relation between the two treatises De opificio mundi and Legum allegoriae, among other issues relating to Philo’s interpretation of the creation week in Gen 1-2. The difficulty of the article, as rightly stated, stems from the complexity of the texts with which it deals. Some of the issues raised by Nikiprowetzky, along with his sweeping conclusion that the Allegorical Commentary and the Exposition are basically one grand commentary, are incorporated in

---


3. These include the inconsistencies in Philo’s interpretation, the unfolding of the Timaean allegory of the descent of the soul in his interpretation of Gen 2, and that of the Phaedran myth of the ascent of the soul in subsequent treatises of the Allegorical Commentary, such as De migratione Abrahami and Quis rerum divinarum heres ist. In a projected excursus I shall follow up on Runia’s four-point summary in “Appendix I” and his observations on the two above-mentioned treatises. For a valid criticism of Nikiprowetzky’s views, especially on the inconsistencies in Philo’s interpretation, see T.H. Tobin, The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 14), Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983, 169-172.
his major work on Philo as an exegete. To a certain extent, this sweeping conclusion — if not methodological convenience — seems to rest also on a new assessment of scholarship a century old andmethodologically questionable, devoted to the chronology of Philo's works. In the sequel I shall address these difficulties and other problems indicated below, in an effort to clarify the basic issues in the debate over the proper place of De opificio among Philo's Pentateuchal commentaries.

Problems Without and Within

Topping the list of acknowledged problems is the Eusebian catalogue of Philo's works (Historia Ecclesiastica 2.18.1-8), where the Pentateuchal writings are arranged in two sets: those on Genesis constituting one, and those on Exodus and the remainder of the Pentateuch constituting the other (the Quæstiones are split between the two sets); a third set is entitled μονοβιβλία (single or non-serial books). Compounding the problem is Eusebius' omission of De opificio from the catalogue, along with four works that follow Legum allogoriae sequentially: De cherubim, De sacrifciis, Quod deterius, and De posteritate in the first set, as also De vita Mosis in the second, and De aeternitate and the first book of De Providentia in the third. Elsewhere he refers to De opificio in a unique way when introducing

---

4 Le commentaire de l'écriture chez Philon, 192-202: "Nous pensons que Philon a écrit en réalité non pas trois commentaires de l'écriture, mais seulement deux. La série des Quæstiones forme l'un de ceux-ci avec son caractère et ses problèmes particuliers; l'ensemble du Commentaire allégorique et de l'Exposition de la Loi constitue le second." (202) Elsewhere he calls this second division "le Commentaire allégorique — l'Exposition de la Loi", "le Grand Commentaire" or simply, "le Commentaire" (232, 241-242). Runia tends to concur with Nikiprowetzky's assessment of the Allegorical Commentary and the Exposition as basically one grand commentary since this helps eliminate the blunt distinction often made between "allegorical exegesis" when referring to the former and "literal exegesis" when referring to the latter (Philo of Alexandria and the Timeaus of Plato, 384-389, 416-420, 553-555; especially 386 n. 107, 555 Ad [3]).

5 One wonders about the extent to which Nikiprowetzky was influenced by the questionable views of L. Massebeau and E. Bréhier, who follow a rather bizarre methodology of reconstructing the chronology of Philo's works around the ever-changing political situation in 1st-century Alexandria: "Essai sur la Chronologie de la vie et des oeuvres de Philon," Revue de l'Histoire des Religions LIII (1906) 25-64, 164-185, 267-289. This work, completed and published by Bréhier after the death of Massebeau, in effect negates the earlier and much sounder work of Massebeau, "Le classement des oeuvres de Philon," Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences religieuses I (1889) 1-91.
extracts with this lemma: ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτου τῶν εἰς τὸν νόμον, "from the first of those [works] on the Law" (Praep Evang 8.12.21).

Intensifying the Eusebian problematics is the usual reading of Legum allegoriae immediately following De opificio, in keeping with the very sequence of Philo’s works in most printed editions and translations. However, De opificio is a thematic exposition, like the rest of the treatises in the Exposition, whereas those of the Allegorical Commentary are more exegetical and overly allegorical commentaries — especially Legum allegoriae. Moreover, the traditional placement of De opificio before Legum allegoriae has long been considered a supplementary insertion of a commentary on Gen 1, for want of a Philonic treatment of this chapter, since Legum allegoriae begins with Gen 2:1. Although this usual sequencing, often justified simply on the assumed yet unverifiable authority of Eusebius, lends itself on the one hand conveniently to certain deductive approaches in Philo scholarship (advancing the methodological preference of treating his cosmology in De opificio before treating his anthroplogy in Legum allegoriae), it compounds on the other hand the interpretative difficulties in-

6 Among the various translations the German is a rare exception: Philo von Alexandria: die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung [PCH], ed. L. Cohn, J. Heinemann et al., 7 vols., Breslau: S. Münz, 1909-1938 (Band 1-6 [repr. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962]); Berlin: De Gruyter (Band 7), 1964; it begins with De opificio followed by the works comprising the Exposition (vols. 1-2). It seems to me that Cohn and Heinemann chose to follow the order of the treatises as found in the preferred manuscripts (see Cohn and Wendland, Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt, 7 vols., Berlin: G. Reimer, 1862-1937 [repr. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962], Ii-lxxix). As Runia observes, "From the introductory words at GT 1.vi it would appear that Cohn-Wendland adopted the traditional order in their edition out of expediency rather than conviction," Philo of Alexandria and the Timeaus of Plato, 388 n 118; cf. L. Cohn, "Einteilung und Chronologie der Schriften Philos," Philologus Supplbd. 7 (1899) 392, 406-407. The tendency to place De opificio at the beginning of the Allegorical Commentary goes back to the first printed edition of Philo: “Le désordre commence avec la première édition de Philon, 1552. Plus tard Mangey, au lieu de le réparer, l'aggrave." (Massebeau, "Le classement des oeuvres de Philon," Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses 1 (1888) 36 n. 4)

7 For the earliest arguments favoring the placement of De opificio immediately before Book I of Legum allegoriae, see A. F. Dähne, "Einige Bemerkungen über die Schriften des Juden Philo," Theologische Studien und Kritiken VI (1833) 1000-1002. For the more convincing arguments on placing De opificio with the Exposition, followed by De Abrahamo, see A. Grüber’s response, Philo und die jüdisch-alexandrinische Theosophie, 2 vols., Stuttgart: Schweizerbart, 1835 (2nd ed.), I, 8-10.

8 A good example of such concerns is found in C. Mondésert’s introduction to Legum allegoriae I-III (Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie [PAPM], vol. 2), Paris: Éditions du Cerf,
herent in the respective works, besides creating some overlap between them. Nearly a third of De opificio is devoted to Gen 2, and it overlaps unsuitably with the contents of Book I of Legum allegoriae.

Establishing this part of the chronology of Philo’s works remains a fundamental introductory question that must be addressed — if not resolved — before establishing the “chronology” of his cosmology or any other aspect of his thought. This is not to imply that the latter cannot aid the former; on the contrary, and the more so in the absence of certainty on the proper sequence of certain works. Nor is our task intangible. Fortunately, there is a scholarly consensus on the five-fold division of the Philonic corpus (the three Pentateuchal commentaries, the philosophical treatises, and the apologetic / historical writings), and some recent advances have been made in determining the chronological loci of two of these divisions: the Quaestiones and the philosophical treatises. As for the last division, although its scope is not firmly established be-

1962, 17: “... il est important de ne pas trop séparer le de Opificio et le Legum allegoriae; il faut au contraire les éclairer l’un par l’autre, car le premier, comme le dit justement R. Arnaldez, donne le ‘fondement qui dirige l’emploi de l’allégorie’ pour l’interprétation du texte de l’Hexahémeron.”


cause of lost treatises, there have been no serious objections regarding its place within the corpus. Questions linger, however, on the proper place of De opificio within the established Gestalt: assigned either to the beginning of the second grand commentary, the Allegorical Commentary, or to that of the third, the Exposition (more on the tertiary place of the latter will be said later). On a broader scale, the subject with which we are dealing bears also on the place of the Exposition in relation to the Allegorical Commentary, and vice versa. Some important passages that help determine the place of De opificio have long been identified; unfortunately, however, they have been either shoved aside or twisted for the sake of affirming certain presuppositions.

Since most previous chronological configurations of Philo’s works rest on partial, questionable or misinterpreted data, there is need for a definitive study on our subject, one that would take into consideration all the internal evidence for the chronology at this juncture. But because the majority of these efforts, from antiquated 19th-century inquiries to more recent treatments of the subject such as that by Lucchesi,14 rely heavily on Eusebius in their final analyses, I shall begin with the external evidence: the pertinent testimonia of the ecclesiastical Father and the witness of the manuscript tradition. Afterwards, moving from textual to literary matters, I shall resort to key passages before focusing on the two treatises De opificio and Legum allegoriae together, and shall conclude by assessing anew the relationship between the Allegorical Commentary and the Exposition.

---


12 Runia, inadvertently it seems, lists De opificio at the beginning of both the Allegorical Commentary and the Exposition; see his Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato, 64-65.

13 See especially Abr 1-2; cf. Op 1-3, Vita Mos 246-47 and Praem 1-3, on the extent of the Exposition. See also Op 15 and 52 on the lost numerological treatise Περι ἀριθμῶν; a crucial line (ἀς ἀκριβότερον καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτής ἰδιω λόγῳ προσυποδεικτέον ["which could be pointed out besides those detailed in the special treatise devoted to it"]) in the last passage has been mistranslated in all of the existing translations. I have elsewhere discussed this passage and its chronological ramifications in detail; see my article “The Priority of the Quaestionis,” 41-44.

The External Evidence

A cursory analysis of the catalogue of Philo’s writings provided by Eusebius in Hist Eccl 2.18.1-8 shows some restructuring in the first two groups of its tripartite arrangement: those on Genesis, those on Exodus, and the non-serial works. This systematization is so transparent that the prior sequence of the works is traceable and can be recovered. Although this is not the place for a thorough redaction criticism of the Eusebian catalogue, which appears to have been an independent document distinct from the Eusebian text of Philo’s works, the following annotation (in parentheses) should suffice to invite attention to the likelihood of a twofold redaction: one culminating with the tripartite arrangement through transpositions, and the other culminating with the present text punctuated with remarks by Eusebius. Thus: “GENESIS” (redacted primarily from the Allegorical Commentary): Leg All, Quaes Gen (transposed), Quaes Ex (gloss; note the doublet at the beginning of the second group, in keeping with the new arrangement), Agr-Plant, Ebr 1-2 [book 1 lost], Sobr, Conf, Fuga, Congr, Heres, Virt (transposed), Mut (ἐν ὧ φησι συνταχέναι καὶ περὶ διαθήκην πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον — “in which he refers to two books On Covenants” [lost]), Migr, Abr (transposed), Gig, Quod Deus, Somn I-V [books 3-5 lost]; “EXODUS” (redacted primarily from the Exposition): Quaes Ex 1-5 (transposed [books 1, 3-4 lost]), τὸ περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς — On the Tabernacle (gloss = Quaes Ex 2), Decal, Spec Leg I-IV, τὸ περὶ τῶν εἰς τὰς ἱερομαντίας ὄψιν καὶ τίνα τὰ τῶν θυσίων εἰδή — On the Animals for Sacrifice and the Kinds of Sacrifice (gloss = Spec Leg I 162-256), Praem; “SINGLE BOOKS” (the rest): Prov [i.e., book 2], Hypoth, Jos (transposed), Anim, ὁ περὶ τοῦ δυσλόγου εἰναι πάντα φαύλον — That Every Bad Man is a Slave [lost], Quod Omn, Vita Cont, τῶν ἐμβασικῶν ὄνοματων αἱ ἐρµηνεῖαι — Interpretations of the Hebrew Names (spurious = Onomasticon), Gaivm or, “ironically”, περὶ ἄρετῶν — On Virtues.15

---

15 Given the third designation (μονοβιβλία), the catalogue, as an independent document originally, does not seem to allow the inclusion of other books under the last title (περὶ ἄρετῶν) even though five such books were known to Eusebius (see Hist Eccl 2.5.1). Certainly, there is a potential problem of reading into the catalogue information gathered from elsewhere in Eusebius. The text of Hist Eccl 2.18.1-8, excerpted by Cohn and Wendland, Opera, I. c-ci, deserves further and careful attention; cf. D.T. Runia, Philo in Early Christian Literature (Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, section III. Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 3), Assen: Van Gorcum / Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993, 17-19, for a columnar list of the works in the catalogue.
The systematization in the first group is to be seen in *Quaes Gen* following *Legum allegoriarum*, in *De virtutibus* following *Heres*, and in *De Abrahamo* following *De migratione Abrahami*. Noteworthy is the omission of *De opificio* and, sequentially, *De Cherubim*, *De sacrificis*, *Quod deterius*, and *De posteritate* at the beginning of the treatises pertaining to this group on Genesis. The next group of writings, pertaining to Exodus, is a cluster of works on the remainder of the Pentateuch, beginning with *Quaes Ex* and followed by *De Decalogo* with the rest of the *Exposition*, ending with *De praeemiis* (note the omission of the two books of *De vita Mosis*). The systematization here is in the placement of *Quaes Ex* at the beginning of these works. The last cluster, entitled “Single Books”, includes the philosophical and the apologetic / historical writings, except for *De aeternitate* and the first book of *De Providentia*. Runia surmises that *Legum allegoriarum* may have included *De opificio* (and the other omitted writings on Genesis) from which Eusebius quotes in *Praeparatio evangelica*, and that this and the other omissions (*De vita Mosis* and *De aeternitate*, but certainly not the first book of *De Providentia*) may have been inadvertent. Such inadvertent omissions cannot be ruled out. However, it could be argued on the basis of the incongruities between the catalogue in *Historia Ecclesiastica* and the Eusebian text of Philo in *Praeparatio Evangelica* — if not also on the basis of occasional correspondences between the catalogue and the Ambrosian text of Philo — that Eusebius may have procured this catalogue separately, independent of the Philonic corpus from which he quotes profusely in the *Praeparatio*.

---

16 Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, 19: “We should note that what Eusebius calls *Legum allegoriarum* almost certainly refers to the entire sequence from *Leg. to Post.*” But see the next note.

17 For similarities obtaining between the Eusebian catalogue and the Ambrosian text of Philo, cf. Lucchesi, *L’usage de Philon dans l’œuvre exégétique de Saint Ambrose*, 34-38, 122-126. See Runia’s summary and criticism of Lucchesi at this point: “Lucchesi concludes that the *Allegorical Commentary*, which from *Opif.* to *Post.* was probably not divided into separate books as in our editions, has been seriously restructured by the Christians in the early period of transmission. Why then at this point does Ambrose move to *QG* 1 instead of continuing with *Det.?* This was probably a matter of convenience for Ambrose, who in his haste found the *Questiones* easier to use” (thus far summarizing Lucchesi, 34-38). Runia then inserts this critical note: “[Lucchesi] cannot admit that Ambrose may not have had access to *Det.*, since he believes *Opif.-Post.* were all together in one extended treatise.” (Runia, 299 n. 52) I agree with Runia’s criticism, and would like to suggest that the Ambrosian text of Philo, like the Eusebian catalogue, moved from *Legum allegoriarum to Quaes Gen*, and did not have those treatises said to be part of *Legum allegoriarum* (*Cher*, *Sarc*, and *Posi*) immediately following. Ambrose simply followed the sequence as found in his codex, which seems to correspond with
In *Praeparatio Evangelica* Eusebius has five extracts from *De opificio*, and he introduces their source differently on two occasions: 1) 8.12.21-14.72; and 2) 11.23.12-24.12. Of the two instances only the first lemma is substantive: ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτον τῶν εἰς τῶν νόμον (lit., “from the first of those [books] on the Law”). But he never uses this formula with other ordinal numbers when quoting from other treatises of the *Allegorical Commentary* or those grouped with Genesis. The form of the ascription remains a *hapax* among the references to Philo’s works in Eusebius. Nonetheless, the lemma presents two possibilities in its ascription: one pointing with less credibility (since it relies on two further, untenable assumptions) to the *Allegorical Commentary* and the other, with greater probability, to the *Exposition*. The first possibility is that by this ascription in the lemma Eusebius implies the first book of the Pentateuch, the Law broadly conceived, and thereby the first treatise of the Genesis collection in his catalogue of Philo’s works — assuming that the assembled writings on Genesis have become almost synonymous with that book and that *De opificio* is here relegated to the beginning of the books comprising the *Legum allegoriarum* (the first title in the catalogue).

The assumption that the assembled writings on Genesis became almost synonymous with that book, though not altogether unlikely, has to be rejected on the grounds that the singular τῶν νόμων distinguishes the Scriptural text more than it designates the *Allegorical Commentary*. Likewise, the assumption regarding the extent of *Legum allegoriarum*, thought to encompass *De opificio*

the Eusebian catalogue of Philo’s works but not necessarily with the Eusebian text of Philo (since in his works Eusebius shows familiarity with certain works of Philo not found in the catalogue). The Ambrosian text of Philo appears to be older than the Eusebian and seems to indicate that the Eusebian catalogue belongs to an earlier *vortage*, attested in the Ambrosian text of Philo more than in the Eusebian. By implication, it appears that arguments for the inclusion of *De opificio* under the title of *Legum allegoriarum*, along with *Cher*, *Sacr*, and *Post*, are weak — if not unfounded. One would agree with Lucchesi that the Philonic corpus was seriously restructured by the Christians in the early period of its transmission, but not with his suggestion to include more works under the title of *Legum allegoriarum*. Moreover, a stronger distinction must be made between the Eusebian catalogue of Philo’s works and the Eusebian text of Philo.

---


through *De posteritate* in the Eusebian catalogue (where they are omitted), has to be rejected for the reason that the books of *Legum allegoriae* are usually — if not invariably — designated by the plural: νέμων ἑρών ἄλληγορια.

The second possibility, that the ascription in the lemma places the treatise at the beginning of the *Exposition*, the series on the Pentateuch or the Law thematically, seems to be much more credible for two simple reasons: τῶν νέμων applies well to the Pentateuch, beginning with Genesis; and the preceding part of the lemma, ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτου τῶν εἰς . . . , singles out the treatise as the first of those works devoted to it. Moreover, our ensuing discussion on the internal evidence tends to support the latter notion. We therefore conclude that of the two possibilities the first is less likely and the second seems the probable one. Cohn is not altogether wrong in taking this unique lemma of the extracts from *De opificio* as equally referring to the first book of the *Exposition.*

So far we may infer that the chronological importance attached to the obviously restructured Eusebian catalogue of Philo’s works in *Historia Eclesiastica* has been overestimated, and the evidence posited by the unusual lemma in *Praeparator Evangelica* appears to have been misconstrued. The Eusebian catalogue and text of Philo are but two of several early, shuffled witnesses among others in the Patristic and Byzantine periods. They serve as proof of the condition of the Philonic corpus at the episcopal library of Caesarea and at such an early date. Equally inconclusive evidence may be presented from other early witnesses of no lesser significance.

Another 4th-century Caesarean source is preserved in the noted Codex Vindobonensis theologicus graeus 29, where the first half of *De opificio* (1-91) is found separately among non-Philonic works. The scribe of this 11th-century Viennese manuscript also copied from his exemplar a cruciform colophon of the 4th century together with a short list of Philo’s works, taken from the archetype once belonging to Euzoios, Bishop of Caesarea (338-365, 376-379) who, accord-

---


ing to the colophon, commissioned the transcription of the text from papyrus to
parchment (Ἐν Ἐπισκοπῇ ἐν συμμαχίᾳ ἄνευωσάτο). The list begins with De
opificcio, followed by a work or two from each of the three grand commentaries;
thus: Op, Quaes Gen 1-6, Quaes Ex 2 and 5, Post, Dec, and Spec Leg III-IV. Of
course, this could not have been all that was available of Philo’s works at the
episcopal library of 4th-century Caesarea, given the broader list in Eusebius and
— more importantly — his utilization of Philo’s works. There is good reason to
believe that the colophon refers to the transcription of the immediately preced-
ing works, listed just above it, on the same folio, and not necessarily to the
Philonic corpus as it was known locally.

The primary place of De opificcio in this 4th-century list is as noteworthy
perhaps as its detachment in the 13th-century manuscript. Far more notewor-
thy, however, is the fact that the short list contains two titles not found in the
Eusebian catalogue, separated here by the Quaestiones. This may serve to show
that De opificcio and De posteritate were not part of Legum allegoriae, and whether
the first was part of the Allegorical Commentary remains doubtful. Nor did the
treatise originally precede the Quaestiones; it simply does not fit with that
collection. If its subsequent placement there is intentional, then the obvious expla-
nation for the transposition would be that it was to compensate for a commen-
tary on Gen 1, since the Quaestiones in Genesim begins with Gen 2:4; and this
cannot be ruled out. If so, then its placement there appears to serve the same pur-
pose as the placement of the treatise before Legum allegoriae in the majority of

23 Given the further dissemination of the Philonic text, it appears that the corpus brought to
Byzantium was neither the only copy from Caesarea nor the edition of Euzoios, but a copy of
the larger corpus utilized earlier by Eusebius (just as Origen did not bring the only copy of
Philo’s writings from Egypt to Palestine). On the whole, I agree with the history of the
transmission of the Philonic text as outlined by Runia, Philo in Early Christian Literature,
16-31; see also my essay: “Notes on the Transmission of the Philonic Corpus,” Studia Philo-
nica Annual VI (1994) 91-95 [Ed. — repr. in the present vol., pp. 375-380].

24 Obviously, De opificcio is a transposed work. It probably was at the beginning of another col-
lection of Philo’s works, the Exposition, from where it was severed (and some of the gather-
ings were lost, judging from the partial text) and eventually placed at the beginning of the
Quaestiones; all this apparently before the time of Euzoios. Its newfound place brought it to
the top of the table of contents in the 4th-century archetype of this 11th-century copy, where
it is found in part (i.e., if De opificcio in this 4th-century list is the partial treatise preserved in
the 11th-century manuscript; that is possible, since all five extracts from De opificcio in the
Praeparatio Evangelica are limited to the first half of the Philonic book, the half preserved in
the Vindobonensis — which seems to reflect the Caesarean text available to Eusebius).
the printed editions and translations of Philo: to provide a commentary on Gen 1.

Further evidence for the mutilated state of the Philonic text early in the history of its transmission may be gathered from the 3rd-century Oxyrhynchus papyrus of Philo. The fairly reliable reconstruction of its contents by Royse is quite revealing: Sacr by scribe A; Leg All I-II, De pietate, book 1 of De ebrietate I (the latter two inferred from three fragments, the last two of which are paginated), and Ebr (book 2 of De ebrietate II) by scribe B; and Post and Quod Det by scribe C. The absence of De opificio in this small cluster of works belonging to the Allegorical Commentary is as significant as its absence in the Eusebian canon. Although Sacr is by a different hand and its order disturbed, the original pagination of the papyrus leaves no allowance for another treatise to fall between it and Leg I.

Neither in the earliest extant lists of Philo’s works nor in any of the eight manuscripts containing De opificio and utilized by Cohn and Wendland in their editio maior of Philo’s works is this treatise followed by one or another of the books of Legum allegoriae, or by any of the treatises belonging to the Allegorical

25 P Oxy IX 1173, P Oxy XI 1356, PSI XI 1207, P Oxy XVIII 2158, and P Haun. 8.


27 A comparable picture emerges from the 10th-11th century paleimpsest of Philo (Atheniensis Bibl. Nat. 880, a parchment manuscript of the 13th century containing the typikon of the Laura of St. Sabas). Although the exact order of the eleven treatises attested therein cannot be established with absolute certainty, in eight instances the folia preserve the end of one treatise and the beginning of another. These may be arranged in two groups, as follows (parenthesizing those works the sequence of which is unattested in the paleimpsest): Group A: (Sacr), Det, Post, Gig, Inmut; Group B: (Agr), Ebr, Sobr, Cont, (Somm), Virt = De paeinientia, and Virt = De nobilitate. For the details, see P.J. Alexander, “A Neglected Palimpsest of Philo Judaeus,” in Studia Codicologica (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 124), ed. K. Treu, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1977, 1-14. According to Alexander, its handwriting has “strong resemblances” to the Vindobonensis theol. gr. 29 (p. 9 n. 2). He also invites attention to the contents of two comparable manuscripts: Vaticanus Graecus 381 (sigl. U in Cohn and Wendland) and Laurentianus LXXXV cod. 10 (sigl. F in Cohn and Wendland).
Commentary (through the extant Books 1-2 of De somniiis). Except for the above-mentioned Codex Vindobonensis theologicus graecus 29, where De opificio is found partially and separately among non-Philonic works, and in the accompanying 4th-century list ascribed to Eusébius, where it is followed by the Quaestiones, De opificio is always followed by one or another of the works comprising the Exposition. In the two manuscripts where the corpus begins with De opificio, it is followed by De Decalogo and much of the rest of the Exposition. In three other manuscript families which begin with one or another of the treatises comprising the Exposition, De opificio comes along with the same cluster of works belonging to this third grand commentary. The integral place of De opificio is maintained even in the most jumbled manuscript family of the Philonic corpus, where it is embedded between De vita Mosis and De Decalogo. Likewise, in the only family of manuscripts which begins with Legum allegoriae (Books 1 and 2 only) and several of its cognates in this grand commentary (culminating here

28 On the eight manuscripts (VMABPFGH) collated by Cohn and Wendland for their critical text of De opificio, see the "Prolegomena" in Opera, I, i-1xxix, especially lxxv-lxxvi, and cxiv for the "Index Siglorum"; on the general classification of the manuscripts into three families (A, including B; H, including P; and U/F), with three additional manuscripts (MGV) that cannot be classified with any of the three families, see iii-xxxvii; see also Goodhart and Goodenough, Bibliography, 139-153.

29 The two manuscripts, Venetus 40 (H) and Petropolitanus XX A 1 (P) belong to the same family (H): Cohn and Wendland, Opera, I, cxiv; cf. xi-xvi and xvii-xix; Goodhart and Goodenough, Bibliography, 147 no. 84; 152 no. 104.

30 Venetus 41, Laurentianus LXXXV 10, and Vaticano-Palatinus 248 (sigl. B, F, and G in Cohn and Wendland, Opera, I, cxiv; cf. x-xxi, xx-xxv, and xxxiv-xxxv; Goodhart and Goodenough, Bibliography, 141 no. 46; 146 nos. 80 and 83).

31 Monacensis 459 (sigl. A in Cohn and Wendland, Opera, I, cxiv; cf. iv-viii; Goodhart and Goodenough, Bibliography, 139 no. 35). The sequence of the thirty-eight titles in the table of contents (fol. 1v-2v) is as follows: 1=Spec Leg I 1-12; 2=Spec Leg I 13-35; 3=Spec Leg I 36-65; 4=Spec Leg I 131-161; 5=Spec Leg I 162-256; 6=Spec Leg I 257-279; 7=Mut; 8=Leg All III; 9=Heres; 10=Praem 1-126; 11=Praem 127-172; 12=Virt 1-50; 13=Vita Mos 1; 14=Vita Mos 2.1-65; 15=Vita Mos 2.66-292; 16=Op; 17=Dec; 18=Spec Leg IV 151-238; 19=Quod Omn; 20=Vita Cont; 21=Spec Leg I 280-284; 22=Spec Leg III; 23=Jos; 24=Flacc; 25=Gaium; 26=Spec Leg IV 55-78 and Virt 51-180; 27=Sacr; 28=Cher; 29=Agr; 30=Quod Deus; 31=Gig; 32=Migr; 33=Vita Cont; 34=Leg All I; 35= Leg All II; 36=Somn I; 37=Somn II; 38=Abr.
with Book I of De somniis), De opificio comes, as expected, immediately afterwards and followed by much of the rest of the Exposition.\textsuperscript{32}

Certainly, the manuscript tradition does not of itself constitute conclusive evidence regarding the place of De opificio in the Philonic corpus, especially when the partiality of some works and the total loss of others are reckoned and the existing medieval manuscripts are traced to a single archetype. For the question at hand, however, the fragmentary evidence from the early history of the transmission of the text and the witness of the existing manuscripts cannot be ignored — all the more so since it seems to agree with the internal evidence (as we shall see). Such an understanding apparently prevailed among the editors of the German translation, when Cohn and Heinemann chose to follow the order of the treatises as found in the preferred manuscripts. They were able to ameliorate the previous mistake made in the critical edition by Cohn and Wendland. As Runia observes, “From the introductory words at GT 1.vi it would appear that Cohn-Wendland adopted the traditional order in their edition out of expediency rather than conviction.”\textsuperscript{33}

The Internal Evidence

Philo introduces the Exposition, his third grand commentary on the Pentateuch (Op-Praem), with a declaration on the Law and the Lawgiver of the Jews at the outset of De opificio (1-3). His opening remarks encompass more than the creation of the world. They indicate a much wider contemplation on the work of the Lawgiver: the Torah in its entirety which Philo is about to explore, “the world and the laws”. He is introducing the new series of thematic expositions in the same fashion as Moses “introduced his laws with an admirable and most impressive exordium”, which he defines as follows:

\textsuperscript{32} Represented by Laurentianus X 20 (sigl. M in Cohn and Wendland, Opera, 1, cxiv; cf. xxxi-xxxiv; Goodhart and Goodenough, Bibliography, 149 no. 100). In this manuscript De Abrahamo precedes De migratione Abrahami (no doubt as a result of a deliberate association) and De plantatione is relegated to the very end (perhaps to compensate for an inadvertant omission). The contents, sequentially, are: 1=Leg All I; 2=Leg All II; 3=Sacr; 4=Cler; 5=Agr; 6=Quod Deus; 7=Gen; 8=Abr; 9=Migr 10=Vita Cont; 11=Somn I; 12=Op; 13=Dec; 14=Spec Leg I; 15=Spec Leg II; 16=Spec Leg III; 17=Spec Leg IV; 18=Vita Mos 1; 19=Vita Mos 2.1-65; 20=Vita Mos 2.66-292; 21=Virt; 22=Jos; 23=Quod Omn; 24=Vita Cont; 25=Flacc; 26=Gaum; 27=Aet; 28=Plant.

\textsuperscript{33} Runia, Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato, 388 n. 118 (GT = G[erman] T[ransl.]).
It consists of an account of the creation of the world, implying that the world is in harmony with the Law, and the Law with the world, and that the man who observes the Law is constituted thereby a loyal citizen of the world, regulating his doings by the purpose and will of Nature, in accordance with which the entire world itself is also administered.

His focus is on the Torah prefaced by a cosmogony. These opening remarks on the Law and the Lawgiver of the Jews resonate in the opening lines of the last treatise in the Exposition (Praem 1-3) and echo through the series, especially its central part devoted to the life of Moses. There is a fundamental conception that underlies the Exposition as a whole and which is contemplated here. This introduction is not limited to Genesis; it is a fitting introduction to the Exposition and not to the Allegorical Commentary. Though some have argued that the treatise could be a suitable introduction to the Allegorical Commentary, it simply cannot be reconciled literally with Legum allegoriae.

By all counts, Abr 2 contains the most decisive statement on the important place of De opificio in this third grand commentary: ὅν μὲν εὐν τρόπον ἡ κοσμοποίησις διατεταγμέναι, διὰ τῆς πρώτῃς συντάξεως ὡς οἶν τε ἡ, ἡκριβώσαμεν (“The story of the order in which the world was made has been set forth in detail by us as well as was possible in the preceding treatise”). The absolute clarity of the Greek text, with this excellent translation by Colson, leaves no reason to resort to exegesis. Moreover, the passage has received some attention in scholarship with a resounding affirmation of its sequential and consequential significance. I shall be content to let the passage speak for itself.

The basic outline of the Exposition is discernible in Philo’s remarks on the two parts of the Pentateuch in Vita Mos 2.46-47: 1) the historical (τὸ ἱστορικὸν μέρος), meaning the Genesis narratives, and 2) the legislative, “commands and prohibitions” (τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις, meaning the rest of

34 So also Goodenough, Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 35; Massebieau, “Le classement des œuvres de Philon,” 36.
35 For a brief review of scholarship, see Morris, “The Jewish Philosopher Philo,” III.2.830-832, 844-845.
the Pentateuch with its halakhic content. He then subdivides the historical into two: 1a) the creation of the world (τὸ μὲν περὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως), and 1b) the genealogical (τὸ δὲ γενεαλογικόν), thereby meaning the patriarchal narratives. This, in all likelihood — if not in effect — is his outline of the Exposition, beginning with De opificio and followed by De Abrahamo, the rest of the lives of the Patriarchs (with those now missing) and including De vita Mosis, and those on the Mosaic legislation following.

Such is also the implication of Praem 1-3, where with nearly identical categories yet in clearer terms, Philo indicates the Scriptural divisions underlying the Exposition as a separate commentary. Here, however, he divides the Pentateuch into three parts, dealing with 1) creation 2) history and 3) legislation. As Colson observes, the three parts here correspond with the two parts in Vita Mos 2.46-47, with the first part there divided into two. These two passages could be outlined and their corresponding parts schematized and matched easily with the corresponding treatises in the Exposition (Op-Praem). Moreover, as stated above, this opening page of De praemiiis, the last of the Exposition, parallels the opening remarks at Op 1-3.

The very form of De opificio does not allow the insertion of the treatise between the Quaestiones and Legum allegoriae, nor its placement just before the latter if the focus is strictly on De opificio at the beginning of that grand commentary which constitutes the bulk of Philo's writings and which is conveniently referred to as the Allegorical Commentary (through the extant two books of De somniis). The form of Legum allegoriae is transitional when compared with that of the Quaestiones, as Philo continues to cite Scripture in the form of lēmmata at the outset of his exegesis yet without phrasing them as questions. When placed before Book I of Legum allegoriae, De opificio interrupts the transitional character of that book vis-à-vis the Quaestiones. By contrast, the form of De opificio is thematic and more in keeping with the prevalent form of the trea-

38 Colson translates the last category as “particular persons” and notes, “though of course genealogies play a great part in the Pentateuch, γενεαλογικά if used in the strict sense is a very inadequate term to describe the historical part of the books, as distinct from the creation story. The wider sense, as given in the translation, appears to have been in use in the grammatical schools, whose language Philo often adopts” (PLCL VI, 470-471, further elucidation in the Appendix, 606). The relationship between the cosmological views that follow (2.48-51) and those expressed in Op 1-3 has been noticed by E.L. Grumach, who attributes them to an intermediate Stoic source: “Zur Quellenfrage von Philos De opificio Mundi §1-3,” Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums LXXXIII (1939) 126-131.

39 PLCL 8.313 n. a.
tises comprising the Exposition, the remainder of Philo’s progressively less exegetical works where he treats important themes in the Pentateuch. This set of thematic writings is characterized also by fewer citations of Scripture and more apologetic commentary.\textsuperscript{40} De opificio is not an exegetical or allegorical interpretation in the same sense that Legum allegoriae is.\textsuperscript{41} It remains to insist that it is indeed a most fitting work at the start of this new series of thematic expositions of the Pentateuch. Its place there is as essential as that of the rest of the works that follow. In the Exposition Philo is following the basic outline of the Pentateuch: creation, the Patriarchs, Moses, the giving of the Law, the Mosaic legislation, followed by an overly apologetic interpretation of the Jewish Law in terms of the Greek ideals of Virtue, as seen in his De virtutibus and De praemiis et poeniis. It is in keeping with this tendency that after his Exposition he devotes several treatises to philosophical themes derived from the Mosaic Law. Unfortunately for us, some of these treatises have been lost and others were mutilated early on or by the time of Eusebius.

Nor should the transitional character of the extant books of De somniis (I-II) be overlooked, since they anticipate the more thematic writings in the ensuing commentary. Moreover, by the time Philo resorts to writing the Exposition he has come a long way apologetically from the first book of Legum allegoriae. The following schema should help illustrate some of the foregoing remarks.

The Allegorical Commentary

The beginning: \textit{Leg All I} 
Transitional when compared with the \textit{Quaestiones}, in that Philo continues to use \textit{lemmata} yet without phrasing them as questions

The end: \textit{Somm I-II} 
Transitional when compared with the \textit{Exposition}, in that Philo is gradually moving into more thematic writing.

\textsuperscript{40} I disagree with the often repeated assessment that the earlier exegetical commentary is much more apologetic since it is more allegorical. The thematic commentary is certainly no less apologetic than the exegetical; indeed, it is much more apologetic. It was primarily for this reason that Goodenough consistently — yet unconvincingly — held that the thematic \textit{Exposition} was aimed at non-Jewish readers; see his “Philo’s Exposition of the Law,” \textit{Harvard Theological Review} XXVII (1933) 109-125; idem, \textit{The Politics of Philo Judaicus: Practice and Theory}, 42-63.

\textsuperscript{41} So also Runia, \textit{Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato}, 388 n. 120: “This is not to say that Gen 1 could not be subjected to an allegorical exegesis. An example is found at \textit{Leg All II} 12 (exeg. 1:24), but it is an isolated instance. Philo preferred not to do it apparently.”
A similar development in the *Allegorical Commentary* was observed by Adler, noting how Philo gradually frees himself from excessive use of the biblical text, no longer having to account for every verse. Adler’s work is a lengthy criticism of Massebieau and Bréhier, showing that the composition of the *Allegorical Commentary* is governed by exegetical and literary underpinnings and not historical developments. It is precisely along the same trajectory of literary progression that we find the emergence of the *Exposition*, beginning with *De opificio*, and at the opposite end of the spectrum or pole of the continuum, the *Quaestiones*. Given this perspective, we find a continuity in Philo’s Pentateuchal commentaries. Nikiprowetzky’s treating the *Allegorical Commentary* and the *Exposition* as basically one, ongoing commentary is not altogether wrong when viewed from this perspective.

**Summary and Conclusion**

We have probably arrived at a point where we can no longer assess the Philonic corpus by Eusebian *testimonia* that reflect a degree of confusion regarding it (we should instead subject the Eusebian *testimonia* to criticism in light of what we now perceive to be a more accurate perception of the Philonic corpus). Nor can we blame Eusebius for the confusion that appears to antedate his time and which he probably inherited (judging from parallels in the Ambrosian text of Philo’s works). We see no deliberate substitution on his part of a treatise for Gen 1 before *Legum allegoriae*. The confusion appears to have arisen early in the history of the transmission of the corpus, from an early mix-up between Philo’s references or allusions to his works and those near-synonyms he employs when refer-

---


43 Massebieau and Bréhier, “Essai sur la Chronologie de la vie et des oeuvres des Philon.”
ring to the respective parts of the Pentateuch. And this is understandable whenever a text is taken for its commentary and vice-versa.44

The supposed authority of Eusebius seems to be the only grounds on which the placement of De opificio before Legum allegoriae continues to be retained.45 In essence, it is his inherited confusion (whether canonical or textual) that proffers the methodical justification for the transposition of this treatise, especially since the beginning of the printed editions and translations of the Philonic corpus. But why should he be granted so much undue credibility at this point once his silence on the canon is acknowledged and the preexistent, mutilated condition of the text is recognized? After all, the Philonic corpus he possessed hardly differed from ours today, and we are able to look into it more critically perhaps than he did — unless we should believe in Eusebian inerrancy (which ought not be a factor here, given his indeterminate testimonia on the treatise) or assume that not much has changed in Philo scholarship since the 4th century.

De opificio is so unlike Legum allegoriae that it could not have been a part of the same commentary. Even if we were to grant that the title of Legum allegoriae in the Eusebian catalogue encompassed the missing treatises pertaining to the opening chapter(s) of Genesis, we would fairly conclude on the basis of equally ancient textual tradition that De opificio could not have been among them. And if one were to insist that Philo must have had an allegorical treatment of a substantial part of Gen 1 at the start of his Allegorical Commentary, then we would have to conclude that it was possibly lost before the time of Eusebius, and that that was probably because of its being at the beginning of the archetypal manuscript.

Although one can find philosophical and some structural connections between the two treatises, De opificio mundi and Legum allegoriae, Philo’s treatment of Gen 2-3 in Leg All I-III does not seem to be dependent on De opificio, perhaps not even on an earlier exegesis of Gen 1 (a chapter which Philo could have bracketed for future treatment, albeit differently, as he seems to have planned his Pentateuchal commentaries and produced them over a relatively

44 This sort of confusion is already apparent in Clement of Alexandria, especially in his unacknowledged extracts from De virtutibus in Book 2 of his Stromateis, implying that that is what Scripture or the Law says. For a survey of scholarship on Clement’s use of Philo, see Runia, Philo in Early Christian Literature, 132-156 (though none of those cited seems to dwell on this point).

45 Until recently, further justification was drawn from a mistranslation in Op 52, the reference to the lost Περὶ ἀπίθυνω. See my article “The Priority of the Quaestiones,” 41-44.
short time), since Gen 2 is an ample text for him to discuss the seven days of the Mosaic cosmogony,\(^{46}\) to indicate man’s place in the macrocosm and his composition of soul and body under the guidance of Mind, and to bring the allegory of the soul into his anthropological commentary on these two chapters. Hence, the books of *Legum allegoriae* could very well be independent of *De opificio*, as they seem to be. The overlap between the two treatises is not of the form encountered in serial books whereby ancient authors establish continuity between their respective treatises, even as Philo does elsewhere — but not here.

As one surveys the works of Philo chronologically, or considers just the three grand commentaries as clusters or groupings of treatises, one cannot help but see a progression in his works, moving from midrashic type exegetical commentaries (or narrative *aggada*, to use a more current designation for “the expansion and elaboration of the biblical text in narrative form”)\(^{47}\) to thematic expositions with ever-increasing apologetics — a process that continues through the philosophical and the apologetic / historical writings. If one were to look for a place for *De opificio* within such a schema, a schema that is not imposed but rather suggested by the very structure of the corpus and through considerable internal evidence, its usual place at the beginning of the *Exposition* appears to be most convincing. There is really no good reason to move it from its conceivably rightful place, at the start of this third grand commentary. There is an unmistakable progression through Philo’s writings when considered chronologically, and from such a perspective his Pentateuchal commentaries can be seen as a continuous work. The foregoing, however, does not grant us the freedom to move *De opificio* anywhere down the line of that continuum. It is in a locked position.

It remains to repeat that the placement of *De opificio* before *Legum allegoriae* is altogether arbitrary. It disregards the usual place of the treatise under consideration in the manuscript tradition: its occasional absence as well as detachment in the earliest known lists of Philo’s works, and its belonging to the *Exposition* in the extant manuscript tradition that could be traced to a single Caesarean archetype. The Eusebian catalogue itself is restructured and, at best, is vague on the place of *De opificio*, which it does not even mention. The external

---

\(^{46}\) Cf. *Dec* 101: “But in what sense the world is said to have been created by God in six days when no time-period of any kind was needed by Him for his work has been explained elsewhere in our allegorical exposition” (μετέχοντα διὰ τῶν ἀλληγοριζομένων ἐν ἑτέροις). Colson adds this note to his translation: “i.e., in *Leg. All.* 1.2.4” (PLCL 7.58 n. s.).