

DISSERTATION | DOCTORAL THESIS

Titel | Title

Commemorating Saint Eudoxios: Armenian Chalcedonian
Translators and the Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century

verfasst von | submitted by

Lewis John Read MA MLitt.

angestrebter akademischer Grad | in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doktor der Philosophie (Dr.phil.)

Wien | Vienna, 2025

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt | Degree
programme code as it appears on the
student record sheet:

UA 792 312

Dissertationsgebiet lt. Studienblatt | Field of
study as it appears on the student record
sheet:

Geschichte

Betreut von | Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Tara Andrews

Commemorating Saint Eudoxios:
Armenian Chalcedonian Translators and the
Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century

Abstract

This thesis provides the first critical edition, English translation, and historical study of the Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios. Arguing for Armenian Chalcedonian sponsorship, this thesis embeds the production of the text—translated from Greek into Armenian in the city of Melitene in 1092—within a set of socio-cultural and political conditions particular to the expansion of the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and eleventh century, situating its emergence into the Armenian tradition within an active milieu of Armenian Chalcedonian translation and veneration activity.

The present study aims to place the text within a wider process of push and pull, whereby the imperial centre and its Chalcedonian populations actively co-operated in the construction of a shared spiritual and cultural environment through the dissemination and translation of a prescribed canon of hagiographical, patristic, exegetical and liturgical texts. This was a process which not only brought previously unattested commemorations and feast days into the Armenian tradition, as was the case with Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios, but one which consummated the intrusion of the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople into the norms of Christian communities in Northern Syria, Northern Mesopotamia, Eastern Anatolia, and the Caucasus; serving to construct, reinforce, and maintain a trans-regional imperial space throughout the eleventh century.

Abstract

Diese Dissertation legt die erste kritische Edition, englische Übersetzung und historische Untersuchung des armenischen Martyriums der Heiligen Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon und Makarios vor. Sie argumentiert für eine armenisch-chalkedonische Trägerschaft des Textes und bettet seine Entstehung – er wurde 1092 in der Stadt Melitene aus dem Griechischen ins Armenische übersetzt – innerhalb der sozio-kulturellen und politischen Bedingungen ein, die für die Expansion des Byzantinischen Reiches im zehnten und elften Jahrhundert charakteristisch waren, indem sein Auftauchen in der armenischen Tradition innerhalb eines regen Milieus von armenisch-chalkedonischer Übersetzungspraxis und Heiligenverehrung verortet wird.

Die vorliegende Untersuchung zielt darauf ab, den Text in einen breiteren *Push- und Pull* Prozess einzuordnen, bei dem das imperiale Zentrum und seine chalkedonischen Glaubensgemeinschaften aktiv an der Schaffung einer gemeinsamen spirituellen und kulturellen Umgebung mitwirkten, die durch die Verbreitung und Übersetzung des vorgeschriebenen Kanons hagiographischer, patristischer, exegetischer und liturgischer Texte geprägt war. Dieser Prozess führte nicht nur dazu, dass zuvor nicht überlieferte Gedenk- und Festtage, wie im Fall der Heiligen Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon und Makarios, in die armenische Tradition integriert wurden, sondern auch dazu, dass das Byzantinische Reich und die Kirche von Konstantinopel in die Normen der christlichen Gemeinschaften in Nordsyrien, Nordmesopotamien, Ostanatolien und im Kaukasus vordrangen und dazu beitrugen, einen transregionalen imperialen Raum zu schaffen, zu festigen und das elfte Jahrhundert hindurch aufrechtzuerhalten.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements v

A Note on Transliteration and Citation vi

Introduction

THE PRODUCTION OF ARMENIAN HAGIOGRAPHY IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY 1

Grigor II Vkasēs, the Eleventh Century, and the Expansion of the Armenian Liturgical Tradition 2

Translation as an Act of Armenian Cultural Revival 5

The Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios 11

Chapter Outline 12

Chapter 1

THE ARMENIAN MARTYRDOM OF SAINTS EUDOXIOS, ROMYLOS, ZENON, AND MAKARIOS: THE TEXT AND ITS ELEVENTH-CENTURY CONTEXT 14

The Greek Model: Hagiographical Collections and Metaphrasis in 10th and 11th century Byzantium 16

Identifying the Greek Model 23

Identifying the Sponsor: Discounting Grigor Vkasēs 38

Identifying the Sponsor: An Armenian Chalcedonian Context 51

The Cult Dossier of Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios: The Emergence of the Armenian Martyrdom 56

Conclusion 65

Chapter 2

ARMENIAN CHALCEDONIAN TRANSLATORS AND THE EXPANSION OF THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A LONG ELEVENTH CENTURY 66

The Expansion of Byzantium and the Disruption of the Spiritual Environment 67

Engineering Spiritual Uniformity: The Translation of Byzantine Relics and Greek Texts by Yovsēp of Constantinople 71

Taking the Initiative: Chalcedonian Translators, Greek Models, and the Expansion of the Byzantine Empire 79

Building a Shared Confessional Environment and Imposing Hegemony through Text and Translation: Syriac and Arabic Comparisons 90

Conclusion 103

Chapter 3

GRAECO-ARMENIAN TRANSLATIONS AFTER MANZIKERT: DEMARCATION AND CONTINUATION 104

Reassessing Armeno-Byzantine Relations after Manzikert: Current Trends **105**

Graeco-Armenian Translations after Manzikert: Traditional Trends and New Possibilities **108**

Maintaining Contact or Losing Touch ? Armenian Chalcedonians and the Byzantine Empire after 1071 **110**

Performing the Liturgy **114**

The Iconography of Byzantine Provincial Seals and the Cult of Saints after Manzikert **117**

Commemorating Saint Eudoxius: Maintaining Confessional Continuity after Manzikert **126**

Conclusion **129**

Chapter 4

THE ARMENIAN MARTYRDOM OF SAINTS EUDOXIOS, ROMYLOS, ZENON, AND MAKARIOS: TEXT AND TRANSLATION 131

The Edition **132**

Principles of Edition and Translation **136**

Text and Translation **137**

Conclusion

COMMEMORATING SAINT EUDOXIOS IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY BETWEEN ARMENIA AND BYZANTIUM 157

Bibliography 161

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of a doctoral thesis incurs many debts of gratitude. My first thanks go to my supervisor Professor Tara Andrews for her support, encouragement and, most of all, for providing the transformative opportunity to pursue my doctoral studies in Vienna. I would also like to thank the Department of History at the University of Vienna, where I have been employed during the writing of this thesis, and the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies at the University of Vienna, where I have been made to feel very much at home during my time in Austria.

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the support of the various members of staff at the Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts in Yerevan, the Mekhitarist Monastery of Vienna, the Mekhitarist Monastery of San Lazzaro degli Armeni in Venice, and the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem, where I have had the opportunity to carry out several periods of archival work during the writing of my thesis.

To the many dear friends and colleagues who have supported me throughout the last three years, I am deeply thankful for your time, guidance, and generosity. Lastly, but most importantly, to my dad: Robert, mum: Julie, and sister: Grace, thank you for everything which has led me to where I am today.

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND CITATION

A hybrid approach has been adopted for the translation and transliteration of proper nouns, titles, and technical terms. Well-known places and persons, such as Melitene or Diocletian, have been rendered in their familiar anglicised form. Armenian titles, technical terms and publications have been transliterated according to the Hübschmann-Meillet-Benveniste system employed by the *Revue des Études Arméniennes*. The names of saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios have been transliterated according to their Greek, rather than Latin, form. This has been done to reflect the original composition of the Martyrdom. In this, and other cases of Greek proper nouns or technical terms, the ALA-LC transliteration system has been preferred. For Arabic proper nouns and technical terms, the transliteration system of the International Journal of Middle East Studies has been used. The Chicago Manual of Style 18 (2024) has been used for all citations.

INTRODUCTION

The Production of Armenian Hagiography in the Eleventh Century

During his tenure as pontiff of the Armenian Miaphysite Church between 1066CE and 1105CE, the Catholicos Grigor II Pahlavuni embarked on a wide-ranging translation programme, rendering texts preserved in Latin, Syriac, and Greek into Armenian.¹ Alongside patristic, exegetical, and liturgical compositions, a significant proportion of Grigor's activity focused on the introduction of previously untranslated saints' lives' and martyrologies into Armenian, drawing primarily from Greek hagiographical collections codified according to the normative calendrical cycle of the Church of Constantinople.² Aptly known by his epithet 'Vkasēr' (the martyr-lover), Grigor left a record of his activities in a number of manuscript colophons attached to his translations; detailing his travels from Egypt to Constantinople in search of textual models and the names of the various collaborators who worked with him to facilitate the wider goals of his translation programme. Though we will encounter a number of these colophons in more detail throughout the present study, it is a colophon attached to Grigor's translation of a Roman calendar/book of feasts, in this case a Greek Constantinopolitan lectionary, into Armenian which offers perhaps the best insight into the methods and objectives of his project from his own perspective:

Այս էլիշատակարան տաւնից տէրունականաց եւ սրբոց Աստուծոյ, ցուցմամբ աւուրց Հոռոմի
ամսոց, ըստ իւրաքանչիւր սրբոց հանդիպմամբ չարչարանաց կատարման, եւ կամ ըստ
խաղաղական ելից հանգստեան մարտիրոսաց եւ հայրապետաց սրբոց, որք հանդայցան

¹ D. Gevorgyan, "Grigor II Vkasērī Naxajēñac T' argmanakan Šaržum (The Translation Movement Initiated by Grigor II Vkasēr)," *Banber Matenadarani* 34 (2022): 94-111.

² Ibid., 93-111., S. Peter Cowe, "Armenian Hagiography," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography I: Periods and Places*, ed. S. Efthymiadis (Routledge, 2016), 312.

Աստուծոյ, նեղ եւ անձուկ ճանապարհաւն Յիսուսի: Չոր եւ Գրիգորիս ծառայ Աստուծոյ եւ դիտապետ Հայաստան ազգիս: Համարձակեալ վասն սիրոյ վկայից Քրիստոսի, յաւելի ի նախակարգեալ տաւնսն Հռոմի ամսոց, ընտրեալ ի տաւնամակաց³ յորունց գտակաւս: Որ ի բազմաց անփոյթ էր լեալ: Եւ մեք աշխատեալ զայսպիսի համառատահաւաք տաւնամակս գրեցաք ի պայծառութիւն եկեղեցւոյ: Չոր ցանկ ընթերցցի ի նմա ի ժամու սոսկալի պատարագին: Չոր մի որ աւելորդ վարկցի զորոց զվարս քաղաքավարական պատմութեանց զոր ոչ գոյր առ մեզ հայ գրով, մեք աշխատութեամբ թարգմանեցաք ի յունականէն ի մերս զիր եւ բառ:⁴

This is the record of the Lord's feasts and saints of God, assigned according to the days of the Roman months, according to when each of the saints met their painful end, or according to the peaceful and tranquil departure from the world of holy martyrs and bishops, who, pleased God, [and took] the straight and narrow path of Jesus. I, Grigor, servant of God and spiritual overseer of the Armenian people, having had the boldness, on account of love for the martyrs of Christ, added to the preordained festivals of the Roman calendar. I have chosen few from the many books of feasts, many of which have been carelessly [assembled]. And we worked in this manner, writing this book of feasts concisely for the magnificence of the church, which is to be read from at the hours of the wondrous liturgy. May you not consider superfluous the lives of those whose edifying stories that did not exist for us in Armenian writing, with diligence we translated them from Greek into our writing and word.⁵

Grigor tells us how he adapted and modified a Constantinopolitan lectionary, selecting from various models and enlarging the calendar to include the feast days of saints within the Armenian tradition. As Grigor outlines himself, much of the *modus operandi* of his activity was also to expand the number of existing commemorations in Armenian by translating unfamiliar hagiographies and martyrologies taken from Greek Constantinopolitan liturgical manuscripts with the purpose of enriching the Armenian liturgy.

Grigor II Vkasēr, the Eleventh Century, and the Expansion of the Armenian Liturgical Tradition

Since the 1928 study of Nicholas Adontz, *Les Fêtes et Les Saints de L'Église Arménienne*, the periodic introduction of new saints' lives and martyrologies into the Armenian liturgical tradition⁶ via the translation of Greek texts coming from collections arranged according to the norms of the Church of Constantinople

³ **Տաւնամակ** – lit. feast (տաւն) + writing/book (կամակ). I have preferred as literal a rendering as possible for this term in the translation. Due to the considerable gap between production and transmission in the Armenian liturgical manuscript tradition it is extremely challenging to clarify the exact contents and structure of these compositions in their original context. I have therefore chosen to initially render these terms as close as possible to the phrase found in the colophons so as not to infer too much about the shape of the original composition without further justification. In this case the manuscript which now preserves this colophon: Rome, Pontificio Leoniano Collegio Armeno Ms. 4 (71) is a lectionary and so in this case the use of the term տաւնամակ may be inferred to mean that Grigor's original translation (or a copy thereof), which was used in the compilation of Leoniano Collegio Armeno Ms. 4(71) was something akin to a lectionary of the Church of Constantinople in form, content, and structure, rather than a synaxarion, a menologion, or Armenian liturgical equivalents thereof.

⁴ Rome, Pontificio Leoniano Collegio Armeno Ms. 4 (71), ff. 127r.

⁵ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

⁶ **Armenian liturgical tradition or Armenian tradition:** The use of these terms is implicitly flexible in this thesis. They account for the varied confessional identities of Armenians who celebrated the liturgy in Armenian and via liturgical manuscripts written in Armenian. These are used to allow for the fact that both Chalcedonian and Miaphysite Armenians were collectively responsible for bringing new commemorations into Armenian during the tenth and eleventh century via translation activity. As a result of this cross-confessional translation activity these commemorations can now be found in Armenian liturgical manuscripts regardless of the confessional arrangement/purpose/orientation of those manuscripts.

has been a well observed phenomenon. Through close textual scrutiny of the Armenian manuscript evidence, Adontz identified the presence of three underlying sources which have historically informed the shape and contents of the Armenian liturgical tradition: the *Hayadir* (Հայադիր, Հայ + դիր, meaning 'Armenian arrangement'), the *Hromadir* (Հռոմադիր, Հռոմ + դիր, meaning Roman arrangement), and the *Tonakan* (Տոնական, lit. a festal calendar – Adontz employed this term to distinguish a third underlying calendar arrangement stemming from the hagiopolite tradition);⁷ a tripartite system of classification which continues to inform scholarly approaches in the field of Armenian heortological studies.⁸ The 'Roman' tradition is primarily distinguished by the presence of feasts and commemorations corresponding to or originating from the liturgical context of the Church of Constantinople; a process of periodic inclusion and expansion of feasts days dedicated to saints and martyrs in the Armenian liturgical tradition which was stimulated by various socio-cultural and political contacts with the Byzantine Empire and its church hierarchy and specifically through translation from Greek textual models.⁹ Though Adontz recognised the significance of the surviving presence of the *Hromadir*, that is the influence of the Church of Constantinople, on the formation of the Armenian liturgical tradition it was not within the purview of his work to locate the adoption of this strand of influence to specific socio-cultural and political conditions at various times or in different spaces.

Since Adontz's study, the works of Renoux,¹⁰ Van Esbroeck,¹¹ Ant'abyan,¹² Findikyan,¹³ Outtier,¹⁴ Pogossian,¹⁵ Gippert,¹⁶ and others have given deeper consideration to the periodic emergence

⁷ N. Adontz, "Les Fêtes et Les Saints de L'Église Arménienne," *Revue de L'Orient Chrétien*, no. 26 (1927-1928): 75. C. Renoux, "Les Fêtes et Les Saints de L'Église Arménienne de N. Adontz," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 14 (1980): 287-305.

⁸ **Heortology:** The study of the origin and development of commemorations and feasts days within respective Christian traditions through textual criticism of liturgical manuscripts as articulated by Kellner: K. H. Kellner, *Heortology: A History of the Christian Festivals from their Origin to the Present Day* (Paul, Trench, Trübner & co, 1908).

⁹ Adontz, "Les Fêtes," 76.

¹⁰ C. Renoux, "Liturgie de Jérusalem et lectionnaires arméniens. Vigiles et année liturgique," *La prière des heures, Lex Orandi* 35 (Paris: 1963): 167–199., C. Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121 II: Édition comparée du texte et de deux autres manuscrits. Introduction, textes, traduction et notes*, *Patrologia orientalis*, 36/2 (1971)., C. Renoux, *Le Lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie Le Čašoc' II: Édition Synoptique des Plus Anciens Témoins*, *Patrologia orientalis*, 48/2 (1999)., Charles Renoux, "Čašoc' et Tōnakan arméniens: dépendance et complémentarité," *Ecclesia Orans* 4/2 (1987): 169–201.

¹¹ M. Van Esbroeck, "Salomon de Makenots," *Armeniaca, Mélanges d'études arméniennes* (1969): 33–44., M. Van Esbroeck, "Description du répertoire de l'homélaire de Muš (Maténadaran 7729)," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 18 (1984): 237 – 280., M. Van Esbroeck, "La structure du répertoire de l'homélaire de Mush," *Miřagayin bayerenagitakan gitařolov, Zekowc'owmner* (1982) 282-303.

¹² P. Ant'abyan, "Tawnapatčar žolovacown," *Banber Matenadarani* 10 (1971): 106.

¹³ M. D. Findikyan, *The Commentary on the Armenian Daily Office by Bishop Step'anos Sinnec'i († 735): Critical Edition and Translation with Textual and Liturgical Analysis*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 270 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2004)., M. D. Findikyan, "Armenian Hymns of the Church and the Cross," *St. Nersess Theological Review* 11 (2006): 63–105.

¹⁴ B. Outtier, "The Armenian Homiliaries. An Attempt at an Historical Overview," in *Manuscript Cultures 13: Homiletic Collections in Greek and Oriental Manuscripts*, ed. Jost Gippert and Caroline Macé (University of Hamburg Press, 2019), 117-122.

¹⁵ Z. Pogossian, "Relics, Rulers, Patronage: the True Cross of Varag and the Church of the Holy Cross on Alt'amar," in *The Church of the Holy Cross of Alt'amar*, ed. Z. Pogossian and E. Vardanyan (Brill, 2019), 157.

¹⁶ J. Gippert, "Palimpsests from the Caucasus: Two Case Studies," in *Palimpsests and Related Phenomena across Languages and Cultures* ed. J. Gippert, J. Maksimczuk and H Sargsyan (De Gruyter, 2024), 253-282. We should expect to develop a much fuller picture of the development of the Armenian liturgical tradition as the results of the palimpsest project: "The Development of Literacy in the Caucasian Territories (DeLiCaTe)" are published in full.

of new feast days of particular saints and martyrs in Armenian and their presence in the Armenian liturgical tradition. Critical to this discourse is the 1987 study of Charles Renoux: *Le Čaşoc, Typicon-Lectioinaire Origines et Évolutions*. In his rich and wide-ranging analysis Renoux outlined several stages in development of the arrangement and content of Armenian liturgical manuscripts; identifying periodic injections of previously unattested saints' lives and martyrologies from, amongst other sources, translations of Greek compositions stemming from collections arranged according to the liturgical cycle of the Church of Constantinople.¹⁷ According to Renoux, the exact time of the opening of the Armenian *sanctorale*¹⁸ for each and every individual saint, martyr or feast day is impossible to determine "Il est impossible, semble-t-il, de déterminer avec exactitude les années durant lesquelles furent apportés de tels accroissements au calendrier universel. Indiquons cependant quelques étapes tardives..."¹⁹, but he drew the conclusion that for a significant number of commemorations, the eleventh century should be considered a key moment of expansion for the Armenian *sanctorale* stimulated by a period of intense Armeno-Byzantine contact and the initiation of the wide-ranging translation programme of the Armenian Catholicos Grigor II Vkasasēr: "L'action qu'exercèrent, dans la transformation ... Grigor Vkasasēr ne peut être mise en doute."²⁰ After all, it was Grigor himself who, along with his collaborator Kirakos, claimed to have introduced seventy-four new commemorations into the Armenian tradition in the colophon attached to his translation and modification of the 'Roman' lectionary.²¹

If the eleventh century was framed by Renoux as a key period in the transformation of the Armenian *sanctorale*, facilitated by the translation of previously unattested saints' lives and martyrologies from Greek Constantinopolitan collections, it is undoubtedly the activities of Grigor Vkasasēr and his collaborators which have come to be regarded as the primary vehicle behind this period of transformation. It is a perpetual association which can be located back to the decades immediately following Grigor's death. The twelfth-century Armenian chronicler Matthew of Edessa recalls Grigor II's tenure as Catholicos of the Armenian Miaphysite Church in his entry for the year 1105 CE:

Սա նորոգեաց զկարգ հաւատոց Հայաստանեայց եւ անհանգիստ թարգմանութեան եր պարսպեալ եւ զամենայն պակասութիւն կտակարանացն Աստուծոյ առ մեզ կարգաւ կատարեալ զարդարեաց ի Յունաց եւ յԱսորոց թարգմանութեան հոգ տարեալ անդադար խորհրդով եւ ամենայն պայծառութեամբ Սուրբ Գրոց եկից զեկեղեցի Հայաստանեայցն:²²

¹⁷ C. Renoux, "Le Čaşoc, Typicon-Lectioinaire Origines et Évolutions," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 20 (1986-1987): 136.

¹⁸ **Armenian *sanctorale*:** I implicitly use this term as a shorthand to refer to the canon feasts of saints and martyrs commemorated in Armenian and by Armenians as it is articulated in definition by the Hill Manuscript Library Lexicon: <https://hmmilschool.org/lexicon/14940/>. In this thesis it is frequently used as a shorthand to refer to the appearance of saints' lives and martyrologies during the tenth and eleventh century that were previously unattested in Armenian and which, as a result of this process of inclusion, we still find in Armenian liturgical manuscripts down to the present day.

¹⁹ Ibid., 137-138.

²⁰ Ibid., 142., See also: P. Ant'abyan, "Tawnapatčar žolovacun," in *Banber Matenadarani* 10 (Yerevan: Matenadaran, 1971), 106.

²¹ Rome, Pontificio Leoniano Collegio Armeno Ms. 4 (71), ff. 127r – 128v.

²² Matt'ēos Urhayec'i (Matthew of Edessa), *Žamanakagrut'inn*, ed. by M. Mēlik'-Adamean and N. Tēr-Mik'ayēlean (Valaršapat, 1898), 299.

‘He renewed the order of the faith of the Armenians and was restlessly occupied with the act of translation. He took painstaking care to translate from Greek and Syriac in order to adorn us completely with the knowledge of all the absent testaments of God. And with all splendour, he filled the Church of Armenia with sacred Scripture.’²³

It is a reoccurring framework of interpretation which can be traced all the way down to the most recent studies to address the broadening of the Armenian *sanctorale* in the eleventh century.²⁴ In his recent work on the development of Armenian hagiography in the *Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, Peter Cowe has characterised the eleventh century in such terms, arguing that:

‘The period of the eleventh–fourteenth centuries heralds a new outpouring of translations initially from Greek and Syriac under the impetus of Catholicos Grigor Vkasēs (Martyrophile) (d. 1105) who was responsible for enlarging the sanctoral.’²⁵

The scholarly framework developed over the last fifty years is such that when we think of the introduction of previously unattested saints’ lives and martyrologies into the Armenian tradition facilitated by the translation of Greek Constantinopolitan textual models, we view the eleventh century as a pivotal moment. However, when we think of this transformative period, we frame it almost exclusively through the lens of the translation activities of the Armenian Catholicos Grigor II; defining a wholesale interpretation of the actors responsible for a period in which previously unattested saints’ lives and martyrdoms made their way into the Armenian tradition via the act of translation and informing our understanding of the purposes of this activity.

Translation as an Act of Armenian Cultural Revival

The translation programme of Grigor II Vkasēs has come to be viewed by scholarship not only as the key vehicle in a period of transformation of the Armenian liturgical tradition during the eleventh century through the injection of previously unattested saints’ lives and martyrologies, but also as a foundational driver of a period of Armenian cultural revival and resistance to Byzantine imperial hegemony, embedded in the emergence of a new Armenian kingdom in Cilicia and the reconstitution of Armenian statehood

²³ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

²⁴ Gevorgyan, “Grigor II Vkasēs,” 94-111., Cowe, “Armenian Hagiography,” 312., M. Avdalbegyan, *Yaysmanvurk’ Zolovacuner* (Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1982), 52., R. Vardanyan, *Hayoc’ Tonac’nyec’ (4-18rd davar)* (Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1999), 283-288. As a further case study for the association between the process of broadening the Armenian liturgical tradition and the translation activities of the Catholicos Grigor II Vkasēs we can look to Renoux’s 1996 article: C. Renoux, “Une influence du rite byzantin sur la liturgie arménienne: un pentecostaire arménien” *L’Arménie et Byzance, Byzantina Sorbonensia* 12 (1996): 187-190. In his study Renoux identified a corpus of nine Armenian liturgical manuscripts surviving from the thirteenth century onward containing arrangements close to the Constantinopolitan Church Pentecostarion, which regulated liturgical practice during the paschal season, between Easter and the Pentecost. This corpus represents what Renoux describes as an attempt to put into circulation ‘un livre liturgique arménien, qui serait l’analogue du *Pentecostaire* byzantin de l’office des Heures’. Renoux traces the evidence of this influence back to a process of translation initiated in the eleventh century by the activities of the Catholicos Grigor II Vkasēs in the monastery of Darzark’.

²⁵ Cowe, “Armenian Hagiography,” 312. See also: S. P. Cowe, “The Armenians in the era of the Crusades,” in *Cambridge History of Christianity*, Volume 5, ed. M. Angold (New York, 2006), 421.

during the closing decades of the eleventh century.

During the Byzantine expansion of the tenth and mid-eleventh century, numerous Armenian populations were gradually absorbed into the Byzantine Empire.²⁶ Armenian kingdoms and polities in Eastern Anatolia, the Caucasus and Northern Mesopotamia were annexed, their secular and ecclesiastical elites were relocated, and their lands subject to a radical reconfiguration.²⁷ The lived environment was reshaped and re-ordered into a system of overlapping regional and local administrations in a qualitatively new socio-administrative structure; changes that were accompanied by the re-organisation of existing land patterns, the implementation of new fiscal policies, the establishment of new Chalcedonian sees, and the emergence of renewed cultural-intellectual ties between Armenians and Byzantium.²⁸ In contrast, the second half of the eleventh century, when the Catholicos Grigor II embarked on his translation programme, is generally regarded as a period of gradual collapse for the Byzantine Empire in Anatolia, the Caucasus, Northern Syria, and Northern Mesopotamia, marking the arrival of the Seljuk Turks, the defeat of the Byzantine army at Manzikert in 1071, and the subsequent fracturing of the Empire's eastern frontier.²⁹

The enduring idea of imperial collapse after 1071 has led to the long-held belief that the many Armenians who constituted large populations within the Empire's East, and who had been living within the borders of the Byzantine Empire for the best part of a century, were unwilling to maintain their contact with Byzantium and took the opportunity to re-assert their sovereignty. In his 1971 work *The decline of medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the process of Islamization from the eleventh through the fifteenth century*, Speros Vryonis described the prelude to the battle of Manzikert in terms of the tensions between the 'ethnic groups of Byzantine Anatolia—Greeks, Syrians, and Armenians... who were at the throats of one another as separatist movements among the Armenians commenced'.³⁰ When he came to discuss the effects of Manzikert and the breakdown of imperial authority after 1071, Vryonis argued that the Armenians in the Empire's East 'finally took the opportunity to throw off the hated Byzantine authority and to give expression to their own separatist desires'.³¹ For Vryonis, the Armenians took advantage of this period of imperial instability and 'consummated the disruption of Byzantine authority' in Anatolia and the Armenian

²⁶ Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, *Patmut'ivn Aristakisi Lastivertc'woy*, ed. K.N. Yuzbašyan. (Matenadaran, 1963), chapters 2 and 10, Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. and trans. G. Moravcsik and R. J. H. Jenkins (Dumbarton Oaks Press, 2009), chapter 43 (Taron).

²⁷ C. Holmes, "How the East Was Won in the Reign of Basil II," in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, ed. A. Eastmond (Ashgate, 2001), 41-56., C. Holmes, *Basil II and the Governance of Empire, 976–1025* (Oxford University Press, 2005)., T. Greenwood, "Social Change in Eleventh-Century Armenia: The Evidence from Taron," in *Social Change in Town and Country in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, ed. J. Howard-Johnston (Oxford University Press, 2020), 196-219.

²⁸ N. Matheou, "Hegemony, Counterpower, and Global History: Medieval New Rome and Caucasia in a Critical Perspective," in *Global Byzantium: Papers from the Fiftieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, ed. L. Brubaker, R. Darley & D. Reynolds (Routledge, 2022), 208-236., Greenwood, "Social Change". Holmes, *Basil II*, 299–391.

²⁹ E. McGeer and J. Nesbitt, *Byzantium in the Time of Troubles* (Brill, 2020), 139., M. Angold, "The Byzantine State on the Eve of the Battle of Manzikert," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 16 (1991): 9–34.

³⁰ S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (University of California Press, 1986), 88. See also P. Charanis, *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire* (Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1963).

³¹ *Ibid.*, 104.

highlands.³² In his view, the relationship between Armenians and the Byzantine Empire in the two decades after 1071 was pejoratively defined by antagonism and separation. It is an interpretive framework which has remained remarkably durable.³³

In 1985, Kazhdan and Wharton Epstein set out to modify what they termed the ‘ponderous image of Byzantium’ during the eleventh century in their monograph: *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*.³⁴ Through a wide-ranging sweep of economic, social, and political affairs, they largely shifted the narrative away from one of wholesale collapse and decline. Yet even in this work, which marked a considerable change of direction in scholarly approaches to Byzantium in the eleventh century, we still find the Armenians classified as an ‘alien culture’ and a group ‘given to revolt’.³⁵ Arguing that they remained religiously and linguistically distinct from the Empire, the Armenian experience during the period after 1071 is viewed by Kazhdan and Wharton Epstein in terms of the ‘desire for political independence’.³⁶ Nina Garsoïan reached a not dissimilar conclusion in her 1998 assessment of the same period. Basing her argumentation on contemporary Armenian historiographical material, she observed the Armenian literary-historical construction of the Byzantine Empire as ‘the root of all evil... bent on the destruction of Armenian realms and on the eradication of their faith’.³⁷ According to Garsoïan, the effects of this ‘semi-mythological pattern of betrayal, resentment, and hostility’ showed its results in the period after Manzikert.³⁸ Garsoïan argued that the Armenians pursued their own ambitions beyond the reach of Constantinople and soon thereafter ‘turned away from Byzantium’.³⁹ In 2001, Jean-Claude Cheynet explored the nature of the Byzantine frontier and its defence between the ninth and thirteenth centuries in his article *La conception militaire de la frontière orientale (IX–XIII siècle)*.⁴⁰ Describing the Empire’s east after 1071, Cheynet spoke of the Armenian populations as feeling less attached to the Constantinopolitan authorities; ‘Nous sommes dans une région où la population arménienne est nombreuse et il est possible, quoique non prouvé, qu’elle se soit sentie moins attachée aux autorités constantinopolitaines’.⁴¹ Even in approaches which attempt to re-think some of the traditional assumptions about the decades which pre-ceded and followed the battle of Manzikert, there is still the underlying characterisation of Armenians as resentful of Byzantine hegemony

³² Ibid., 110.

³³ See also G. Dagron, “Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l’orient byzantin à la fin du Xe et au XIe siècle: l’immigration syrienne,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 6 (1976): 177–216., W. Treadgold, *Byzantium and its Army* (Stanford University Press, 1995) 218–219.

³⁴ A. Kazhdan and A. Wharton Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Los Angeles, 1985).

³⁵ Ibid., 170.

³⁶ Ibid., 172

³⁷ N. Garsoïan, “The problem of Armenian integration into the Byzantine Empire,” in *Studies of the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, ed. H. Ahrweiler & A.E. Laiou (Dumbarton Oaks, 1998), 122–124.

³⁸ Ibid., 122–124.

³⁹ Ibid., 122–124.

⁴⁰ J.-C. Cheynet, “La conception militaire de la frontière orientale (IX–XIII siècle),” in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, ed. A. Eastmond (Ashgate, 2001). J.-C. Cheynet, “Les Arméniens de l’Empire en Orient de Constantin X à Alexis Comnène (1059–1081),” in *L’Arménie et Byzance: Histoire et culture*, ed. N. Garsoïan (Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996), 67–78.

⁴¹ Ibid., 65.

and engaged in a process of long-desired separation.

This impression is largely informed by the perspective of two key primary historiographical sources composed in Armenian during the late eleventh and early twelfth century. The Armenian historian Aristakēs Lastivertsi, writing in the decade after the battle of Manzikert, rebuked the state of the Empire following the murder of the emperor Romanus IV:

Եւ արդ զոր Աստուած ազատեալ ի ձեռանէ այլազգւոյն կորզեալ եհան, որ իւրքն էին նենգութեամբ եւ խայտառականաւք խաւարեցուցին զուսարանս նորա ... Յայնմ հետէ բարձաւ զաւրութիւն յիշխանաց եւ ի զինուորաց, եւ ոչ տուաւ յաղթութիւն այնմ թագաւորութեան եւ իշխանք նենգութեամբ եւ մախանաւք առ իրեարս կային, եւ զդատաստանաց իրաւունս բարձին. Միայն զաշխարհն աւերէին եւ ոչ փրկութիւն գործէին:⁴²

And so, the one whom God had freed from the hands of foreigners was blinded by those who were his own, deceptively, shamefully and then they extinguished his light Thereafter the power of princes and soldiers was removed, and victory was no longer given to that kingdom. And the princes were deceitful and envious with one another, and the rights of the courts were removed. They only ruined the land and they did not work for its salvation.⁴³

Aristakēs' *History* offers the impression of an Empire in a state of decay, one which was seen negatively from the perspective of an Armenian author. The Armenian chronicler Matthew of Edessa shared this view, writing some fifty years later from his retrospective vantage point in the early twelfth century:

Զայս բազում անգամ զնոաւ ածեալ եմ, վասն այս յետին ժամանակին գրել զդառնաշունչ կատարածսն, զայս սոսկալի բարկութիւնս, զոր կրեաց ազգս Հայոց ի զիսաւոր եւ ի պիղծ Եդիմնացոց ազգէն Թուրքաց, յերբարց իւրեանց Հոռոմոց:⁴⁴

I myself was minded to write about the bitter events of these latter days of ours, about the terrible wrath which the Armenian people bore from the long-haired and foul Edomites —the Turks — and from their brothers, the Romans.⁴⁵

Matthew's equivalence between the Seljuk and Byzantine Empires, and the equitable damage which they had inflicted on Armenians, tends to compound the idea that Armenians were less than keen to maintain their contact with the Byzantine Empire after Manzikert. By relying primarily on this material, secondary commentators have concluded that the relationship between the Empire and its Armenian populations after 1071 should be defined in terms of separation, driven by long term-antagonism and a desire to be rid of imperial hegemony.

This idea of Armenian separation from the Byzantine Empire in the closing decades of the eleventh century continues to play a pervasive role in the most recent approaches which have considered the nature

⁴² Aristakēs, *Patmut'ivn*, 140.

⁴³ Ibid., trans. L. Read

⁴⁴ Matt'ēos Urhayec'i, *Žamanakagrut'ivn*, 112-113

⁴⁵ Ibid., trans L. Read., T. L. Andrews, *Matt'ēos Urhayec'i and His Chronicle: History as Apocalypse in a Crossroads of Cultures* (Brill, 2016), C. MacEvitt, "The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: Apocalypse, the First Crusade and the Armenian Diaspora," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 61 (2007): 175-77.

of this relationship during this particular historical juncture. In his 2023 critical study on the role of methodological statism embedded in scholarly approaches to the Byzantine Empire: *Hegemony, Counterpower, and Global History: Medieval New Rome and Caucasia in a Critical Perspective*, Matheou defines the late eleventh century in such terms, characterising the year 1071 CE as marking an end to the Byzantine hegemonic cycle over the region of Anatolia, Upper Mesopotamia, and Caucasia, stretching from ‘c. 861, when the Caliphal cycle collapsed with the onset of centrifugal political-economic forces, and c.1071, when the Roman cycle ended in turn amid combined crises of invasion and fiscal collapse’.⁴⁶ Bromige’s recent attempt to engage with the question of Armeno-Byzantine relations during this period: *Armenians in the Byzantine Empire: Identity, Assimilation and Alienation from 867 to 1098*, is particularly unambiguous in its interpretation of the second half of the eleventh century period, titling the final chapter covering the years 1071-98: ‘separatism’, in which Bromige characterises the Armeno-Byzantine relationship as arriving ‘at its final destination’.⁴⁷ Rather strikingly in May of the same year, the French-Armenian scholar Aram Mardirossian, in an interview for Le Figaro, discussed what he believed to be the historical parallels between current foreign relations between Russia, Armenia, Turkey, and Azerbaijan and the relationship between Armenians, the Byzantine Empire, and the Seljuk Turks during the second half of the eleventh century: “Like Basil II, Vladimir Putin is misguided in believing that Armenia is of no use as a counterweight to pan-Turkish expansionism... like Emperor Basil II, Putin takes the risk of favouring Turkish expansion by abandoning Armenia.” Mardirossian went on to cite the battle of Manzikert as evidence of the disastrous consequences of such a short-sighted policy. In Mardirossian’s opinion, 2023 was the new 1071 and, as unique as we might find this parallel, it speaks to the enduring idea of collapse and separation which surround the perception of Armeno-Byzantine relations in the second half of the eleventh century, and particularly after 1071.⁴⁸

This process of gradual separation, facilitated by the battle of Manzikert and the steady fracturing of the Byzantine Empire’s eastern frontier at the end of the eleventh century, is seen as reaching its conclusion, via a series of semi-independent polities established throughout Northern Syria and Northern Mesopotamia, in the formation of a new Armenian polity in Cilicia: the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia. The lens of a linear progression from collective separatism to state foundation tends to frame the political, cultural, and intellectual activities of Armenians during the second half of the eleventh century in terms of coalescence toward the foundation, propagation, and enrichment of this emerging state and facilitating Armenian political revival in Cilicia.⁴⁹ It is Grigor Vkeyasēr and his translation programme which have come

⁴⁶ Matheou, “Hegemony, Counterpower, and Global History,” 211.

⁴⁷ T. Bromige, *Armenians in the Byzantine Empire: Identity, Assimilation and Alienation from 867 to 1098* (Bloomsbury, 2023) 101.

⁴⁸ A. Mardirossian, “En sacrifiant l’Arménie, Poutine commet la même erreur que l’Empire byzantin face aux Turcs”, Le Figaro, 3rd May, 2023: <https://www.lefigaro.fr/vox/histoire/en-sacrifiant-l-armenie-poutine-commet-la-meme-erreur-que-l-empire-byzantin-face-aux-turcs-20230503>.

⁴⁹ G. Dédéyan, “The Founding and Coalescence of the Reubenind Principality 1073-1129,” in *Armenian Cilicia: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, ed. R. Hovannisian (Mazda Publishing, 2008), 82-83., A. Bozoyan, “Armenian Political Revival in Cilicia,” in *Armenian Cilicia: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, ed. R. Hovannisian (Mazda Publishing, 2008), 67-68., S. P. Cowe, “Armenian Integration to the Sebastia Region, Tenth-Eleventh Centuries,” in *Armenian Sebastia/Sivas: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, ed. by R. Hovannisian (Mazda Publishing, 2004), 111. G. Dédéyan, “Les Arméniens en Cappadoce aux X et XI Siècles,” in *Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri and Cappadocia: Historic*

to be viewed as the instrumental and foundational tool in inaugurating this Armenian cultural and political renaissance in Cilicia, frequently referred to as the Armenian ‘silver age’, decisively marking Armenian separation from the Byzantine Empire in the process.⁵⁰ David Gevorgyan has summarised the scholarly context of this interpretation in his recent article *The Translation Movement Initiated by Grigor II Vkasasēr (Գրիգոր Բ. Վկասսերի նախաձեռնած թարգմանական շարժումը)*.⁵¹ As Gevorgyan explains, upon assuming the Catholical throne in 1065, Vkasasēr presided over the Armenian Miaphysite Church in a time of profound crisis, where its ‘independence was under sustained pressure’ from the Church of Constantinople.⁵² Being aware of the challenges, Grigor’s translation activities ‘strengthened the confessional and ritual basis of the Church’, an interpretation of the significance of his work which recalls Avdalbegyan’s and Vardanyan’s opinion that Vkasasēr’s translations not only stabilised and legitimised the Miaphysite Armenian Church by codifying and standardising feasts days and commemorations in Armenian, but that this process demarcated Armenians from the sustained encroachment of Byzantine imperial and ecclesiastical influence and provided a basis for the intellectual, cultural, and confessional strengthening of the Cilician Kingdom of Armenia from the twelfth century onward.⁵³ It is in this sense that this period of significant transformation in the Armenian *sanctorale* during the eleventh century, and the role of Armenian translation activity in facilitating it, have come to be viewed as tools through which the Armenian Miaphysite Church was able to emancipate itself from the pressure placed upon it by the Chalcedonian Church of Constantinople and the imposition of its standardised liturgical practices.⁵⁴ It is in this framework that the translation programme of Vkasasēr has been articulated; as a vehicle of cultural revival and as a tool of demarcation from the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople in the closing decades of the eleventh century.⁵⁵

Scholarship in the field of Armenian studies has long highlighted that the eleventh century was a key period in the transformation of the Armenian *sanctorale*, facilitated by the translation of texts which recorded previously unknown saints’ lives and martyrologies drawn from Greek Constantinopolitan liturgical collections. However, this transformation has come to be exclusively associated with the translation programme of Grigor Vkasasēr, whose activities have been framed as both a tool of cultural revival and of separation from the Byzantine Empire. Consequently, our current interpretive model framing the expansion of the Armenian *sanctorale* and the transformation of the Armenian liturgical tradition through

Armenian Cities and Provinces, ed. R. Hovannisian (Mazda Publishing, 2013), 77-79. J. Ghazarian, *The Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia during the Crusades: The Integration of Cilician Armenians with the Latins, 1080–1393* (Curzon Press, 2000).

⁵⁰ ‘Silver Age’: referred to in contrast to the Armenian ‘Golden Age’ of translation in the fifth century. Bozoyan, “Armenian Political Revival in Cilicia,” 72-73., L. Ter-Petrosyan, *Hay Hin T’argmanakan Grakanut’iwn (Ancient Armenian Translations)* (St. Vartan Press), 10., Cowe, “Armenian Hagiography,” 312., R. V. Chétanian, “Les citations scripturaires dans la version arménienne du XI siècle de quatre homélies de Jean Chrysostome sur les actes des apôtres,” *Le Muséon* 119, no. 3-4 (2006): 369–74.

⁵¹ Gevorgyan, “Grigor II Vkasasēri.”

⁵² Ibid., 94: ‘վտանգված էր նաև Հայոց եկեղեցու ինքնուրույնությունը’

⁵³ Ibid., 95: ‘ամրապնդել եկեղեցու դավանական և ծիսական հենքը հարստացնելով մատենագրությունն’, Avdalbegyan, *Yaysmanurk’ Zolovacuner*, 52., Vardanyan, *Hayoc’ Tonac’ iyc’ (4-18nd darer)*, 283 - 288.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 100.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 95.

the act of translation during the eleventh century is one articulated solely in terms of the creation of a national space, serving the purpose of demarcating Armenians from the influence of the Church of Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire and stimulating a period of Armenian cultural revival.

The Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*

This thesis provides the first critical edition, English translation, and historical study of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*. This unique martyrology, at present, provides the only securely dateable example of a hagiographical composition entering the Armenian tradition during the closing decades of the eleventh century which was not a product of the translation programme of the Miaphysite Armenian Catholicos Grigor Vkasasēr. As this thesis will elaborate, its translation and the entry of these saints into the Armenian *sanctorale* speaks to an entirely different set of circumstances and motivations on the part of those responsible for its production.

Arguing for Armenian Chalcedonian sponsorship, this thesis embeds the production of the text—translated from Greek into Armenian in the city of Melitene in 1092—within a set of socio-cultural and political conditions particular to the expansion of the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and eleventh century, situating its emergence into the Armenian tradition within an active milieu of Armenian Chalcedonian translation and veneration activity. Through the lens of the *Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*; this thesis will advance a conversation aimed at broadening the current scholarly model which surrounds a period of transformation in the Armenian liturgical tradition through translation from Greek textual models during the eleventh century; one which foregrounds the role of Armenian Chalcedonian translators in this process. The present study aims to set the production of the *Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* within a process of push and pull factors, whereby the imperial centre and its Chalcedonian populations actively co-operated in the construction of a shared spiritual and cultural environment characterised by the dissemination and translation of a prescribed canon of hagiographical, patristic, exegetical and liturgical texts. This was a process which not only brought previously unattested commemorations and feast days into the Armenian tradition, as was the case with Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios, but one which consummated the intrusion of the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople into the norms of Christian communities in Northern Syria, Northern Mesopotamia, Eastern Anatolia, and the Caucasus; serving to construct, reinforce, and maintain a trans-regional imperial space throughout the eleventh century.

The aim of the present thesis is not to replace one homogenizing model another. Instead, it seeks to put forward a more complex and dynamic framework for the activities which surround the expansion of the Armenian liturgical tradition in the eleventh century via translations from Greek: one in which we can acknowledge the agency of Grigor Vkasasēr in this period of transformation and accept that his translations were a medium through which Armenians could resist the hegemonic reach of the Byzantine Empire and which Vkasasēr used to establish a distinct period of Armenian cultural activity in Cilicia, but also one which takes into account the full range of evidence for Armenian translation activity which brought

previously unattested saints into the Armenian tradition and acknowledge that it was stimulated by a much broader range of actors with varied motivations and incentives during this period. It is a model that fully considers a parallel milieu of Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity which also stimulated transformations in the Armenian *sanctorale* through the translation of Greek Constantinopolitan textual models but functioned as an implicitly participatory response to Byzantine political, cultural, and spiritual hegemony.

This is an investigation and reassessment of a particular interpretation framing a period of transformation in the Armenian *sanctorale* facilitated by translation activity during the eleventh century and the role of that activity in conditioning Armeno-Byzantine during this historical period. It should be noted from the start of this study that the subsequent discussion is specific to the socio-cultural, political, and spiritual environment of the lived experiences of Armenian communities that had been absorbed within the borders of the Byzantine Empire during the tenth and eleventh centuries and the processes which subsequently conditioned that relationship. It does not seek to apply a singular model to all Armenians and recognises that many communities living outside of this purview interacted with and responded to the Byzantine Empire in different ways, or not at all, across different times and spaces.⁵⁶

Chapter Outline

The first chapter of this thesis will aim to identify and establish the compositional context and sponsor behind the production of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*. It will first identify the underlying Greek model used by the translator in 1092 in a step toward a deeper understanding of the composition in its original eleventh-century context; learning something of the priorities, processes of selection, and style of translation recorded by the anonymous scribe in the colophon. With this basis, this chapter will open a conversation grounded in both the translation technique which rendered the *Martyrdom* from Greek into Armenian and in the historical dossier of the cult of saints Eudoxios Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios in the Greek and Armenian traditions, using this evidence to propose the identity of the community or individual responsible for commissioning the translation in the late-eleventh century. This chapter will argue that the production of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092 was the product of the Armenian Chalcedonian community of Melitene and it will demonstrate that the emergence of these saints into the Armenian tradition was a product of an active Armenian Chalcedonian milieu of translation and veneration particular to the very late tenth and eleventh century.

⁵⁶ N. Garsoïan, "Reality and Myth in Armenian History," *The East and the Meaning of History: International Conference (23–27 November 1992)*, *Studi orientali* 13 (Rome, 1994): 117–45. T. M. Van Lint, "The Formation of Armenian Identity in the First Millennium," *Church History and Religious Culture* 89, no. 1 (2009): 277. T. Greenwood, "Armenian Space in Late Antiquity," in *Historiography and Space in Late Antiquity*, ed. P. Van Nuffelen (Cambridge University Press, 2019), 57–85. S. Aslanian, "From Autonomous to Interactive Histories: World History's Challenge to Armenian Studies," in *An Armenian Mediterranean: Words and Worlds in Motion*, ed. K. Babayan and M. Pifer (Palgrave Macmillan 2018), 95–97.

Having highlighted an alternative route through which previously unattested saints could enter the Armenian tradition during the eleventh century, Chapter two will aim to embed the translation of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092, and more broadly the emergence of evidence for the veneration of these saints in Armenian and by Armenians, within a specific set of socio-cultural and political conditions particular to historical experience of Chalcedonian communities in the expansion of the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and eleventh century. It aims to place the *Martyrdom* in a process whereby the imperial centre and provincial Chalcedonian populations co-operated in the construction of a shared spiritual and cultural environment through the injection and translation of hagiographical, patristic, exegetical and liturgical texts in Armenian, Syriac, and Arabic. This was a process which not only brought new commemorations and feast days into the Armenian tradition, but one which facilitated the intrusion of the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople into the norms of provincial Christian populations throughout the Empire's eastern frontier during the tenth and eleventh century. In doing so, this chapter will foreground an Armenian Chalcedonian translation milieu active in the late-tenth and eleventh century that carried distinctly different objectives from the translation activities of Grigor II Vkasasēr

Chapter 3 will then use the preceding discussion to reflect on the way in which this Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity continued to shape and condition the relationship between Armenian Chalcedonians and the Byzantine Empire in the fractious post-Manzikert Byzantine East. Moving past a scholarly framework which views the translation of hagiographical, exegetical, patristic, and liturgical texts from Greek into Armenian at the close of the eleventh century solely as a tool of separation and of cultural emancipation under the aegis of Grigor Vkasasēr, this chapter will attempt to articulate the role that Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity played in the maintenance of shared confessional, cultural, and intellectual environment which ensured that the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople continued to have meaning to Armenian Chalcedonian communities after the events of 1071. In doing so this chapter will place the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* at the service of an ongoing scholarly conversation that has begun to re-evaluate and nuance our interpretation of Armeno-Byzantine relations during the closing decades of the eleventh century.

Finally, Chapter 4 will present the first critical edition and English translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*, with the aim of supporting future textual and historical investigation into the text, its transmission, and its reception in the Armenian tradition.

1

The Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios: The Text and its Eleventh-Century Context

Թարգմանեցաւ պատմութիւն սրբոց վկայիցս ի յունարէն գրոց ի հայերէն բարբառ: Ի մայրաքաղաքին Հայոց որ կոչի Մելետինի: Ի թուականիս Հայոց ի հինգ հարիւր քառասուն և մի (1092): Ընդ որս և Քրիստոս բարեխաւսութեամբ սուրբ վկայից տացէ վարձս թարգմանողին և գրողին աշխատելոց ի սմա, ընթերցաւոյաց եւ լսաւոյաց եւ ստացաւոյաց եւ ինքն եղիցի արինեալ յաւիտեանս: Ամէն:

The account of these holy martyrs was translated from Greek writing into the Armenian language, in the mother city of the Armenians, which is called Melitene, in the Armenian era five-hundred and forty-one (1092). Through the intercession of the holy martyrs and Christ, may a reward⁵⁷ be given for the translation and the scribal work within. Readers, listeners, and owners, may it be praised forever. Amen.⁵⁸

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arménien 178 (BnF, Arm. 178), ff. 204v to 209r, preserves the earliest surviving copy of the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*. The manuscript, measuring 32.5 cm by 51 cm, was penned by a certain Pawlos in the city of Sebasteia, who refers to himself in a series of sporadic intercessory interventions as both scribe⁵⁹ (գիր)՝

⁵⁷ Վարձ: 'salary', 'pay', 'stipend', 'reward': the recompense due to the scribe for his translation. This can be taken to carry a more celestial meaning, but the term Վարձ also holds an implicitly financial definition: salary or stipend. In this case it may be a reference to a payment for services rendered, indicating non-monastic, possibly lay, sponsorship.

⁵⁸ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. Arménien 178, f. 209r.

⁵⁹ BnF, Arm. 178., f. 44r.

and owner⁶⁰ (ստացող) of what he refers to as ‘this book of martyrs’ (վկայական մատենիս).⁶¹ Beyond appealing to the saints on his own behalf, Pawlos also records the names of a bishop Papan, and the binder of the manuscript Kač’atur.⁶² Though the scribe chose not to reveal the exact time of its creation, the double column, forty-line, slanted Erkat’agir majuscule script allows us to approximate the manuscript’s completion to somewhere between the ninth and twelfth centuries.⁶³ A colophon copied by Pawlos which follows the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* provides a key *terminus post quem* in this respect by retaining the date in which the Armenian model used in the process of collation was originally produced: 1092. If the creation of one of the underlying sources used by Pawlos can be dated to the late eleventh century, we can confidently place the completion of BnF, Arm. 178 to somewhere between the very end of the eleventh century and the twelfth century, predating any later witness to the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* by half a century.

By retaining the colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in the copying process, we can be thankful to Pawlos for preserving a window through which to reflect on the processes which lay behind the creation of this Armenian martyrology in its original context. The colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom* records that it was originally translated in the city of Melitene in 1092, informing the reader that it was rendered into Armenian from Greek, and detailing the services of a scribe to facilitate this process. Whilst the colophon informs us of the where, when, and how, it naturally invites further questions concerning the Greek model from which the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* derives, the identity of those who commissioned the work and bore the costs of its creation, and the wider context behind its translation. The aim of this chapter is to first identify and establish the underlying Greek model used by the translator of the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom* in 1092, in a step toward a deeper understanding of the composition in its original eleventh-century context. With this basis, this chapter will then open a conversation grounded in both the translation technique which rendered the *Martyrdom* from Greek into Armenian and in the historical dossier of the cult of saints Eudoxios Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios in the Armenian tradition, using this evidence to propose the identity of the community or individual responsible for commissioning the translation in the late-eleventh century. This chapter will argue that the production of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092 was the product of the Armenian Chalcedonian community of Melitene.

⁶⁰ BnF, Arm. 178., f. 212r.

⁶¹ BnF, Arm. 178., f. 212r., The manuscript comprises a collection of saints lives and martyrdoms. The arrangements do not follow a standard liturgical cycle, though the notice which preserves the date for the *Martyrdom of St Eudoxios et al.* (6th September) follows the dating of the Church of Constantinople. The manuscript is not ordered alphabetically as Outier has recently suggested see; Outier, “The Armenian Homiliaries. An Attempt at an Historical Overview,” 119.

⁶² BnF, Arm. 178., f. 586r.

⁶³ R. H. Kevorkian and A. Ter-Stépanian, *Manuscrits arméniens de la Bibliothèque nationale de France. Catalogue* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1998), 590.

The Greek Model: Hagiographical Collections and *Metaphrasis* in 10th and 11th century Byzantium

Referring to the magisterial study of Albert Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, Charles Astruc reminds us that, despite his extensive work with Greek hagiographical collections, Ehrhard only encountered the Greek version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* authored by Symeon Metaphrastes; one of the canon of 148 texts included in his eponymous late-tenth-century Metaphrastic Menologion: '(il) notait qu'il n'avait jamais rencontré, au cours de l'immense enquête à laquelle il avait consacré sa vie, de Passion ancienne relative à ce groupe de saints'.⁶⁴ Indeed, when one examines the entry for the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* and its supplements up until 1984, only the version of the text attributed to Metaphrastes is identified under BHG 1604.⁶⁵ In his 1959 study of Paris suppl. gr.1002, Charles Astruc identified the one exception to this prevailing trend with the discovery of a fragmentary late ninth or, more likely, early tenth-century Greek version of the *Martyrdom* preserved on two palimpsest leaves which pre-dated the Metaphrastic version. Prior to its scraping for re-use, the manuscript comprised a menologion for the month of September arranged according to the liturgical year cycle of the Church of Constantinople.⁶⁶ Astruc's study highlights several discrepancies between the largely mutilated version of the text found in Paris suppl. gr. 1002 and the Metaphrastic version of the *Martyrdom*, which clearly indicated the discovery of an otherwise unknown pre-Metaphrastic version of the text. These differences were primarily categorised by Astruc as **i**) omission - significant amounts of material found in the version preserved by Paris suppl. gr. 1002 had been removed in the Metaphrastic text, with a particular focus on reducing direct dialogue, and **ii**) alteration - the Metaphrastic text contains structural and lexical additions not otherwise found in Paris suppl. gr. 1002, as well as possessing an upgraded stylistic and linguistic register.⁶⁷ Following Astruc's study, Paris suppl. gr. 1002 was recognised as a pre-Metaphrastic Greek version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in the 1984 BHG *Novum Auctarium*, and added under entry 1603x.⁶⁸ Though it is preserved in a tenth century manuscript, we can assume that this version of the text had been in circulation well before its inclusion in Paris suppl. gr. 1002.

One of the distinctive features of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* is the combination of two very distinct narratives: the martyrdom of the Roman *Praepositus* Romylos in the city of Melitene under the reign of the Emperor Trajan in the second century and the martyrdom of the *Komēs* Eudoxios, along with Zenon, Makarios, and 1104 of their fellow soldiers in the city of Melitene during the reign of the Emperor Diocletian in the late third century. Whilst hagiographical compositions devoted

⁶⁴ C. Astruc, "Un fragment palimpseste d'une Passion prémétaphrastique inconnue de S. Eudoxios et de ses compagnons (Parisinus Suppl. gr. 1002)," *Analecta Bollandiana* 77 (1959): 42; A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche: von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts: 1. Teil, Die Überlieferung* (J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1937), 453.

⁶⁵ *Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca I-III.*, ed. F. Halkin (Société des Bollandistes, 1957), 227.

⁶⁶ Astruc, "Un fragment palimpseste," 43.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 49-53.

⁶⁸ F. Halkin, *Novum Auctarium Bibliothecae hagiographicae Graecae* (Société des Bollandistes, 1984), 185; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. Supplément grec 1002; *Pinakes*: Romylos, Eudoxios, Zeno and Macarius mm. Melitinae (SS.), *Passio metaphrastica*, accessed January 5, 2025.

to groups of martyrs are by no means uncommon, combining the events of individuals who suffered martyrdom nearly a century and a half apart is, as Astruc pointed out, ‘un peu surprenant’.⁶⁹ It is likely that these texts started life as separate narratives and were, at some point in their textual history, combined and reworked into a single version. In this respect, it is notable that the fragmentary version preserved by Paris suppl. gr. 1002 does not preserve the martyrdom narrative of Saint Romylos. Given the late ninth or early tenth century dating of the Paris suppl. gr. 1002 palimpsest, Astruc proposed that this absence provided evidence of an earlier stage in textual development of the *Martyrdom* in which the two distinct narratives; that of saint Romylos, and that of saints Eudoxios, Zenon, and Makarios originally existed separately. In turn, he suggested that the initiative to combine these separate narratives fitted squarely within the programme of Symeon Metaphrastes, whose version of the text has both narratives.⁷⁰ However, Astruc urges caution in his own supposition and stresses the fact that the martyrdom of saint Romylos may well have originally been attached to that of saints Eudoxios, Zenon, and Makarios in Paris suppl. gr. 1002 and that it was simply lost during the scraping of the folios.⁷¹ This argument nonetheless poses a possible point of divergence between the only surviving pre-Metaphrastic Greek version of the text and its Metaphrastic Greek successor and it is worth bearing this in mind as we progress in identifying the model which was used by the Armenian translator of the *Martyrdom* in 1092, especially since the Armenian translation contains both narratives: the martyrdom of Romylos and the martyrdoms of Eudoxios, Zenon, and Makarios. Considering that both possible candidates for the Greek version used by the translator of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* are preserved in hagiographical collections arranged according to the liturgical calendar established by Church of Constantinople, either produced in or dating to the tenth century, and that the subsequent translation into Armenian in the eleventh century took place in a city which was at that time still nominally under the control of the Byzantine Empire, it is worth taking some time to orientate ourselves within the world of tenth and eleventh-century Byzantine hagiographical production to gain a better understanding of the trends and choices available to the anonymous translator of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092.

The process of gathering, arranging, and rewriting hagiographical and martyrological texts for liturgical use was certainly nothing novel by the time Symeon Metaphrastes began to compose his eponymous Menologion in the late tenth century. Hagiographical collections in Greek appear from the seventh and eighth century onward, comprising a variety of compositions each suited to different idiosyncratic liturgical and institutional needs.⁷² These collections of living texts were subject to change over time and the hagiographies and martyrologies contained within them were often the object of re-ordering,

⁶⁹ Astruc, “Un fragment palimpseste,” 44; M. Detoraki, “Greek Passions of the Martyrs in Byzantium,” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography II: Genres and Contexts*, ed. S. Efthymiadis (Ashgate, 2011), 71-72.

⁷⁰ Astruc, “Un fragment palimpseste,” 45-46. Högel identifies this process as a fourth possible characteristic working method of Symeon Metaphrastes, see C. Högel, *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization* (Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002), 109-110.

⁷¹ Ibid., 46.

⁷² C. Högel, “Hagiography under the Macedonians: the Two Recensions of the Metaphrastic Menologion,” in *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, ed. P. Magdalino (Brill, 2003), 220., See also S. Constantinou and C. Högel, *Metaphrasis: A Byzantine Concept of Rewriting and Its Hagiographical Products* (Brill, 2020).

re-working, and renewal to suit contemporary tastes. This point has recently been reiterated by Alwis, Hinterberger, and Schiffer in the introduction to their volume *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature* where they elucidate on the long developmental history of the hagiographical genre which preceded Symeon Metaphrastes: the collection and ‘rewriting of hagiographical texts can be observed at least as early as the beginning of the seventh century, such as the *enkomion* of Anastasios the Persian by George of Pisidia, which is based on the saint’s martyr acts’.⁷³ Pointing to the work of John of Sardis, the editors also highlight the fact that ‘around the end of the eighth, or beginning of the ninth, century, the rewriting of hagiographical texts seems to have gradually gained importance’, a trend which they argue ‘can be connected to the general stylistic and ideological upgrading of texts that related the lives, deeds, and deaths of saints’.⁷⁴ So, whilst the dual processes of collection and, in particular, metaphrasis, the term used to describe the process of rewriting a text through omission, reduction, abbreviation, addition, amplification, substitution/replacement, or repetition which alter the stylistic, linguistic, ideological, and narrative register of a model text were not idiosyncratic to a particular time period, they have nonetheless, for reasons we will now explore, come to be viewed as emblematic of tenth century Byzantine hagiographical production.⁷⁵ Whilst the processes and objectives of hagiographers like Symeon Metaphrastes were nothing new, the tenth century witnessed a shift in the scale and scope of hagiographical compilation and the reworking of the textual content therein, primarily driven by direct imperial involvement and sponsorship.⁷⁶

The *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* represents one aspect of this significant developmental shift in tenth-century Greek hagiographical production. A synaxarion is generally defined as a liturgical codex which provides an abbreviated summary of the lives of the saints on their respective feast days throughout the year.⁷⁷ In the mid-tenth century, the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus commissioned Euaristos to produce a new imperial synaxarion, known now by its editorial title: *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, specifically for services in the Hagia Sophia.⁷⁸ The text was soon copied, disseminated beyond the capital and, as we will learn more about later in this study, translated. We should

⁷³ A. P. Alwis, M. Hinterberger, E. Schiffer., “Introduction,” in *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*, ed. A. P. Alwis, M. Hinterberger, and E. Schiffer (Brepols, 2021), 12.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 12; C. Rapp, “Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians, Seventh to Tenth Centuries,” in *Bosphorus: Essays in Honour of Cyril Mango*, ed. S. Efthymiadis, C. Rapp, and D. Tsougarakis (Adolf M. Hakkert Press, 1995), 35. Rapp distinguishes between a period of activity up to the middle of the seventh century, and a later period, from the end of the eighth century to the end of the tenth century, which culminated in the work of Symeon Metaphrastes.⁷⁴

⁷⁵ H. Hunger, *Anonyme Metaphrase zu Anna Komnene, Alexias XI–XIII. Ein Beitrag zur Erschließung der byzantinischen Umgangssprache*, *Wiener Byzantinistische Studien* 15 (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981).

⁷⁶ C. Högel, “Hagiography under the Macedonians: The two recensions of the Metaphrastic menologion,” in *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, ed. P. Magdalino (Brill, 2002), 220; C. Högel, “Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement,” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography. II: Genres and Contexts*, ed. S. Efthymiadis (Ashgate, 2011), 183. P. Odorico, “Une appropriation impossible. Textes et formes littéraires entre Byzance et l’Occident,” in *Proceedings of the Plenary Sessions of the 24th International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, ed. E. Fiori and M. Trizio (Venice Ca Foscari University Press, 2022), 281 – 298., P. Odorico, “La cultura della sillogé: 1) Il cosiddetto enciclopedismo bizantino. 2) Le tavole dei saperi di Giovanni Damasceno,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 83 (1990): 1-23.

⁷⁷ N. P. Sevcenko, “Synaxaria and Menologia,” in *A Companion to Byzantine Illustrated Manuscripts*, ed. V. Tsamakda (Brill, 2017), 319- 20; A. Luzzi, “Synaxaria and the Synaxarion of Constantinople,” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography II: Genres and Contexts*, ed. S. Efthymiadis (Ashgate, 2011), 197-198.

⁷⁸ *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanum e codice Sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi*, ed. H. Delehaye (Reproduction Anastatique, 1954).

not imagine this to have given birth to a linear and stable tradition across different languages; an examination of its translation into languages other than Greek demonstrates that the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* displays a complex transmission history with multiple recensions.⁷⁹ Constantine's grandson, the emperor Basil II would continue this imperial tradition by sponsoring his now erroneously named "Menologion", one of the most well-known illustrated versions of the *Synaxarion* preserving 430 miniatures of saints celebrated from September through February.⁸⁰

The project which has come to define tenth century Byzantine hagiographical collection and renewal is the Menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes. Like a synaxarion, a menologion is a collection of saints' lives chronologically arranged in liturgical order according to their feast day in the church calendar. However, where a synaxarion is characterised by brief entries, a menologion comprises full, *vita longior*, versions of saints' lives and martyrologies.⁸¹ These collections are defined by their fluid and interchangeable content tempered by editorial choices which varied with context. Surviving in some 900 manuscripts and fragments, the Menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes is marked apart not only by its popularity, but by its programmatic renewal of the majority of the 148 hagiographical texts that it contains.⁸² A particular, and frequently reiterated, characteristic of hagiography, summed up by Högel, is that 'though new texts, sometimes on near-contemporary saints, were composed, by far the majority of texts read from the liturgical manuscripts were old texts, written in what we call Late Antiquity'.⁸³ As Rapp has argued, this 'feeling of distance from the saints of old' was coupled with the 'ardent desire to render them more accessible' at any different stages in their transmission history.⁸⁴ At different developmental stages, hagiographical collections and their constituent texts often required adjustment and reworking as literary expectations and demands changed. The impetus behind the tenth-century Metaphrastic Menologion programme of hagiographical compilation and renewal is generally viewed in the context of a changing intellectual landscape and the composition of the *martyria* and *vitae* in the Menologion is largely characterised by an upgrading of their stylistic register, primarily through lexical and syntactical replacements, attributed to the demands of 'an increasing number of well-educated persons, who enjoyed and, in some cases, even produced more literary hagiographical texts, became weary of hearing the old stories repeated in their humble and unpretentious tone'.⁸⁵ However, as Rapp points out, Michael Psellos' *encomium* on Symeon Metaphrastes praises Symeon's ability to create a perfectly balanced style that was 'easily understood by the many, while causing no offense to the refined taste of the educated few', so it is perhaps more prudent to characterise his stylistic re-working in terms of its applicability to general contemporary tastes rather than a tailored response to the demands

⁷⁹ Luzzi, "Synaxaria and the Synaxarion of Constantinople," 202-204.

⁸⁰ Sevčenko, "Synaxaria and Menologia," 320.

⁸¹ Högel, "Hagiography under the Macedonians," 220-221.

⁸² S. Papaioannou, *Christian Novels from the Menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes* (Harvard University Press, 2017), xi. C. Papavarnavas, *Gefängnis als Schwellenraum in der byzantinischen Hagiographie: Eine Untersuchung früh- und mittelbyzantinischer Märtyrerakten* (De Gruyter, 2021), 31.

⁸³ Högel, "Hagiography under the Macedonians," 220.

⁸⁴ Rapp, "Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians," 43.

⁸⁵ Högel, "Hagiography under the Macedonians," 218-219; Alwis, Hinterberger, Schiffer., "Introduction," 12-15

of a small intellectual élite.⁸⁶ Despite the enormous popularity of his work, Symeon remains a somewhat enigmatic individual, save for the fact that he held the position of *logothetes tou dromou*, was a high-level official in the imperial administration in Constantinople, and was active toward the end of the tenth century.⁸⁷ It is fairly apparent that such a vast project required that Symeon did not work alone. As Papaioannou has recently observed ‘he seems to have directed a group of collaborators, but whether these were scribes, co-authors, or both is unclear. No single authorial voice is clearly detectable in the collection, though a certain consistent approach to style and content suggest unifying editorial principles set by Metaphrastes himself’.⁸⁸ In the same manner as the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, the Metaphrastic Menologion exhibits a ‘fluid’ state between its creation in the tenth century and its mass production in the eleventh century; two recensions of the Menologion, for example, have been the subject of study by Høgel.⁸⁹ There is certainly no doubt that the Metaphrastic Menologion was one of the most significant hagiographical and liturgical projects in the Byzantine empire during the tenth century, which established a more or less coherent canon of saints and martyrs grounded in a firmly Constantinopolitan liturgical context.

In contrast with this period of innovative creation, the eleventh century, by and large, has been viewed as a relatively unproductive period of Byzantine hagiographical production, largely based on the dearth of new lives/martyrdoms or new metaphrastic projects. Although this ponderous image has recently been challenged by Paschalidis, he acknowledges that the ‘hagiographic literature of the eleventh century is characterised by the continuation and standardisation of the more or less successful attempts, going back to the ninth century, to organise the great hagiographic collections, particularly in the form of menologia and synaxaria’, which served ‘to inhibit the further composition of original texts about new saints at least during the eleventh century’.⁹⁰ In other words, eleventh-century Byzantine hagiographical production is primarily defined by the consolidation and copying of already existing models produced in the tenth century. In the context of what is now recognised as the most prolific corpus of hagiographical literature produced in Byzantium during that period, it is perhaps natural to overstate the immediate impact of the Metaphrastic Menologion on the priorities of copyists in the eleventh century. Though the composition of the Metaphrastic Menologion is dated to the last decades of the tenth century, no surviving full versions can be securely dated until the mid-eleventh century, the earliest of which appears in 1042.⁹¹ This gap between production and ‘publication’ of the Metaphrastic Menologion in the eleventh century has naturally led

⁸⁶ Rapp, “Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians,” 37. M. Hinterberger, “Language,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*, ed. S. Papaioannou (Oxford University Press, 2021), 26.

⁸⁷ Høgel, “Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement,” 185., Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 61-88.

⁸⁸ S. Papaioannou, “Authors (with and excursus on Symeon Metaphrastes),” in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*, ed. S. Papaioannou (Oxford University Press, 2021), 504.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 508-509.; Høgel, “Hagiography under the Macedonians,”.

⁹⁰ Symeon A. Paschalidis, “The Hagiography of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography I: Periods and Places*, ed. Stephanos Efthymiadis (London: Routledge, 2016), 144; Papavarnavas, *Gefängnis als Schwellenraum*, 30.

⁹¹ Høgel, “Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement,” 189., see Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 130., Høgel also draws our attention to three earlier manuscripts containing Metaphrastic texts dating 1004, 1011, and 1039 representing what Ehrhard classified as “vermischter Metaphrast”, manuscripts containing Metaphrastic texts mixed with other texts.

scholars to attempt to explain why Symeon's work was not immediately successful. The eleventh century account of the Georgian monk Ephrem Mtsire suggests that Symeon fell out of favour with the Emperor Basil II and that his Menologion was burned.⁹² The veracity of such a claim is challenging to confirm, but, as Høgel has very convincingly demonstrated, the gap between composition and production make it tempting to accept such an explanation.⁹³ Directly suppressed or not, the slow build toward the mass production of the Metaphrastic Menologion and its dissemination throughout the wider Byzantine world can also be explained by more practical challenges. In the context of such a monumental corpus, the feasibility of producing and sponsoring its copying has naturally drawn the attention of scholarly investigation. Whilst the initiative to produce the Menologion lay firmly in the framework of imperial sponsorship, Høgel has suggested that much of the economic impetus behind the subsequent production of manuscripts can be located in major monastic institutions such as Athos, Studios, and Evergetis.⁹⁴ The Menologion was, after all, a liturgical collection, and as Høgel points out, 'the collection could hardly have functioned as a liturgical instrument in many places other than monasteries, as the long texts would have made severe demands on readers and audiences'.⁹⁵ It seems fair to assume that the financial and practical strain of such a project, initially limited the copying of the Menologion, and that its design did not lend itself to immediate widespread production throughout the Empire. Beyond the financial practicalities there is also the matter of the distribution of available models for copying. Many of the earliest identifiable individuals responsible for commissioning the Metaphrastic Menologion are perhaps unsurprisingly marked by their connections to the imperial court. Høgel points to the *patrikios*, Niketas, a copyist of the first dated Metaphrastic manuscript of 1042, the *proedros*, Ioannes, who was the donor of a Metaphrastic Menologion also, and the *patrikios* of the Senate, Pothos, in 1057, who paid 150 nomismata for the first seven Metaphrastic volumes.⁹⁶ Through palaeographic evidence, Hutter has also located early copying activities to a single Constantinopolitan scriptorium that produced a series of Metaphrastic volumes, which has been further explored by Høgel in his study on the two recensions of the Metaphrastic Menologion.⁹⁷ The production of the Menologion and the distribution of its early copying then appear to have been largely associated with the capital of the Empire.

Though it appears that eleventh-century production was largely Constantinopolitan and that, beyond that, only much larger monastic centres could support the outlay of costs for such production, Høgel has demonstrated that smaller monastic and ecclesiastical institutions founded by members of the provincial élite also owned and sponsored the production of the Menologion. Eustathios Boilas, protospatharios and hypatos, for example, bequeathed his collection of books, among them four

⁹² Høgel, "Hagiography under the Macedonians," 223.

⁹³ Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 127-135.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 224-227.

⁹⁵ Høgel, "Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement," 186.

⁹⁶ Høgel, "Hagiography under the Macedonians," 223.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 223; I. Hutter, "Le copiste du Métaphraste. On a Centre for Manuscript Production in Eleventh-Century Constantinople," in *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito. Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia Greca Cremona, 4 - 10 ottobre 1998*, ed. G. Prato (Gonnelli, 2000).

Metaphrastic volumes, to a church he had founded.⁹⁸ In their role as *charistikarioi*, these lay benefactors of monastic institutions carried the available capital to support the textual production of such a large corpus. It is perhaps only through this route that copies of the Menologion could reach more provincial centers. Although the second half of the eleventh century witnessed an increase in the production of the Metaphrastic Menologion, we must be conscious to frame this textual production within these parameters: as a steady process of increased production, limited by cost, available models, and initially linked to Constantinopolitan-based sponsorship; not an immediate mass publication throughout every corner of the Empire. We should ultimately be conscious not to overstate the dominance of the Metaphrastic Menologion, as *the* model of choice for the copying of hagiographical collections and individual hagiographies in eleventh-century Byzantium. As the Menologion of John Xiphilinos the Younger illustrates, new models competed with the Metaphrastic Menologion at the end of the eleventh century and, as the Paris suppl. gr. 1002 palimpsest shows, pre-Metaphrastic menologia continued to be circulated and copied.⁹⁹ In his study, Astruc observes that the original manuscript which contained the old version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* formed a pre-Metaphrastic menologion for the month of September.¹⁰⁰ The manuscript was not scraped for re-use until the thirteenth century, so we can assume this pre-Metaphrastic Menologion was still in use for its original purpose throughout the eleventh century and that the Greek version of the *Martyrdom* which it preserves was still in circulation.¹⁰¹

We should then be conscious that the eventual dominance of the Metaphrastic Menologion was by no means definitive in the eleventh century, and that its introduction into the wider milieu of hagiographical textual production in the Byzantine Empire was certainly not a uniform replacement of all pre-Metaphrastic hagiographical textual models.¹⁰² This is perhaps best summarised by the translator Yovsēp, who when translating the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* into Armenian in Constantinople in 991 CE remarked that:

Իցեն եւ այլ Հռոմ տաւնացոյցք յորում չեն այս սուրբքս գրեալ այլ սրբոց պատմութիւնք են եւ էթէ որչափ սուրբք իցեն ընդ ամենայն երկիր առաւել քան զհազարս հազարաց եւ բիւրս բիւրոց եւ ոչ ոք գիտէ զթիւսն եւ զհամարն բայց միայն ընդդող հոգոց նոցա Քրիստոս որ հրաւիրեաց եւ ընդդեաց յորովայնէ եւ գրեաց զանունս նոցա յերկինս ի գիրն կենաց եւ կարգեաց ի դասս հրեշտակաց.¹⁰³

There may be other Roman testimonies of feasts, in which these saints are not recorded; there are histories of different saints, and how many saints there may be across the whole world, more than thousands of thousands and ten thousands of ten thousands and no-one knows the number and the

⁹⁸ P. Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin* (Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1977). English translation by S. Vryonis Jr., “The Will of a Provincial Magnate, Eustathius Boilas (1059),” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 (1957): 263 – 277.

⁹⁹ Paschalidis, “The Hagiography of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” 144.

¹⁰⁰ Astruc, “Un fragment palimpseste,” 43.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 44.

¹⁰² Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 111-113.

¹⁰³ Vienna, Mekhitarist Monastery, ms. 1048, f. 8r.

total, but only Christ, selector of their souls, who, having been invited and elected from the womb, wrote their names in heaven in the book of life and established them in the ranks of angels.

To contemporary authors working with hagiographic material in the period immediately after the production of the Metaphrastic Menologion, the vast variety of available models and collections of saints' lives and martyrdoms was all too evident. It is in this fluid context that we should frame the choice of Greek model made by the translator of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in Melitene in 1092.

Identifying the Greek Model

Of the sixty-seven surviving Greek manuscript witnesses of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*, sixty-six are versions of the text attributed to the tenth-century authorship of Symeon Metaphrastes and are found in copies of his Metaphrastic Menologion. Only one witness, contained in Paris suppl. gr. 1002, preserves the pre-Metaphrastic version of the *Martyrdom*.¹⁰⁴ It may be tempting to assume that the eleventh-century Armenian translation of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* would be modelled on the Metaphrastic version; unlike the pre-Metaphrastic Greek *Martyrdom* found in Paris suppl. gr. 1002, we know for certain that the Metaphrastic Greek *Martyrdom* contained both the narrative cycles of Saint Romylos and Eudoxios, Zenon, and Makarios as one text, just as in the Armenian version translated in 1092. However, if we permit that Paris suppl. gr. 1002 originally contained the martyrdom of Saint Romylos before it was lost during scraping, then it is equally possible that the translator could have deferred to a Greek model from an earlier pre-Metaphrastic collection. These two possibilities provide the point of departure for a full textual comparison between the Armenian, pre-Metaphrastic Greek, and Metaphrastic Greek versions of the *Martyrdom* to determine the Greek model used by the anonymous translator in Melitene in 1092.

What follows is a parallel textual comparison of three versions of the *Martyrdom*: The pre-Metaphrastic Greek, the Metaphrastic Greek, and the Armenian translation made in 1092. The source material does impose certain limitations on this task. In the absence of any alternative Greek witnesses to the pre-Metaphrastic *Martyrdom*, we are limited to using Paris suppl. gr. 1002 as the representative version of the text at the tenth-century stage in its transmission history. The opposite can be said for the Metaphrastic Greek *Martyrdom*, with sixty-six surviving witnesses to choose from. For reasons of time and accessibility, the present study relies on the Metaphrastic version of the text prepared by J.P. Migne in his *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*.¹⁰⁵ The Armenian version is based on a semi-diplomatic transcription of the text as it is preserved in BnF, Arm. 178.¹⁰⁶ The current state of the Paris suppl. gr. 1002 palimpsest is such that

¹⁰⁴ According to *Pinakes*: Romylos, Eudoxios, Zeno and Macarius mm. Melitinae (SS.), Passio metaphrastica, accessed January 5, 2025.

¹⁰⁵ "De Sancto Romulo Martyre in Graecia item De Ss. Martyribus Eudoxio, Zenone, Macario Et Mciv Militibus Melitinae in Armenia Minori," in *Acta Sanctorum Volume 42: Sep. II* (1868), 511-517., *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Graeca vol. 115: Symeonis Logothetae*, ed. J. P. Migne (1899), 610-634. All Greek text has been taken directly from the relevant entry in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Passio sanctorum Romuli, Eudoxii, Zenonis et Macarii* (BHG 1604).

¹⁰⁶ Abbreviations in Armenian have been expanded and normalised.

much of the narrative is not accessible, and in the absence of further spectral imaging, we are confined to examining the sections which were visible to and subsequently transcribed by Astruc during his investigation of the manuscript in the 1950's. Due to these limitations the following analysis will be confined to a comparison between the surviving sections of pre-Metaphrastic Greek version of the text visible on the palimpsest with their equivalent sections in the Metaphrastic Greek and Armenian versions. The text has been divided into five narrative units for ease of reference in the analysis which follows. Each narrative unit is accompanied by an English translation.¹⁰⁷

Pre-Metaphrastic Greek

I)

Εἰσηλθε οὖν κατήγορος πρὸς τὸν ἡγεμόνα περὶ Εὐδόξιου τοῦ καὶ Μαρριανῶ ἀπὸ πριμικηρίων τῆς ἱερᾶς λεγεῶνος, ὅστις ἐζώσθη κόμης, ὅτι οὐ πείθεται τοῖς προστάγμασιν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς, καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς οὐ προσκυνεῖ, ἀλλὰ τιν' ἐσταυρωμένον λέγει εἶναι Θεὸν καὶ τοῦτον σέβεται. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ ἡγεμὼν, ἐκέλευσεν πέντε ἄνδρας τῆς τάξεως ἀπελθόντας πιάσαι αὐτόν. Ἐλθόντες δὲ ἐν ᾧ κατέμεινεν κτήματι, ἐμάνθανον περὶ αὐτοῦ μηνυθέντες δὲ ὅτι εἰς τὸν κάμπον τὸν λεγόμενον Κουτακούων ἐστίν, ὥρμησαν πρὸς αὐτόν. Αὐτὸς δὲ μαθὼν ἀνῆλθε καὶ πλησίον τοῦ θυρώματος ἐκάθητο θεωρῶν αὐτούς· καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι σπουδὴν εἶχον ζητοῦντες αὐτόν, ἐλθὼν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ἤλλαξεν τὸν χιτῶνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιβαλλόμενος ἱμάτιον οἰκτρὸν ἤλθεν ἐν τόπῳ τινί. Καὶ ἀπαντήσαντες αὐτόν οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν ἔγνως που τὸν κόμητα Μαρριανόν, τὸν καὶ Εὐδόξιον; λέγει αὐτοῖς τί γὰρ αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχετε; εἶπατέ μοι, κἀγὼ ὑμῖν ὑποδείξω αὐτόν. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον ὁ ἄρχων αὐτὸν ζητεῖ. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τί αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν. Ἵνα τοῖς προστάγμασιν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς πεισθεῖς τοὺς θεοὺς ὁμολογήσῃ

Armenian

I)

Եկեալ արք նմանք չարախաւսւնիքին առ իշխանն մատուցանէին, վասն Մարինուի որ Եւրոքսիսն կոչեցաւ, որ էր ի դասէ Պրիմիկիւնացն, որ պատուեցաւ ի կոմսութեան իշխանութեամբ, եւ աւելին եթէ ոչ խոնարհի երբեք հնազանդ լինել թագաւորական հրամանաց, եւ աստուածոցն զոհս ոչ մատուցանէ այլ զխաչեալն խոստովանի աստուած, եւ ի նա հաւատացեալ է: Եւ լուեալ զայս դատաւորն հրամայեաց արանց հնգից զաւրականաց խնդրել զնա ուր եւ գտանիցեն բերել յառեան դատաստանի: Եւ եկեալ նոցա ի գելդն յորում բնակեալն էր նա, եւ հարցանէին վասն նորա: Ասէն արքն ցնոսաւ, աւանդի զոր դուքն խնդրէք շրջի ի դաշտիան որ կոչի Կուլպատիա: Եւ զնացին առ նա: Իսկ նորա յառաջագոյն իմացեալ զգալուստ նոցա զնաց ի լեառնն եւ նստէր անդ տեսանելով զնոսա: Եւ տեսեալ զի փոխանակի խնդրէին զնա եկեալ ի տունն իւր եւ փոխեալ զհանդերձս իւր եւ զգեցաւ հանդերձ աղքատի, եւ եկեալ ի տեղի մի հանդիպէր նոցա: Եւ ասէն ցնա զինուորքն զհոյհեմս արդէք թէ ուր իցէ բնակեալ կոմսն Մարինոս որ կոչի Եւրոքսիս: Ասէ ցնոսա: Վասն

Metaphrastic Greek

I)

Ἐνταῦθα μηνύεται τις εὐσεβής, καὶ τοῦ μὴ λαθεῖν ὄντως ἄξιος, Εὐδόξιος ἢ Μαρριανὸς ὄνομα ἀνὴρ· ἀμφοτέρους γὰρ ἐκυριολογεῖτο τοῖς ὀνόμασιν· ἀπὸ πριμικηρίων δὲ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἥς διὰ τὸν εἰς Χριστὸν πόθον ἀπεληλαμένος, ἐν τῇ τῶν κομήτων ὑπεβιάσθη· καὶ ταύτης δὲ μὴ τυχὼν, ἔστερξεν ἂν τῷ ποθουμένῳ μόνῳ παρακαλούμενος. Μηνύεται δὲ τὸ τινικαῦτα Μελιτηνῆς ἡγεμόνι· ὃς ἐπειδὴ τὰ περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἕκαστα μεμαθήκοι, τοὺς ἄξοντας αὐτόν παραχρῆμα ἐκπέμπει. Τοῦτο δὲ μὴ τὸν Εὐδόξιον λαθὼν, εὐτελεστέραν περιθέμενος τὴν στολήν, ἵνα μὴ ὅστις εἴη φανερός γένοιτο, ἐμφανίζεται τοῖς ἀπεσταλμένοις. Ἐντυχόντες τοίνυν αὐτῷ καὶ μήπω τοῦτον ἐκείνον εἶναι νομίσαντες, ὅπη ἄρα διατρίβοι ὁ κόμης Εὐδόξιος, εὐθέως ἠρώτων. Ὁ δὲ· Εἴ μοι παρελθεῖν ἐθέλήσετε εἰς τὴν στέγην, ἡμερώτατα πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη, καὶ βραχὺ τὸν ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ κόπον διαναπαῦσαι, καὶ τραπέζης καὶ ἁλῶν κοινωνῆσαι, ἐγὼ ὑμῖν τὸν ζητούμενον ὑποδείξω.

¹⁰⁷ To date, as is the case with the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romulos, Zenon, and Makarios*, both the pre-Metaphrastic and Metaphrastic Greek versions of the text remain untranslated. This section therefore also offers the first translation of the respective portions of the two versions of the Greek *Martyrdom*. A full translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* is provided in Chapter 4.

Ὁ δὲ εἶπον αὐτοῖς δεῦτε ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν.

որո՞յ իրաց խնդրէք, եւ կամ զի՞նչ բանք իցեն ձեր ընդ նմա ասացէք ինձ եւ ես ցուցից զնա ձեզ: Ասեն ցնա, իշխանն խնդրէ զնա: Եւ ասէ ցնոսա, վասն որո՞յ իրի խնդրէ զնա: Ասեն ցնա: վասնզի ո՛չ հնազանդի հրամանաց ինքնակալին, եւ աստուածոցն ոչ զոհէ: Ասէ ցնոսա, եկայք ի տուն իմ եւ հանգերուք փոքր մի եւ ես ցուցից զնա ձեզ:

Then an accuser came before the Governor concerning Eudoxios, who is also Marianos, who, from the office of the *Primikērios* of the holy legion, was invested with the seat of *Komēs*, saying: “He does not accept the imperial decrees, nor does he worship the gods, but the crucified one who he says is a God and worships him.” Hearing this, the Governor ordered five soldiers to go and seize him. Having come to that estate in which he was residing, they learned about him and having been informed that he was in the plain called “of Koutakios”, they hastened to him. Having learned of this, he went out and sat near the courtyard. Observing them and having seen that they were seeking him with haste, he went into his house and changed his attire, and putting on pitiful clothing he went to that place. And encountering him, the envoys said to him: “Do you perhaps know of the *Komēs* Marianos, the one who is also Eudoxios?” And he said to them: “What need do you have of him? Tell me, and I will show him to you.” And they said: “The Governor seeks him.” And he said to them: “What need does he have of him?” And they said to him: “That, having obeyed the imperial decrees, he may confess the gods.” And he said to them: “Come into my house, I will show him to you.”

Then certain accusers came before the Governor concerning Marianos who is also Eudoxios, who, from the office of the *Primikērios* was honoured with the authority of the *Komēs*, and they said: “He does not humbly obey the imperial decrees, nor does he worship the gods, but rather the crucified one who he acknowledges as God and worships him.” Hearing this, the Governor ordered five soldiers to search for him and, upon finding him, to bring him to the court of judgement. Having come to the estate in which he was residing, they enquired about him. The men said to them “The one which you seek, he wanders in the plain which is called ‘of Kupati’.” And they went to him. But he, having learned before that they were coming for him, went up to the mountain and sat there. Observing them and having seen that they were seeking him with haste, he went into his house and changed his attire and putting on pitiful clothing he went to that place, as a stranger to them, and the soldiers asked him: “Do you know where the *Komēs* Marianos, the one who is also Eudoxios, is residing?” And he said to them “For what reasons do you enquire? What words might you have with him? Tell me and I will show him to you.” And they said to him “The Governor seeks him.” And he said to them “For what reason does he seek him?” And they said to him: “Because he does not obey the decrees of the emperor and he does not sacrifice to the gods” and he said to them, “Come into my house and rest a little, and I will show him to you.”

At that time, a certain pious one was reported, truly worthy of not being overlooked, Eudoxios who is named Marianos, since he is called by both names. A former *Primikērios* by rank, having been removed on account of his love for Christ, he was demoted to the office of *Komēs* - even if he had not obtained this, he would have been fine with it, comforted by the love for the one who he longed for. He was reported to the then Governor of Melitene. Once he had learned every detail about the man, he immediately sent forth those to apprehend him. Eudoxios, this not having escaped his attention, adorned humble clothing, in order that it was not obvious who he was and he showed himself to the envoys. Meeting him and having not yet acknowledged he was the one, they immediately asked where the *Komēs* Eudoxios was staying. He politely said to them, “If you are willing to join me in the house, refresh from the toils of the road, and share my table and my salt, I will show you the one you seek.”

II)

Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ἤγαγεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λέγει τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ κυρία μου, διάταξον ἄριστον. Καὶ διαταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἀνέκλινεν αὐτοῖς. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀριστῆσαι αὐτούς, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν κόμητα Εὐδόξιον. Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγὼ εἰμι ὃν ζητεῖτε. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν· τί τοῦτο ἐποίησας ἡμῖν; Ἀπελθόντες λέγομεν ὅτι οὐχ ἠϋρομεν αὐτόν. Καὶ αὐτός ἀποκρυβηθῆς εἰς τὸ μὴ φανῆναι σε.

II)

Եւ երբերի տուն իւր, եւ ասէ ցամուսին իւր, պատրաստեալ ճաշակելոցս ան մէզ: Եւ նորա եղեալ անաջի նոցա սեղան, ճաշակեցին եւ ասէն ցնա արդ ցոյց զոր խնդրեմքն զկոմսն Եւդոքիոս: Եւ նա ասէ ցնաս, զոր խնդրէք եւ եմ: Ասէն ցնա արքն ընդէ՛ր զայդ արարեր: Երբե կամիս երթամք ան իշխանն եւ ասեմք երբե ոչ զտաք զնա: Եւ դու զանխաջիր եւ թաքն զանձն քո զի մի ըմբռնեցիս եւ անկցիս ի ձեռս իշխանին:

II)

Παρασκευασάμενος οὖν τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἐστίασιν φιλοτίμως, δεξιοῦται τοὺς ἄνδρας. Τῶν δὲ ἡσθέντων ἱκανῶς τῇ τραπέζῃ, εἶτα καὶ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν ἀπαιτούντων καὶ δεομένων φανερόν αὐτὸν ποιήσεσθαι τὸν ζητούμενον, ἐκεῖνος εὐθὺς τὸν ἔνδον αὐτοῖς ἀνακαλύπτει Εὐδόξιον· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὃν ζητεῖτε, εἰπὼν. Τοῦτο μαχαίρας ὀξύτερον καθίκετο τῆς ἐκείνων ψυχῆς· καὶ ὑπολαβόντες, Οὐ προδόσομέν σε τὸν ἡμέτερον ἐστιάτορα, εἶπον, οὐδὲ οὕτω τὴν φιλοξενίαν κακῶς ἀμειψόμεθα· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἡμῖν εἰς ἀπολογία ἀρκέσει τὸ πολλὰ περὶ τὴν ζήτησιν καμόντας, ὅμως μὴ δυνηθῆναι ὅλως τὸν Εὐδόξιον ἀνευρεῖν. Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ταύτας Εὐδοξίῳ τῆς ξενίας τὰς χάριτας ἀπεδίδοσαν.

And inviting them, he led them into his house, and said to his wife, "My lady, prepare a meal." And having prepared it for them, she laid it before them. And after they had dined, they said to him, "Show us the *Komēs* Eudoxios." He said to them, "I am the one that you seek." And they said to him, "Why did you do this to us? So that departing, we report that we did not find you? You concealed yourself, so as not to be seen."

And he brought [them] into his house and said to his wife "Prepare us a meal" And having put it before them on his table, they ate and then they said "Now, show the one we seek, the *Komēs* Eudoxios." And he said to them "I am the one that you seek." And the men said to him "Why did you do this? So that you wanted us to depart to the Governor and report that we could not find him? You have concealed yourself, so that you would not be seized and fall into the hands of the Governor."

Having hospitably prepared the meal, he welcomed the men, and after having sufficiently treated themselves at the table, and then demanding and asking for the promise that the one they were looking for be made known, he immediately uncovered Eudoxios who was inside, saying: "I am the one that you are looking for!" This touched their souls more sharply than a dagger, and in response they said: "We will not betray you who received us with a feast, nor will we thus repay your hospitality, but our excuse will be sufficient, that although we laboured much in the search, we were not able to find Eudoxios." And, so, they returned the grace of the hospitality of Eudoxios.

III)

Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς οὐχί, ἀλλὰ κἀγὼ ἔλθω μεθ' ὑμῶν· μόνον ἐκδέξασθέ με μικρὰν ὥραν. Καὶ καλέσας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα, διετάξατο πάντα τὰ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ· ἐάν τι ἀκούσης περὶ μοῦ, μὴ ἐνέγκης

III)

Ասէ ցնաս ո՛չ արարից զայդ այլ եկից զկնի ձեր բայց փոքր մի համբերեցէք ինձ: Եւ կոչեաց ցամուսինն իւր եւ ասէ ցնա վասն տան իւր յարինել զամենայն ըստ խրատու իւրոյ: Ասէ ցնա, եւ ո՛վ կին դու

III)

Ὁ δὲ καὶ λαθεῖν εἰδὼς ὅτε δέον, καὶ μὴ λαθεῖν αὖ ὅτε τούτου καιρός· θεία γὰρ ἦν χάρις ἢ παροῦσα καὶ διδάσκουσα τὸν ἀθλητὴν ἀκολουθῆσαι τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐσκέψατο· καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καλέσας Βασίλισσαν, ἢ

δάκρυα ἐπὶ ἐμοί, ἀλλὰ
λαμπροφόρεσον ταγματικά σου,
καὶ κήρους λαμπροὺς ἄξον, καὶ
πόκον λαμπρόν εὐτρέπισον, καὶ
δέξαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ αἷμά μου καὶ
τὴν κεφαλὴν μου, μετὰ τῶν ὕδων
σου χαίρουσα. Ταῦτα σὺ οὕτως
ποίησον ὡς νύμφη Χριστοῦ. Καὶ
διαταξαμένου αὐτοῦ παρέλαβον
αὐτὸν οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι,
καθίσαντος ἐπὶ λαμπρὸν ἵππον
καὶ ἐσθῆτα λαμπρὰν
ἐνδυσασμένου αὐτοῦ, καὶ
ἀγαγόντες αὐτὸν παρέστησαν τῷ
ἡγεμόνι.

փոխելոց եւ ի սնոտի եւ փանցաւոր կենաց աստի ի մշտնջենաւոր եւ յաւիտենական կեանսն: Եւ այլ ո՛չ եւս տեսանելոց եւ զիս ի մարմնի աստ: Արդ զոր ասեմ քեզ լուր ինձ, եւ մի յեկանելն իմ ի մարմնոյ աստի, որքս առեալ արտասուեցես ի վերայ իմ: Այլ զգեցիր դու զգեստ հարսանեացն քոց, եւ վառեա լապերս եւ ջահս եւ առեալ ամանս մաքուրս ժողովեա զարիւն իմ: Եւ առեալ զգլուխ իմ եւ զմակարիոսի որդւոյն մերոյ եւ ուրախէր, եւ զայս արս որպէս հարսն Զրիստոսի: Եւ ասացեալ նորա զայս, առեալ զնա զինուորացն, նստեալ ի վերայ երիվարին իւրոյ: Եւ զգեցեալ զգեստս ազնիւս եւ պայծառս, եւ տարան զնա առաջի դատաւորին:

καὶ Μανδάνην, εἰ βούλει· διπλοῖς
γὰρ καὶ αὐτῇ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν
ἐκαλεῖτο· ὅσα τε ἔδει τῶν κατ'
οἶκον αὐτῇ ἐντέλλεται, καὶ πάντα
τῇ αὐτῆς ἀναθεῖς φροντίδι,
ἐσχάτην τοῦτο καὶ γνησίαν
ἐντολὴν δίδωσι· μὴ ἐπιδακρῦσαι
τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐκδημίᾳ, μὴ
ἀποδύρασθαι, μὴ θρηνηῖσαι ὅλως
τὴν τελευτήν· ἀλλὰ καὶ
λαμπροφωρίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ
παιδιρότῃ ἐκείνην τιμῆσαι
μάλιστα τὴν ἡμέραν. Εὐθὺς οὖν
καταφρονεῖ μὲν τῆς οἰκείας
συγγενείας Εὐδόξιον·
ἐπιλανθάνεται δὲ διὰ Χριστὸν
τῆς πρὸς τὰ τέκνα στοργῆς, τοῦ
ἰσχυροῦ δὴ τούτου καὶ
ἀπαραιτήτου τοῖς πατράσι
δεσμοῦ· ἵνα γὰρ ἐκεῖνον
κερδήσῃ, ζημίαν ἡγεῖτο πάντα
καὶ σκύβαλα· καὶ ἄπεισι πρὸς τὸν
ἡγεμόνα.

He said to them, "No, but I will come with you, only allow me a short while." And calling his wife, he put his house in order, and he said to her "If you should hear anything about me, do not shed tears over me, but with your splendid garments, bring bright torches and prepare a fine woolen pouch, and collect my blood and my head in it, rejoicing with your children. Do these things as a bride of Christ." And having instructed her, the envoys took him, sitting upon a bright horse and dressed in fine clothing, and they brought him before the Governor.

He said to them “No, I did not do that, but I will come with you, only allow me a short while.” And calling his wife he put his house in order. And he said to her “Oh wife, I am transforming from this vain and sinful life to a perpetual and eternal life, but you will see me no longer in corporeal form. Now I say, if you should hear news of me, do not shed tears over me leaving my corporeal form, but dress in your bridal clothing and light lanterns and torches and prepare a fine pouch to collect my blood and take my head and our son Makarios and rejoice. Do these things as a bride of Christ.” And having instructed her, the soldiers took him sitting upon his horse and dressed in fine and bright clothing, and they brought him before the Governor.

But, knowing when it is proper to remain hidden, and when it is not - because divine grace was present and was guiding the athlete - he decided to follow the men, he called his wife Basilissa, who is also Mandane if you wish, because she is also called by two names, as far as it was necessary to invest the estate to her and having entrusted everything to her care, he gave this last and genuine instruction, that she should not weep over his departure, nor bitterly lament, nor grieve over his death at all, but rather, above all, honour that day with splendid garments and other rejoicings. And so Eudoxios rejected his ties of kinship, for through Christ he forgot the love for his children, that powerful and indissoluble bond of fathers, so that, by considering everything forfeit and waste, he would gain Christ. And he went to the Governor.

IV)

‘Ο δὲ ἡγεμὼν λέγει· χαίροις, ἐνδοξότατε καὶ πανεύφημε κόμης Εὐδόξιε. ‘Ο δὲ Εὐδόξιος εἶπεν χαίροις καὶ σὺ, ἡγεμὼν. ‘Ο δὲ ἡγεμὼν εἶπεν ἔγνω, κόμης Εὐδόξιε, ἔνεκεν τίνος τὸ δικαστήριον σοῦ χρεῖαν ἔσχεν. ‘Ο ἅγιος Εὐδόξιος εἶπεν ἐάν μοι ἐξηγήσῃ, γινώσκω. ‘Ο δὲ ἡγεμὼν εἶπεν ἔνεκεν τοῦ εἰῆσαι σε τοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως προστάγμασιν περὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς Θεοὺς καθαρᾶς λατρείας. Εὐδόξιος εἶπεν, ἐμπαιζὼν αὐτόν· διὰ τοῦτο καθαρὸς χιτῶνας περιβαλλόμενος καὶ ἐπὶ ἄσπρου ἵππου καθίσας παρέστην τῷ βήματί σου. ‘Ο δὲ ἡγεμὼν λέγει μὰ τοὺς Θεοὺς, ἐάν ἀκούσῃ περὶ σοῦ ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ, δεῦτερος τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ καθίστασαι. Εὐδόξιος εἶπεν· ἐλπίζω τυχεῖν τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς καὶ προσκυνῆσαι τὴν ἀληθινὴν θεότητα. ‘Ο δὲ ἡγεμὼν ἔχαιρεν, νομίζων ὅτι περὶ τῶν θεῶν αὐτοῦ λέγει εἴτα λέγει αὐτῷ ἐνδοξότατε κόμης, ἐλθὲ οὖν αὐριον καὶ θύσον τοῖς θεοῖς. ‘Ο κόμης εἶπεν ποίοις Θεοῖς ἵνα θύσω, ἢ πόσοις. ‘Ο ἄρχων εἶπεν τῷ Διί, καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, καὶ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ μεγάλῃ θεᾷ. ‘Ο κόμης εἶπεν τοῖς τρίσιν με ἐπέτρεψας θύειν οὕτως, καὶ θύω τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, τῇ ὁμοουσίῳ Τριάδι. ‘Ο ἡγεμὼν εἶπεν ὥς περιφρονῶν τῶν βασιλικῶν προσταγμάτων ταῦτα λέγεις.

IV)

Եւ աւէ բռնաւորն, ուրախէր փառաւորեալ կոմս եւդոքիէ: Եւ աւէ Եւդոքիէ ուրախէր եւ դու ո՛վ բռնաւոր: Եւ աւէ ցնա դատաւորն իմացա՛րով կոմս եթէ վասն որոյ գործոյ խնդրէար գրեգ: Եւ նա աւէ, պատմեա՛ ինձ ով դատաւոր զի գիտացից վասն որոյ խնդրէին զիս: Իշխանն աւէ, վասն այնորիկ կոչեցի գրեգ զի հաւանեցիս հրամանաց ինքնակալին: Եւ զոհեցես աստուածոցն: Իսկ սուրբ վկայն ծիծաղելով ի վերայ անստուրեան բռնաւորին աւէ: Եւ վասն այնորիկ զգեցեալ եմ հանդերձս պատուականս, եւ պայծառս եւ նստեալ ի վերայ սպիտակ երկվարի, եւ եկեալ կամ առաջի քո յոյգ բեմի: Աւէ դատաւորն, երդուեալ յաստուածսն ամենայն, եթէ լսէ թազաւորն վասն հնազանդելոյ քո կայսերական հրամանին եւ զոհելոյ աստուածոցն յերկրորդական յաթոռ թազաւորութեան իւրոյ նստուցանէ գրեգ: Աւէ երանելին, եւ յուսացեալ եմ ի տեր յաւիտենական կենացն արժանի լինել, եւ երկիր պազանել ճշմարիտ աստուածութեան նորա: Եւ բռնաւորն ուրախ լինէր կարծէր եթէ վասն աստուածոցն ասիցէ զայն: Աւէ ցնա դատաւորն, փառաւորեալ եւ քաջ կոմս վաղիւն եկեաջիր ի տաճար աստուածոցն եւ ընդ մեզ երկիր պազցես նոցա: Աւէ ցնա կոմսն, որո՞ց եւ քանիւ աստուածոց հրամայես զոհել: Իշխանն աւէ, Դիայ եւ ի Ապողոնի եւ մեծին Արտեմեայ: Կոմս աւէ, երի՛ց հրամայեցեր հաւատալ այնպէս եւ եւ հաւատամ ի հայր եւ յորդի եւ ի սուրբ հոգին: Երրորդութիւնն անբաժանելի: Իշխանն աւէ, որպէս արհամարհելով զհրաման թազաւորին ասացեր զայդ:

IV)

Καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ἰδὼν, Χαίροις, ἔφη, κόμης Εὐδόξιε. ‘Ο δὲ τοῖς ἴσοις εὐθὺς ἡμεῖβετο, Χαίροις καὶ αὐτός, εἰπὼν, ὃ ἡγεμὼν. Καὶ ὃς πάλιν, Μετεστελάμεθά σου, ἔφη, τὴν περιφάνειαν, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς βασιλικοῖς ὑπηρετῆσαι προστάγμασι, καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς τὴν προσήκουσαν θυσίαν προσενεγκεῖν, μάλιστα τῷ πατρὶ πάντων θεῶν τῷ μεγάλῳ Διί, Ἀπόλλωνί τε τῷ Φοίβῳ, καὶ τῇ φίλῃ παρθένῳ Ἀρτέμιδι. Καὶ ὁ μάρτυς· Ἐμοὶ μία, ἔφη, θυσία, ἡ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ τὸ πᾶν τόδε παραγαγόντος· καὶ αὐτῷ θύσω θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, ὃς ἐν τριάδι θεολογούμενος ὑποστάσεων, ζωῆς ταμίας καὶ οἰκονόμος ἀληθοῦς σωτηρίας γνωρίζεται. Οὗς δὲ θεοὺς ὀνομάζεις ξύλα τούτους καὶ λίθους ὁρῶ τῆς λοιπῆς ἀψύχου ὕλης μηδὲ βαρὺν διαφέροντας. Πρὸς ταῦτα διαβλέψαι οὐκ ἔχων ἐκεῖνος πόθεν ὅσγε ὑπὸ βαθεῖα τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐκάθευδε μέθη· Ἐγὼ σε τὰς τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκτελέσαι προστάξεις, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τὰ εἰθισμένα δρᾶσαι προετρεψάμην, ἔφη· ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ θεῶν, ὡς ὁρῶ, καὶ βασιλέως ὑπερορᾷς, οὕτω μὲν ἀναιδὴν εἰς οὗς ἐκεῖνος σέβει θεοὺς ἐνυβρίσας, οὕτω δὲ καινοφανῆ τινα λατρείαν παρὰ ταύτην νομοθετῶν, καὶ ταύτη, ὡς εἰς ἐμὰ ὧτα ἤκει, τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀναπείθων.

The Governor said “Greetings, most glorious and renowned

And the tyrant said “Greetings glorious *Komēs* Eudoxios.” And

And seeing the man he said “Greetings, *Komēs* Eudoxios,” and

A multitude from the army was assembled near them, and surrounded Eudoxios. The Governor said, “Those among you who do not wish to obey the emperor and his decrees, untie your belts and place them before me.”

A multitude from his army gathered near him and stood around the saint. The tyrant said “Those among you who do not wish to obey the decrees of the emperor, untie his military belt and place it before me.”

And the Governor said this surrounded by many soldiers. And casting a stern and piercing gaze at them, he said “Those among you, who do not obey the imperial decree, loosen your military belts and consider yourselves stripped of these symbols of rank.”

Metaphrastic Greek

Comparing the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* with the Metaphrastic Greek version reveals several significant differences. Although they share a broad narrative structure and do not present any formal points of disagreement in the narrative progression, the Armenian and Metaphrastic Greek texts are considerably divergent in content. Rather noticeably these points of difference can be isolated and divided in much the same way that Astruc categorised the differences between the pre-Metaphrastic Greek and Metaphrastic Greek versions of the text: i) omission and ii) alteration and elaboration.

In the Armenian version, direct speech is generally preferred to indirect speech or narrative summary in the Metaphrastic text. In narrative unit I of the Metaphrastic version, two dialogues are entirely absent (between the accusers and the Governor of Melitene, and between the envoys/soldiers and the locals) and another is significantly shortened (between the envoys/soldiers and Eudoxios). To offer an illustrative example, in narrative unit IV, most of the dialogue between Eudoxios and the Governor found in the Armenian text is not present in the Metaphrastic version:

Metaphrastic: Καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ἰδὼν, Χαίροις, ἔφη, κόμης Εὐδόξιε. Ὁ δὲ τοῖς ἴσοις εὐθὺς ἡμείβετο, Χαίροις καὶ αὐτός, εἰπὼν, ὃ ἡγεμών. Καὶ ὃς πάλιν, Μετεστειλάμεθά σου, ἔφη, τὴν περιφάνειαν, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς βασιλικοῖς ὑπηρετῆσαι προστάγμασι, καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς τὴν προσήκουσαν θυσίαν προσενεγκεῖν, μάλιστα τῷ πατρὶ πάντων θεῶν τῷ μεγάλῳ Δίί, Ἀπόλλωνί τε τῷ Φοίβῳ, καὶ τῇ φίλῃ παρθένῳ Ἀρτέμειδι.

Metaphrastic: And seeing the man he said “Greetings, *Komēs* Eudoxios”, and he returned the greeting, saying “Greetings also to you Governor,” who in turn said “We have brought you to subordinate to the royal decrees, and offer sacrifice to the gods, above all to the father of all the gods, the great Zeus and to Phebus Apollo and to the fair Goddess Artemis.”

BnF, Arménien 178: Եւ ասէ բռնաւորն, ուրախելի փառաւորեալ կոմս եւդոքսիէ: Եւ ասէ Եւդոքսիէ ուրախելի եւ դու ո՛վ բռնաւոր: Եւ ասէ ցնա դատաւորն իմացա՛րով կոմս եթէ վասն որոյ գործոյ խնդրէաք զքեզ: Եւ նա ասէ, պատմեա՛ ինձ ով դատաւոր զի զիտացից վասն որոյ խնդրէին զիս: Իշխանն ասէ, վասն այնորիկ կոչեցի զքեզ զի հաւանեցիս հրամանաց ինքնակալին: Եւ զոհեցես աստուածոցն: Իսկ սուրբ վկայն ծիծաղելով ի վերայ անստուրեան բռնաւորին ասէ: Եւ վասն այնորիկ զգեցեալ եմ հանդերձս պատուականս, եւ պայծառս եւ նստեալ ի վերայ սպիտակ երիվարի, եւ եկեալ կամ առաջի քո յոյզ բեմի: Ասէ դատաւորն, երդուեալ յաստուածսն ամենայն, եթէ լսէ թագաւորն վասն հնազանդելոյ քո կայսերական հրամանին եւ զոհելոյ աստուածոցն յերկրորդական յաթոռ թագաւորութեան իւրոյ նստուցանէ զքեզ: Ասէ երանելին, ես յուսացեալ եմ ի տեր յաւիտեանական կենացն արժանի լինել, եւ երկիր պազանել ճշմարիտ աստուածութեան նորա: Եւ բռնաւորն ուրախ լինել կարծէր եթէ վասն աստուածոցն ասիցէ զայն: Ասէ ցնա դատաւորն, փառաւորեալ եւ քաջ կոմս վաղիւն եկեսցիր

ի տաճար աստուածոցն եւ ընդ մեզ երկիր պագցես նոցա: Ասէ ցնա կոմսն, որո՞ց եւ քանոյ աստուածոց հրամայես զոհել: Իշխանն ասէ, Դիայ եւ ի Ապողոնի եւ մեծին Արտեմնայ:

BnF, Arménien 178: And the tyrant said “Greetings glorious *Komēs* Eudoxios.” And Eudoxios replied “Greetings to you also, oh tyrant.” And the Governor said to him “Do you understand *Komēs*, for what reason we seek you?” And he responded “Tell me oh Governor, that I might know for what reason they sought me?” The Governor said “I called you so that you may accept the decrees of the emperor and so that you may worship the gods.” But the holy martyr replied taunting the foolishness of the Governor: “So, for this reason, I dressed in fine and bright robes, sitting upon a white horse to stand before your tribunal.” The Governor replied, “By the gods, if the emperor hears about your obedience to imperial decree and sacrificing to the gods, he will seat you as second in his kingdom.” The blessed one replied, “I am hoping to be worthy of eternal life and to worship the true divinity.” The tyrant was pleased, believing that he was speaking about his gods. Then the Governor said to him “Glorious and brave *Komēs*, come tomorrow to the temple of the gods and worship them with us.” The *Komēs* asked “To which and to how many gods do you command me to sacrifice?” The Governor replied “To Zeus, Apollo, and the great Artemis.

The loss of direct speech is coupled with a loss of superfluous detail in the Metaphrastic text. In unit I this includes the absence of information about the number of soldiers sent to find Eudoxios or the details of their subsequent journey. A particularly significant omission in this regard is the named location associated with the estate of Eudoxios, identified as ‘դաշտիան զոր կոչի Կուպասիայ’ in the Armenian and in the pre-Metaphrastic Greek version as ‘τὸν κάμπον τὸν λεγόμενον Κουτακούων ἐστίν’. In unit III, the Metaphrastic text does not retain the details of Eudoxios’ instructions to his wife regarding the modality by which his head and blood should be collected, in the Armenian: ‘Եւ առեալ ամանս մաքուրս ժողովեալ զարիւն իմ: Եւ առեալ զզուխ իմ’ (prepare a fine pouch to collect my blood and take my head). This process of omission is also evident in the treatment of Eudoxios’ dual name. Noticeably, where the Armenian text reiterates both of his names through the formula վասն Մարինոսի որ Եղորքիոսն, and this is the case throughout the entirety of the text, the Metaphrastic text only states this once at the start of the narrative ‘Εὐδοξίος ἢ Μαρίανδς ὄνομα ἀνήρ’.

Alongside omission, we also encounter sections of the Armenian text which are found significantly altered or elaborated in the Metaphrastic version. The most marked additions in comparison to the Armenian are found in narrative units II and IV. Upon receiving the envoys into his house, Eudoxios reveals his identity. In the Armenian version we find a very brief accusatory response toward his deception, whilst in the Metaphrastic text this is reworked into a qualifying passage in which the envoys recognise the hospitality offered by Eudoxios:

Metaphrastic: Τοῦτο μαχαίρας ὀξύτερον καθίκετο τῆς ἐκείνων ψυχῆς· καὶ ὑπολαβόντες, Οὐ προδώσομέν σε τὸν ἡμέτερον ἐστιάτορα, εἶπον, οὐδὲ οὕτω τὴν φιλοξενίαν κακῶς ἀμειψόμεθα· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἡμῖν εἰς ἀπολογίαν ἀρκέσει τὸ πολλὰ περὶ τὴν ζήτησιν καμόντας, ὅμως μὴ δυνηθῆναι ὅλως τὸν Εὐδόξιον ἀνευρεῖν. Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ταύτας Εὐδοξίῳ τῆς ξενίας τὰς χάριτας ἀπεδίδουσιν.

Metaphrastic: This touched their souls more sharply than a dagger, and in response they said: “We will not betray you who received us with a feast, nor will we thus repay your hospitality, but our excuse will be sufficient, that although we laboured much in the search, we were not able to find Eudoxios.” And, so, they returned the grace of the hospitality of Eudoxios.

BnF, Arménien 178: Ասեն ցնա արքն ընդէ՛ր զայդ արարեր: Եթէ կամիս երթամք առ իշխանն եւ ասեմք եթէ ոչ զտաք զնա: Եւ դու զանխաջիր եւ թաքոյ զանձն քո զի մի ըմբռնեսցիս եւ անկցիս ի ձեռս իշխանին:

BnF, Arménien 178: And the men said to him “Why did you do this? So that you wanted us to depart to the Governor and report that we could not find him? You have concealed yourself, so that you would not be seized and fall into the hands of the Governor .”

After meeting the Governor in section IV, the Metaphrastic text introduces a new rhetorical exchange following the saint’s profession of faith, which includes a criticism of idol worship and a more developed response offered by the Governor :

Metaphrastic: Καὶ ὁ μάρτυς· Ἐμοὶ μία, ἔφη, θυσία, ἡ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ τὸ πᾶν τόδε παραγαγόντος· καὶ αὐτῷ θύσω θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, ὃς ἐν τριάδι θεολογούμενος¹⁰⁸ ὑποστάσεων, ζωῆς ταμίας καὶ οἰκονόμος ἀληθοῦς σωτηρίας γνωρίζεται. Οὓς δὲ θεοὺς ὀνομάζεις ξύλα τούτους καὶ λίθους ὁρῶ τῆς λοιπῆς ἀψύχου ὕλης μηδὲ βαρὺ διαφέροντας. Πρὸς ταῦτα διαβλέψαι οὐκ ἔχων ἐκεῖνος πόθεν ὅσγε ὑπὸ βαθείᾳ τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐκάθειδε μέθη· Ἐγὼ σε τὰς τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκτελέσαι προστάξεις, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τὰ εἰθισμένα δρᾶσαι προετρεψάμην, ἔφη· ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ θεῶν, ὡς ὁρῶ, καὶ βασιλέως ὑπερορᾷς, οὕτω μὲν ἀναίδην εἰς οὓς ἐκεῖνος σέβει θεοὺς ἐνυβρίσας, οὕτω δὲ καινοφανῇ τινα λατρείᾳ παρὰ ταύτην νομοθετῶν, καὶ ταύτη, ὡς εἰς ἐμὰ ὦτα ἤκει, τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀναπείθων.

Metaphrastic: And the martyr replied “My only sacrifice is to the true God, the producer of all things, and to whom I offer a sacrifice of praise, who in the hypostasis of the Trinity, dispenses life, and is to be made known as the guardian of true salvation. But the gods you name, I see them as wood and stone, differing little from the rest of inanimate matter.” The Governor , unable to figure out where all of that was coming from, deeply asleep as he was in the drunkenness of impiety, said: “I have exhorted you to carry out the decrees of the emperor, and perform the customary rites to the gods, but you, as I see, disdain the gods and the emperor, so shamelessly insulting the gods who are to be revered, even introducing new forms of worship, which, as it has reached my ears, has persuaded many.”

BnF, Arménien 178: Կոմս ասէ, երի՛ց հրամայեցեր հաւատալ այնպէս եւ ես հաւատամ ի հայր եւ յորդի եւ ի սուրբ հոգին: յերրորդութիւնն անբաժանելի: Իշխանն ասէ, որպէս արհամարհելով զհրաման թագաւորին ասացեր զայդ:

BnF, Arménien 178: The *Komēs* said, “You ordered me to confess in this way to three, and so I confess the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the undivided trinity. The Governor said, “You say this as though you despise the imperial decrees.”

Additions also include the introduction of specific details that are absent in the Armenian version, for example the Metaphrastic text informs us of the dual name of saint Eudoxios’ wife: ‘Basilissa’ and ‘Mandane’, which acts as a literary parallel to the double naming of the martyr, a feature absent from the Armenian version. The Metaphrastic and the Armenian also distinctly diverge in their interpretation of the rank of Eudoxios, who is promoted in the Armenian (and the pre-Metaphrastic Greek) but demoted in the Metaphrastic:

¹⁰⁸ This theologoumenon is not present in the pre-Metaphrastic Greek version, and is subsequently not present in the Armenian translation, giving further grounds to assume that the Armenian version is based on the pre-Metaphrastic Greek text. It is also a nice reflection of the types of interventions and alterations which were made to the text by Metaphrastes in the tenth century.

Metaphrastic: Ἀπὸ πριμικηρίων δὲ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἧς διὰ τὸν εἰς Χριστὸν πόθον ἀπεληλαμένος, ἐν τῇ τῶν κομήτων ὑπεβιβάσθη·

Metaphrastic: Having been removed from the dignity of the office of the *Primikērios* on account of his love for Christ, he was demoted to the office of *Komēs*.

BnF, Arménien 178: Որ էր ի դասէ Պրիմիկիւռացն, որ պատուեցաւ ի կոմսութեան իշխանութեամբ...

BnF, Arménien 178: Who, from the office of the *Primikērios* was honoured with the authority of the *Komēs*...

Strikingly, the differences between the Armenian and Metaphrastic text are features which are frequently characterised as standard points of divergence between pre-Metaphrastic and Metaphrastic Greek versions. Echoing the foundational study of Zilliaceus' characterisation of Metaphrastic texts, Alwis, Hinterberger, and Schiffer have reiterated that comparison between versions of a text attributed to Symeon Metaphrastes and its pre-Metaphrastic antecedent reveal a conspicuous difference in their narrative mode, whereby 'indirect speech frequently replaces direct speech or the latter is summarised in the form of a narration'.¹⁰⁹ In her detailed study on the process of hagiographical *metaphrasis*, Franco has elaborated on certain 'typical' features of Symeon's *metaphrasis* which include the amplification of certain passages and, at the same time, the shortening or omitting of others, often limiting the use of dialogues and direct speech. Franco suggests that the condensing of sections of the pre-Metaphrastic textual model likely functioned to avoid unnecessary repetition, whilst elaboration served a rhetorical and edifying function in the narrative; both interpretations appear to ring true when comparing the Armenian and Metaphrastic texts.¹¹⁰ These are by no means uniform rules, but they do help to contextualise the evident differences between the Armenian and Greek Metaphrastic versions of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*. These differences are such that we are left to conclude that the Greek model used by the translator of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092 was not the version of the text authored by Symeon Metaphrastes. Rather, the differences between the Armenian and Metaphrastic versions appear to closely follow common features which generally demarcate a Metaphrastic text from its pre-Metaphrastic Greek predecessor.

Pre-Metaphrastic Greek

The differences which separate the version of the Armenian *Martyrdom* preserved by BnF, Arm. 178 from the Metaphrastic version align the Armenian translation far more closely with a Greek model typical of the pre-Metaphrastic tradition. Comparison between the Armenian text and the pre-Metaphrastic Greek

¹⁰⁹ H. Zilliaceus, "Zur stilistischen Umarbeitungstechnik des Symeon Metaphrastes," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 38 (1938): 333-349., Alwis, Hinterberger, Schiffer, "Introduction".

¹¹⁰ L. Franco, "Observations on the Methods of Metaphrastic Rewriting: The Case of the *Passio* of St James (BHG 773)," in *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*, ed. A. P. Alwis, M. Hinterberger, E. Schiffer (Brepols, 2021), 77; E. Peyr (Schiffer), "Zur Umarbeitung rhetorischer Texte durch Symeon Metaphrastes," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 42 (1992): 143-55.

version as it is preserved in the palimpsest of Paris suppl. gr. 1002 accordingly reveals that these versions not only share the same differences between their respective text and the Metaphrastic version, but, more crucially, share a very close textual correspondence with one another. The following argument is not to suggest that the version of the Armenian *Martyrdom* preserved by BnF, Arm. 178 was directly based on the text preserved in Paris suppl. gr. 1002, but rather to highlight similarities which demonstrate that the Greek model used by the translator of the Armenian *Martyrdom* was a pre-Metaphrastic version belonging to the same tradition as the version in Paris suppl. gr. 1002 in circulation by the early tenth century.

When compared, the Armenian and pre-Metaphrastic texts show direct or near to direct structural and lexical correspondence throughout. The following examples are illustrative of the subtle but variant levels of proximity between the two texts. We find instances of near univocal lexical and syntactical correspondence:

Pre-Metaphrastic: καὶ (and) ἰδὼν (having seen) ὅτι (that) σπουδῇν (haste) εἶχον (they had) ζητοῦντες (seeking) αὐτόν (him), ἐλθὼν (having gone) ἐν (in) τῷ οἴκῳ (the house) αὐτοῦ (his) ἥλλαξεν (he changed) τὸν χιτῶνα (the clothing/attire) αὐτοῦ (his), καὶ (and) περιβαλλόμενος (putting on) ἱμάτιον (clothing) οἰκτρὸν (pitiful) ἦλθεν (he went) ἐν (to) τόπῳ τινί (a place).

Pre-Metaphrastic: And having seen that they were seeking him with haste, he went into his house and changed his attire, and putting on pitiful clothing he went to that place.

BnF, Arménien 178: Եւ (and) տեսեալ (having seen) զի (that) փութանալի (hastily) խնդրէին (they sought) զնա (him), եկեալ (having gone) ի (in) տուն (the house) իւր (his) եւ (and) փոխեալ (he changed) զհանդերձս (clothing/attire) իւր (his) եւ (and) զգեցաւ (he put on) հանդերձս (clothing) աղբատի (pitiful) եւ (and) եկեալ (he went) ի (to) տեղի (a place)...

BnF, Arménien 178: And having seen that they were seeking him with haste, he went into his house and changed his attire, and putting on pitiful clothing and he went to the place...

This is also the case in narrative unit IV:

Pre-Metaphrastic: Ὁ κόμης (The Komēs) εἶπεν (said): τοῖς τρισὶν (to the three) με (me) ἐπέτρεψας (you ordered) θύειν (to sacrifice) οὕτως (in this way), καὶ (and so) θύω (I sacrifice) τῷ Πατρὶ (to the father) καὶ (and) τῷ Υἱῷ (the Son) καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι (and the Holy Spirit), τῇ ὁμοουσίῳ (the consubstantial) Τριάδι (Trinity).

Pre-Metaphrastic: The *Komēs* said, "You ordered me to sacrifice in this way to three, and so I sacrifice to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the consubstantial Trinity."

BnF, Arménien 178: Կոմս (The Komēs) աւէ (said) երի՛ց (to three) հրաւայեցեր (you ordered) հաւատալ¹¹¹ (to confess) այնպէս (in this way) եւ (and) (so) ես հաւատամ (I confess) ի հայր (to

¹¹¹ Notably the Armenian translator chose to switch to հաւատալ (confess) rather than continue using զոհել (sacrifice), which is deployed in the lines prior and better reflects the meaning of θύω. Perhaps the Armenian translator was attempting to distance the Armenian text from issues surrounding orthopraxy, specifically as a rejection of the Armenian Miaphysite practice of մատաղ. If so, this could be a very subtle indicator of the confessional identity of the translator: an Armenian Chalcedonian.

the father) եւ (and) յորդի (to the Son) եւ ի սուրբ հոգին (And to the Holy Spirit): յերրորդութիւնս (the Trinity) անբաժանելի (undivided):¹¹²

BnF, Arménien 178: The *Komēs* said, “You ordered me to confess in this way to three, and so I confess the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the undivided trinity.”

The majority of cases show close correspondence between syntactical units in the Greek and Armenian versions but exhibit minor variation to one lexical unit. This is the case in narrative unit I, where the Armenian version introduces us to the accusers in the plural, and the Greek version introduces an accuser in the singular:

Pre-Metaphrastic: Εἰσῆλθε (came) οὗν κατήγορος (an accuser) πρὸς (to) τὸν ἡγεμόνα (the Governor) περὶ (concerning) Εὐδοξίου (Eudoxios) τοῦ καὶ (who is also) Μαριανοῦ (Marianos).

Pre-Metaphrastic: An accuser came before the Governor concerning Eudoxios who is also Marianos.

BnF, Arménien 178: Եկեալ (came) արք (men) ոմանք (certain) չարախաւսութիւն (accusation) առ (to) իշխանն (the Governor) մատուցանելին (offering) վասն (concerning) Մարինոսի (Marianos) որ (who) Եւդոքիոսն (Eudoxios) կոչեցաւ (he is called).

BnF, Arménien 178: Certain accusers came before the Governor concerning Marianos who is also Eudoxios.

We also see an inversion of the order of the names of Eudoxios, though elsewhere in the Greek Paris suppl. gr. 1002 follows the Μαριανόν, τὸν καὶ Εὐδόξιον formula. These are very subtle alterations, and only on one occasion do these instances of lexical difference contribute to an entirely different meaning. In section I, we encounter the replacement of θυρῶνος (courtyard) with լեւան (mountain) in the Armenian which places Eudoxios in a very different context as he observes the arrival of the envoys. We might account for this as a scribal error during the translation of the manuscript from Greek into Armenian and from that Armenian archetype to the copy made in BnF, Arm. 178. Perhaps θυρῶνος was misread as ὄρος and subsequently translated into Armenian as mountain in 1092, or perhaps the Armenian archetype had rendered θυρῶνος as դուռն (door or doorway) in 1092 and the copyist of BnF, Arm. 178 mis-transcribed this as լեւան. Given the lack of any mention of mountainous landscapes in either of the surviving Greek or the Armenian version of the Martyrdom - in fact both texts stress the fact that Eudoxios lived in a plain - it seems likely that the appearance of the word mountain is the result of a scribal error rather than the underlying Greek model containing the word ὄρος instead of θυρῶνος.

¹¹² The translation of ὁμοούσιος (consubstantial) as անբաժանելի (undivided), certainly reflects an alteration of language which is rooted in a transition from a pre-Chalcedon/post-Nicean compositional context for the original pre-Metaphrastic Greek version, to a post Chalcedon context for the Armenian translation which deploys Chalcedonian rooted terminology. This change, however, does not tell us anything concrete about the confessional identity of the translators in and of itself.

In certain instances, we find structural and lexical concordance, but with a singular lexical omission or alteration in the Armenian text. For example at the close of unit III, when Eudoxios is led away by the envoys sent by the Governor, we find that the Armenian version describes him as ‘sitting upon his horse’ but adopts the double adjectival description of his clothing as ‘fine and bright’, whereas the Greek version has Eudoxios sitting upon a ‘bright’ horse, but only uses the adjective λαμπρὸν to describe his clothing. It appears that either the Greek archetype did not have an adjectival description of the horse, or more likely, that in the process of translation this verb was reassigned to the description of his clothing.

Pre-Metaphrastic: Καθίσαντος (sitting) ἐπὶ (upon) λαμπρὸν (bright) ἵππον (horse) καὶ (and) ἐσθῆτα (clothing) λαμπρὰν (bright) ἐνδυσάμενου (dressed)...

Pre-Metaphrastic: Sitting upon a bright horse and dressed in fine clothing...

BnF, Arménien 178: Նստեալ (sitting) ի վերայ (upon) երիվարին (horse) իւրոյ: (his) եւ (and) զզեցեալ (dressed) զզեւսու (clothing) ազնիւս (fine) եւ (and) պայծառս (bright)...

BnF, Arménien 178: Sitting upon his horse and dressed in fine and bright clothing...

We also find another example when Eudoxios and the Governor meet in unit IV. In the pre-Metaphrastic Greek version, Eudoxios is hailed as the ‘glorious and renowned *Komēs*’, whilst in the Armenian he is simply the ‘glorious *Komēs*’. In certain cases, the opposite phenomenon is found, whereby the Armenian text exhibits short additions which are not present in the Greek version preserved by Paris suppl. gr. 1002. In unit I, when the Governor orders the envoys to search for and seize Eudoxios, the Armenian version adds the instruction that ‘upon finding him, bring him to the court of judgement’. This is also the case in narrative unit III where the Armenian has Eudoxios instructing his wife to gather his head and blood in a ‘fine pouch’, dropping the adjective woolen which is found in the Greek.

There is only one occasion when a major textual addition in the Armenian text not found in the Greek version preserved by Paris suppl. gr. 1002 significantly alters the narrative: in narrative unit III, the Armenian text includes a short exhortation addressed by Eudoxios to his wife ‘ով կին դու փոխելոց եմ եւ ի սնոտի եւ յանցաւոր կենաց աստի ի մշտնջենաւոր եւ յաւիտենական կեանսն եւ այլ ոչ եւս տեսանելոց եւ զիս ի մարմնի աստ’ (Oh wife, you transformed me from this vain and sinful life to a perpetual and eternal life, but you will no longer see me in corporeal form). This appears as quite an uncharacteristic intervention in the schema of the Armenian translation, but whether this reflects the agency of the translator in adding this passage or simply that the Greek model used by the translator included this edifying section where Paris suppl. gr. 1002 did not is unclear.

Viewed solely on the lexical level, comparison between these two textual witnesses reveals varying levels of concordance, but examples which consistently indicate the proximity of the Armenian version to the pre-Metaphrastic Greek version of the *Martyrdom*. The Greek terms *πρωμύηρος* and *κόμης* were transliterated directly into Armenian where they are found in the pre-Metaphrastic narrative as պրիմէկիո and կոմս respectively. We also find consistent patterns of terminological translation, for example Βασιλεὺς

is always rendered as ինքնակալ, but ἀποκροάτω as բազաւոր, though we might have expected to find these terms the other way around. We witness cases where the Armenian text shows consistency by always rendering ἄρχων as իշխան in sections I and IV, but also variety in word-choice for a term which is otherwise consistent in the Greek, for example the translation of the term ἡγεμὼν as բռնաւոր, իշխան and more commonly դատաւոր. The choice of the three terms in Armenian does indicate an interpretation of the judicial and leadership role which is suggested through the otherwise broad use of the term ἡγεμὼν in the pre-Metaphrastic Greek textual model and clearly reflects an attempt to express several equivalents in the Armenian. A very significant point of concordance is the identification of the location of Eudoxios as Κουτακούων in the pre-Metaphrastic Greek and Կուպաստիայ in the Armenian, a toponym which is absent in the Metaphrastic version.¹¹³ Although this does not represent a direct transliteration, the transmission of which is obscured to us in the absence of any other pre-Metaphrastic examples, the fact that this name is not present in the Metaphrastic Greek text and present in closely related forms in both in BnF, Arm. 178 and Paris suppl. gr. 1002 is further indicative of the close textual relationship between the Armenian and pre-Metaphrastic versions of the *Martyrdom*.

Textual comparison between the texts preserved by Paris suppl. gr. 1002 and BnF, Arm. 178 reveals a very close structural and lexical concordance. Whilst the Armenian version preserved by BnF, Arm. 178 was not directly based on the Greek version preserved in Paris suppl. gr. 1002, as is evidenced by several, often subtle, divergent features, their textual similarities demonstrate that the Greek model used by the original translator of the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092 was certainly based on a Greek model drawn from a pre-Metaphrastic menologion, proximate to a version of the text surviving in the early tenth-century manuscript of Paris suppl. gr. 1002.

On its own terms, this conclusion provides the first detailed insight into the Greek model used in the creation the Armenian *Martyrdom*. Due to the damage sustained to the only surviving witness to the pre-Metaphrastic Greek version, and in the absence of further spectral imaging which might reveal more of the scraped sections which once comprised the *Martyrdom*, the Armenian version preserved in BnF, Arm. 178, based very closely as it is on a pre-Metaphrastic Greek model, is, at present, the only way of accessing a full pre-Metaphrastic Greek version of the *Martyrdom*. It provides a basis to access the original pre-Metaphrastic Greek text and to provide new insights into how the Greek *Martyrdom* was rewritten by Metaphrastes in the tenth century through a more in-depth philological study. From the present analysis alone, it is particularly significant that the Armenian version translated in 1092 retains the combination of the martyrdom of Saint Romylos and the martyrdoms of Saints Eudoxios, Zenon, and Makarios as a single narrative. This suggests

¹¹³ Astruc, “Un fragment palimpseste,” 52. Astruc speculated that the plain mentioned in the *Martyrdom* was in the vicinity of the fortified town: Κουτάκος mentioned in Skylitzes: *Ioannis Scylitzae synopsis historiarum, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis* 5 ed. J. Thurn (De Gruyter, 1973), 137. This town is implicitly described as near Melitene by Skylitzes. Encountering a plain in the vicinity of Melitene called ‘of Koutakios’ in the *Martyrdom* does indeed seem to indicate this toponymic relationship. The slight alteration of the name as it travelled from Greek into Armenian is not particularly noteworthy, but such a change could signal a local reflection of the name of plain in Armenian as it was known to the translator working in Melitene in 1092.

that the pre-Metaphrastic Greek model used by the Armenian translator in 1092 originally comprised both and this evidence dispels Astruc's speculation that the unification of these two narratives should be attributed to the rewriting of Symeon Metaphrastes.¹¹⁴

Beyond the possibility of using the Armenian translation to better understand the pre-Metaphrastic version of the Greek text and its relationship with its Metaphrastic successor,¹¹⁵ a task which lies beyond the scope of the present study, the proximity of the Armenian text with the pre-Metaphrastic Greek version offers a foundational understanding of the process of production of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in its original eleventh-century context as it is described in the colophon. It tells us something of the priorities, available models, processes of selection, and technique behind the act of translation recorded by the anonymous scribe.

Identifying the Sponsor: Discounting Grigor Vkasēs

With the knowledge of its underlying Greek model and a deeper understanding of the modality by which it was rendered into Armenian by the anonymous translator, we now move to the question of sponsorship. Who was responsible for commissioning the translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in Melitene in 1092?

Viewed within the framework of scholarly approaches to the production of Armenian hagiography in the eleventh century, it is immediately tempting to suggest that the impetus and initiative to translate the *Martyrdom* into Armenian lies within the translation programme of the Armenian Catholicos Grigor II and was the product of his attempts to enrich the liturgical basis of the Armenian Miaphysite Church by means of the avid translation activity which characterised his tenure as leader of the Armenian Miaphysite Church from 1065 until 1105. The prolific nature of Grigor's textual production and the greater cultural capital afforded to texts produced within his Armenian Miaphysite milieu by secondary literature in the field of Armenian studies is such that Vkasēs tends to overshadow and dominate discussions of Armenian translation activities during the eleventh century and particularly between 1077 and 1105 when he was engaged in his peak period of translation activity.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ C. Papavarnavas, "The Secret that Led Them to Martyrdom: The Role Swap between a Christian Reader and a Pagan Flute Player" (forthcoming).

¹¹⁵ Notably, the Armenian *Martyrdom* (see Ch.4) still retains three different dates within the text: Romylos 4th September; Eudoxios, Zenon, and their 1104 soldiers 6th September; and Makarios 13th September. These individual dates clearly speak to an earlier memory in which these saints were celebrated separately, perhaps in late-Antiquity, and likely speak to the local traditions of the city of Melitene. This was an element which the Armenian text took from the pre-Metaphrastic Greek version of the text. Though the pre-Metaphrastic version of the *Martyrdom* combined these saints in one narrative and, as the tenth-century Greek menologion (Paris suppl. gr. 1002.) illustrates, they were celebrated under the singular date of the 6th September in Constantinopolitan liturgical manuscripts by the early tenth century, the pre-Metaphrastic Greek version retained multiple dates within its narrative. These multiple dates were entirely removed from the narrative by Symeon Metaphrastes in the late tenth century when he came to rework the text, retaining only a single date within the narrative: 6th September. So, whilst Metaphrastes was not responsible for combining these narratives together, nor for dictating that they be celebrated collectively on the 6th September, we can see how he cleaned the contents of the text of any mentions of earlier separate commemoration dates.

¹¹⁶ Cowe, "Armenian Hagiography," 312.

A precise set of parameters for the classification of works belonging to the translation programme of Vkyasēr still remains a major desideratum and it has been something of a common practice to attribute any hagiographical, patristic, or homiletic work translated into Armenian to the Catholicos Grigor II. Such traditional attributions reflect a tendency within the field of Armenian studies, as Findakyan points out, to connect the approximate period of the emergence or introduction of a given text in the Armenian tradition with certain popular historical Armenian authors within the Miaphysite tradition at any given particular historical juncture.¹¹⁷ Such a tendency in the case of Grigor Vkyasēr can be traced back to the foundational studies of the Mekhitarist fathers in Venice and Vienna during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By way of example, in his study of 1914: *Material for the study of Armenian Martyrdom* (Նիւթեր Հայ Վկայաբանութեան Ուսումնասիրութեան Համար), Father Nerses Akinian attributed the Armenian *Life of Aberkios* to Grigor on the following terms: 'Die Zeit und der Name des Übersetzers der Vita sind nicht angegeben (vielleicht war am Schluss des Textes davon die Rede, wovon uns aber nichts aufbewahrt ist). Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach stammt die Übersetzung aus der Wende des 11 Jahr-hunderts, aus der Zeit, als Katholikos Gregor sich in Konstantinopel mit martyrologischen Übersetzungen beschäftigte.'¹¹⁸ Despite there being no definite name or date attached to the translation, the immediate instinct of Akinian was to draw a connection between this translation and Vkyasēr.

So it follows that by virtue of the fact that the precise date given by the colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* coincides with the period of Grigor Vkyasēr's activities, scholarship has traditionally attributed the Armenian *Martyrdom* to Grigor's sponsorship in this same fashion as Akinian. A century before Akinian, in 1811, the Armenian Mekhitarist linguist and lexicographer Mkrtic' Awgerean oversaw the production of the monumental *Compendium of Lives and Martyrdoms* (Լիակատար վարք և վկայաբանութիւն սրբոց), an attempt to compile a printed edition of every existing Armenian hagiography.¹¹⁹ From pages 723 to 726 we find the first printed version of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*. At the end of the text Awgerean, making note of the date and place of the translation in 1092 contained in the colophon of the manuscript he was using to create the printed edition, added in the short commentary appended to the text that the Armenian *Martyrdom* was produced by Vkyasēr himself, without reason or justification. Awgerean himself does not explicitly state which manuscript(s) in the monastery of San Lazzaro were used in the creation of his edition. During a period of archival work at the Mekhitarist monastery, I was afforded the opportunity to examine Venice Mekhitarist monastery of San Lazzaro Ms. 17 (V 17), a Čarēntir dated to 1224 CE which contains the Armenian *Martyrdom* between folios 199r – 202r. Despite considerable interventions in the text by Awgerean, the number of shared variations between the printed version and V 17 suggest that Awgerean based much of his edition on this manuscript. Upon further inspection of V 17, I found that the manuscript

¹¹⁷ Findikyan "Armenian Hymns of the Church and the Cross," 65.

¹¹⁸ N. Akinian, *Niut'er Hay Vkyabanut'ean Usumnasirut'ean Hamar* (*Material for the study of Armenian Martyrdom*) (Mekhitarist publishing house of Vienna, 1914), 2.

¹¹⁹ M. Awgerean, *Liakatar varke' ew vkyabanut'ivn srboč* (*Compendium of Lives and Martyrdoms*) (Mekhitarist publishing house of San Lazzaro, Venice, 1810).

preserves only half of the original colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom*, with the folio containing the second half missing. When the time came to use the manuscript for his compendium, Awgerean would have found the following at the end of the Armenian *Martyrdom*:

Թարգմանեցան պատմութիւնք սրբոց վկայիցս ի յունարէն գրոց ի հայ բարբառ, ի մայրաքաղաքին Հայոց, որ կոչի Մելիտենի, ի թուականիս Հայոց հինգ հարիւր և քառասուն և մէկ (1092), ընդ...¹²⁰

The accounts of these holy martyrs were translated from Greek writing into the Armenian language, in the mother city of the Armenians, which is called Melitene, in the Armenian era five-hundred and forty one (1092)...¹²¹

Without any knowledge of the full colophon, Awgerean presumably surmised that the missing portion must have recorded the name of Grigor Vkasas̄ based on the dating of the translation given by the first half of the colophon. This may offer a possible explanation for his otherwise inexplicable insertion of Vkasas̄'s authorship into the short commentary appended to the print version of the Armenian *Martyrdom* and this manuscript deficiency may also explain why the colophon was never printed with the text despite its value for compositional context. In any case, we find here again evidence of a scholarly impulse to attribute an eleventh-century Armenian hagiographical translation to Vkasas̄, purely based on supposition. It is this supposition which is itself the root of subsequent scholarly interpretations attributing the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* to the Catholicos Grigor II and it has proven remarkably durable. Up until the 1970's studies such as Covakan's 1967 work devoted to the hagiographical translations of Vkasas̄, *Grigor Vkasas̄ and the Translations of the Lives of Saints* (Գրիգոր Վկայասէր և թարգմանութիւնք վարուց սրբոց), included the Armenian *Martyrdom* in the definitive lists of texts attributed to the activities Catholicos Grigor II.¹²²

By the end of the 1980's, it is possible to detect a change in direction against the traditional Vkasas̄ attribution with the publication of the colophon, based on a witness to the Armenian *Martyrdom* preserved in Matenadaran Ms. 6196, by Aratšes Mat'evosyan in his *Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 5th – 12th Century* (Հայերէն Ձեռագրերի Հիշատակարաններ Ե-ԺԲ դդ). Mat'evosyan clearly considered the lack of any mention of Vkasas̄ in the colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* enough to bring into doubt any possible connection between the Armenian Catholicos and the translation and chose not to indicate any relationship between the two.¹²³ In the most recent and long overdue article devoted to the activities of the Catholicos Grigor II, *The Translation Movement Initiated by Grigor II Vkasas̄* (Գրիգոր Բ. Վկայասէրի նախաձեռնած թարգմանական շարժումը), David Gevorgyan has provided his own up-to-date list of compositions translated by Vkasas̄:¹²⁴

¹²⁰ Venice, Mekhitarist Monastery of San Lazzaro ms. 17, f. 202r.

¹²¹ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

¹²² N. Covakan, "Grigor Vkasas̄ ew t'argmanut'iwnk' varuc' srboc' (*Vkasas̄ and the Translations of the Lives of Saints*)," *Sion* 9-10 (1967): 430-432.

¹²³ A. Mat'evosyan, *Hayeren Jer'agrer Hišatakaranner 5–12 dd* (*Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 5th – 12th Century*) (Haykakan SSH Gitut'yunneri Akademiayi Hratarak'ut'yun, 1988), No. 136.

¹²⁴ Gevorgyan, "Grigor II Vkasas̄ Naxajernac T'argmanakan," 101-102. (translated into English).

Work	Source Language	Author	Year of Translation
Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles	Greek	John Chrysostom	1077
Martyrdom of Saint Stephen, Bishop of Rome	Latin		1100
The Life of Ephrem the Syrian	Syriac		1101
Encomium on the beheading of John the Baptist	-	Ephrem the Syrian	1101
Canon on the observation of Maundy Thursday	-	Ephrem the Syrian	1101
The Martyrdom of Saint Laurentius	Latin		1101
Encomium to Saint Gregory the Illuminator	Greek		1101
Life of Saint John Chrysostom	Greek	Ps. George of Alexandria	1101-1102
Life of Saint Gregory of Nazianzus	Greek		1101
Martyrdom of Saint George	Greek		1101
Martyrdom of Saint Paraskevi	Latin		1103
Martyrdom of Saints Eulampius and Eulampia	Greek		1103
Martyrdom of Saints Barabara and Juliana	Greek		1103
Martyrdom of Saint Mamas	Greek		1103
Commentary on the Gospel of John	Greek	John Chrysostom	1105 – 1110 (posthumously completed)

Evidently sharing the same doubts as Mat'evosyan, Gevorgyan opted not to include the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in this list. Instead, his system of classification is based strictly on those translations which implicitly bear the name of Grigor Vkasasēr, who, when commemorating the translation of these compositions in their colophons referred to himself as the author and the year in which he carried out his work. In the last three decades it is evident that scholarship has

gradually moved away from the traditional presumptions which once linked the Catholicos Grigor II to the translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092 and is, in general, far more cautious to draw such connections without clear evidence of authorship.

Whilst a lack of any authorial identification in the colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092 certainly brings the notion of Vkayasēr's sponsorship into doubt, I would argue that we can go further and definitively dispel any connection between the Catholicos Grigor II and the Armenian *Martyrdom* on the basis the method of translation which rendered the text from Greek into Armenian.

The colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom* records the very precise process through which a translator was employed to render the colophon from Greek into Armenian on behalf of the anonymous sponsor, and comparison between the Armenian translation and its pre-Metaphrastic Greek model reveal a highly proximate product in terms of structure, lexical content, and syntax. It is this process and the product that it produced which lacks the specific and very striking hall marks that defined compositions produced within the translation programme of Vkayasēr, outlined by Grigor himself in the colophons attached to these translations and recently summarised by Gevorgyan in his 2022 study.¹²⁵ As Gevorgyan elucidates, Vkayasēr employed a two-step translation process: he would first work directly with a bi-lingual translator to provide a first translation of the text from its original source language into Armenian. This draft would then be taken by Grigor to his monastic complex at Paṛlah on the Black Mountain and given to one of his collaborators and students to adjust and edit the Armenian draft. This dual process of translation and then rewriting is described in several colophons attached to Vkayasēr's works, perhaps best in his translation of *The Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles by John Chrysostom* made in 1077 (Yerevan, Matenadaran, Ms. 1315, ff. 452rv):

Յամի վեց հազարերորդի հինգհարիւրորդի առաջներորդի արարածոց աշխարհի և ի հազարերորդի եւթանասներորդի եւթներորդի (1077) կենարարին մերոյ գալստեանն, և ըստ Խոսրովային թուոյ Հայկազանց հինգհարիւրորդի քսաներորդի հինգերորդի (1076/7): Ի թագաւորութեան Միքայէլի Դուկի, և ի պատրիարքութեան Կոզմայի երկարնակի, եւ Գրիգորիս, որդի Գրիգորի Պալիաւունոյ, ողորմութեամբ մեծին Աստուծոյ արժանացեալ աթոռաց հաւոյն իմոյ սրբոյն Գրիգորի: Եւ ըստ յառաջատես տեսեան սրբոյն Սահակայ, ի սաստկացեալ սրոյ Սկիւթացւոցն հալածանաւք հասի ի պայծառաշէն կայանս սրբոյն Կոստանդիանոսի և մեծաւ ըղձմամբ հայցեալ գտի զտենչալիս յոքունց: զգերահրաշ մեկնութիւն գործոց առաքելոցն մեծին Յովհաննու Ոսկեբերանի յուսաւոր և ոգեշահ վարդապետութեամբ: Եւ հանդիպեալ հմտագոյն հռետորին Կիւրակոսի յունական և հայկական ուսմամբն պերճացեալ և առատաձեռն պարգեւաւք, ետու թարգմանել զտենչալիս ոգւոյ իմոյ: Եւ ընկալեալ սրտալիր ուրախութեամբ իբրև գտախտական նախամարգարէին, և մեծաւ տաժանմամբ հատեալ զհամատարածն Լիբիա և Ասիական ծոցոյն: Իսնամաւք Հոգւոյն հասի ի բաժինս Սեմայ, ի ստորոտս Տորոսի, ի հրեշտակաբնակ կայարան սրբոցն: Եւ գտի անդ զհոգեշնորհի զիտնականն Կիրակոս, որդի իմ ըստ հոգւոյ և աշակերտ մեծ զիտնականին Գէորգեայ փոխանորդին մեր: Եւ սորա յաւժարական մտաւք աշխատութիւն զանձամբ առեալ ըստ առատատուր հոգւոյն պարգեւացն, վերստին արծարծեալ զխորթացեալ բանս հռետորին,

¹²⁵ Gevorgyan, “Grigor II Vkayaseri Naxajernac T’argmanakan,” 109-111.

յեղանակելով ի դիւրաւորս և յարմարականս մերոյին ազգինս: Արդ մաղթեմ զամենեւեան որք հանդիպիք այսմ հոգիաբարոյիս պատգամիս, յիշել զիմ աղկադկութիւնս ի Տէր սրտի մտաւք ընդ նմին և զաշխատողս ի սմա, և գրել զվոքր յիշատակս ընդ սմին գրոց յորժամ գրեսցիք, և մի պակասեցուցանել: Չի և զձեզ գրեսցէ Տէր ի գիրն կենաց յաշխարհին կենդանեաց, որ է և եղիցի աւրինեալ յաւիտեանս յաւիտենից:¹²⁶

In the six thousandth five hundredth and first year of the creation of the world and in the one thousandth and seventy seventh since the coming of our Saviour (1077), and according to the Haykazan era of Xosrov, the five hundredth and twenty fifth (1076/7), in the Kingship of Michael Doukas, in the Patriarchate of Kozmas, believer in two natures, I Grigor, son of Grigor Pahlavuni, though the great mercy of God, being worthy of the thrones of my forefather Saint Grigor, and according to the foresight of Saint Sahak, from the severity of the sword of the *Skinits*, with troubles, I reached the brightly made station of Saint Constantine and, with great willing supplication, I found the much coveted [work], the wonderful commentary on the Acts of the Apostles by the great John Chrysostom with enlightening and life sustaining teaching. And meeting the learned rhetorician Kiwrakos, expertly studious in Greek and Armenian and with abundant generosity, I gave to translate the desires of my soul and he accepted with heartfelt joy like the tablets of the first prophet. With great toil I crossed the very extended Libya and the depths of Asia through the care of the Spirit I reached the portion of Sem, at the foot of Toros, to the angelic station of saints, and I found there the spiritual scholar Kirakos, my son through faith and pupil of the great scholar Georg - our successor. And through his willing mind he undertook the work personally according to the generosity and munificence of [his] soul, again he renewed the corrupted words of the orator, altering [it] in order that it be compliant and suitable for our people. Now I pray, all of you who chance upon this spiritual message, remember my destitute state before the lord with heartfelt judgement, and the same for the workers, write a small memory through that same writing when you write, do not diminish that which the Lord has written to you in the book of life in the land of the living, which is to be blessed forever and ever.¹²⁷

The colophon tells us that Grigor Vkasasēr travelled first to Constantinople expressly to locate a copy of Chrysostom's *Commentary on the Acts* and commission a translation of the text. This draft translation was then brought to the monastery of Paṛlah on the Black Mountain to have the register of the Armenian adjusted by one of his pupils, Kirakos.

Naturally this process detailed in several of the colophons attached to the Vkasasēr school begs the question of the relationship of those translations to the Greek models upon which they were based. Vkasasēr's translation of the *Commentary on the Acts* has drawn the most scholarly attention in this regard, being the only of Grigor's extant works to be subject to a full granular textual comparison with its Greek model. Conclusions as to the product of this two-step translation process, however, have varied from characterising his translation as a distinct and divergent rendering of the Greek, to arguments suggesting the translation to be a more faithful representation of the model from which it was taken. In his 1952 study surrounding Vkasasēr's pupil and collaborator Kirakos, mentioned in the above colophon, Nerses Akinean characterised Vkasasēr's translation and rewriting as a distortion of the Greek original which

¹²⁶ Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 1315, ff. 452r – 452v. (Mat'evosyan, Hišatakaranner, No. 129)

¹²⁷ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

would be unavoidable in the process of adjusting and altering the Armenian text after it had been initially translated, leaving a highly divergent product.¹²⁸ Ter-Petrosyan largely echoes this conclusion in his 1992 monograph *Ancient Armenian Translations* (Հայ Հին Թարգմանական Գրականություն), where he describes Vkasasēr's translation technique as producing translations which vary considerably from the original texts and can be considered "free translations".¹²⁹ More recently, however, the two studies of Rose Varteni Chétanian, *La version arménienne ancienne des Homélies sur les Actes des Apôtres de Jean Chrysostome* and *Les citations scripturaires dans la version arménienne du XI^e siècle de quatre homélies de Jean Chrysostome sur les actes des apôtres*, have brought a greater level of granularity to the analysis of the relationship between Vkasasēr's translation of the *Commentary on the Acts* and its Greek model. In her most recent work, *Les citations scripturaires*, Chétanian conducted a detailed analysis of the translation of scriptural quotations in Vkasasēr's translation through a comparison with both the Greek version of the *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles by John Chrysostom*, as well as both the Greek and Armenian (5th century) version of the *Acts of the Apostles*. Though much of Chétanian's conclusions are channelled toward stressing the benefits of viewing later medieval translations on their own terms rather than through the lens of the so called "Golden Age" of Armenian translation in the fifth century, she highlights the varied proximities of Vkasasēr's translated and reworked text to its Greek original, stressing complete divergence in certain places, whereby Vkasasēr and his collaborators inserted and amended Biblical quotations in Greek to resemble the fifth century Armenian translation of the *Acts of the Apostles*, to rendering other quotations derived from the Old Testament verbatim to Chrysostom's original.¹³⁰ Chétanian concludes that Vkasasēr's translation technique produced a text which, deviating considerably in places, attempted to remain broadly faithful to the meaning of the original.¹³¹ Širinian has more recently described the results of Vkasasēr's translation and rewriting of the *Commentary on the Acts* as synoptic (համաստեղ), in the sense that it conveys the idea of any given passage taken from the Greek original, though by its nature is not a word for word direct rendering and draws from multiple other sources in its compilation.¹³² Though scholarship is still forming a more nuanced model for assessing the results of the translation techniques of Grigor Vkasasēr, it is apparent that his translation technique did not produce the type of close proximate product in terms of structure, lexical arrangement, and syntax that we see in the case of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Endoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*.

¹²⁸ N. Akinean, "Kirakos Vardapet Gitnakan (Kirakos, the learned Vardapet)," *Handes Amsorya* 10-12 (1952): 495.

¹²⁹ Ter-Petrosyan, *Hay Hin T'argmanakan Grakanut'ivn*, 10., L. Ter-Petrosyan, "P'orj Hay Hin ew Miġnadaryan t'argmanakan grakanut'yan parberac'man (An Attempt at Periodizing Ancient and Medieval Armenian Translated Literature)," *Eġmiacin*, 39 (4) (1982): 45-52., A. Bozoyan "Aylazgi t'argmanič'nerə hay matenagrut'yan meġ (Foreign translators in the Armenian Literature)," *Levon Xač'ikyan at 90, Nyut'er matenadarani himnadir tnoreni cndyan innsunamyakin nvirvac miġazgayin gitažolovi* (9-11 Hoktemberi 2008) (2010): 277-282.

¹³⁰ R. V. Chétanian, *La version arménienne ancienne des Homélies sur les "Actes des Apôtres" de Jean Chrysostome : Homélies I, II, VII, VIII* (Peeters, 2004)., Chétanian, "Les citations scripturaires," 321-74.

¹³¹ Ibid., 367- 374

¹³² E. Širinyan, "Surbgrayin naxakrt'ut'yunnerə hay matenagrut'yan meġ (Scriptural precedents in Armenian Literature)," *Eġmiacin*, 79 (1) (2022): 41-44.

Strikingly however there have been no studies to date which undertake this type of textual comparison for Vkasasēr's hagiographical and martyrological translations: his most prolifically translated genre of literature. As Gevorgyan has argued in his 2022 article summarising the colophons of several of these hagiographical translations, whilst the colophon tells us that Grigor and his collaborators also applied the same aforementioned two-step translation method to his many hagiographical translations, further textual study is required to gain a full understanding of the proximity of these products from their source model. As the following case study briefly illustrates, it is these hagiographical translations which, I would argue, can yield the most fertile evidence for a better understanding of the process and outputs of Grigor and his translation team and better define what makes a "Vkasasēr translation".

In 1101/1102 the Catholicos Grigor II completed a translation of the Greek *Life of Saint John Chrysostom* by ps. George of Alexandria in the monastery of Paṛlah:

Յամի հազարերորդի հարիւրերորդի Աստուածոյ մերոյ եւ Տեառն Յիսուսի Քրիստոսի զայստեանն եւ ի հինգ հարիւրերորդի յիսներորդի մերում թուականութեանս եւ յաւթն եւ ի տասներորդի թագաւորութեան Կոմինոսի Ալէքսի... Եւ ապա ի յառաջասացեալ ամդ հասար ի սուրբ լեառնն, զոր Սեաւն կոչեն, ի մեր սեփիական պարգեւական եկեղեցիքն յուխտն սուրբ, զոր ըստ ասորի բարբառ Պառլահոյ կոչի, որ թարգմանի Դրախտ Աստուծոյ: Եւ անդ յերեսուն եւ ի վեց ամի մերոյ աթոռակալութեանս թարգմանեցի զվարս ճգնութեան մեծ և սքանչելի առնն Աստուծոյ Յովիաննու Ոսկերբեանի Կոստանդնուպոլսի հայրապետի, ի ձեռն առն միոյ, որում անուն էր Թէոփիստէ, ազգաւ յոյն: Եւ ապա ետու վերստին արծարծել զսա ի տարաբան և յաւտարաձայն բայից և բառից առաջին թարգմանութեանն, ըստ քերդողացն իմաստից, միաշար տողելով ի ձեռն Աթթեսի քահանայի, որ սնեալ և վարժեալ էր ընդ մերով ձեռամբ.¹³³

'In the one-thousandth, one-hundredth, and second year of the coming of our God and Lord Jesus Christ and in the five-hundredth and fiftieth of our era and in the seventeenth of the rule of Alexios Komnenos... We reached the Holy Mountain, that they call "Black", to our Churches, our specially accorded property, in the holy monastery, which according to the Syriac language is called Parlah, which translates as "Garden of God" and in that place, in the 37th year of our occupancy, I translated the life of the great ascetic and wonderous man of God, John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, by the hand of one man, who was named T'ēop'istē, Greek by race. And then I gave this to renew afresh the foreign verbs and terms of the first translation according to the grammatical meaning, through a line-by-line arrangement, to the hand of Matthew the Priest, who was nurtured and trained by our hand.¹³⁴

The colophon informs us of the familiar two-step process: a draft was first rendered by the translator T'ēop'istē and then given to Matthew the Priest, a member of Vkasasēr's translation school, to adjust and amend; specifically, to 'renew afresh the foreign verbs and terms of the first translation.' However, a close textual analysis between the final Armenian product and its source text in Greek reveal much more to this translation technique than the colophon tells us alone.

¹³³ Mat'evosyan, *Hišatakaraner*, No. 168.

¹³⁴ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

In her recent 2021 study: *Rewriting the Life of St John Chrysostom in Tenth-Century Byzantium*, Elisabeth Schiffer carried out an in-depth textual comparison between the Greek *Life of John Chrysostom* composed by ps. George of Alexandria in the 7th or early 8th century and four subsequent Greek versions rewritten by four separate authors in the tenth century: The *Life of John Chrysostom* by Niketas David the Paphlagonian, preserved in Thessalonica, Moni Vlatadon MS 4, an eleventh-century mixed Metaphrastic *Menologion*; The *Life of John Chrysostom* by the Anonymus Savilii preserved in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS gr. 108; The *Life of John Chrysostom* by the Anonymus of Vatopedi, preserved in Mount Athos, Moni Vatopediou MS 73, an eleventh-century Jahrespanegyrikon; and The *Life of John Chrysostom* rewritten by Symeon Metaphrastes in his Metaphrastic Menologion at the end of the tenth century.¹³⁵ By highlighting the interdependencies between these Greek versions which speak to a complex and still unresolved manuscript tradition, and, perhaps more crucially, the idiosyncrasies which are testament to the individual processes and choices behind each rewritten Greek version, Schiffer offers the reader a wide-ranging impression and understanding of the development of the *Life* within the Greek tradition of *metaphrasis* in the century before Vkyasēr undertook his own translation and rewriting of the text.

Taking the idiosyncrasies of each rewritten Greek version into account, a comparison between the *Life* rewritten by Symeon Metaphrastes in the tenth century and the Armenian *Life* produced by Grigor Vkyasēr's translation team at the start of the eleventh century reveal some striking, previously unidentified affinities. The following is a comparison between passages taken from chapters 21 and 27 of *Life of John Chrysostom* composed by ps. George of Alexandria, with their equivalent passages in the Metaphrastic rewrite by Symeon and the Armenian *Life* by Vkyasēr.

Chapter 21 of the *Life of John Chrysostom* composed by ps. George of Alexandria contains an episode in which John Chrysostom performs a miracle during a sermon; healing a possessed man afflicted by an impure spirit:

Ps. George of Alexandria¹³⁶

Ἔτι τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁμιλοῦντος αὐτοῖς βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς ἀποκαλύψει πᾶσαν τὴν ἀρετὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὁσίου, ἰδοὺ τις ἀνὴρ ἐνοχλούμενος ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου εἰσηνέχθη ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ παρεκάλουν τὸν μακάριον τοῦτον οἱ κατέχοντες αὐτὸν εὐξασθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ

Symeon Metphrastes¹³⁷

Ἔτι δὲ τοῦ ἁγίου τὴν ἡδίστην συνείροντος διδασχὴν καὶ τῇ χρυσῇ γλώττῃ καὶ μουσικῇ καλὸν τι καὶ ᾠδικὸν τερετίζοντος, τοῦ Θεοῦ δοξάζειν τὸν αὐτοῦ θεράποντα βουλομένου, ἀνὴρ τις ἀθρόον ἀκαθάρτῳ δαίμονι κάτοχος εἰς μέσον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἑαυτὸν εἰσῶθεϊ ἀφρόν τε τοῦ στόματος ἀπορρέων καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν, ὥς ἄκοσμον ἰδεῖν, καθίεις. Πάντων

Grigor Vkyasēr¹³⁸

Կամեցաւ աստուած յայտնել
սրանչելաւք զառաքինութիւն
սրբոյն: Չի ահա զայր մի
բարձեալ ոմանց որ էր նեղեալ
յայսոյ պղծոյ եւ բերեալ եղին
առաջի նորա եւ աղաչէին զի
աղօթս արասցէ վասն նորա
որպէս զի բժշկեսցի: Չի
առաւել սաստիկ լիկեր զնա
թիրերով զղէմոն եւ զեզուն
բնաւին արտաքոյ բերանոյն

¹³⁵ E. Schiffer, "Rewriting the *Life* of St John Chrysostom in Tenth-Century Byzantium," in *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*, ed. A. P. Alwis, M. Hinterberger, E. Schiffer (Brepols, 2021), 87-107.

¹³⁶ F. Halkin, *Douze récits byzantins sur Saint Jean Chrysostome*, Subsidia hagiographica 60, (Société des Bollandistes, 1977), 131-132

¹³⁷ Schiffer, "Rewriting the *Life* of St John Chrysostom," 99.

¹³⁸ *Patmut'wn varuc' sk'anč'eleac' ew dipuacoc' srboyn Yovhann Oskeberan Hayrapetin Kostandnupolsoy*, ed. Sargis Archbishop of Constantinople (Venice, 1754), 104

ὅπως ἰαθῇ· οὗτος γὰρ ἦν	οὖν δεομένων τῆς ἁγίας ἐκείνης	հաւնեալ...
ἀφρίζων ἔχων καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν	ψυχῆς ἴασιν τοῦ πάσχοντος	
αὐτοῦ ἔξωθεν τοῦ στόματος...	ὑπερεύξασθαι ...	

God willingly revealed all the virtue of the pious one to those in his company. Behold a man, troubled **by an impure spirit** was brought into the Church and those restraining him appealed to the blessed one to pray for him that he might be cured, because he was foaming at the mouth and his tongue was hanging from his mouth...

While the holy one was weaving together a pleasant teaching and, with his golden tongue and melodious voice, uttering something fair and songlike, God, willed to glorify His servant. A man, possessed by **an impure demon** entered into the middle of the church, foam flowing from his mouth and his tongue hanging from his mouth, frightful to observe. All were beseeching the holy one to intercede for the healing of the afflicted one...

And God willingly revealed the virtue of the pious one by a miracle. Behold a man who was afflicted by **an impure spirit** was brought in, they placed him before him and beseeched that he might offer prayer on his behalf that he might cure him of the **demon** that greatly tormented him and his tongue was hanging from his mouth...

Comparing first the Greek text by ps. George of Alexandria with its Metaphrastic successor, Schiffer has highlighted a number of adaptations to the narrative, some of which are shared with alterations made by the other tenth century rewriters, namely placing the possessed man ‘εἰς μέσον τῆς ἐκκλησίας’ which is also found in the versions by Niketas David the Paphlagonian and the Anonymous of Vatopedi. Schiffer identifies one alteration which is specific to the version produced by Symeon Metaphrastes: in all the other Greek versions of the text the man is described as being afflicted by an impure spirit (πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου εἰσπνέχθη) as in the original by ps. George of Alexandria, but in the Metaphrastic version he is afflicted by an impure demon (ἀκαθάρτῳ δαίμονι). Turning to the Armenian version produced by Vkasasēr and his team in 1101/1102, this passage offers an ideal example of the two-step translation and rewriting process described in the colophon. We find a text which is by and large a word for word rendering of the Greek version by ps. George of Alexandria, indicating that this was the base text used by T’ēop’istē in his stage one initial translation, replicating elements of structure and syntax. Crucially, however, we encounter a number of editions and alterations to the Armenian text which speak to the intervention of Matthew the Priest in stage two: the rewriting process. The Armenian text display two specific alterations: the first is the addition of **սքանչելալք** (by miracles) in the first sentence, an addition unique to the Armenian text. The second alteration to the Armenian translation of ps. George of Alexandria concerns the description of the possessed man. Though the Armenian initially reproduces ps. Georgia of Alexandria's description of the man as afflicted by an ‘impure spirit’ (յայսյ պղծոյ), the text then introduces the term demon (զղէմն), from the Greek term δαίμονι later in the passage. Strikingly, this otherwise anomalous alteration in the Armenian text appears to echo (albeit not directly) a specific alteration/addition found only otherwise in the version of the *Life* authored by Symeon Metaphrastes.

The possible Metaphrastic connection in the translation programme of Grigor II Vkasasēr is given greater weight by the next example, a passage taken from chapter 27 of the Greek *Life* by ps. George of

Alexandria. In this episode, John's disciple Proclus witnesses the apostle Paul appearing to Chrysostom as he composed his Commentary on the Pauline Epistles:

Ps. George of Alexandria¹³⁹

...καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ κοιτῶνος· καὶ παρακύψας διὰ τινος ὁπῆς ὁρᾷ τὸν Ἰωάννην καθήμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ καὶ γράφοντα καὶ τὸν ἅγιον Παῦλον ἀνακεκλιμένον ἐξόπισθεν τοῦ θρόνου πρὸς τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔχοντα τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ κάτω εἰς τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιὸν καὶ ὁμιλοῦντα αὐτῷ· ἦν γὰρ Ἑλισσαία ἡ μορφή αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ πῶγων τέλειος καὶ πλατύς...

And he came to the door of the Bedchamber and leaning through the opening he saw John, sitting upon his chair, writing. And saint Paul was leaning behind the chair toward his head, his mouth to his right ear, speaking to him. His appearance was like Elisha, with the perfect and full beard...

Symeon Metphrastes¹⁴⁰

... καὶ κοιτῶνι δὲ προσελθὼν ἔνθα σχολάζων ὁ μέγας πόνου εἵχετο καὶ τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ προσκεκυφὼς ἦν, ἐν χρῶθι θυρῶν τε τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν προσπελάσας καὶ δι' ὁπῆς, ὡς ἐγγωροῦν ἦν διαβλέψας, ὁρᾷ τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐχόμενον μὲν τοῦ γράφειν καὶ αὐτῷ προσπονούμενον ἄνδρα δὲ τινα φαλακρὸν **οἷον αἱ εἰκόνες τὸν Ἑλισσαῖον** ἔχουσι, πλατὺ τὸ γένειον, καθεμμένον **ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων**, ἡρέμα τῷ μακαρίῳ προσμίζαντα καὶ πρὸς οὓς ἐκείνῳ διαλεγόμενον.

And he came toward the bedchamber, where the great one was attending to his [literary] toil and was devoting himself to his exegetical work. With his eye pressed against the door, looking through an opening, as far as it was possible to peer through, he saw John was engaged in writing, and beside him a bald man, **in the manner of the images of Elisha**, with a broad beard, sitting **on his shoulder**, leaning in to the ear of the blessed one and gently conversing with him.

Grigor Vkayasēr¹⁴¹

... եւ եկն առ դուրս սենեկին, եւ ի բաց առեալ զծածկոյթ պատուհանին, եւ խոնարհեալ ի ներքս ետես զՅովհաննէս նստեալ ի վերայ աթոռոյ զի գրէր զմեկնութիւնս թղթոցն առաքելոյն պողոսս զի կայր **յետոյ թիկանց նորա** եւ խոնարհեալ առ գլուխն Յովհաննու եւ մերձեցուցեալ զբերանն առ աջոյ ունկն խոսէր ընդ նմա: եւ էր նշան կերպարանացն այսպէս այր չափահասակ հերն զանգուր, մօրուօր կատարեալ լայնագոյն մեծ ակն յօնակից ունչքն երկայնագոյն **ամենեւին ըստ եղիսէական կերպարանացն**.

And he came to the door of the bedchamber and opening the cover of the window and leaning in, he saw John sitting upon a chair, writing the commentary on the epistles of the Apostle Paul, who stood **upon his shoulder**, leaning into John's head and bringing his mouth to his right ear, he spoke with him. He was **in the manner of the images of Elisha**, a grown man with wavy hair, a perfect, full beard, great eyes, eyebrows and long nostrils.

The text by Symeon makes a number of alterations to this passage, some of which are shared by the other tenth century rewriters: the enhanced description of the man behind John Chrysostom as *φαλακρός* and the preservation of the anonymity of this individual, described not initially as the apostle Paul but rather simply a man (*ἄνδρα*) are also found in Niketas David the Paphlagonian and the Anonymus Savilii. However there are also, as Schiffer has highlighted, two idiosyncratic changes made by Symeon: the first is to situate the man behind John Chrysostom as *ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων* (on his shoulder) and to describe the Apostle Paul's likeness

¹³⁹ *Douze récits byzantins*, 144

¹⁴⁰ Schiffer, "Rewriting the *Life* of St John Chrysostom," 96.

¹⁴¹ *Patmut'ivn varuc' sk'anc'eleac' ew dipuacoc' srboyn Yovhann Oskeberan*, 120.

to the prophet Elisha in terms of iconographic similarity ‘οἶον αἱ εἰκόνες τὸν Ἐλισσαῖον ἔχουσι’, rather than textual correspondences as in Niketas David the Paphlagonian and the Anonymus Savilli: ‘οἶον ὁ λόγος τὸν Ἐλισσαῖν γράφει’. Turning to the Armenian version produced by Vkayasēr, we are again offered a good sense of the two-step translation and rewriting process as we find it in the text. In its structure and syntax, the Armenian version has clearly been modelled on the Greek version by ps. George of Alexandria, but with several significant interventions in the narrative made by Matthew the Priest that move the final version further away from its original Greek model. Strikingly, two of these three interventions show connections to features which are specific to the Metaphrastic *Life* as it was rewritten by Symeon in the tenth century. The first describes the Apostle Paul as ‘on the shoulder’ of John Chrysostom (յետոյ թիկանց նորա) and the second likens the appearance of the Apostle Paul to the prophet Elisha in terms of iconographic similarity ‘wholly according to the Elissian images/icons’ (ամենեւին ըստ եղիսէական կերպարանացն).¹⁴² Even more strikingly in this case, the second addition drawn from Metaphrastes’ version appears to prompt a further unique alteration to the Armenian text. Rather than the likeness of the Apostle Paul being described in terms of his bald head and long full beard, a description drawn from the Greek Acts of Paul and Thecla,¹⁴³ the Armenian text describes him as a man with ‘wavy hair, a perfect, full beard, great eyes and eyebrows and long nostrils’, a description which has been directly excerpted from the Armenian Acts of Paul and Thecla.¹⁴⁴ Indeed where Paul is consistently iconographically represented as bald in the Greek tradition, the Armenian tradition is generally split with images of Paul appearing both with and without hair on different occasions.¹⁴⁵ This particular passage offers a more dynamic reflection of the working methods of members of Vkayasēr’s translation team, not only highlighting different and competing interpretations based on diverging source material used in the process of rewriting, but most importantly it provides evidences which seems to show knowledge of alterations drawn from the *Life of John Chrysostom* as it was rewritten by Symeon Metaphrastes. On multiple occasions we find Matthew the Priest dialoguing with and reacting to changes and claims that appear only otherwise in Symeon’s rewritten text

¹⁴² We might have expected to see the term պատկեր used here for εἰκών, rather than կերպարան. We first find կերպարան for μορφή: ἦν γὰρ Ἐλισσαία ἡ μορφή αὐτοῦ as էր նշան կերպարանացն այսպէս. The second use of the term կերպարան is as part of the phrase: ամենեւին ըստ եղիսէական կերպարանացն which appears to be a response to and rendering of οἶον αἱ εἰκόνες τὸν Ἐλισσαῖον from the Metaphrastic version. In this second case εἰκών is rendered into Armenian using կերպարան. Perhaps for reasons of consistency կերպարան has been preferred to պատկեր in this case. On the use of պատկեր as image/icon see B. Contin, “Intertwining Aristotelian Ontology and Logic with Theology: The Early Armenian Non-Chalcedonian Perspective: The Book of Beings and the Questions Addressed to the Heretical Diophysites,” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 70 (2020): 429–464. On the use of կերպարան as image/icon see: A. Bozoyan (ed.), *Patkerapaštut’yan ev Patkeramartut’yan Xndir Hayastanum ev Byzandiatum (The Problem of Iconoclasm and Iconolatry in Armenian and Byzantium)* (NASRA, 2024).

¹⁴³ A. J. Malherbe, “A Physical Description of Paul,” *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 79, No. 1/3: Christians among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday (1986): 170-175.

¹⁴⁴ V. Calzolari, *Apocrypha Armeniaca I: Acta Pauli et Theclae, Prodigia Theclae, Martyrium Pauli* (Brepols, 2017), 240-243.

¹⁴⁵ Images of Paul with hair can be found in Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 1524, f. 886r and Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 4802, f. 802r. Iconography of Paul without hair can be found among the reliefs of the Armenian Church of Akhtamar (10th C.), Lake Van, Turkey.

and these appear to largely inform the unique shape of the Armenian version of the *Life* produced in 1101/1102.

This previously unidentified features of Vkyasēr's translations should not only give cause, I would argue, for more systematic study of the textual products of his translation programme, but in the context of the current conversation gives us more solid ground to discount his sponsorship of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*. Though Vkyasēr also made use of pre-Metaphrastic versions of Greek hagiographical texts, the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* does not display anywhere near the forms of specific textual and intertextual interventions and alterations that we find in the Armenian *Life of Saint John Chrysostom* and does not excerpt from the Metaphrastic Greek version of the text. The translator of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092 instead produced a translation designed to retain close proximity to its pre-Metaphrastic Greek model.

To push this argument further, beyond the lack of clear authorship and stylistic discrepancy in the modality of translation which clearly weaken any argument in favour of Vkyasēr's sponsorship, the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* does not fit the profile of the Catholicos Grigor II when we consider their absence from his translation of a Greek Constantinopolitan Lectionary highlighted already in the introduction to this thesis. Grigor tells us how he adapted and modified a Greek lectionary, selecting from specific models and enlarging the *sanctorale* to include the feast days of saints within the Miaphysite Armenian tradition. In the style of his other translations, Vkyasēr describes how he translated and rewrote his model text through additions to and alterations of its context, streamlining and expanding feast days to suit the arrangement of the Armenian Church. This process, however, appears not to have included an accommodation of a feast day dedicated to saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, or Makarios, who are entirely absent from the work, as far as it can be reconstructed from the later thirteenth century manuscript in which it is preserved. So, although Vkyasēr was responsible for playing a role in widening the Armenian *sanctorale* and enriching the Armenian liturgical tradition, the translation of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* and their entry into the Armenian tradition cannot be connected to Vkyasēr. Despite the mobility inherent in his translation programme, predicated on his wide-ranging travels from Egypt to Rome¹⁴⁶ to Constantinople, there is also no evidence connecting Vkyasēr directly to Melitene or anything to suggest that he was in the city to commission a translation in 1092. Ultimately, the lack of authorial notice, the modality and style of translation, the location of production, and the absence of these saints from his Armenian lectionary all point toward discounting Grigor Vkyasēr's sponsorship of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*.

¹⁴⁶ J. Ghazarian, *The Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia*, 81-112. P. Halfter, *Das Papsttum und die Armenier im frühen und hohen Mittelalter: von den ersten Kontakten bis zur Fixierung der Kirchenunion im Jahre 1198* (Böhlau, 1996).

Identifying the Sponsor: An Armenian Chalcedonian Context

Both the anonymous translator behind the production of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092 and the translation programme of Grigor II Vkasēs drew from the same coherent library of Greek knowledge, from hagiographical collections arranged according to the commemoration of feasts throughout the fixed liturgical year within the Constantinopolitan tradition. However, the distinctly different treatment of their textual models in the process of rendering them into Armenian tells us something of the different objectives of each translator in terms of their perception of the authority of the model text as it is expressed by Høgel: ‘Since all languages and areas each had their own ideas, conventions, and norms with regard to how texts should be produced and presented, translators would have to know the procedures of the source language (or source area) in order to read and understand the source text.’ However, as Høgel points out ‘despite the measure of authority that a text could carry in the first place, in its context of origin, nothing guaranteed that this authority would be in place at the receiving end, in the target sphere of a translation’ and in the process of translation, ‘the original status of authority of a text would in these cases be transferred, transformed, or contested’.¹⁴⁷ In the case of Grigor II Vkasēs, Greek texts were taken from their Constantinopolitan liturgical context and transformed in the process of translation, altered and changed to suit the Miaphysite Armenian audience to which they were aimed, dismantling the authority of the original text in the process. In contrast, the process of translation behind the Armenian *Martyrdom* tells us something of the anonymous translator’s intention to maintain the original authority of the Greek model, not only through a translation which maintained proximity, but one which also transferred its liturgical essence by maintaining the feast date of the sixth of September as it is determined by the calendar of the Church of Constantinople. In Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arménien 178, our nearest Armenian witness to the original translation we find the following:

Կատարեցան ընթացք նահատակութեան վկային Քրիստոսի Եւդոքսիոս յամսեանն Սեպտեմբրիի ի վեցն:¹⁴⁸

The processes of the martyrdom of the martyr Eudoxios were complete in the month of September, on the sixth.¹⁴⁹

BnF, Arm. 178 preserves a crucial snapshot into the early transmission history of the Armenian *Martyrdom*, specifically that the original translation was designed to maintain the textual and liturgical authority derived from the context of its Greek model by maintain the liturgical feast day of the sixth of September as it is found in collections arranged according to the norms of the Church of Constantinople. If we maintain, as Høgel does, that ‘hagiographical texts – whether full-text Lives, Passions, enkomia, or abbreviated versions

¹⁴⁷ C Høgel, “The Authority of Translators: Vendors, Manufacturers, and Materiality in the Transfer of the Barlaam and Josaphat along the Silk Road,” *Postscripts* 8.3 (2012): 221–241. Although this date specifically refers to Saint Eudoxios, it is used as the feast for all four saints.

¹⁴⁸ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arménien 178, f. 208v

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., trans L. Read.

of these – were in many cases used, if not originally produced, for liturgical purposes. Saints had their feast days (on fixed days according to the Church calendar), and they would be commemorated, with their icons set up and texts presenting their lives and deeds read on these days,¹⁵⁰ then the translation of the *Martyrdom* into Armenian not only represents a very deliberate choice to commemorate saints intimately associated with the city in which they were martyred, but a specific choice to do so by maintaining a liturgical and textual framework provided by the Church of Constantinople. Notably, as the Armenian *Martyrdom* migrated into Armenian Miaphysite liturgical collections by the beginning of the thirteenth century this date was changed to October 19th, the date on which the saints are celebrated in the Miaphysite Armenian tradition down to the present day. If the translation of the *Martyrdom* in 1092 cannot be associated with the sponsorship of the Miaphysite Armenians who we consider to be the major Armenian hagiographical translators of the period, then we might look to another group of Armenians who were present and prominent in Melitene in 1092, who were also producing translations at this particular historical juncture, and who would have sought to maintain the textual and liturgical authority of the Church of Constantinople in their local environment.

Byzantine Melitene and its hinterland formed a rich multi-lingual milieu during the tenth and eleventh centuries, a milieu in which the Byzantine Empire and its textual and linguistic authority mediated with Armenian and Syriac communities through ‘multi-directional motions in the displacement of persons and texts.’¹⁵¹ Translators shifted between Greek and Armenian, between Syriac and Armenian, and between Syriac and Greek in acts of knowledge and authorial exchange or appropriation which reflect a range of diverse objectives. In the case of our anonymous translator that objective was driven toward rendering the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* into Armenian within a framework provided by Greek Constantinopolitan literary and liturgical authority. It is, in turn, striking that the translation of the *Martyrdom* coincides with a period of Chalcedonian Armenian ascendancy amongst the city’s elite, that is those Armenians who were in communion with the Church of Constantinople and recognised its spiritual authority. This was a shift in dynamic which had coalesced in the localised systems of centrifugal power that had emerged in the period after Manzikert, largely facilitated through the establishment of semi-autonomous representatives legitimised through Byzantine titles, acting, at least nominally, on behalf of the Empire.

During the tenth and eleventh centuries Melitene came to nurture and incubate a profoundly Armenian political, socio-cultural and literary environment formed through several phases of migration caused by the increasing interaction between Armenian communities and the Empire in the context of its expansion from the tenth century onward. We can trace an increasing Armenian presence in Melitene and its surrounding region following the Byzantine capture of the city in 934 CE, a growing presence which manifests itself most clearly in several early eleventh century Armenian colophons attached to manuscripts

¹⁵⁰ Høgel, “Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement,” 182.

¹⁵¹ Høgel, “The Authority of Translators,” 225.

produced by scriptoria in or near to the city from 1018 onward.¹⁵² According to the Armenian historian Aristakes Lastivertc'i, writing in the late 1070s, King Gagik II of Armenia was offered a new home in the city of Melitene by the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos in return for relinquishing his kingship in 1045.¹⁵³ Though Gagik allegedly refused this offer, preferring instead estates between Caesarea and Melitene, the eventual migration of Gagik and much of the Armenian elite undoubtedly brought with it another significant phase of Armenian re-location to the surrounding region generated by interaction with the Byzantine Empire.¹⁵⁴ Even before this period of migration a colophon attached to a Gospel produced by an Armenian community based in or near Melitene orientated its temporal framework by Byzantine Imperial regnal year, Armenian era, the spiritual authority of the Armenian Catholicos and the secular authority of the Armenian king seated in Ani:

Ի թագաւորութեան Հոռոմոց, որ կոչի Միխայիլս, եւ ի թուականութեանն Հայոց ի ՆՂ (1041), եւ ի կաթողիկոսութեանն տեառն Պետրոսի Հայոց կաթողիկոսի եւ վերադիտողի, յորժամ Յաւանէս Հայոց թագաւորն վախճանեցաւ ի Քրիստոս:¹⁵⁵

In the kingship of the Romans, of the one who is called Michael (V Kalaphatēs), and in the Armenian era 490 (1041), and in the Catholicosate of Ter Petros, Catholicos of Armenia and overseer, when Yovhannes King of Armenia departed this life to Christ.¹⁵⁶

Some ten years later we encounter a Gospel 'written in the city of Melitene, under the shadow of Saint Grigor, in the Armenian era 506 (1057), in the Catholicosate of Lord Kachik (II).'¹⁵⁷

Melitene itself housed a diverse population throughout the period of renewed Byzantine rule from 934 until the end of the eleventh century comprising, amongst others, Miaphysite and Chalcedonian Armenians, and a considerable West Syrian community.¹⁵⁸ By the time the *Martyrdom* was translated into Armenian in 1092, Melitene had passed firmly under the control of Gabriel, described as Armenian by birth language and habit but Greek in faith by William of Tyre.¹⁵⁹ Gabriel was the latest in a succession of Chalcedonian Armeno-Byzantine overseers of the city following the battle of Manzikert in 1071, including the *protoproedros*, *doux*, and *keuropolates* T'oros/Θεόδωρος Χετάρης, who, according to the sigillographical evidence, gained control of the city after 1078 on behalf of the Empire.¹⁶⁰ Michael the Syrian places Gabriel's appointment to the first year of the reign of the Emperor Alexios Komenos in the year 1082, but

¹⁵² Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 4804, ff. 267v.

¹⁵³ *Patmut'inn Aristakisi*, 61-62.

¹⁵⁴ Matt'ēos Uḥhayec'i, *Žamanakagrut'inn*, 95.

¹⁵⁵ Jerusalem, The Armenian Monastery of St James, ms. 3624, f. 337 v. (Mat'evosyan, *Hišatakaranner*, No. 105.)

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, trans. L. Read.

¹⁵⁷ Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 3784, ff. 267v. trans. L. Read.

¹⁵⁸ D. Gyllenhaal, "Byzantine Melitene and the Social Milieu of the Syriac Renaissance," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* Vol. 75 (2021): 205-236

¹⁵⁹ William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea, vol.1*, trans. E. A. Babcock and A. C. Krey (Columbia University Press, 1943), 450.

¹⁶⁰ W. Seibt, "The eastern frontier of Byzantium in the decennia after Mantzikert—can seals help reconstruct developments?," *SBS* 12 (2016): 27; A. Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia ca.1040-1130* (Routledge, 2017), 288.

his Greek seals dating to the year 1090 give us more concrete evidence.¹⁶¹ On the obverse of his seal we find ‘Γραφὰς σφραγίζω τοῦ Γαβριήλ, ἁς βλέπεις, ἀμνηρᾶ δουκὸς πρωτοκουροπαλάτου’ (I seal the writings that you see of Gabriel, emir, doux and protokouropalates).¹⁶² The formulation of his titles clearly give weight to Michael the Syrian’s claim that Gabriel had received legitimisation from both Constantinople and Baghdad/Isfahan as a semi-autonomous ruler of the city by the end of the 1080s, though Gabriel himself continued to rule with, at least nominal invocation of Byzantine authority.¹⁶³

The tenure of the Armenian Chalcedonian Byzantine doux of Melitene Gabriel from the mid 1080s until 1101 was, amongst other activities, marked by his sponsorship of the translation of *Tales of Sinbad* from Syriac into Greek at the hand of Michael Andreopoulos. What we know about Michael comes only from the dedicatory epigram to the work where he refers to himself as *grammatikos*, giving us something of an impression of his educational background, possibly also an indication of his role as a teacher overseeing the instruction of grammar, literature, and prose composition.¹⁶⁴ Certainly the colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom* could itself possibly indicate such external sponsorship. According to the colophon, the scribe was given a ‘reward’ for his work (Ψῆμα: ‘salary’, ‘pay’, ‘stipend’, ‘reward’), the recompense due to the scribe for his translation. This can be taken to carry a more celestial meaning, but the term also holds an implicitly financial definition for salary or stipend. In this case it may be a reference to a payment for services rendered, indicating non-monastic, possibly lay, sponsorship. Gabriel of Melitene, then, may himself pose a possible candidacy for sponsorship, as a lay Chalcedonian Armenian who would have an interest in rendering the spiritual and liturgical authority of the Church of Constantinople into Armenian, and as an elite with the available capital and profile to commission such a translation. As Dedeyan argues, the presence of an Armenian Chalcedonian commander favoured engagement and promotion of Greek literary culture, and it was his literary activity evidenced in his sponsoring of the *Tales of Sinbad* that first led Dedeyan to tentatively suggest that the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* could have itself been connected to the sponsorship of Gabriel, or at very least the Chalcedonian Armenian community in the city.¹⁶⁵ Certainly, the commemoration of local military saints would suit his profile and self-fashioning as ruler of Melitene, but the lack of clear sponsorship leaves this question open.¹⁶⁶ If we were to speculate that the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* was not translated as a standalone composition, but rather as part of a full menologion for the month of September rendered from Greek into Armenian, the form of which is now obscured by a lack of direct manuscript transmission, we could view his

¹⁶¹ Michael the Syrian, *Chronique de Michael Le Syrian III*, trans. J.B Chabot (Ernest Leroux Éditeur, 1905), 179 – 180.

¹⁶² **Gabriel of Melitene** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/156290/>): **Seal 33**, N. Oikonomides, *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals* (Dumbarton Oaks, 1986), no. 107; **Seal 70**, Oikonomides, *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 108.

¹⁶³ *Chronique de Michael Le Syrian*, 179 – 180

¹⁶⁴ Michael Andreopoulos, *The Byzantine Sinbad*, trans. J. Beneker and C. A. Gibson, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 67 (Harvard University Press, 2021), viii – ix.

¹⁶⁵ G. Dedeyan, *Les Arméniens entre Grecs, Musulmans et Croisés. Étude sur les pouvoirs arméniens dans la Proche-Orient méditerranéenne Vol. 2 (1068-1150)* (Calouste Gulbenkian, 2003). 957.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 957.

sponsorship in terms of the role of the *charistikarios*. As a lay benefactor of a monastic institutions, the *charistikarios* carried the available funds to support the production and translation of such a large codex and perhaps bequeathed this translated pre-Metaphrastic menologion in Armenian to a local ecclesiastical or monastic institution; one dedicated to Saint Eudoxios in the city of Melitene, explaining why this particular *Martyrdom* was given a dedicatory colophon connecting this larger enterprise to the local environment it was being produced in or the institution it was being produced for.¹⁶⁷ If, however, we would prefer to propose that the *Martyrdom* was translated as a singular text drawn from a Greek menologion, in so far as we imagine this translation served a practical purpose, that is to celebrate the saints on their feast day according to the liturgical calendar, with their icons present and with a text, we might imagine that the translation was commissioned on the commemoration of the saints' feast day in early September as an act of personal devotion by Gabriel himself, but one which maintained its Constantinopolitan liturgical context as a standalone text carrying the date of the 6th September.

In any case, we need not be confined to arguing solely for the sponsorship of Gabriel. Perhaps we could view this translation as the initiative of a local Armenian Chalcedonian lay confraternity, existing in Melitene in similar terms to the confraternity of the Kyros in Constantinople, recently studied by Paul Magdalino, in which members of the Byzantine elite converged in "lay or mixed confraternities that performed various ritual acts of charity and devotion in association with the public churches and certain monasteries, both in Constantinople and in the provinces."¹⁶⁸ As Magdalino points out, the confraternity of the Kyros is marked by its impressive literary activity, which, 'although it surely did not preclude the other pious activities that confraternities performed, such as feeding and bathing the poor, and liturgical devotion to the icon of the Kyriotissa, the Kyriotai (the members of the confraternity) expressed their devotion to the Virgin primarily by chanting the hymns of the humble Romanos, or by composing poems and encomia in her honour'.¹⁶⁹ Perhaps such an Armenian Chalcedonian confraternity attached to a foundation devoted to Saint Eudoxios in Melitene commissioned the anonymous scribe to produce the Armenian *Martyrdom* for exactly this function. Or, more simply, if we take the term Վարձ to signify a more celestial reward for the translation, of either a full Menologion for September or just an extraction of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*, its production may have been carried out under the initiative of an Armenian Chalcedonian monastic foundation dedicated to Saint Eudoxios and in possession of a pre-Metaphrastic Greek menologion in its library.

We might be tempted to assume that Armenian Chalcedonians would have been carrying out their liturgical practices in Greek, but the translation of this text into the Armenian language does not conflict with the idea that this translation was sponsored by Chalcedonian Armenians active in Melitene. A letter exchange between the Chalcedonian patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem and the monastic community of Saint Symeon *Thaumaturgos* on the Black Mountain concerning the spiritual practices of Chalcedonian

¹⁶⁷ Lemerle, *Cinq études*; English translation Vryonis Jr., "The Will of a Provincial Magnate, Eustathios Boilas (1059)".

¹⁶⁸ P. Magdalino, "The Liturgical Poetics of an Elite Religious Confraternity," in *Reading the Byzantine Empire and Beyond* ed. T. Shawcross and I. Toth (Cambridge University Press, 2018), 122.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 130

Armenians (c.a 1080's) preserved in the eleventh-century *Taktikon* of Nikon of the Black Mountain informs us that Chalcedonian Armenians continued to carry out their liturgical practice in their own tongue:

...καὶ εἰς τὴν Θεόκτιστον ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιτραπῆναι παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐν τῇ Ἀρμενίῳ διαλέκτῳ ψάλλεσθαι τὴν ἀκολουθίαν, τοὺς δὲ Ἑλληνιστὰς παραμίαν πάλιν ψάλλειν, καθὼς καὶ οἱ ἐνταῦθα ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν ψάλλουσιν τῇ τῶν Ἀρμενίων διαλέκτῳ καὶ οἱ Ἑλληνισταὶ παραμίαν, εἰς διαφόρους δὲ χοροὺς, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν δύο ἐκκλησίας...¹⁷⁰

...and in the God-created Church it was permitted by the saint that the liturgy be sung in the Armenian language while the Greeks sang separately, as also our brothers here sing in the Armenian language and the Greeks apart, but in a separate choir on account of not having two churches...¹⁷¹

Going by this evidence, finding Armenian Chalcedonians translating and using texts for liturgical purposes in Armenian in Byzantine Melitene would be exactly what we might expect to find based on this contemporary evidence.

Identifying the exact sponsor of the Armenian *Martyrdom* will always remain in the realm of supposition, but establishing the objectives of the translator seeking to render the linguistic and liturgical authority of his Greek Constantinopolitan model into Armenian and connecting this translation to a period of Chalcedonian Armenian ascendancy in the city of Melitene marked by literary activity all point to a compelling argument in favour of concluding that the sponsor or sponsors of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092 came from amongst the city's local Armenian Chalcedonian community. After all, who, other than Armenian Chalcedonians at that time, could describe the city of Melitene as their 'mother city', their metropolis, in 1092 (մայրաքաղաքին Հայոց)?¹⁷²

The Cult Dossier of Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios: The Emergence of the Armenian Martyrdom

The final evidence in favour of Chalcedonian sponsorship lies in situating the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* within the historical dossier of the cult of saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios in both the Greek and Armenian traditions; an investigation which reveals that the translation of the *Martyrdom* in 1092 fits neatly within a precise temporal political, intellectual, and socio-cultural cycle stretching from the late-tenth to the late-eleventh century which witnesses the emergence of evidence for the veneration of these saints by Armenians and in Armenian; an emergence of otherwise

¹⁷⁰ Nikon of the Black Mountain, *Das Taktikon Des Nikon Vom Schwarzen Berge*, Griechischer Text und kirchensalische Übersetzung des 14. Jahrhunderts Vol. 11, ed. Christian Hannick (Weiher, 2014), 884.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

¹⁷² A familiar calque of the Greek *μητροπόλις*, "metropolis". By the eleventh century we encounter the term in chapter 17 of *The Universal History of Step'anos Tarōnec'i*, referring to the Armenian city of Kars. However, it is not found in the *History* of Aristakēs, and only appears again in the eleventh century in two other colophons: Yerevan, Matenadaran, ms. 288, 1099CE, where it refers to Jerusalem and Alexandria and New Julfa Ms. 543, 1098CE, where it refers to Antioch. Notably then, most examples for the use of this term during the eleventh century appear in the 1090s.

previously unattested saints in the Armenian tradition associated exclusively with the activities of Armenian Chalcedonians.

Though the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* comprises a narrative of four saints, much of the martyrology is concerned specifically with the trial and execution of saint Eudoxios who is fashioned as the central figure within the composition; it is Eudoxios' name which always appears first in the title of the text as it is found in manuscripts. Whilst we do not have any clear indications of the veneration of the other three martyrs independently of the textual evidence, evidence for early cult activity comes to us in the form of sites dedicated solely to Eudoxios. In their analysis of the cult of Saint Eudoxios, the Bollandists point to a church carrying the saints name which was founded in Constantinople during the reign of Constantine the Great, evidence which, although not verified by archaeological data, would trace the commemoration of our central figure back to the fourth century in a cult context centred in Constantinople.¹⁷³ In his own study of the *Martyrdom*, Charles Astruc draws our attention to a Greek church inscription dedicated to Saint Eudoxios dated to 960/967 CE which records the restoration of the building following the re-interment of relics - regrettably we do not have any confirmation of the geographical context in which this fragmentary epigraphical evidence originally existed, though Astruc suggests this was likely in or near to Melitene – the site of his martyrdom.¹⁷⁴

The next securely dateable material attesting to the veneration of our martyrs comes in the form of textual evidence, where we find the narrative of all four saints within Greek hagiographical collections arranged according to the liturgical calendar of the Church of Constantinople. Paris suppl. gr. 1002, our fragmentary early tenth-century Greek version of the *Martyrdom* preserved on two palimpsest leaves on a manuscript which once comprised a menologion for the month of September is the earliest in this regard, followed in date by the appearance of an abbreviated Greek version of the *Martyrdom* in the mid-tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople*:

Τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἄθλησις τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων Ῥωμύλου, Εὐδοξίου, Ζήνωνος καὶ Μακαρίου. Τούτων τῶν ἁγίων ὁ μὲν Ῥωμύλος πραιπόσιτος ἦν τὴν ἀξίαν· ὑπῆρχεν δὲ ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ βασιλείᾳ, πρῶτην μὲν ὁμόφρων αὐτῷ καὶ συμβουλευσάμενος ἀποστεῖλαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Γαλλίᾳ στρατιώτας καὶ καταναγκάσαι αὐτοὺς προσκυνῆσαι τοῖς εἰδώλοις. Οὗς καὶ ἀντειπόντας τῷ προστάγματι αὐτοῦ μετὰ ζέοντος τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐξορία παρέδωκεν εἰς χώραν τῆς Ἀρμενίας ἐν πόλει Μελιτηνῇ· κάκεῖσε πικρῷ θανάτῳ ὑπέβαλεν, ὄντας τὸν ἀριθμὸν χιλιάδας ἑνδεκα. Ὡν τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ μεταμεληθεὶς ὁ Ῥωμύλος καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐπιμεμψάμενος, θείῳ ζήλῳ κινηθεὶς ἐπίστευσε τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν παρρησιασάμενος καὶ τὴν ἀπήνειαν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐλέγξας, μετὰ πολλὰς τὰς βασάνους τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπετμήθη. Μετὰ δὲ Τραϊανὸν καὶ λοιποὺς βασιλεῖς, οὐκ ὀλίγων ἐτῶν ἀπελθόντων, κρατήσαντος τῆς βασιλείας Διοκλητιανοῦ καὶ δόγμα ἐκθέντος ἀναιρεῖσθαι τοὺς χριστιανούς, συνελήφθη παρὰ τοῦ τῆς Μελιτηνῆς ἡγεμόνος καὶ ὁ ἐνδοξότατος Εὐδόξιος, κόμης ὢν τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ τὸ σέβας χριστιανός· ὅφ' οὗ πλείσταις καὶ διαφοροῖς ἐκδοθεὶς ταῖς τιμωρίαις, ὕστερον ἀπεκεφαλίσθη μετὰ

¹⁷³ “Commentarius Præuius Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon Ac Macarius,” In *Acta Sanctorum Volume 42: Sep. II* (1868), 507-510; “Romylos, Eudoxios, Zeno, and Makarius”, in *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity Database* (Oxford University), accessed January 2025 <http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=S02681>.

¹⁷⁴ Astruc, “Un fragment palimpseste,” 46.

Ζήνωνος τοῦ φιλάτου καὶ Μακαρίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου ἅμα σὺν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν στρατιώταις, τὸν ἀριθμὸν οὗσι χιλίοις ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα τέσσαρσιν.¹⁷⁵

On this day, the martyrdom of the holy martyrs Romylos, Eudoxios, Zenon, and Makarios. Concerning these saints, Romylos, who was a *Præpositos* by rank in the time of the Emperor Trajan. He was formerly of the same mind as him, agreeing to dispatch [people] against the soldiers in Gallia and forcing them to worship the idols. Resisting his command, in the heat of anger he exiled them to the land of Armenia to the city of Melitene, where he subjected them to a bitter death, numbering eleven thousand. Being regretful of this loss and casting blame upon himself, moved by divine zeal, he put faith in Christ and having openly expressed [his] piety and having rebuked the Emperor’s cruelty, after much suffering, his head was severed. After Trajan and other Emperors, not a few years had passed when the Emperor Diocletian held sway and issued a decree to suppress the Christians. The most glorious Eudoxios was brought before the Governor of Melitene, a *Komēs* by rank and a Christian by faith, who, after being subjected to many and varied tortures, was then beheaded with the beloved Zeno and the blessed Makarios, along with the soldiers under him, numbering 1134.¹⁷⁶

And, as we know, a reworked Greek version of the text emerged in the late-tenth-century *Menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes. All Greek textual versions of the *Martyrdom* share the 6th September as the date of the feast day within the Constantinopolitan liturgical calendar.

We are also fortunate to retain some iconographic representations of our saints within these Greek hagiographical collections. The erroneously named “Menologion” of Basil II, the well-known illustrated version of the Imperial Synaxarion, preserving 430 miniatures of saints celebrated from September through February, contains an illumination of the execution of Eudoxios, Zenon and Makarios on folio 18r (Image 1).¹⁷⁷ London, British Library, Add. 11870, an eleventh-century illustrated manuscript of the Metaphrastic Menologion for September, depicts the bearded saints during the cycle of their martyrdom, comprising confession, torture, confinement, and execution, on folio 67r (Image 2)¹⁷⁸ :

¹⁷⁵ *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanum*, 20–21. Edited Greek text taken from *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 20–21. Edited Greek text taken from *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, trans. L. Read.

¹⁷⁷ Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1613. f. 18r. © *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, W. Braunfels, *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* 6 (Herder, 1974), 175.

¹⁷⁸ London, British Library, Add. 11870, f. 67r. © *British Library*, N. Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts of the Metaphrastic Menologion* (University of Chicago Press, 1990), 118–25., Image obtained from open access publication: Papavarnavas, *Gefängnis als Schwellenraum*, v, with permission of C. Papavarnavas.

This detail from a medieval manuscript depicts a dramatic scene, likely the martyrdom of a saint. Three figures, all with halos, are shown. The central figure, wearing a red and blue robe, stands and holds a sword aloft in his right hand. To his left, a figure in a white and gold robe kneels in prayer or supplication. To the right, a third figure in a white robe lies on the ground, seemingly dead or unconscious. The background is a gold leaf surface with faint, illegible text. The entire scene is framed by a red border.

Image 1: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1613. f. 18r



Image 2: London, British Library, Add. 11870, f. 67r.

Unfortunately, none of the dossier of Greek evidence provides any connection between the veneration of these saints and the place of their martyrdom: Melitene. We can perhaps imagine an early cult context which developed traditions surrounding these saints present in the city, but we have no tangible evidence with

which to reflect on how the cult migrated beyond its original local environment and merged into Constantinopolitan hagiographical collections which determined them as a feature of the calendrical liturgical practices of the wider Byzantine Empire. Whilst our saints were by no means the most popular of those recorded in the 148 hagiographies included in the Metaphrastic *Menologion*, we can conclude that they were an established part of the Constantinopolitan liturgical canon, and so the normative liturgical cycle of the Byzantine Empire by the tenth century.

Turning to the Armenian tradition, there is, at present, no evidence for the veneration of any of these saints in Armenian or by Armenians before the very end of the tenth century, being as they are entirely absent from the earliest versions of the Armenian Čaşoc' (Lectionary) based on the fifth-century Lectionary of Jerusalem.¹⁷⁹ Whilst the Čaşoc', which serves as a carrier of the developing Armenian liturgical tradition from the fifth century onward makes note of other saints such as Saint Stephen, Saint Antony, Saint Theodore *Stratelates*, and Gregory the illuminator¹⁸⁰, we do not encounter our saints in Armenian until an abbreviated narrative of their martyrdom appears in the Armenian translation of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, composed in 991 CE by Yovsēp, a Chalcedonian Armenian working in the ossuary of Hagia Sophia at the end of the tenth century (Vienna, Mekhitarist Monastery, MS 1048, 1302 CE):

Յայսմ աւուր կատարեցաւ սրով սուրբ մարտիրոսն Քրիստոսի Ռամիլոս ի Տրիանուէ արքաւ: նոյնպէս եւ սուրբ վկայն Եւդոքսիոս կատարեցաւ սրով ի Դէոկղիտիանուէ արքաւ: ի Մելիտենի քաղաքին եւ ընդ սրբոյն Եւդոքսիոսի կատարեցան ՌՃԼԴ: մարտիրոսք ի քաղաքին Մելիտենի.¹⁸¹

On this day the holy martyr of Christ, Romylos, was martyred with love in the time of the Emperor Trajan and the holy martyr Eudoxios was martyred with love in the time of the Emperor Diocletian in the city of Melitene, and with Saint Eudoxios was martyred 1134 martyrs in the city of Melitene.¹⁸²

We will return to the textual transmission and content of Yovsēp's translation in the next chapter, but the 1987 study by Ugo Zanetti on this *codex unicus* allows us to briefly summarise here that the Armenian translation was modelled according to the standard Constantinopolitan arrangement of the heortological year, with Christmas on the 25th December, the presentation of Christ in the Temple on February 2nd, the annunciation on the 25th March, which Yovsēp points out is according to the arrangement of the 'Greeks'.¹⁸³ As Zanetti explains, almost all the notices correspond to the arrangement of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, with the only exceptions coming in the form of a number of interpolated Armenian festivals, which are the result of later addition and augmentation during the fourteenth century copying

¹⁷⁹ P. Ant'abyan, "Tawnapatčar žolovacown," 103–127., Charles Renoux, "Le Čaşoc'," 123–152., C. Renoux, *Le Lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie Le Čaşoc' I: Introduction et liste des manuscrits*, Patrologia orientalis, 44/4 (1989)., Renoux, *Le Lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie Le Čaşoc' II*, Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121 II*, Renoux, "Čaşoc' et Tōnakan," 169–201.

¹⁸⁰ Renoux, *Le Lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie Le Čaşoc' II*, 153., 157., 164., 180.

¹⁸¹ Vienna, Mekhitarist Monastery, ms. 1048, f. 25r.

¹⁸² Ibid., trans. L. Read.

¹⁸³ U. Zanetti, "Apothegmes et Histoires Édifiantes dans le Synaxarie Arménien," *Analecta Bollandiana* 105 (Brepols, 1987): 171.

process.¹⁸⁴ Zanetti has also observed that the entries are abbreviated notices modelled on entries in the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, but comprising shorter summaries thereof made by Yovsēp himself in the process of translation.¹⁸⁵ It is note-worthy that the earliest abbreviated Arabic version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* also first appears at this historical juncture in the Melkite Synaxarion, an Arabic translation of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, the earliest surviving witness of which is dated to 1095 and originates from a Melkite community in lower Egypt; we will revisit this connection in the next chapter.¹⁸⁶

It is in the form created by Yovsēp that the abbreviated Armenian *Martyrdom* was transmitted into the Armenian Yaysmavurk¹⁸⁷ liturgical manuscript tradition¹⁸⁸ which emerged in the thirteenth century, surviving in three primary recensions: the Armenian Yaysmavurk¹⁸⁹ of Ter Israel (c. 1240.), the Armenian Yaysmavurk¹⁹⁰ of Kirakos Arewelec'i (1296), and the Armenian Yaysmavurk¹⁹¹ of Catholicos Grigor VII (1295-1307). Two of these works were first represented in collated form in Gevorg Bayan's *Patrologia Orientalis* text, *Le Synaxaire Arménien de Ter Israel*.¹⁹² The challenges inherent in the study of the Armenian Yaysmavurk¹⁹³ tradition are best exemplified by Bayan's misattribution of his edition of the text to Ter Israel. In fact, the two versions of the text compiled by Bayan, Paris, Arm. 180 and an edition printed in Constantinople in 1834, are the work of Kirakos Arewelec'i and Catholicos Grigor VII respectively. Only between 2008 and 2011 was the version of the Yaysmavurk¹⁹⁴ attributed to Ter Israel made available via Petrosyan's new synoptic edition.¹⁹⁵ In the recensions of the Armenian Yaysmavurk¹⁹⁶, our saints are sometimes found twice. Alongside the abbreviated version of the Armenian *Martyrdom* originally composed by Yovsēp in 991 which appears consistently throughout all the recensions, we encounter a second short notice concerning Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios present only in the thirteenth century Armenian Yaysmavurk¹⁹⁷ recensions of Kirakos Arewelec'i and Grigor VII:

Ի նոյն յիշատակ սրբոց վկայից Ռոմիլոսի պրեպոսիտու, եւ Ուրբանոսի, եւ Չենոնի, եւ Մակարիոսի, եւ նմին սրբոյն Եւտոքսիոսի եւ Մանտանայ կնոջ նորա, եւ այլ ընկերաց նոցա, որք ի Տրայանոսէ ի Մետիլինի կատարեցան վասն Թրիստոսս: ¹⁹²

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 171.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 170.

¹⁸⁶ Mount Sinai, Saint Catherine's Monastery, Arabic ms. 417, ff. 7v-8r.

¹⁸⁷ The use of the term synaxarion to refer to the Yaysmavurk¹⁸⁸ is questionable due to its considerable difference in form, content, and structure from a Greek synaxarion. However, the term is currently embedded so deeply in scholarship that the term synaxarion is routinely used to refer to these manuscript types.

¹⁸⁸ E. Petrosyan, *Համաքարքաւ Յայսմաւորք (The Synoptical Haysmavurk)*, September (Etchmiadzin, 2010), 182-183.

¹⁸⁹ S. Brock, "Ephrem and the Persian Martyrs in the Armenian Synaxarion," in *Armenia through the Lens of Time: Multidisciplinary Studies in Honour of Theo Maarten van Lint*, ed. F. Alpi, R. Meyer, I. Tinti, and D. Zakarian (Brill, 2023), 393.

¹⁹⁰ G. Bayan, *Le Synaxaire Arménien de Ter Israel: I Mois de Navasard*, *Patrologia orientalis*, 5/3 (1910).

¹⁹¹ E. Petrosyan, *Համաքարքաւ Յայսմաւորք (The Synoptical Haysmavurk)*, 12 vols. (Etchmiadzin, 2008–11).

¹⁹² Bayan, *Le Synaxaire Arménien de Ter Israel*, 513 (169); Petrosyan, *Համաքարքաւ Յայսմաւորք*, 87,

On the same day, commemoration of the holy martyrs Romylos *praepositos*, Urbanos, Zenon, and Makarios, and Saint Eudoxios and Mantana his wife, and their other companions, who in the time of Trajan, died for Christ in Melitene.¹⁹³

In this version, the saints are merged with the martyr Urbanos traditionally separated on the sixth September in the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*. The abbreviated Armenian *Martyrdom* appears here in mangled form, diverging considerably from its traditional characteristics of placing the martyrdom of Romylos during the reign of the Emperor Trajan and Eudoxios, Zenon and Makarios during the reign of the Emperor Diocletian. As well as the sudden appearance of Urbanos, this short notice implies that the wife of Eudoxios was also martyred, which is specifically not the case in both the full and abbreviated versions of the *Martyrdom* in the Greek, in the abbreviated version of the Armenian *Martyrdom* translated from the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* by Yovsēp, and in the anonymous Armenian translation made in Melitene in 1092. The appearance of this warped second reference to the Armenian *Martyrdom* likely appears as a result of editorial processes during the compilation of the various recensions of the Armenian Yaysmavurk⁴ in the thirteenth century which condensed and merged separate sub entries originating from *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* on the 6th September, and does not appear to speak to the remnant of an earlier festal tradition which combined all of these saints in this way. The fact that this alternative warped version does not appear at all in the synaxarion of Yovsēp, as it is preserved in Vienna, Mekhitarist Monastery, ms 1048, also points toward a later date for the emergence of the alternative version; certainly, it came well after Yovsēp's abbreviated version of the *Martyrdom* appeared in the Armenian tradition.

It is after the appearance of an abbreviated version of the *Martyrdom* in the Armenian translation of *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* by Yovsēp in 991 that our *vita longior* version of the *Martyrdom* appears, translated in the city of Melitene in the year 1092 from a pre-Metaphrastic Greek Menologion for the month of September arranged according to the liturgical year cycle of the Church of Constantinople, celebrated on the 6th September. It is in the form produced by our anonymous translator in 1092 that all later long versions of the Armenian *Martyrdom* derive, and which appear in later Armenian collections known as the Ճառընտիր (Ġarēntir), a compound liturgical manuscript which, rather than keeping the fixed cycles of feasts separate from the moveable as in the Greek tradition of using *menologia*, *homilaria*, and *panegyrika*, combines both the fixed and moveable calendar. The nature of the stemmatic relationship between the Armenian *Martyrdom* as it is preserved in BnF, Arm. 178 and its later descendants will be the subject of a more thorough discussion in Chapter 4.

Strikingly, in the late eleventh century we also encounter the unique occurrence of Saint Eudoxios on the seal of the Chalcedonian Armeno-Byzantine commander Krakourates, ἄρχων τῶν ἀρχόντων (archon of the archons), operating in Commagene.¹⁹⁴ It is, at present, the only example of Saint Eudoxios represented on Byzantine seal iconography.¹⁹⁵ Though we will return to the enigmatic Krakourates and the

¹⁹³ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

¹⁹⁴ Dédéyan, *Les Arméniens entre Grecs, Musulmans et Croisés*, 942., Seibt, “The eastern frontier”, 29-30.

¹⁹⁵ J. Cotsonis, *The Religious Figural Imagery of Byzantine Lead Seals II: Studies on Images of the Saints and on Personal Piety* (Routledge, 2020), 65.

context of his iconographic choices in Chapter 3, the appearance of saint Eudoxios on the seal of Krakourates draws a very clear connection between the commemoration and veneration of the saint and an Armenian Chalcedonian in service to the Byzantine Empire operating just under fifty miles south of Melitene in the late eleventh century, near to contemporaneous with the translation of the full-length *Martyrdom* into Armenian in 1092.

We are presented then with three key sources of evidence for the emergence these saints in the Armenian *sanctorale* and their veneration within a period stretching from the very end of the tenth to the end of the eleventh century in material produced by or associated exclusively with Armenian Chalcedonians:

- **The abbreviated Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*** translated from the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* by the Armenian Chalcedonian Yovsēp in Constantinople in 991 CE.
- **The long Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*** translated from a pre-Metaphrastic Greek Menologion of the Church of Constantinople produced in Armeno-Byzantine Melitene in 1092.
- **Saint Eudoxios on the seal of Krakourates**, an Armenian Chalcedonian Byzantine military figure operating in Commagene, late eleventh century.

The location of the translation of the *Martyrdom* in Melitene in 1092 certainly attests to the more local dimensions involved in the emergence of evidence for the active veneration of these saints amongst Armenians. The appearance of the long Armenian *Martyrdom* draws a direct connection between the nascent veneration of these saints and an Armenian community active in the place of their martyrdoms, a connection which we do not find in the Greek tradition. Clearly one of the motivations behind the translation of this particular martyrology in 1092 was to commemorate local saints associated with the civic environment in which these Armenians were active. However, when it is not viewed in isolation, the translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092 sits within a corpus of textual and material evidence for the emergence of the active veneration of these saints in Armenian and by Armenians within a specific hundred-year span implicitly connected to Chalcedonian Armenians operating in Constantinople and in the area around in or near to Melitene, associated with individuals directly in service to Byzantine ecclesiastical and imperial administrations respectively. It is this crucial supporting evidence which appears to speak to the distinctly Chalcedonian confessional dimensions of the emergence of textual and material evidence for the veneration of the Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios in Armenian during the tenth and eleventh century.

This evidence strongly supports a conclusion in favour of Armenian Chalcedonian sponsorship of the translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092. Like the abbreviated version of the *Martyrdom*, translated from a collection codified in a tenth-century Constantinopolitan milieu, arranged according to the liturgical calendar of the Church of Constantinople by Yovsēp an Armenian Chalcedonian in service to the Empire, and like the unique appearance of saint Eudoxios on the seal of an Armenian Chalcedonian in service to

the Byzantine Empire, the Armenian *Martyrdom* translated in Armeno-Byzantine Melitene in 1092, also fits in to an active milieu of Armenian Chalcedonian translation and veneration of saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios.

Commemorating Saint Eudoxios: Armenian Chalcedonian Hagiography in the Eleventh Century

With the knowledge that the Armenian *Martyrdom* was translated in Melitene in 1092, based on a Greek model, and commissioned by an anonymous sponsor, the present textual investigation has identified that the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* was based on a pre-Metaphrastic Greek model. Textual comparison between the Armenian, as it is preserved in BnF. Arm 178, and the Metaphrastic and pre-Metaphrastic Greek versions of *Martyrdom* indicate that, although not directly based on Paris suppl. gr. 1002, the Armenian text and its Greek model belong to the pre-Metaphrastic tradition, proximate to a version of the text surviving in the tenth-century manuscript of Paris suppl. gr. 1002, drawn from a menologion for September arranged according to the liturgical cycle of the Church of Constantinople.

By considering the Greek model, the modality of its translation, the objectives of the translator, the conscious maintenance of the date of veneration, and the context behind its production, this chapter has argued that the Armenian *Martyrdom* was sponsored by a member or members of the Armenian Chalcedonian community of Melitene, introducing a confessional dimension underpinning the creation of the text; one which moves away from a traditional scholarly line of argument which has placed the *Martyrdom* within the purview of the Miaphysite Armenian translation activities of the Catholicos Grigor II. Instead this chapter has argued for the agency of those Armenians who looked to the spiritual authority of the Church of Constantinople. Placing the production of the Armenian *Martyrdom* within the cult dossier of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios in both Armenian and Greek offers further support in favour of a conclusion for Armenian Chalcedonian production. Viewed in this wider context, the translation of an abbreviated version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* derived from the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* by the Armenian Chalcedonian Yovsēp in 991 as well as material evidence for the veneration of saint Eudoxios on the seal of the Chalcedonian Armeno-Byzantine commander Krakourates not only strengthens an argument for Chalcedonian translation of the *vita longior* version translated from a Greek menologion arranged according to the liturgical year cycle of the Church of Constantinople in 1092, but locates the emergence of these previously unattested saints into the Armenian liturgical tradition to an Armenian Chalcedonian milieu of translation and veneration active during the tenth and eleventh century. It was this Armenian Chalcedonian translation milieu which brought both a short (991CE) and long version (1092CE) of the *Martyrdom* into Armenian for the first time.

2

Armenian Chalcedonian Translators and the Expansion of the Byzantine Empire: A Long Eleventh Century

The consensus of scholarship in the field of Armenian hagiographical studies has highlighted that the eleventh century was one of the most intense periods in the transformation of the Armenian *sanctorale*, facilitated by the translation of previously unattested saints' lives, martyrologies, and feast days drawn from Greek Constantinopolitan hagiographical and liturgical collections. Within this scholarly framework it is the activities of Grigor II Vkasēs and his translation team carried out in the closing decades of the eleventh century which have come to be viewed as the prime vehicle of this transformation.¹⁹⁶ The translation programme of the Armenian Miaphysite Catholicos was undoubtedly significant in this regard, but as the previous chapter has demonstrated, he was not the only individual responsible for the entry of new commemorations into the Armenian liturgical tradition facilitated via translations of Greek hagiographical material at this particular historical juncture. The translation of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* may well be rare in the context of Armenian hagiographical material produced in the late-eleventh century as the only surviving and securely dateable hagiographical translation not produced by Grigor II Vkasēs, but it is this rarity, the conditions and impetus behind its translation, and the emergence of evidence for the veneration of these martyrs in the Armenian tradition during the very late tenth and eleventh century which presents a unique viewpoint from which to explore another route through which previously unattested saints and feast days made their way into the Armenian tradition during this

¹⁹⁶ Renoux, "Une influence du rite byzantin sur la liturgie arménienne: un pentecostaire arménien," 187-190., Renoux, "Le Čaşoc", Typicon-Lectionnaire," 136-138., Ant'abyan, "Tawnapatčar žolovacown," 106., Gevorgyan, "Grigor II Vkasēri," 94 -111., Cowe, "Armenian Hagiography," 312., Avdalbegyan, *Yaysmanurk' Žolovacuner*, 52., R. Vardanyan, *Hayoc' Tonac'uyc'*, 283 -288.

period; it is an approach which offers an entirely different discursive space to the interpretive framework provided by the activities of Grigor Vkasēs.

This chapter aims to situate the translation of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092 and more broadly the emergence of evidence for the veneration of these saints in Armenian and by Armenians within a process of textual dissemination and translation which followed the vicissitudes of Byzantine imperial expansion during the tenth and eleventh. It will argue that the translation was part of a wider trans-regional process of spiritual transformation in the *longue durée* of the Byzantine Empire's expansion stimulated by the translation of a canon of sacred literature from Greek by Chalcedonian Christian populations living throughout the Empire's newly formed eastern frontier. This is, it should be emphasised, not an attempt to highlight a monodirectional policy emanating from an imperial centre, which should be judged on how successfully provincial populations were moulded to a univocal imperial confessional model which strengthened the Empire's political economy, but rather it aims to highlight a process of push and pull, whereby the imperial centre and provincial Chalcedonian populations actively participated and co-operated in the construction of a shared spiritual and cultural environment through the injection and translation of hagiographical, patristic, exegetical and liturgical texts. This was a process which not only brought new commemorations and feast days into the Armenian tradition, but one which facilitated the intrusion of the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople into the norms of provincial Christian communities living throughout Northern Syria, Northern Mesopotamia, Eastern Anatolia, and the Caucasus during the tenth and eleventh century and served to construct, reinforce, and maintain a trans-regional, imperial space. Ultimately, this chapter seeks to foreground an active Armenian Chalcedonian translation and veneration milieu throughout the late-tenth and eleventh century that carried distinctly different objectives from the translation activities of Grigor II Vkasēs.

The Expansion of Byzantium and the Disruption of the Spiritual Environment

The evidence presented in the previous chapter situates the production of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in 1092 within a profoundly Armenian Chalcedonian socio-cultural, intellectual, and confessional milieu which was responsible for the promotion of the commemoration of these saints in a century long cycle of activity from 991 CE to the end of the eleventh century, bringing them into Armenian for the first time. Crucially it provides evidence for a previously unknown martyrology making its way into Armenian from Greek contemporaneously to the activities of Grigor Vkasēs', but not under the agency of his translation programme. If our current interpretive model framing the expansion of the Armenian *sanctorale* during the eleventh century is one articulated in terms of the injection of previously untranslated saints lives and martyrdoms into Armenian under the aegis of Grigor Vkasēs' as means of demarcating Armenians from the influence of the Church of Constantinople and stimulating an Armenian cultural revival, then the translation of the *Martyrdom* into Armenian in 1092 and, more generally, the production of the material and literary tools for the veneration of these saints which facilitated their emergence in Armenian during the tenth and eleventh century speaks to an entirely different set of

circumstances and motivations. It offers a window into a process of text dissemination, translation, and veneration stimulated and shaped by the activity of Armenian Chalcedonians throughout the Empire's eastern frontier and it is the case study of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* which can provide the red thread with which to contextualise this Armenian Chalcedonian activity and connect it to a wider Chalcedonian translation milieu intimately influenced by and dependent upon Byzantine Imperial expansion.

The eastward expansion of the Byzantine Empire during the late-tenth and eleventh-century came at the expense of a number of autonomous Armenian kingdoms and polities, a process which not only altered local political, administrative, legal, fiscal, economic, cultural, and intellectual practices, but also dramatically transformed the spiritual norms of the Armenian communities which found themselves living within a new Byzantine provincial environment.¹⁹⁷ The subsequent relocation of Armenian elites into the Empire's eastern themes was accompanied by the ancillary movement of the Miaphysite Armenian Church hierarchy, the removal of its ecclesiastical elite, and the implementation of new Chalcedonian sees. Arutjunova-Findanjan, using evidence drawn from the *Notitiae Episcopatum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, has identified the emergence of some twenty-one Chalcedonian eparchies on the former lands which once comprised the Armenian principality of Taron and the Kingdom of Vaspurakan.¹⁹⁸ In *Notitia* 10, we find the new dioceses of Hagios Nikolaos, Hagios Georgios, and Hagios Elissaios emerging alongside the new thematic system in the region of Vaspurakan.¹⁹⁹ Another see of Hagios Nikolaos is specifically associated with the city of Arčēš, which itself had become a new thematic centre following its annexation. It is striking, as Greenwood notes, to observe that several of the new Byzantine dioceses established following the departure of the Armenian King Senek'erim Yovhannes in 1021CE, appear to bear the names of pre-existing religious institutions.²⁰⁰ Greenwood points to evidence reported by Step'anos Tarōnec'i pertaining to Xlat'/Hilāt on the northern shore of Lake Van. Tarōnec'i recalls that there was 'an Armenian church outside the circuit wall which had become a bishop's residence and a monastery – previously it had been an Armenian community dedicated to the Holy Cross and Saint Gamaliel'.²⁰¹ The emergent eparchies in Bagrewand, Basean, and Tayk also suggest new jurisdictions were created over the lands which formerly comprised the Armenian principality of Tao-Tayk.²⁰² The replacement of existing ecclesiastical structures

¹⁹⁷ The annexation of Armenian polities was achieved primarily through legal mechanisms established on the consensual transfer of lands through written wills in exchange for properties, titles, and incomes in the Empire. See for example Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, *Patmut'umn Aristakēsi Lastivertc'voy*, ed. K.N. Yuzbašyan. (Erevan, 1963), chapters 2 and 10, or Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. G. Moravcsik and R. J. H. Jenkins (Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2009), chapter 43 (Taron).

For the reconfiguration of the Empire's eastern frontier see; C. Holmes, "How the East Was Won in the Reign of Basil II," C. Holmes, *Basil II and the Governance of Empire, 976–1025*, T. Greenwood, "Social Change in Eleventh-Century Armenia: The Evidence from Taron".

¹⁹⁸ V. Arutjunova-Fidanjan, "Some aspects of the Military Administrative Districts and of Byzantine Administration in Armenia during the Eleventh-century," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 20 (1986-1987): 309-320.

¹⁹⁹ Greenwood, Social Change in Eleventh-Century Armenia: The Evidence from Tarōn, 217.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 217.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 217.

²⁰² E. McGeer, J. Nesbitt, and N. Oikonomides, *Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art, Volume 4: The East* (Dumbarton Oaks, 2001), 162.

with new Chalcedonian hierarchies, often directly replacing former Armenian Miaphysite foundations, represented a considerable break from the norms of ecclesiastical authority amongst Armenian communities living in the newly conquered provinces spread through the Eastern Anatolia, Northern Mesopotamia, Northern Syria, and the Caucasus.

It is fairly apparent from the contemporary evidence that this ecclesiastical disruption was accompanied by periods of confessional tension which gradually eroded the authority of what remained of the Armenian Miaphysite church. Stephen of Taron recalls the hostilities between the Byzantine metropolitan of Sebasteia and the local Armenian ecclesiasts in the late tenth century following the Byzantine re-capture of the city:

The metropolitan of Sebasteia began to oppress the people of Armenia in matters of faith. He had recourse to violence and began to torture the priests concerning faith, and he conveyed the leading priests of the city of Sebasteia in iron chains to the court of the king. Having been ill-treated in prison, the senior one of the priests, Gabriēl, was killed; he was an old man and full of knowledge and steadfast in this divine faith. This occurred in 435 of the Era. Then others, unnamed priests and two bishops of Sebasteia and Larissa, Sion and Yovhannēs, through the same metropolitan, accepted the Council of Chalcedon and were excluded from the unanimity of Armenians. And from that time, they banned the Armenian call to prayer in the city of Sebasteia until king Basil came to the country of the east.²⁰³

This tension can also be traced well into the eleventh century. The Armenian Catholicos Petros I was relocated from his seat in Ani to the city of Theodosiupolis-Karin at the behest of Constantine IX Monomachos following the annexation of the Kingdom of Armenia, before being held in Constantinople for an extended period.²⁰⁴ The same treatment was afforded to his nephew, the future Catholicos Xač'ik II, who was detained before being brought to the imperial capital.²⁰⁵ Hamada, in a recent study on the development of polemical literature between Miaphysite Armenians and Chalcedonian Greeks, has pointed in particular to the anti-Armenian sentiment displayed in the treatise of Byzantine theologian Niketas Stethatos and the heightened division and entrenchment in matters of religious identity which such polemical activity brought with it.²⁰⁶ It seems that the Catholicos Petros sought to push back against much of the sectarian animosity being levelled towards him by commissioning the Armenian Vardapet Anania Sanahnetsi to compose a text in 'Opposition against those who believe in two natures (Dyophysites)' which, according to the manuscript colophon, was completed shortly after his death in 1058.²⁰⁷ The tenuous position of the head of the Armenian Church clearly speaks to a crisis of authority which emerged amongst

²⁰³ Step'anos Tarōnec'i, *The Universal History of Step'anos Tarōnec'i: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, ed. and trans. T Greenwood (Oxford University Press, 2017), 252.

²⁰⁴ *Patmut'inn Aristakisi*, 63-64.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 63-64.

²⁰⁶ K. Hamada, "Old Issues in the New Regime: The Revival of Religious Controversies Between Byzantines and Armenians after the Fall of the Bagratid Kingdom," in *Armenia and Byzantium without Borders*, ed. E. Bonfiglio and C. Rapp (Brill, 2023), 241-42, 249.

²⁰⁷ Mat'evosyan, *Hišatakaraner*, 101-102.

the Miaphysite hierarchy in the eleventh century. Though Garsoïan highlights the fact that, despite moments of diatribe, the position of the Imperial church and the Empire toward Miaphysite Armenians ‘cannot be dismissed as monolithic’ in its hostility, we are still led to assume that Miaphysite Armenians generally found themselves under sporadic pressure. Bromige has most recently described the period as one in which confessional ‘belligerence and intolerance’ toward Armenians in matters of faith was on the rise.²⁰⁸

Sharing the Empire’s Chalcedonian confessional identity was not by any means a *conditio sine qua non* for participation in the Empire, as the case of the Armenian Miaphysite doux of Taron and Mesopotamia Grigor Magistros illustrates, but it is evident that the Armenian Miaphysite Church hierarchy found itself under considerable pressure proliferated by several phases of relocation and disruption.²⁰⁹ As Greenwood observes, ‘the fact that Catholicos Grigor II Vkasēs (‘Martyrophile’) is best-known for wandering through the Middle East collecting and translating martyrologies rather than for his leadership of the Armenian Church suggests that this institution was under intense strain, if not close to complete collapse by this time’.²¹⁰ By 1085 there were four elected Armenian Catholicoi including Vkasēs, which perhaps gives us something of an impression of the fragmented and challenging situation faced by the Miaphysite Armenian Church after a century of hegemonic imperial pressure undermining its organisational authority.²¹¹ Wassiliou-Seibt and Boersema have reiterated what they describe as the ‘well-known Byzantine policy of repressing the Armenian church and attempting to move it under the auspices of the ecumenical patriarch’.²¹²

Whilst the mechanisms of imperial intrusion into the spiritual norms of Armenian localities in the tenth and eleventh century through the removal of local church hierarchies, the implementation of new Chalcedonian sees, and the production of anti-Miaphysite polemics has been well demonstrated by Arutjunova-Findanjan, Greenwood, Hamada, and others, the role of the dissemination and translation of a prescribed canon of sacred literature by Chalcedonian Armenians in this process has yet to be considered.²¹³ It is the appearance of saints Romylos, Eudoxios, Zenon, and Makarios in the Armenian tradition during this exact temporal period which offers an ideal starting point from which to advance just such an investigation.

²⁰⁸ Bromige, *Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*, 90.

²⁰⁹ Garsoïan, "The Problem of Armenian Integration," 71.

²¹⁰ T. Greenwood, "Aristakes Lastivertc'i and Armenian Urban Consciousness," in *Byzantium in the Eleventh Century*, ed. M. Lauxtermann and M. Whittow (Routledge, 2017), 96., V. Torosyan, *Հայոց Կաթողիկոսական Բշխման Պայմանները (The Authority of the Armenian Catholicosate - Mid-11th Century – Early 12th Century)* (Matenadaran, 2018).

²¹¹ Urhayec'i (Matthew of Edessa), *Žamanakagrut'ivn*, 374-375.

²¹² A. Wassiliou-Seibt and G. Boersema, "The Orthodox Monastery of the Virgin of Arayi: Evidence for Byzantine Ecclesiastical Policy in Greater Armenia (1045–1064)," in *Armenia and Byzantium without Borders*, ed. by E. Bonfiglio and C. Rapp (Brill, 2023), 296.

²¹³ Arutjunova-Fidanjan, "Some aspects of the Military Administrative Districts and of Byzantine Administration in Armenia during the Eleventh-century," Greenwood, "Social Change".

Engineering Spiritual Uniformity: The Translation of Byzantine Relics and Greek Texts by Yovsēp of Constantinople

Though a long version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* did not appear until 1092 CE, the first evidence for the emergence of these saints in Armenian and evidence for their veneration by Armenians comes exactly a century before, in abbreviated form, as part of the Armenian translation of *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* which, according to its colophon, preserved now only in Vienna, Mekhitarist Monastery, MS 1048 (1302 CE), was translated from Greek into Armenian in Constantinople in 991 CE by a certain Yovsēp. Beyond information on its dating and provenance, the colophon offers us some key insights into the processes and motivations behind its production:

Եւ ես անարժանս եւ տգէտս եւ մեղաւոր թարգմագրիչս Յովսէփ, ծնեալ եւ սնեալ եւ ծերացեալ յաստուծապահ քաղաքիս Կոստանդինուպոլիս, եւ զհայրենի լեզու եւ զգիր ի տեղիս ուսեալ, ի միոյ Հոռոմ տաւնացոյցէ²¹⁴ թարգմանեցի զնառա[***]լաւտի²¹⁵, ի թորգոմական բարբառ ի Ն եւ Իս (991) թուականիս Հայոց, եւ էր յԱդամա ԶՌԾ (6500): Անցեալ ամաց եւ յուղարկեցի ի Հայոց եկեղեցիս, որ ընթեռնուն եւ գրեն զիրաքանչիւր սրբոցն զնշանութիւնս եւ յիշեն յանուանէ զմեղաւոր հոգիս, եւ վարձս ի վարձատուողէն առցեն. Ամէն:

Եւ վասն զի ծանր եւ անձանաւթ իցեն անուանք սրբոցն, այսպէս գրեցի յորում գրեալ: Էթէ Վկայաբանութիւն սրբոյն, զիտասջիր որ մարտիրոսս այր էր, եւ յորում գրեալ է Վկայութիւն սրբոհուն զիտասջիր որ մարտիրոսս կին է եւ յորում գրեալ է Վարք երանելոյն չէ մարտիրոսս այլ առաքինի: Եւ աստուածահաճոյ: Վարիւք ճգնեալ վասն անուանն որ ի Քրիստոս²¹⁶

And I unworthy, ignorant and sinful translator Yovsēp, born and raised and grown old in this God-protected city Constantinople, having studied the Armenian language and literature in this place, I translated from the Roman testimony of feasts a short treatise, in T'orgomean speech in 400 and 40 of this Armenian era; and it was from Adam 6500 years which had passed and I despatched it to this Armenian church. Whoever reads and writes their own ascetic life of the saints, may they remember by name this sinful soul and they shall receive reward from the rewarder, Amen.

And since the names of the saints may be difficult and unknown, so I have written in this way, in which if it is written the martyrology of the saint, you shall know which man was a martyr, and when it is written testimony of the lady saint, you shall know which woman was a martyr, and when it is written 'life of the blessed one', he is not a martyr but lived an austere life for with courageous conduct pleasing to God for the sake of the name which is to Christ.²¹⁷

²¹⁴ **Տաւնացոյց** – lit. feast (տաւն) + testimony/index (ցոյց). I have preferred as literal a rendering as possible for this term in the translation, as has been the case for the term **տաւնամակ** – lit. feast (տաւն) + writing/book (մամակ). Due to the considerable gap between the production and the transmission of Armenian liturgical manuscripts it is extremely challenging to clarify the exact contents, structure, and form of these compositions in their original context. I have therefore chosen to initially render these terms as close as possible to the phrase found in the colophons so as not to infer too much about the shape of the original composition without further justification. In this case the manuscript which now preserves this colophon and is the descendant of the original composition: Vienna, Mekhitarist Monastery, MS 1048, contains both a contents and structure proximate to the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, but with each entry abbreviated and edited by Yovsēp himself. It is possible then to infer that տաւնացոյց in this case can be taken to mean that the composition produced by Yovsēp in Armenian in 991 was something akin to the synaxarion of the Church of Constantinople in both form and function.

²¹⁵ Damage to the manuscript renders this term challenging to read.

²¹⁶ Vienna, Mekhitarist Monastery, ms. 1048, 8r.

²¹⁷ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

We learn that Yovsēp was a native of the city of Constantinople and that, strikingly, he studied Armenian in the capital during the tenth century. Regrettably, the enigmatic translator chose not to divulge any further details of his own identity or training. This is, however, not the only time we encounter him in the historical record. More information comes to us in the form of an Armenian *translatio* which records the journey of the monk Pantaleon to Constantinople to obtain the relics of the Apostles Peter and Paul at the very end of the tenth century. Whilst in Constantinople, Pantaleon was assisted by Yovsēp, who he found working in the ossuaries of the Hagia Sofia and who helped Pantaleon render accounts surrounding the relics from Greek into Armenian.

Որք ընթերնուք յիշեցէք զտառապետալ Պանտալէոն զի բազում աշխատութեամբ հանի զգալ յարկեղաց Սրբոյն Սոփիա եւ թարգմանեցի ի յունականէն ի հայ լեզու, ձեռամբ արքիմեղոյն Յովսէփայ ի փառս Աստուծոյ.²¹⁸

You who read, may you remember the suffering Pantaleon, and that with much work I extracted sense from the ossuaries of Saint Sofia and translated from Greek into the Armenian language, by the hand of (with the assistance from) the blessed Yovsēp for the glory of God.²¹⁹

It is this evidence which led Father Nerses Akinean in his 1957 article: *Yovsēp‘ Kostandnonpolsēc‘i T‘argmanich Haysmanurk‘i* (Yovsēp of Constantinople: Translator of the *Synaxarion*), the first and very brief study of the Yovsēp’s translation, to argue that Yovsēp was himself of Armenian descent and must have belonged to an Armenian Chalcedonian community present in the city.²²⁰ Given Yovsēp’s activities in the library and archive of the Hagia Sofia and his role in the translation and distribution of relic accounts and the *Synaxarion* of the Church of Constantinople into Armenian it seems apparent that he was certainly confessionally aligned with the Empire and if not Armenian himself, certainly a Chalcedonian Constantinopolitan descent with a good command of the Armenian language and connections to the city’s Armenian Chalcedonian community.²²¹

The 1987 work by Ugo Zanetti remains the key entry point into the complex textual tradition and content of Yovsēp’s translation of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, and his study allows us to speculate more on the content of the original translation.²²² Zanetti naturally urges caution regarding the current shape of the text, acknowledging the fact that, surviving in a fourteenth-century manuscript, it may well bear little resemblance to its original form. However, his study clearly demonstrates that the Armenian text was originally modelled according to the standard Constantinopolitan arrangement of the liturgical year, with Christmas on the 25th December, the presentation of Christ in the Temple on the 2nd February, the annunciation on the 25th March, which Yovsēp points out was according to the arrangement of the ‘Greeks and the Latins’.²²³ As Zanetti explains, almost all the notices found correspond to the arrangement

²¹⁸ Mat‘evosyan, *Hayeren Jer‘agreri Hišatakaranner*, No. 71.

²¹⁹ Ibid., trans. L. J. Read.

²²⁰ N. Akinean, “Yovsēp‘ Kostandnowpolsēc‘i T‘argmanich Haysmanurk‘i,” *Handes Amsorya* 1-2 (1957): 3.

²²¹ Ibid., 4-7.

²²² Zanetti, “Apothegmes et Histoires Édifiantes dans le Synaxarie Arménien,”

²²³ Ibid., 171.

of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, with the only exceptions coming in the form of a number of interpolated Armenian festivals, which are likely the result of later addition and augmentation during the fourteenth century copying process.²²⁴ Zanetti has also observed that the majority of entries comprise abbreviated notices not directly rendered from entries in the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* but resulting from shorter summaries thereof made by Yovsēp himself.²²⁵

Yovsēp tells us that his work was specifically designed to render the Greek *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* into Armenian for use by Armenian communities in liturgical settings. The colophon, combined with Zanetti's reconstruction of the original content, demonstrate that Yovsēp's translation, arranged according to the Constantinopolitan Church calendar, was implicitly designed to introduce the norms of Constantinopolitan devotional practices amongst Armenians from the closing decade of the tenth century onward. Yovsēp's translation of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* laid out a new schema for festal commemoration, one which comprised new or unfamiliar saints in a renovated order which would ideally align its target audience to the Constantinopolitan liturgical rite. Yovsēp himself consciously acknowledged that his translation included saints that he anticipated would be unfamiliar or unknown to Armenians and subsequently addressed this issue by providing a guide to distinguish saints from martyrs in the colophon of the text. Crucially, he tells us that his translation was designed to be despatched to Armenian ecclesiastical and monastic environments for liturgical use. It is challenging to discern where exactly Yovsēp intended when he spoke of the distribution of his Armenian translation of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*; but it seems evident that its production surely followed the vicissitudes of the Empire's expansion in localities with substantial Armenian populations and was surely designed to support the establishment of the new Armenian Chalcedonian eparchies in recently annexed Northern Syria, Melitene, Sebasteia, and Taron and which presumably continued to be distributed and copied as the Empire expanded and established new eparchies in Tao-Tayk and Vaspurakan in the early eleventh century. The evidence situates Yovsēp as a key agent in a concerted and coordinated effort to influence the practices of Armenian populations throughout the Byzantine Empire's newly formed eastern frontier through a process of translation and distribution aimed at injecting a distinctly Constantinopolitan canon of saints and feast days and so the liturgical authority of the Church of Constantinople into these local provincial environments.

Certainly, from this textual evidence we can discern that the promotion of the cult of saints was perceived as a key tool in the Empire's eastern expansion. As his role in the Armenian *translatio* of the relics of Peter and Paul suggests, Yovsēp was also involved in a concerted effort by the Byzantine Empire to leverage the cult of saints for this purpose through the distribution of relics. With the gradual collapse of Islamic rule in the Caucasus and Northern Mesopotamia, the ninth and early tenth century witnessed the emergence of new centres of Armenian royal power gravitating primarily around the Bagratunis, Arcrunis, and the Siwnis. These dynastic families gradually embarked on the consolidation and expansion of their

²²⁴ Ibid., 171.

²²⁵ Ibid., 170.

own zones of political and economic influence at the expense of Abbasid hegemony. Soon, however, these emergent Armenian kingdoms and principalities became the object of a resurgent Byzantine Empire which orchestrated the annexation of these polities from the 960s onward. We are fortunate to catch a glimpse of hagiographic production and traditions relating to the cult of saints and relics in Armenian sources in the immediate prelude to the expansion of the Byzantine Empire into localities in Anatolia, the Caucasus, Northern Syria, and Northern Mesopotamia through a colophon attached to the *History of the Holy Cross of Saint Nino* composed at the behest of the Abbot Aaron Vanandec'i at the start of the tenth century. The scribe records his research into the history of the relic and how it came to rest at his own Monastery of the Holy Cross situated 'to the west of the fortress of Karneneac' north of Lake Van.²²⁶ After consulting several Armenian hagiographical sources, including the *Life of St Gregory the Illuminator*, the *Life of Saint Sabak*, and the *Martyrdom of Šušanik*, the scribe informs us that during the reign of King Smbat I Bagratuni (890-912), the Catholicos Georg II, at the behest of some disgruntled monks who were unhappy with the high pilgrimage demand to visit the cross in its original site, had commanded that the cross be moved to its new home in the monastery of the Holy Cross.²²⁷ Crucially, the scribe acknowledges the reason that the recent history of the cross had been lost by the monastic community which housed it:

Ապա երեք հարիւր վաթսուն եւ մեկ թուականին Հայոց ի կատարման Սմբատայ, մեծ կործանումն եղել աշխարհիս Հայոց եւ առհասարակ երկիրս աներեալ կործանեցաւ.²²⁸

After, in three hundred and sixty-one (912) of the Armenian era, at the execution of Smbat, there was great destruction of this land of Armenia and this entire land, having been brought to ruin, was destroyed.²²⁹

In this dossier of the traditions surrounding the Holy Cross of Nino, the scribe implicitly attributes the loss of hagiographical texts and narratives associated with the cult of saints to the early tenth century campaigns of the Sajid Ostikan Yusuf against the Bagratuni Kingdom of Armenia and his execution of the Armenian King Smbat.²³⁰ The scribe goes on to tell us that, during his research on the cult of the cross of Saint Nino, in the wake of this period of instability, he also re-discovered the *Martyrdom of Hmayek and forty men from the house of Tayk* and that he also found 'the lives of many other saints who have been forgotten in the crisis of this land'.²³¹ The various mentions of the source material used in the construction of the *History of the Cross of Nino* not only reveal the ways in which the scribe established his legitimate credentials as a researcher, but also how he mapped the history of the Holy Cross and the production of cult narratives in the tenth century to a contemporary political and social landscape. The period following Yusuf's campaign, the present and lived environment of the scribe, is consciously constructed as a time of hagiographical revival

²²⁶ Mat'evosyan, *Hišatakaranner*, No. 65.

²²⁷ Ibid., No. 65.

²²⁸ Ibid., No. 65.

²²⁹ Ibid., No. 65., Trans. L. Read.

²³⁰ Ibid., No. 65.

²³¹ Pogossian. "Relics, Rulers, Patronage: the True Cross of Varag and the Church of the Holy Cross on Alt'amar," 157.

in which the re-discovery and reuse of lost and neglected narratives not only permitted individuals to recover the knowledge of different cult traditions but, in doing so, to produce and promote new narratives associated with the cult of saints and relics. This evidence offers us a precious view into how the production of Armenian hagiographical narrative in localities which would eventually be absorbed by the Byzantine Empire over the next century was designed to serve the spiritual and intellectual needs of local communities; to legitimise their cult centre and reinforce its legitimacy through the authority of Armenian Royal and Ecclesiastical authority.

Two solitary colophons allow us to backdate this interest in constructing narratives on saints and their relics to the late ninth century: the *Martyrdom of Saint Abd al-Masih* translated from Syriac into Armenian at the behest of the Armenian Lord Gurgen Arcruni in the region of Vaspurakan in 873 and the *Life of Saint Dionysius the Areopagite* translated from Greek into Armenian in Jerusalem by a certain Yovhannes in 880.²³² Alongside the *History of the Cross of Nino* and the rediscovery of the *Martyrdom of Hmayek and forty men from the house of Tayk'*, these works attest to an interest in the production of narratives surrounding relics and saints amongst Armenian communities which emerges in the extant ninth and very early tenth-century material. It was this intense and shared interest in rediscovering and renewing hagiographical and martyrological narratives, as well as traditions associated with the cult of saints and relics, that the Byzantine Empire was able to exploit, as one of several key tools, alongside the dissemination of texts, to disrupt and reorientate the spiritual, cultural, and political norms of Armenian populations in the context of its eastern expansion.

Some forty years after the *History of the Holy Cross of Saint Nino* was composed, after 965, the Armenian priest Pantaleon, from the Armenian Kingdom of Vaspurakan, composed his own *translatio*: the *History of the Relics of the Apostles Peter and Paul*.²³³ The colophons of Pantaleon's narrative introduces a number of interesting markers which indicate a shift in how the translation of relics and their veneration were being constructed within Armenian polities on the eastern borders of the Byzantine Empire as the tenth century progressed. Pantaleon firstly situates his narrative in a manner which is distinctly orientated around the authority of Constantinople and Byzantine expansionism.

Յամս Նիկիֆատայ կայսեր Յունաց քաջի և առաքինոյ, յաղթող ի պատերազմունս հերթանոսաց որ ջարդեաց զլուծ Իսմաէլական որ ի վերայ պարանոցի Քրիստոնէից, և խորտակեաց զկզակս նոցա, և առ զանառիկ ամուրս նոցա, մանաւանդ զմեծ և զյակնաւորն և զհոչակելին զՏառսն Կիլիկեցւոց և զԿոնստիս ուր բնակեալ էին հանապազասուտք չարաճըճիք դատարկապորտքն այնոքիկ և արար ծառայս զամենեսեան զայնոսիկ մեծ պետութեանն Հրոմայեցւոց թագաւորն այն երկրորդ զկնի թագաւորութեամբ վերնոյն. Այլ և երբ զգարդ պեղծ մզկթաց նոցա ի պատիւ Սրբոյն Սովեա:

... ի հրամանէ երկրորդ տիեզերակալէ տեառն իմոյ աւագ Ապուսահիլի Համազասպ արքայից արքաի մեծ պետութեանս տանս Հայոց, գնալ զհանապարհն ուղղելորութեան ուր թագաւորեալ քաղաքն Բիւզանդիոն ի Նորն Հոռոմ, յերկրորդն Բաբելոն և ի ճշմարիտն Եռուսաղեմ յամենատենչն յամենահրաշն ի գրոհս տիեզերաց յանմատչելին և յանկոխելին ի

²³² Mat'evosyan, *Hišatakaraner*, No. 45., No. 46.

²³³ Ibid, No. 71.

թնամեաց ի Կոստանդինուպոլիս ի չորս հարիւրերորդի տասներորդի չորրորդի թուականութեան Հայոց ի տունի աստուածայայտնութեան ի վեցն յունուարի...

Որք ընթեռնուք յիշեցէք գտառապեալ Պանտալէոն զի բազում աշխատութեամբ հանի զգայ յարկեղաց Սրբոյն Սոփիա եւ թարգմանեցի ի յունականէն ի հայ լեզու, ձեռամբ արհնելոյն Յովսէփայ ի փառս Աստուծոյ.²³⁴

In the years of Nikephoros, emperor of the Greeks, valiant and virtuous, victorious in battles against the heathens, who smashed the Ismaeli yoke which was upon the necks of Christians, and he crushed their jaws and took their impregnable fortresses, especially the great, becoming and praiseworthy Tarsos of Cilicia and Crete where there had lived constantly-lying, cunning rogues and that king made them all servants of the great headship of the Romans, the second after the celestial kingdom. In addition, he brought ornaments from their impure mosques in honour of Saint Sofia.

...from the order of the second universe-holder my Lord, the noble Apousahl Hamazasp, king of kings of the great headship of this house of Armenia, to follow the paths of a journey to the royal city Biwandion, to New Rome, to the Second Babylon and to the true Jerusalem, to the most desirable and miraculous peoples of the world, inaccessible and untrodden by enemies, to Constantinople, in the four hundred and fourteenth of this Armenian era (965), at the feast of Epiphany, on the sixth of January...

You who read, may you remember the suffering Pantaleon, and that with much work I extracted sense from the ossuaries of Saint Sofia and translated from Greek into the Armenian language, by the hand of (with the assistance from) the blessed Yovsēp for the glory of God.²³⁵

Pantaleon then goes on to inform his readers that he was sent specifically to request the holy relics from the imperial capital. Upon being informed that they had been stolen from Constantinople during the reign of Emperor Justinian, a dejected Pantaleon tracked them down and fortuitously found that they had arrived in the Caucasus many years before and were laying in Vaspurakan waiting to be rediscovered. Unlike the *History of the Holy Cross of Saint Nino*, which implicitly arranges the legitimacy of the relic and its movement around the Bagratuni King and Armenian Catholicos, Pantaleon constructs his narrative primarily around the primacy and authority of Byzantium in a way which attributes prestige to the relics of the Apostles through an elevated construction of the emperor and of the Empire set against the backdrop of the Byzantine expansion. It offers a reflection on the way in which the gradual expansion of the Empire fundamentally started to alter the hierotopic landscape of neighbouring Armenian polities, shaped by the soft power of Constantinople through the distribution of relics and their associated narratives.²³⁶ Crucially, he also informs us that the history of the relics was communicated orally to him in Greek, before being translated into Armenian with the assistance of Yovsēp, inextricably linking the legitimacy of the narrative to its origin in Hagia Sofia.²³⁷ In this account, recognition of imperial political hegemony is coded into the

²³⁴ Mat'evosyan, *Hayeren Jer'agreri Hišatakaranner*, No. 71.

²³⁵ Ibid., trans. L. Read

²³⁶ A. Lidov, "Hierotopy. The creation of sacred space as a form of creativity and subject of cultural history," in *Creation of Sacred Spaces in Byzantium and Medieval Russia*, ed. A. Lidov (Indrik, 2006). 32-58. J. Shepard, "Constantine VII, Caucasian Openings and the Road to Aleppo," in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, ed. A. Eastmond (Ashgate, 2001), 19-40,

²³⁷ Ibid, No. 71.

elevation of the status of the apostles' relics and the acumen of their cult centre in the Kingdom of Vaspurakan. In contrast to the rediscovery of the Holy Cross of Nino, Pantaleon directly appeals to the imperial Byzantine pedigree of the relics of Peter and Paul rather than the royal Armenian.

The imperial influence found in the *History of the Finger of the Holy Apostle Peter*, which is entirely absent in the *Holy Cross of Nino*, reflects something of the shift orchestrated by a method through which intrusion into Armenian sacred spaces through relics and, in this case, their translated narratives consummated the intrusion of Byzantine political hegemony. As Greenwood observes, 'the granting of fragments of the True Cross by the Byzantine emperor to Armenian princes in recognition of their loyalty and orthodoxy was a long-established tradition', and it is apparent that this policy of disseminating relics to Armenian rulers was deployed by the Empire from the earliest stages of the emergence of independent Armenian politics on the periphery of Byzantium in the ninth century.²³⁸ Prior to his accession as King of Armenia, Ašot Bagratuni was granted a piece of the True Cross by the Patriarch Photios and Emperor Basil I in a diplomatic package designed to win the loyalty of the nascent Armenian ruler at the expense of Abbasid hegemony.²³⁹ The *Life of the Armenian Catholicos Maštoc* (833–98) informs us that the cross was then deposited in the Monastery of Sevan, in a narrative of the genealogy of the relic which impresses upon its reader the status of its imperial connection.²⁴⁰ From this point onward, Armenian relic narratives are punctuated by the transfer from Byzantine emperors into Armenian politics. In his *History of the Holy Cross of Aparank*, Grigor Narekac'i recalls that the bishop of Mokka obtained a number of relics for his own monastery, including a fragment of the True Cross given by the emperor Basil II and transferred to its own sanctuary at Easter 983.²⁴¹ On the façade of the Church of the Holy Saviour in the capital of the Bagratuni Kingdom, Ani, an inscription records that the founder of the Church, Ablgharib Pahlawuni, went to Michael (Michael IV), emperor of the Greeks in Constantinople, on the orders of Smbat Šahanšah (The Armenian king Yovhannes-Smbat III) and recovered a relic of the True Cross.²⁴² Just prior to his visit to Constantinople in 1045, during which he would cede the Kingdom of Armenia to the Byzantine Empire, King Gagik II was induced to present himself before Constantine IX Monomachos when he received a relic of the True Cross from the Emperor himself according to Aristakēs.²⁴³

Armenian narratives from the late ninth to the mid eleventh century concerning the transfer of relics and translated textual traditions surrounding these relics demonstrate an intense interest in the distribution and acquisition of holy objects imbued with Constantinopolitan legitimacy amongst local Armenian rulers on the periphery of the Empire. We should be conscious of the fact that not every account was centred around the notion of Imperial legitimacy, reflecting the fact that the expansion of imperial

²³⁸ T. Greenwood, "Imagined past, revealed present: A Reassessment of Պատմութիւն Տաթուրն (History of Tarōn)," *Travaux et Mémoires* 18 (2014): 387.

²³⁹ Ibid., 387. I. Dorfmann-Lazarev, *Arméniens et Byzantins à L'époque de Photius: Deux Débats Théologiques après le Triomphe de l'orthodoxie* (Peeters, 2004).

²⁴⁰ D. Zakarian, "King Vasil's Holy Sign of War," in *Armenia and Byzantium without Borders*, ed. by E. Bonfiglio and C. Rapp (Brill, 2023), 205.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 205.

²⁴² *Divan Hay Vimagrut'yan, Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum, vol. 1* (Yerevan, 1965), No. 129.

²⁴³ *Patmut'inn Aristakēs*, 61.

hegemony into Armenian polities was not a uniform nor singular process. Jones, and more recently Pogossian, have both illustrated how ninth- and tenth-century Armenian narratives surrounding the cult of the Holy Cross of Varag in the Kingdom of Vaspurakan represent a conscious rejection of Byzantine influence in favour of promoting and legitimising the rule of the Armenian King Gagik of Vaspurakan.²⁴⁴ However, it is evident that, against the backdrop of the gradual expansion of the Empire into the border of these Armenian polities, narratives surrounding relic commemoration composed in the tenth and eleventh century are distinctly orientated around the Byzantine origin of these sacred objects. Jones reminds us that ‘relics served as visible testimony of a ruler's piety throughout all medieval Christendom. The acquisition and possession of important relics, such as those associated with Christ, also reflected divine approval of a ruler and thus functioned to stabilize and enhance power’. Zakarian, in turn, highlights that the exchange of relics between the Byzantine emperors and the Armenian kings and powerful princes, commemorated in a number of medieval Armenian texts, ‘was a common practice from which both parties expected to reap political, military, and economic benefits’.²⁴⁵ The distribution of relics from Constantinople naturally imbued Armenian rulers with imperial legitimacy, but building royal pedigree on imperial patronage through relic translation demanded something in return. With the sacralisation of Armenian kingship through Imperial relics of the True Cross came a process of politicisation and acculturation which is punctuated through contemporary *translationes*.

The dissemination of relics, in which the Armenian Chalcedonian Yovsēp played a key role, marked the sacred landscape of these Armenian polities with the spiritual authority of the Empire and demanded that these polities recognise the political and cultural hegemony of Constantinople in the process. One by one, each of these kingdoms and principalities which received or sought out Constantinopolitan relics were eventually annexed. The dissemination of relics and their related narratives played their role by coding Byzantine spiritual, cultural, and political hegemony into the landscape of the Armenian polities on its periphery and facilitating this process. It leaves one to wonder whether the evidence identified by Astruc, highlighted in Chapter 1, for a new foundation dedicated to Saint Eudoxius in Melitene after the reinternment of his relics in the city in 967 CE and the subsequent uptick in local interest in these martyrs could also have been part of the same process, bringing the veneration of these saints back into their local environment through the concerted efforts of an imperial system of targeted relic distribution in the context of Byzantine expansion.

In *Le Čašoc', Typicon-Lectionnaire Origines et Évolutions*, Charles Renoux made a very brief reference to Akinean's 1957 article, noting that Yovsēp's then still relatively unknown translation of the Synaxarion of Constantinople may have had some influence on the opening of the Armenian *sanctorale* in the eleventh century before moving to a more extensive analysis on the role of Grigor Vkasasēr at the same historical

²⁴⁴ L. Jones, “Medieval Armenian Identity and Relics of the True Cross (9th-11th centuries),” *Journal for the Society for Armenian Studies* 12 (2003): 52., Pogossian, “Relics, Rulers, Patronage: the True Cross of Varag,” 129., 159.

²⁴⁵ Jones, “Medieval Armenian Identity”, 43. Zakarian, “King Vasil's Holy Sign of War,” 202. A. Eastmond, “Byzantine Identity and Relics of the True Cross,” *Eastern Christian Relics* (2003): 205–216., For a recent approach regarding the sacralisation and political propagation of the Imperial office via relics see; C. J. Sprecher, *Emperor and God: Passion Relics and the Divinisation of Byzantine Rulers, 944-1204* (Heidelberg University Publishing, 2024).

juncture.²⁴⁶ It is a similar pattern that we encounter in Vardanyan's 1999 monograph *Hayoc' Tonac'uyec'*. Making reference to Akinean's article and providing a summary of the contents of Yovsēp's colophon, Vardanyan argued that the influence of Yovsēp's work was minimal in the Armenian tradition, especially in comparison to the work of Grigor Vkasasēr and his translation team where the introduction of previously unknown commemoration was significantly more impactful and to which Vardanyan devotes a large portion of his study.²⁴⁷ Based on the analysis of the emergence of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* conducted in the first chapter of this thesis, we know that the impact of Yovsēp's translation did have its desired effect: it injected a new festal commemoration into the Armenian tradition, the impact of which is exemplified in the survival and maintenance of Yovsēp's abbreviated entry in later thirteenth-century Armenian synaxaria. As Akinean points out, despite the significance of his work: the first translation of the Greek *Synaxarion* into Armenian Yovsēp received no recognition amongst contemporary medieval Miaphysite Armenian historians in the way that Grigor Vkasasēr did. This paucity of acknowledgement may well be a product of the original purpose of his translation and a lack of comfortability with the goals of Chalcedonian translators like Yovsēp in late tenth-century Constantinople. Like the Armenian historians of the eleventh century, scholarship has downplayed the role of Yovsēp's translation which, as the case of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios demonstrates was clearly impactful. The first emergence of these saints into the Armenian tradition in the tenth and early eleventh century was no coincidence, but rather it can be plotted specifically onto the prolific activities of an Armenian Chalcedonian translator in Constantinople, whose work stimulated the injection of new feast days, commemorations, and traditions surrounding the cult of saints in the form of texts and relics in a process of distribution and translation specifically designed to support the expansion of the Byzantine Empire into Armenian localities which became part of its eastern frontier during the tenth and eleventh century.

Taking the Initiative: Chalcedonian Translators, Greek Models, and the Expansion of the Byzantine Empire

The long version of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Romylos, Eudoxios, Zeno, and Makarios* translated from a Greek Constantinopolitan menologion in Melitene in 1092, I would argue, can also be viewed within the same context as the activities of Yovsēp, not just because it was Yovsēp's translation of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* which first brought these saints into the purview of Armenian audiences throughout the Byzantine Empire's eastern frontier and undoubtedly acted as a catalyst for the production of the long version translated in 1092, nor solely because it was also produced by a Chalcedonian Armenian community, but because the translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* can also be located within the same system of text distribution and translation by Armenian Chalcedonians underpinned and influenced by the expansion of the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and eleventh century.

²⁴⁶ Renoux, "Le Časoc', Typicon-Lectionnaire Origines et Évolutions," 136.

²⁴⁷ Vardanyan, *Hayoc' Tonac'uyec'*, 282 -283.

The first question we might ask is how the translator of the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Romylos, Eudoxios, Zeno, and Makarius* in 1092 obtained the Greek menologion arranged according to the liturgical cycle of the Church of Constantinople for translation. Was it acquired in Constantinople at the behest of a sponsor, translated, and then brought to Melitene? We know from the last chapter, for example, that this form of acquisition and translation was preferred by the Armenian Miaphysite Catholicos Grigor II Vkyasēr and his translation team and is recorded in several of the colophons attached to their translations, including the Armenian *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles by John Chrysostom* made in 1077. The source tells us how Grigor Vkyasēr went to Constantinople expressly to commission a translation of the text before bringing it to the monastery of Paṛlah on the Black Mountain to have the register and content of the Armenian adjusted by one of his collaborators. This example sits alongside evidence for a process of textual acquisition between centre and periphery expressed in another colophon attached to an Armenian Gospel written in 1066 in Sebastia which describes the journey of a Miaphysite Armenian monk to and from the imperial capital to procure materials for the creation of a Gospels:

Արդ ես Գրիգորս սիրեցի եւ քննող եղէ արուեստի գրչութիւնս ցանգացաւ եւ ուսանել զգործ ոսկւոյ ի զարդ պատուիրանաց Տեառն եւ ի կազմած նորին եւ ի վերայ այսր ամենայնի երանի զայնոսիկ որք տեսին զՏէրն եւ վայելեցին յամենասուրբ բերանոյ վարդապետութեան նորա եւ զերանութիւնսն զոր առ Պետրոս վասն խոստովանելոյ զնա Տէր եւ Աստուած համաւրեն ի վերայ իմ եւ ամենայն հաւատացելոց ի սէր բազում տենչմամբ համարէի զիս անկեալ առ ոտսն Տեառն յետոյ զերանական զձայնն ի բերանոյ նորա եւ առ տենչ փափագանաց եւ աղետի սրտի թախանձեցի զտէրն իմ Սահակ բերել զտուփ կազմածոյս ի թագաւորական քաղաքէն եւ զրեցի զսուրբ Աւետարանս իմով ձեռք...²⁴⁸

Now, I, Grigor, became fond of and inquisitive about the art of writing and I also desired to study the work of gold in the decoration of the commandments of the lord and the preparation of it. And on account of all of this, happy are those who saw the Lord and enjoyed the teaching of his most-holy mouth and felicity, which to Petros, because of confessing him Lord and God, they reckon above mine and all who have faith. In great longing passion I considered myself having fallen at the feet of the Lord, hearing the blessed sound from his mouth and out of the longing desire and grief of my heart, I begged my Lord Sahak to bring the box of equipment from the royal city (Constantinople) and I wrote this holy Gospel by my own hands...²⁴⁹

These examples offer us an insight into another mechanism through which Greek, Constantinopolitan textual models and material were acquired to produce Armenian manuscripts in the second half of the eleventh century. The journey to Constantinople to utilise Greek material was an age-old practice in the Armenian tradition stretching back to the *Surb T'argmanic'k'*, the holy translators, who rendered biblical and patristic literature into Armenian in the fifth century.²⁵⁰ When the example of Grigor Vkyasēr is placed alongside that of the Armenian Gospel of 1066, it demonstrates the functionality of a particular modality of manuscript production between Miaphysite Armenians and the capital of Empire, highlighting how

²⁴⁸ Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 311, f. 280v.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., trans. L. Read (2024).

²⁵⁰ T. M. Van Lint, "Armenian," in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*, ed. S. Papaioannou (Oxford University Press, 2021), 607.

Armenian monastic foundations continued to rely on the co-operation with Constantinople through networks of procurement, knowledge exchange, and translation.

The colophon attached to the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Romylos, Eudoxios, Zeno and Makarios*, however, does not reflect such a process of acquisition: rather, it suggests that the translation was carried out in situ, leading one to assume that the Greek menologion which contained the *Martyrdom* was already in Melitene and available to use at the time of translation in 1092 CE – but how did it get there in the first place? An answer to this question is that Greek hagiographical collections containing the Greek model of the *Martyrdom* made their way into the city shortly after its re-capture by the Byzantine Empire in 934. If we permit that Greek menologia, including the one which contained the *Martyrdom of Saints Romylos, Eudoxios, Zeno, and Makarios* had arrived in Melitene sometime after 934, then evidence for its use and translation in the creation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092 can be mapped onto a larger trans-regional process whereby the dissemination of Greek textual material also followed the vicissitudes of the Empire's expansion and was designed to condition the practices of Christians living throughout its eastern frontier during the tenth and eleventh century. Where Yovsēp's translation tells us that some of that material was distributed in translation in a more centrally co-ordinated effort between the Empire and an Armenian Chalcedonian translator in Constantinople, the Greek menologion behind the translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* gives us the impression that the Byzantine Empire also relied on the individual initiative of local Chalcedonians living in imperial provincial centres to translate and familiarise provincial communities with a prescribed canon of sacred literature arranged according to the norms of the Church of Constantinople distributed as a means to strengthen a Byzantine imperial socio-cultural, political, and confessional economy.

In support of this contention, we can turn to a near contemporary example to the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* which stands as testament to this process of Greek textual dissemination, Armenian Chalcedonian translation, and imperial expansion in the imperial theme of Taron, offering a crucial glimpse into the workings of this hegemonic process through a Greek 'book of lections'. Yerevan M 7729, also known as the Mush Homiliary, was created at the opening of the thirteenth century, sometime between 1200 and 1202.²⁵¹ The monumental size of this manuscript, measuring 70.5 x 55.3 cm, is matched by its extensive content. M 7729 preserves a sizeable collection of 342 lections, comprising homiletic excerpts, as well as saints' lives and martyrologies that were to be read during the liturgical cycle of the year in conjunction with the Divine Office.²⁵² As the colophon of the manuscript recalls, it is a *tawnakan* (տաւնական), a homiliary which traces its origins to an archetype created by the Armenian monk Solomon of the monastery of Mak'enoc' in the year 196 (747CE), arranged according to the liturgy of St James.²⁵³ As both Renoux and Outtier have observed, M 7729 reveals a long developmental process from Solomon's original, which comprised different phases of addition and alteration.²⁵⁴ As such,

²⁵¹ Outtier, "The Armenian Homiliaries. An Attempt at an Historical Overview," 117-122.

²⁵² Ibid., 120-121.

²⁵³ Ibid., 120.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 120-121.

the manuscript offers a window into different stages in the Armenian homiliary tradition. Within its many folios is a colophon, indicative of the inclusion of an older source used in process of the compilation which reveals a crucial yet neglected stage of the history of the homiliary:

Ես, Չորտուանել Մամիկոնեան որդի Տաճատա մեծի իշխան Տարոնոյ և ամենայն աշխարհիս Հայոց, տեսի զայս գիրս սահմանաց, գրել հելլեն և յոյն գրով ի յուսաւորչէն մերմէ Սրբոյն Գրիգորէ Պարթևէ և թարգմանեցի ի հայ գիրս, և հաստատեցի զի մնացական հայրենիս լիցի Սուրբ Առաքելոցն: Եւ յինէն յավելեայ ի հայրենիս, նորա տվի ծննդեան, գեղն գԲերդակ զկայսրովն և իւր ամենայն սահմանովն այգեստանաւք և քիւրաստանաւք:

Ի թիւ Հայոց ՇԻԸ (1079): Եւ զեղկելի գրիչ յիշէ տէր Թադէոս Աստուած ողորմի ինձ.²⁵⁵

I, Čortuanel Mamikonean, son of Tačat, great prince of Taron and all of this land of the Armenians, saw this book of lections²⁵⁶, written in Greek and with Greek writing by our illuminator Saint Grigor Part'ev, and I translated [it] into Armenian writing, and confirmed that it should be the permanent possession of the Holy Apostles. And from me was added to this patrimony, on the day of his birth, the village of Berdak, by the *Kayser*, with all its boundaries, its vineyards, and its many branches.

In the Armenian era 528 (1079). Remember the lamentable scribe, lord Tadeos. God have mercy on me.²⁵⁷

During the process of compilation M 7729 in the thirteenth century, the scribes clearly drew on an earlier 'book of lections', originally written in Greek and translated into Armenian in 1079. Though the original composition of this eleventh-century manuscript is lost and so limits us from using it to identify a direct Greek archetype, the surviving colophon still offers us vital details with which to understand the text in its eleventh-century context. The colophon records that the original Greek manuscript had been picked up by the Armenian elite Čortuanel Mamikonean in the region of Taron some time presumably in the mid to late eleventh century when it was then translated in 1079 and used as a legal document, witnessing the transfer of the village of Berdak, just south of Theodosioupolis/Karin, along with its estates into the possession of the monastery of the Holy Apostles near Mush, from where presumably it was later acquired and used to compile M 7729. The colophon records that the transaction was orchestrated by Čortuanel Mamikonean with the permission of the '*Kayser*', the 'Caesar'. What we know of Čortuanel Mamikonean, comes to us in the form of a colophon preserved in 1104 where Čortuanel describes himself as 'having the support of Christ and the life-giving Cross, and the Emperor of the Greeks (Alexios I)'.²⁵⁸ Identified as a cousin of the strategos of Samosata and prince of Sasun Tornik Mamikonean thanks to Gerard Dedeyan's reconstruction of his family tree, we can place Čortuanel and his lineage in a long line of service to the

²⁵⁵ Mat'evosyan, *Hišatakaraner*, No. 133.

²⁵⁶ գիրս սահմանաց - book of Lections. Given then use of this underlying source in the compilation of the Mush Homiliary, we can presume that the underlying Greek source mentioned here by Čortuanel was likely a Church of Constantinople Greek homiliary which contained homilies dedicated to Grigor the Illuminator.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., trans. L. Read

²⁵⁸ G. Dedeyan, *Les Arméniens entre Grecs, Musulmans et Croisés. Étude sur les pouvoirs arméniens dans la Proche-Orient méditerranéenne (1068-1150)*, vol. 1 (Calouste Gulbenkian, 2003), 336.

Byzantine Empire which stretched from the region's annexation in the tenth century to the last decades of the eleventh and the opening years of the twelfth century.²⁵⁹ His possession and use of Greek liturgical material, surely pointing to an arrangement according to the Church of Constantinople, certainly points toward a Chalcedonian confession, a conclusion also reached by Dedeyan. Again, we find evidence of the injection of Greek liturgical material into a local environment annexed by the Empire in the tenth century subsequently picked up and translated by a Chalcedonian Armenian in the eleventh century.

In his 2008 study *Raiders and Neighbours: The Turks (1040–1304)*, Dimitri Korobeinikov was attracted to the political value of this colophon primarily because the deference to the Emperor in the final line of the text provides evidence of an Armenian elite recognising imperial authority in Theodosiopolis, in a period where we know the city was oscillating between Georgian and Seljuk Turkish control.²⁶⁰ Korobeinikov rendered *Kayser* as Emperor, suggesting that this legal transaction invoked the authority of Nikephoros III Botaneiates. Čortuanel claims that the Greek model included homilies in Greek by the progenitor of the Armenian Church, Gregory the Illuminator. By the tenth century we find the *Vita* of Γρηγορίου, ἐπισκόπου γενομένου της μεγάλης Ἀρμενίας (Gregory, Bishop of Greater Armenia) in both the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* and the Menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes celebrated on the 30th September; so finding lections concerning him in an eleventh century liturgical composition in Greek would be no surprise.²⁶¹ Reference to St Gregory was not an automatic indicator of confessional identity and, in this case, the reference may be more illuminating for its expression of legal dimensions in contemporary Armeno-Byzantine interactions. Greenwood has already identified a near-identical case preserved in the tenth-century *History of Taron* whereby the historic and foundational property rights of the monastery of Glak in Taron, not far from Mush, were reimagined following the Byzantine reconquest of the region. The *History of Taron* asserts that the monastery was founded and its lands confirmed by Gregory the Illuminator, which gave its ownership claims good pedigree. The text then recalls the historic connection between Gregory and the Metropolitan of Caesarea who was responsible for Gregory's ordination as Bishop of the Armenians, emphasising the dependence of Gregory's authority on the See of Caesarea and by extension the authority of the Empire.²⁶² By deriving Gregory's authority from the Empire, the rights and properties of the monastery of Glak, and therefore the foundation of the monastery itself, is given historic imperial credentials. The anomalous mention of Gregory the Illuminator's Greek-speaking pedigree in Čortuanel's 'book of lections' appears to reflect a dynamic similar to that of the *History of Taron*. The colophon, acting as the record of the transaction, evoked the posthumous authority of St Gregory the Illuminator to reinforce its legitimacy amongst Armenians, but specifically emphasised deference to the authority of the Church of Constantinople and tied this to the overarching authority of the emperor and the legal veracity of Greek in

²⁵⁹ N. Adontz, "Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance," *Byzantion* 9 (1934): 715–38., N. Adontz, "Tornik le moine," *Byzantion* 11 (1936): 143–64

²⁶⁰ D. Korobeinikov, "Raiders and Neighbours: The Turks (1040–1304)," in *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire, c. 500–1492*, ed. J. Shepard (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 705 – 706.

²⁶¹ Garsoïan traces the emergence of Gregory in Greek hagiographical collections to the Council of Širakawan of 862, see Garsoïan, "The Problem of Armenian Integration," 73. *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanum*, 90., BHG 713.

²⁶² Greenwood, "Imagined past, revealed present," 383.

the present. It provides a nice example of how power and authority were in the process of being renegotiated following the annexation of Taron and how Byzantine legal culture was received and adapted by local Armenian communities.

The colophon of M 7729 emits a legal language which is intimately connected to the Byzantine Empire. Greenwood has stressed the value of identifying such transactions as evidence for the adoption of Roman legal practices.²⁶³ It is no coincidence that we find examples of this in increasing frequency during the reconquest period of the tenth and eleventh century.²⁶⁴ The example of M 7729 demonstrates a concern with defining ownership, which mirrors language found in an acts of sale and donation preserved by the monastic communities of Mount Athos. An example of such transactional language comes from the monastery of Iveron in 1007, as identified by Neville: ‘from now on you have possession of this farmland, to sell, to give, to plant vineyards in it, to give it as dowry, to leave to heirs and successors and to do in it as much as the divine and holy laws give permission and power to full owners’, one of a number of examples which Neville has found throughout eleventh-century Byzantine legal material.²⁶⁵ Clearly the property transfer preserved in the colophon of M 7729 was intended to be as permanent as the text which came with it, granting the monastery full and perpetual control over Berdak and its lands. Neville views such formulaic definition of ownership as a response to the blurring of lines between the concepts of possession and ownership which became a hallmark of a more flexible imperial policy toward property, motivated by maximising land yields.²⁶⁶ In 1079 the property rights of this Armenian monastery were enshrined according to the norms of Byzantine law and the formula behind its definition of ownership speaks to contemporary concepts of property and land transfer. Notably, Berdak is described by the content of its estates rather than their extent, outlining its taxable potential.²⁶⁷ It is a framing which speaks to the influence of Byzantine economic and fiscal practices, which have been identified in tenth- and eleventh-century Armenian source material by both Greenwood and Matheou. This evidence reflects how, in the context of the Byzantine reconquest, ‘former patrimonial lands were transformed into taxable districts’.²⁶⁸ The recording of Berdak’s land yield and taxable value expresses a relationship between land and ownership which fits well with contemporary Byzantine fiscal arrangements. To have gone to the effort of meticulously recording this exchange may also be indicative of an expectation that it would be recorded in an upcoming update to the Imperial tax register and that evidence would need to be made available to the relevant authority for assessment. In this case, it may well demonstrate knowledge and recognition of continued Byzantine tax collection amongst Armenian elites in the former Byzantine east in 1079. This colophon not only reflects legal expressions derived from the Byzantine Empire but also the maintenance, and expectation thereof, of continued fiscal contact between Armenians and the Empire after 1071. We see evidence for deference to

²⁶³ Greenwood, “Social Change”, 199.

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 199.

²⁶⁵ L. Neville, *Authority in Byzantine Provincial Society 950–1100* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), 54-55.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., 54-55.

²⁶⁷ Tim Greenwood, “Imagined past, revealed present,” 381-382.

²⁶⁸ Matheou, “Hegemony, Counterpower, and Global History”, 213.

the authority of the emperor, but also Armenian monastic and secular elites arranging property exchanges and rights with expressions which clearly appeal to Byzantine legal and fiscal practices after Manzikert, implications which will be expanded on in a separate future study.

Leaving the Armeno-Byzantine political, economic, legal, and fiscal value of this colophon, the preservation of this colophon in M 7729 offers us a window through which to expand our conversation on a process of dissemination and translation of Greek textual, fuelled by imperial expansion and facilitated by local provincial Chalcedonian Armenian translators in Taron and its subsequent circulation to a monastery near Theodosiopolis-Karin in the eleventh century; both regions which had been annexed by the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and early eleventh century. To the evidence provided by relic distribution and hagiographical material, evidently the injection of liturgical material in Greek, presumably arranged according to the calendrical cycle of the Church of Constantinople also played a key role. The eleventh-century colophon of M7729 perhaps best demonstrates how such textual dissemination and translation, designed first and foremost to regulate the spiritual environment, was so closely intertwined with political, legal, and fiscal relationships with conditioned Armeno-Byzantine relations during the eleventh century.

This underlying system of distribution of Greek models to recently annexed provinces in the imperial East not only tallies well with the evidence provided by Čortuanel Mamikonean's 'book of lections', but also fits neatly within a corpus of evidence highlighted by Holmes, Greenwood and Matheou, demonstrating the dissemination of Byzantine Greek chronicles into local provincial contexts during the Byzantine reconquest and their underlying influence on Armenian historiographical production during the eleventh century and, crucially, after 1071. Beyond the changes to the administrative, fiscal, and economic environment which gradually re-orientated the Empire's new eastern themes and their substantial Armenian populations toward the imperial centre, it is also possible to trace key transformations to the cultural and intellectual landscape. The more immediate examples come in the form of the two Armenian historiographical works produced in the eleventh century in regions which had been annexed by the Byzantine Empire. Writing at the start of the century, Step'anos Tarōnec'i appears to have exploited an underlying Byzantine chronicle which formed the spine of his historical composition, orientating his narrative structure around the reigns and exploits of successive emperors. This is attested in the chronological structure, in the focus on imperial history and, as Greenwood observes, in specific linguistic features which reveal a Greek original.²⁶⁹ Greenwood and Matheou have also demonstrated that a similar imperial chronicle produced in Greek, but possibly translated and preserved in Armenian, was exploited by Aristakēs Lastivertsi, writing after the battle of Manzikert in the late 1070s in the city of Arc'n.²⁷⁰ It is evidence which has led Matheou to view such underlying compositions as indicative of the existence of a network of imperial administration and local archives which followed the Empire's expansion and which

²⁶⁹ *Step'anos Tarōnec'i*, 54., T. Greenwood, "Composing World History at the Margins of Empire," in *Global Byzantium: Papers from the Fiftieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, ed. L. Brubaker, R. Darley & D. Reynolds (Routledge, 2022), 102.

²⁷⁰ N. Matheou, *Situating the History Attributed to Aristakēs Lastivertsi, 1000-1072* (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2018), 82-97.

stands as evidence for the flow of information, ideas, and dissemination of texts which entered provincial centres following their annexation.²⁷¹ Both works attest to the circulation of Greek textual models and their use by Armenian historians. As Greenwood has illustrated, the influence of Byzantine literary culture was no less significant than changes to the political or administrative environment, arguing that historical texts like Aristakēs or Tarōnec'i should be thought of as both Armenian and Byzantine: 'written in Armenian and aware of Armenian historical tradition but composed in a Byzantine provincial context and expressing, whether intentionally or not, present conditions and attitudes'.²⁷²

Evidence for the injection of new Greek patristic textual models following imperial expansion can be found in the form of copies of John Chrysostom and Ephrem the Syrian made in regions following their annexation by the Empire. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Arm D.11, preserves an Armenian copy of *Commentary on Epistle to Ephesians by Chrysostom*, likely written around the region of Lake Van in the first half of the eleventh century.²⁷³ Another more direct example is the translation of the works of Ephrem the Syrian, sponsored by a certain Dawit Xalaxordoy (Ժաաղախորդոյ), which were 'translated from [the language] of the Romans to ours, in the Armenian era four hundred and seventy-two (1023)', as per the manuscript colophon.²⁷⁴ Significantly, the name Xalaxordoy may indicate Armenian artisanal sponsorship of works coming from Greek originals: the name may be a combination of *Xalaxord*, 'leather tanner', with the addition of the genitive singular suffix *oy*, rendering his name 'of the leather tanner'; alternatively, it could be regarded as a combination of *Xalax* and *ordhvoy*, meaning 'son of tannin', the substance used to treat raw hide. In either case, this is a uniquely attested surname. Of course, if this is not being used to denote Dawit's profession, then the appearance of a second name amongst the Armenian lower-middle class would itself be far more indicative of the influence of Byzantium on naming practices. The use of second names in this form is not particular to the Armenian tradition, in which hereditary patronymic family names amongst the upper elite were preferred or at least survive in the known material. Perhaps Dawit was from a family which had made its wealth through leather tanning and adopted this patronym. It may itself be indicative of new commercial opportunities which under the auspices of Byzantine hegemony. In the case of the Armenian Commentary on Epistle to Ephesians by Chrysostom and the translation of the works of Ephrem the Syrian sponsored by Dawit Xalaxordoy, the confessional identity of the sponsors and translators remain unclear.

It is hard to ignore the collective evidence which points to the increasing dissemination of Greek models made available in provincial environments following the Byzantine annexation of those regions on textual production in Armenian and by Armenians during the eleventh century. It does much to challenge Garsoïan's contention that Armenian intellectual practices were alienated following the incorporation of

²⁷¹ Ibid., 82-97.

²⁷² Greenwood, "Social Change," 198. Greenwood, "Aristakes Lastivertc'i and Armenian Urban Consciousness," 95.

²⁷³ Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Arm. D.11, f. 123 v.

²⁷⁴ Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 995, f. 507v, trans. L. Read (2024).

Armenians into the Byzantine Empire.²⁷⁵ On the contrary, it seems that Byzantine and Armenian intellectual and cultural practices began to align in the provincial environment. The evidence highlights how the Byzantine reconquest influenced the re-orientation of Armenian intellectual practices, dictated new parameters for the writing of Armenian history, and encouraged Armenians to look to newly disseminated Greek texts for their intellectual, spiritual, and cultural discourse within the new Byzantine provincial context. It is likely that, much like Greek exemplar used by Čortuanel, or the patristic model used by Dawit Xalaxordoy, Greek menologia were also imported into these recently annexed regions. It is reasonable in turn to suppose that the Greek model used by our Armenian Chalcedonian translators in 1092 was indeed imported into Melitene during the period after 934, once it was again under Imperial rule. The translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092, and the emergence of the long version of this martyrology in the Armenian tradition then speaks to a process whereby the dissemination of Greek textual material followed the Empire's expansion and conditioned Armenian textual practices during the eleventh century.

If we are to accept this transmission process, the question arises as to whether this manuscript arrived in Melitene and ended up, for example, in a newly formed Greek-speaking Byzantine monastic community there, where it was later borrowed by or transferred to an Armenian Chalcedonian community in the city for translation in the late eleventh century, or that it arrived directly into an Armenian Chalcedonian foundation in Melitene, most of whose members would have had an interest in and familiarity with the Greek language and where the acquisition of such a manuscript in their library would have served a practical liturgical function. Certainly, from the evidence presented in this chapter, the former seems equally as likely as the latter. If we were to propose the latter: that a pre-Metaphrastic Greek menologion made its way directly into an Armenian Chalcedonian foundation after 934 CE, where it was later translated, either under the sponsorship of the local Armenian Chalcedonian lay community or under the direction of the monastery itself, then it would provide an answer to another question worth addressing in the present conversation surrounding transmission and reception: why did our anonymous Chalcedonian Armenian scribe chose not to exploit the Greek version of the *Martyrdom* attributed to Symeon Metaphrastes, nor to base his work on the Metaphrastic Menologion? After all, this would have been the latest and increasingly popular version of the Greek Constantinopolitan Menologion being used in monastic setting by the end of the eleventh century. The Georgian Chalcedonian evidence, for example, speaks to the circulation and adoption of Metaphrastic texts translated at the hands of Euthymios of Athos and Ephrem Mtsire during this same period used for the purposes of liturgical commemoration.²⁷⁶ The choice of pre-Metaphrastic Greek models amongst Chalcedonian Armenian translators is even more impactful when we consider that, at present, no

²⁷⁵ N. Garsoïan, "The Byzantine Annexation of the Armenian Kingdoms in the Eleventh Century," in *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times Vol. 1, The Dynastic Periods: From Antiquity to the Fourteenth Century*, ed. R. Hovannisian (St Martin's Press, 2004), 197.

²⁷⁶ S. Nikolaishvili, "Georgian Manuscript Production and Translation Activities in the Christian East and Byzantine Empire," *Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7 (2021): 41- 75., S. Nikolaishvili, "The Georgian Milieu and the Metaphrastic Menologion: Three Accounts about Symeon Metaphrastes," *Interface* 9 (2022): 70-94., C. Högel "Euthymios the Athonite, Greek-Georgian and Georgian-Greek translator – and Metaphrast?" *Mélanges Bernard Flusin, Travaux et Mémoires* 23/1 (2019): 353–364.

Armenian translations of full Metaphrastic lives or martyrologies have been identified. It may well be that this is simply a case of Metaphrastic Armenian texts awaiting identification, contained within Armenian liturgical collections which have yet to be thoroughly studied and catalogued. If, however, we accept the present evidence which projects a complete lack of Metaphrastic hagiographies in the Armenian tradition, we are left to speculate on what this might tell us about the collective priorities and tastes of Armenian translators across confessional divides during the eleventh century. Even more so when we acknowledge, as in the previous chapter, that the translation team of Grigor II Vkasasēr excerpted from a Metaphrastic life to adapt a translation of pre-Metaphrastic model, rather than translate Symeon Metaphrastes' version outright. Certainly, further investigation is needed.

To avoid the realm of supposition we might look for more immediate and practical explanations for the use of a pre-Metaphrastic Greek model by our anonymous Armenian Chalcedonian translator in Melitene in 1092. It is worth reiterating that we should be conscious not to overstate the dominance of the Metaphrastic Menologion as the expected model of choice for the copying of hagiographical collections and individual hagiographies in eleventh-century Byzantium; earlier models certainly continued to circulate widely. By way of example the Chalcedonian abbot Antonios of the monastery of St Symeon on the Black Mountain, who we will hear more about shortly, chose to use the pre-Metaphrastic Greek model provided by ps. George of Alexandria in his own translation of the *Life of John Chrysostom* into Arabic in the middle of the eleventh century, maintaining the authority of his source text by producing a highly proximate lexical and syntactical rendering of the Greek text in much the same fashion as the anonymous Armenian Chalcedonian translator of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in Melitene in 1092.²⁷⁷ His passage concerning the appearance of the Apostle Paul behind John Chrysostom shows no evidence of the reworking and alteration which we find in both the Metaphrastic and the Metaphrastic influenced Armenian version of the narrative by Grigor Vkasasēr identified in Chapter 1:

Ps. George of Alexandria²⁷⁸

... καὶ ἔχοντα τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ
κάτω εἰς τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιὸν
καὶ ὁμιλοῦντα αὐτῷ· ἦν γὰρ
Ἑλισσαία ἡ μορφή αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ
πῶγων τέλειος καὶ πλατύς...

...his mouth was to his right ear,
speaking to him. His appearance
was like Elisha, with a perfect and
full beard...

Antonios²⁷⁹

وكان فمه اسفل عند اذن يوحنا اليمنى
يحدثه، وكانت صورته كصوره الشيع النبي
ولحيته تامه عريضه...

...his mouth was to the right ear of
John and his appearance was like that
of the prophet Elisha, with a perfectly
broad and full beard...

²⁷⁷ H. Ibrahim, "Some Notes on Antonios and His Arabic Translations of John of Damascus," in *Patristic Literature in Arabic Translations*, ed. B. Roggema and A. Treiger (Brill, 2020), 158-179.

²⁷⁸ *Douze récits byzantins*, 144

²⁷⁹ Mount Sinai, Saint Catherine's Monastery, Arabic ms. 528, ff. 95v-96r, trans. L. Read.

It should remind us that the choice of closely rendering a pre-Metaphrastic Greek martyrology into Armenian in the style of the Chalcedonian Armenians in Melitene in 1092 was neither unusual or strange within the wider Chalcedonian translation milieu which characterised the Byzantine world in the tenth and eleventh century; a shared milieu of activity which we will explore further in the next section.

However, it may be the very pattern of dissemination and translation identified in this chapter that could provide an answer to this metaphrastic question in the case of the Armenian *Martyrdom*. Taking into account the gap between the production and ‘publication’ of the Metaphrastic Menologion, the very steady process of increased production, limited by cost and available models, that production was initially linked to Constantinopolitan-based sponsorship, that no surviving Greek Metaphrastic menologia from the eleventh century carrying the *Martyrdom* have been identified as produced in Melitene,²⁸⁰ and then placing this alongside evidence that would approximate the injection of a pre-Metaphrastic Greek menologion into the library of a local Armenian Chalcedonian monastic community to the early tenth century shortly after the capture of Melitene in 934, well before the activity of Symeon Metaphrastes (and the late publication of his Menologion), it is likely that the choice of a pre-Metaphrastic model by our Armenian Chalcedonian translators in 1092 was simply dictated by what had been made readily available to them through a process of textual dissemination which followed imperial expansion in the tenth century; a Greek Constantinopolitan textual model which would have been more affordable and readily useable for the Armenian Chalcedonian community to produce the translation of the *Martyrdom* in 1092 than the purchase or acquisition of a new Metaphrastic Menologion. In both the Greek and Georgian evidence, eleventh century production of Metaphrastic collections and translated versions thereof remained largely confined to the larger and wealthier monastic centers of Athos and the Black Mountain²⁸¹

The production of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Romylos, Eudoxios, Zeno, and Makarios* in 1092 fits precisely within a network of textual dissemination and translation embedded in the expansion of Byzantine imperial hegemony and in a network of knowledge and literary exchange which influenced and conditioned the creation of Armenian texts during the tenth and eleventh century. Where the translation of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* by Yovsēp, a Chalcedonian Armenian native of Constantinople, was designed to alter the normative practices and temporal arrangements by providing ready-made translations for centrally co-ordinated distribution, the Armenian version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* and the Armenian ‘book of lections’ of Čortuanel Mamikonean, as well as the other evidence presented in this chapter, offers us a unique opportunity to glimpse how Constantinopolitan arranged collections and other textual material in Greek were distributed into localities recently annexed by the Empire, and how this material was then received, translated, and used by Armenian Chalcedonians under their own initiative, as part of a process which ultimately supported the orientation of Armenian

²⁸⁰ The closest I have been able to identify is Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Cromwell 26., a Metaphrastic Menologion possibly produced in Cappadocia late in the second half of the eleventh century.

²⁸¹ Nikolaishvili, “Georgian Manuscript Production and Translation,” 64.

communities living throughout the Empire's eastern frontier toward a normative Constantinopolitan centre. Crucially it provides further key evidence to understand the method by which a new martyrdom narrative made its way into the Armenian tradition during the late eleventh century. It is in the form produced by the Armenian Chalcedonians of Melitene in 1092 that the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* was copied and gradually became a permanent fixture of the Armenian Miaphysite liturgical manuscript known as the Čarēntir by the thirteenth century, where the date was changed to October 19th, the time in which the saints are celebrated in the Miaphysite Armenian tradition down to the present day.²⁸²

Building a Shared Confessional Environment and Imposing Hegemony through Text and Translation: Syriac and Arabic Comparisons

The fragmentary evidence that can be retrieved through the the emergence of Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios into the Armenian tradition at the hands of Chalcedonian Armenian translators offers a view into an underlying process of textual dissemination and translation which accompanied the Byzantine Empire into the norms of provincial Armenian communities. Although there is a major gap of nearly a century between Yovsēp's translation of the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* and the translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* and the Armenian 'book of lections' – such is the nature of the surviving evidence – it is this commonality which suggests we are working with merely the tip of evidence which offers us a rare glimpse into what must have been a more widespread experience. To better frame and contextualise the Armenian evidence, to better understand how a process of textual dissemination and translation was driven by Byzantine Imperial expansion, to understand further the purpose of this process, and to demonstrate the role of provincial Chalcedonian translators in this process we can turn to a comparison with the experience of Arabic- and Syriac-speaking Melkite communities in Antioch, that is Arabic- and Syriac-speaking Chalcedonian Christians, during this same historical juncture.²⁸³ It is this richer evidence that can help us to reconstruct the more disparate Armenian Chalcedonian evidence and connect it to a wider process which not only injected new commemorations and feast day into the local provincial environment, but one which consummated the intrusion of the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople into the norms of provincial Christian communities by means of Chalcedonian translation activity throughout Northern Syria, Northern Mesopotamia, Eastern Anatolia, and the Caucasus during the tenth and eleventh century as a means of constructing, reinforcing, and maintaining a trans-regional, imperial space in the context of Byzantine expansion.

²⁸² Due to the more moveable nature of the Armenian liturgical calendar, ie always celebrating a saint on the fourth Tuesday of October rather than on an exact date, the date of the feast day of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios floats between the 18th and 24th October.

²⁸³ J. Mugler, "Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā and the Translation Projects of Byzantine Antioch," in *Patristic Literature in Arabic Translations*, ed. B. Roggema and A. Treiger (Brill, 2020), 182., A. Treiger, "The Eucharist in Eleventh Century Jerusalem: New Evidence on the Hagiopolite Communion Rite from Arabic Christian Sources," *Journal of Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 72 (2023): 511-532.

The Melkite community of Antioch and its hinterland had, since the advent of Islamic rule following the capture of the city in 638 CE, lived under distinct socio-economic and political conditions which distanced them from their co-religionists in the Byzantine Empire.²⁸⁴ Nonetheless, they maintained an active literary environment, which included the production of ‘neo-martyrdoms’ that commemorated Christian men and women who had died under Islamic rule.²⁸⁵ These texts, by their nature, recently subject to an extensive and lucid survey by Christian Sahner, offered a response to the historical experience of Christian communities under Islamic rule and sought to make sense of the lived environment that they found themselves in.²⁸⁶ For the Melkites in particular, who prolifically took to the genre, neo-martyrdoms represent what Sahner terms a ‘rejectionist’ tendency toward Islamic rule, heavily informed by their ‘fall from grace’ after a long period of imperial Byzantine hegemony, enshrining their resentment in stories of resistance to Islam.²⁸⁷ As Islamic rule gradually fractured in the ninth and tenth centuries, and the Byzantine reconquest of Northern Syria began apace, new priorities in textual production emerged amongst the Melkites of Antioch, priorities which responded to the re-establishment Byzantine hegemonic power in the local environment.

Treiger traces the beginnings the ‘Graeco-Syro-Arabic Melkite translation’ movement in Antioch and its surrounding regions to the early ninth-century translation of the *Life of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger* into Syriac by Theodosius of Sarmīn in the Monastery of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger on the Black Mountain. Distinct from the framework which produced Syro-Arabic or Graeco-Arabic translations of philosophical works in the Caliphal centre of Baghdad, the translation of the *Life of St. Symeon*, as Treiger argues, served ‘the internal needs of Theodosius’ Melkite Christian community, most immediately those of his own monastery, of which St. Symeon Stylite the Younger was the patron saint. The Syriac version of the *Life* was likely produced to be read publicly during the monastery’s annual celebration of its patron saint, which took place on May 24th.²⁸⁸ A century later the *Life* was copied again, this time into Arabic, by a certain Abraham, disciple of the venerable Abba Serapion, at the Monastery of the Theotokos at Dafnūnā (present-day Harbiye), near to the Monastery of St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger.²⁸⁹ The translation of the same work from Greek into Syriac and subsequently Arabic not only allows us to track the increasing use of Arabic amongst Melkite communities in and near to Antioch by the beginning of the tenth century, but its significance for the present study is that this sporadic translation activity foreshadows a much more extensive translation programme of Christian literature from Greek into Arabic and Syriac throughout the region following the Byzantine capture of Antioch in 969.

²⁸⁴ C. Sahner, *Christian Martyrs under Islam: Religious Violence and the Making of the Muslim World*, (Princeton University Press, 2018), 2.

²⁸⁵ R. Hoyland, "Agapius of Manbiḡ, Qusṭā ibn Lūqā and the Graeco-Roman Past: The Beginnings of Christian Arabic and Muslim Historiography," *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 16, 1-2 (2021): 7-41.

²⁸⁶ Sahner, *Christian Martyrs under Islam*., 2.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 27-28.

²⁸⁸ A. Treiger, "The Beginnings of the Graeco-Syro-Arabic Melkite Translation Movement in Antioch," *Scrinium* 16, 1 (2020): 308.

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 313-314

The Armenian historian Step'anos Tarōnec'i, writing at the beginning of the eleventh century, recalls the successful eastern campaigns of the Emperor Nikephoros II Phokas some forty years earlier:

In 417 of the Era, Bardas, the nephew of Nikephoros, went to Apahunik' with a substantial force and surrounded the city of Manazkert.¹⁷⁶ They took it and undermined its foundations and destroyed its circuit wall. And then, in 418 (969) of the Era, he took Antioch, great city of Syria.²⁹⁰

Though Step'anos mistook the *strategos* Michael Bourtzes for the Emperor's nephew Bardas, the year 969, as he accurately records, marked the first-time that Antioch had been under Byzantine rule for over three centuries. The Byzantine re-conquest brought with it significant administrative, military, infrastructural, and economic transformations in both the lived urban space and its surrounding regions, has already been well surveyed by Holmes, Todt, Roberts and others.²⁹¹ Lying on the bank of the Orontes river, Antioch, described the 'Theoupolis', or 'Madinat Allāh', and its hinterland played host to diverse multi-faith communities, which included Syriac-, Arabic-, and Armenian-speaking Christian populations of both Chalcedonian and Miaphysite orientation.²⁹² Its 'innumerable churches', abounding in 'gold, silver, and coloured glass' are described in glittering detail by Ibn Butlān in his mid-eleventh-century letter to the Buyid secretary Hilāl ibn al-Muhassin.²⁹³ These places of worship, combined with networks of monasteries punctuating the landscape of mountainous Northern Syria, made the city a key monastic and ecclesiastical centre for the new Byzantine administration.²⁹⁴ Renewed Byzantine hegemony interacted with this diverse linguistic and confessional landscape in varied ways, and where the normative Chalcedonian confessional alignment of the Empire eventually induced a somewhat challenging environment for the region's Miaphysite residents, the re-conquest stimulated a period of intense and flourishing intellectual and literary production amongst the Syriac and Arabic-speaking Chalcedonians (Melkites), re-integrated with Byzantium for the first time since the Muslim conquest of the seventh century.²⁹⁵ This activity was primarily predicated on mass waves of Christian translation, rendering patristic, liturgical, and hagiographical texts from Greek into Arabic and Syriac.

The early phases of the Melkite translation in Antioch, following the capture of the city in 969, coalesced around several key figures, including a student of the Chalcedonian Patriarch Christopher: the *protospatharios* Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā. What we know of Ibrāhīm comes to us primarily through the colophons and autobiographical references found in conjunction with his various extant translations,

²⁹⁰ Tarōnec'i, *The Universal History*, 235.

²⁹¹ K-P. Todt, "Antioch in the Middle Byzantine period (969-1084): The Reconstruction of the City as an Administrative, Economic, Military and Ecclesiastical center," *Topoi Orient-Occident. Supplément 5: Antioche de Syrie. Histoire, images et traces de la ville antique* (2004), Holmes, "How the East Was Won in the Reign of Basil II," Holmes, *Basil II and the Governance of Empire*.

²⁹² A. M. Roberts, *Reason and Revelation in Byzantine Antioch: The Christian Translation Program of Abdallah Ibn Al-Fadl* (University of California Press, 2020), 19-21.

²⁹³ Ibid., 25.

²⁹⁴ Roberts, *Reason and Revelation*, 27.

²⁹⁵ Ibid., 30., A. Treiger, "Greek into Arabic in Byzantine Antioch: 'Abdallāh ibn al-Faḍl's »Book of the Garden« (Kitāb ar-rawḍa)," in *Ambassadors, Artists, Theologians: Byzantine Relations with the Near East from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Centuries*, ed. Z. Chitwood and J. Pahlitzsch (Propylaeum, 2020), 227.

recently reconstructed by Mugler.²⁹⁶ Having grown up under Muslim rule, his Chalcedonian confessional identity, and his evident bilingual proficiency in both Greek and Arabic made him well placed to benefit from the period of Byzantine hegemony which followed the capture of Antioch.²⁹⁷ Ibrāhīm bore the imperial title of *prōtopathārios*, so we can infer that following the reconquest he was integrated into the new imperial urban élite.²⁹⁸ His early education had been entrusted to the patriarch Christopher, as we learn through the *Life of Christopher*, Ibrāhīm's only surviving original work, dedicated to his former mentor. This connection placed the young Ibrāhīm at the centre of the ecclesiastical affairs of the city.²⁹⁹ Ibrāhīm's surviving translations, dating from after the Byzantine re-conquest, display a wide variety of Christian literature, including collection of works attributed to Ephrem the Syrian, with a concluding panegyric attributed to Gregory of Nyssa, by Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and Basil of Caesarea. Grand'Henry's comparison between Ibrāhīm's translation of Gregory of Nazianzus into Arabic with another translation made by abbot Antonios led him to suggest that Ibrāhīm's version was a revision of Antonios', and that Ibrāhīm's translation activities also included the *metaphrasis* of existing Greco-Arabic translations produced in the region of Byzantine Antioch.³⁰⁰ Treiger has identified further translations attributed to Ibrāhīm, consisting of panegyrics dedicated to the Evangelists Luke and John derived from the *Menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes.³⁰¹

Ibrāhīm's activity implicitly associates him with Antioch, but it is evident that he also maintained connections with the monastic communities in its hinterland. Mugler, referring to the work of Sebastian Brock on a corpus of manuscripts associated with monastic communities on the Black Mountain, near Antioch, draws our attention to a reference to Ibrāhīm in the colophon of a translation of the Greek Triodion into Syriac (London, British Library, Or. 8697, ff. 28-30), carried out originally in the 'holy monastery of Mar Georgios' and copied in 1056 by John, 'known amongst the priests of the Holy Church of Mar Panteleemon on the Black Mountain'.³⁰² The colophon records that 'This book of the Three Odes, together with Canons, which was translated from the Greek tongue into Syriac in the days of Abraham the King's scribe'.³⁰³ The manuscript is telling in two regards: as Mugler observes, Ibrāhīm's epithet *kātūbā d-malkā*, 'secretary of the King', gives us further evidence of his role as an agent of the imperial bureaucracy in the region, crucially providing a strong indication that he was connected to the translation movement which brought the Constantinopolitan liturgical tradition— including the Triodion—into the Syriac language used in Antiochian church settings, a point reiterated by Trieiger in his own study of Ibrāhīm,

²⁹⁶ Mugler, "Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā".

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 181-183

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 184.

²⁹⁹ Mugler, "Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā", 183.

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 189. J. Grand'Henry, "La méthode de révision d'une version patristique arabe ancienne chez Ibrāhīm fils de Yūḥannā d'Antioche," *Annales du Département des Lettres Arabes*, 6B (1991-1992): 161-172.

³⁰¹ Ibid., 189.

³⁰² S. Brock, "Syriac Manuscripts Copied on the Black Mountain, near Antioch," in *Lingua restituta orientalis*, ed. R. Schulz and M. Görg (Harrassowitz, 1990), 62-63.

³⁰³ Ibid., 62.

citing his role in ‘Byzantinizing’ the Syriac Melkite liturgy.³⁰⁴ Brock’s study of translations carried out in the Antioch region during the eleventh century illustrates a wave of Greek liturgical texts being rendered into Syriac for use in the Melkite liturgical settings following the consolidation of Byzantine rule in Northern Syria. These include a *Praxapostolos* 1041 (Vatican syr. 21), a Lectionary arranged ‘according to the rite of the Greeks’, and a Gospel Lectionary 1046 (British Library Add. 14489) ‘according to the arrangement of the Greeks’ written ‘in the ‘year 1357 of the Blessed Greeks... in the Monastery of Mar Elia on the Black Mountain’.³⁰⁵ To this environment we can add the prolific Graceo-Arabic translation activities of the Chalcedonian abbot Antonios of the monastery of St Symeon on the Black Mountain, which have been subject to extensive study by Habib Ibrahim.³⁰⁶

Increasing evidence of translations of Greek material arranged according to the rite of the Church of Constantinople is coupled with new activity in the translation of hagiographical collections which orientated the festal calendar of Melkite communities in and near Antioch toward Constantinople: the production of the so-called Antiochene Menologion and the Melkite Synaxarion. The *Kitāb al-Dūlāb*, literally the ‘Book of the Wheel’, commonly referred to as the Antiochene Menologion, was produced under the aegis of another active ecclesiast and intellectual, an active contemporary of Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā: Yūḥannā ‘Abd al-Masīḥ. cursory biographical information found in the *Life of Christopher* and the Antiochene Menologion suggests that he was elected as the Melkite Catholicos of Romagryis, giving him, at least nominally, significant oversight of the confessional community’s populations in Central Asia.³⁰⁷ However, as Treiger has argued on separate occasions, Yūḥannā’s proclivity for remaining in Antioch and frequenting its ecclesiastical and intellectual circles suggests he likely rejected this appointment, ‘preferring monastic life and scholarly work as a translator’.³⁰⁸ His most significant work, the Antiochene Menologion, is arranged along the liturgical year from September to August. Close textual analysis has demonstrated that it contained translations from both Syriac and Greek, drawing in part on the textual model provided by Symeon Metaphastes’ Menologion, but also Greek menologia which pre-dated Metaphrastes’ opus. We are fortunate for the colophon of the Antiochene Menologion, in which Yūḥannā offers us an insight into his translation and compilation process:

ورثيت ذلك على أصحها وأوفرها وفسرت ذلك من اللسان اليوناني إلى اللغة العربية أكثرها وأوردت ما كان من ذلك فيما قبل مفسراً وفسرت ما كان وجود تفسيره في عصرنا متعذراً...³⁰⁹

I arranged this according to the truest and most economical order, rendering mostly from the Greek tongue into the Arabic language, I have also provided that which was previously translated, while translating that which was not abundantly accessible in our time...³¹⁰

³⁰⁴ Mugler, “Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā”, 193., Treiger, “The Beginnings,” 317.

³⁰⁵ Brock, “Syriac Manuscripts,” 62-63.

³⁰⁶ Ibrahim, “Some Notes on Antonios and His Arabic Translations of John of Damascus,” 158-179.

³⁰⁷ Treiger, “The Beginnings,” 327-329.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 329.

³⁰⁹ A. Treiger, “Sinaitica (1): The Antiochian Menologion Compiled by Hieromonk Yūḥannā Abd al-Masīḥ,” *Christian Orient, Journal of Studies in The Christian Culture of Asia And Africa*, vol. 8 (2017): 231 - 232 .

³¹⁰ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

The colophon bears a great deal of similarity to the explanation of translation outlined in the colophon of the Armenian translation of *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* by Yovsēp of Constantinople, that is that such translation was designed to inject previously untranslated commemorations into the Melkite environment following the reconquest of Antioch in 969.

Set alongside this, the Antiochene Graeco-Arabic translation milieu also provided the impetus behind the production of the Arabic Melkite Synaxarion. Joseph-Marie Sauget's edition and study of this text, to whom we still owe much of our understanding of both its content and transmission history, demonstrated through the study of a corpus of twenty manuscripts containing the Melkite Synaxarion derived from an model close to recension D of the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* which was translated into Arabic in the second half of the eleventh century.³¹¹ The earliest surviving exemplar, Saint Catherine's Monastery, Mount Sinai, Arabic 417, is dated to 1095 according to its colophon:

أدرج في سنة ألف وستمئة وثلاثة العالم وفي سنة الهجرة سنة ثمان وثمانين وأربعمائة.³¹²

It was introduced in the year six thousand, six hundred and three, and in the year of the Hijra, the year four hundred and eighty-eight (1095).³¹³

This allows us to be confident that it was in circulation, at very least, by the late eleventh century. The colophon goes on to inform us that this version was translated by a Melkite community in Lower Egypt, which should remind us that the Melkite translation movement during the eleventh century was not confined to the immediate locality of Antioch. The Melkite Synaxarion, like its Constantinopolitan Greek archetype, is arranged from September to August, and it was through this route that the abbreviated version of the *Martyrdom of Saints, Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* was first translated into Arabic for Melkite communities to venerate on the 6th of September.

وفي هذا اليوم جهاد القديسين رومولس واطوكسيوس وزينن ومقاريوس لما تقلد طرايانوس مملكه الروم الفا الوفا من النصاري منفين الي بلد ملطيه فجاهر رومولس القايد بامانته وعوقب عقابا شديدا وقطع راسه وكان القديس اوطوكسيوس في ايام ذيوكلتيانوس من مرتبه البرمكيري فقبض عليه امير مدينه ملطيه وعلى جند اخرين كان في جملتهم زينن ومقاريوس فلما جاهروا بمحبتهم لله ضربوهم على جنوبهم بسياط من اعصاب البقر وبرمانات حديد ذوات شعب على فقار اعناقهم واخر عقابهم انهم قضوا اجالهم بضرب اعناقهم بالسيف.³¹⁴

On this day, the martyrdom of saints Romylos, Eudoxios, Zenon, and Makarios. When Trajan assumed the kingship of the Romans, thousands of Christians were exiled to the region of Melitene. The commander Romulus proclaimed his faith and was severely punished and beheaded. In the time of

³¹¹ J.-M. Sauget, *Premières recherches sur l'origine et les caractéristiques des synaxaires melkites (XIe –XVIIe siècles)* (1969), 23

³¹² Mount Sinai, Saint Catherine's Monastery, Arabic ms. 417. f. 318v.

³¹³ Ibid., trans. L. Read.

³¹⁴ Mount Sinai, Saint Catherine's Monastery, Arabic ms. 417. ff. 7v-8r.

Diocletian, Saint Eudoxios, who held the rank of *Primikerios*, was arrested by the Governor of Melite along with other soldiers, including Zenon and Makarios. After having professed their love for God, they beat them on their sides with whips made from cow sinews and with spiked iron balls on their spines and their final punishment was that their lives were ended by having their necks cut with a sword.³¹⁵

As with the *Antiochene Menologion*, which incorporated contemporary accounts of neo-martyrs, the translation of the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* into Arabic also entailed the addition of several local commemorations specific to the traditions of Melkite communities. In the Armenian case, the process of translation and the addition of martyrs or saints particular to the Armenian tradition has been viewed in terms of its national qualities. Let us recall that the translation of Greek hagio-liturgical collections and the subsequent addition of Armenian saints by Vkasēr's has been characterized as providing the Armenian collections with 'national deposits' which demarcated and prevented the encroachment of 'foreign conquerors'.³¹⁶ However, Sauget's analysis of this same phenomenon led him to a more moderate interpretation in the case of the Melkite Synaxarion. As he argues, we need not see additions or alterations to the Greek archetype as an attempt to incubate a locality from the influence of the imperial Constantinopolitan rite, but rather understand them as expressions of the provincial melding with the common framework provided by the archetypal texts circulated from a Chalcedonian imperial Church centre.³¹⁷ We can understand such additions as an expression of the local valences of communal particularities, which were not automatically in conflict with Constantinopolitan models of festal commemoration, but rather speak to the attempts of communities to absorb the standardised imperial calendar of saints within the framework of their local lived traditions which were active prior to the Byzantine re-conquest of the late tenth and eleventh century.³¹⁸ It is perhaps a more pragmatic way to view the imperfect and uneven process of imperial expansion into provincial localities through commemorative and liturgical practice. Rather than viewing the preservation of pre-existing idiosyncratic feast days as evidence of a local group or wider community's rejection of the imperial, it demonstrates the practical reality of combining the imperial with the local. That we need to emphasise a non-conflictual framework for this compilation process seems self-evident in the case of the Melkites, whose confessional identity was certainly not at odds with the aims of the Byzantine Empire. As Sahner reminds us, several Melkite neo-martyrs, including Peter Capitolias, had also made their way into the Byzantine canon, so the presence of saints originating from the Melkite milieu was not an immediate indicator of disagreement or a lack of conformity to a mono-directional process.

The Graeco-Arabic Melkite translation movement of Antioch undoubtedly reached a peak under the final figure worth examining in the context of the present conversation. 'Abdallāh ibn al-Faḍl career

³¹⁵ Ibid., trans, L. Read.

³¹⁶ Gevorgyan, "Grigor II Vkasēr", 109-111.

³¹⁷ Sauget, *Premières recherches*, 174.

³¹⁸ Ibid., 174.

and works have been the subject of exhaustive study by Treiger and Roberts, and it is worth briefly outlining their valuable findings here. ‘Abdallāh was active in Antioch in the middle of the eleventh century: this much we can infer from the date of his translation of Basil of Caesarea’s *Homilies on the Hexaemeron*. The colophon recalls the creation of the manuscript in the ‘fourth indiction of the group of years, in the year six thousand and five hundred and sixty (Anno Mundi)’, 1050-52.³¹⁹ He is referred to as both *malakī* and *Antākī*, from which we can assume both his Chalcedonian confessional identity and, at very least, his residency in the city of Antioch.³²⁰ His sponsors included a number of officials active in the Patriarchate of Antioch, including Abū l-Nasr ibn Butrus and Abū l-Faḍl Salāma ibn al-Mufarraǧ, both holders of the title ‘qubuqlis’, the *keouboukleisios*, a prominent position within the patriarchal administration. It is certainly clear that Ibn al-Faḍl was well connected to elite circles in the city. Treiger has also suggested that Ibn al-Faḍl was instructed by Symeon Seth, named as Sim‘ān al-Shanīhī in a note to the preface of ‘Abdallāh’s translation of the *loci communes*:³²¹ though not irrefutable proof, as Roberts points out, this evidence would connect his translation activity to the ‘highest intellectual circles of Constantinople’.³²² Ibn al-Faḍl’s impressive career is equalled by his extensive translation programme conducted in mid-eleventh-century Byzantine Antioch, which comprised primarily of rendering patristic, liturgical, and hagiographical from Greek into Arabic. Patristic translations include Basil of Caesarea’s *Homilies on the Psalms* and *Homilies on the Hexaemeron*, Gregory of Nyssa’s *Apology on the Hexaemeron* and *Homilies on the Song of Songs*, and Gregory of Nazianzos, numerous homilies attributed to John Chrysostom, Chalcedonian Dyothelite dogmatic and polemical works of Sophronios of Jerusalem and John of Damascus, liturgical texts including a Gospel Lectionary and a Prophetologion, as well as hagiographical encomia dedicated to St Nicholas and St Demetrios.³²³ It is, as Roberts duly observes, an extensive Christian translation programme that offered its readers the tools to interpret, defend, and espouse matters of doctrine, saintly commemoration, and liturgical performance.

The work of Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā, the Abbot Antonios, Yūḥannā ‘Abd al-Masīḥ, and ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Faḍl gives an impression of the scale and depth of the translation of material from Greek into Syriac and Arabic which Antioch and its hinterland experienced during the tenth and eleventh century. Though the earliest hints of what would become a vast Melkite translation milieu pre-dates 969, the exponential increase in these activities did not occur anomalously: rather, it was a demonstratable response to the Byzantine reconquest of the city. Stimulated by the injection of new Greek material into Antioch after 969, translations were carried out by local Chalcedonians closely associated with the imperial bureaucracy and the secular and ecclesiastical élite of Byzantine Antioch and its hinterland, actively promoting and injecting what Roberts has described as ‘an intellectual program grounded in Byzantine culture and the contemporary

³¹⁹ Roberts, *Reason and Revelation*, 9.

³²⁰ Ibid., 8.

³²¹ Ibid., 14-16.

³²² Ibid., 14-16.

³²³ Ibid., 34.

Byzantine ecclesiastical curriculum' amongst provincial Christians.³²⁴ Its systematic and consistent nature, spanning across several key Chalcedonian translators active in or near to the city during the eleventh century, reveals a very specific effort to disseminate a particular canon of sacred texts, coded with the imperial ecclesiastical authority of Constantinople, one which, as Roberts illustrates, connected Christian communities throughout the Empire through a common literary culture that responded to contemporary Byzantine taste.³²⁵

The production of these texts served the spiritual and intellectual needs of local Melkite communities, and Mugler draws our attention to this fact in the concluding note of Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā's translation of a homily by John Chrysostom, which recalls Ibrāhīm's desire to render the work into the Arabic language 'to benefit thereby the people of his town'.³²⁶ It should remind us of the very functional nature of this activity; it made Christian literature preserved in Greek available to a local Arabic-speaking readership, and facilitated the arrangement and performance of events throughout the liturgical year.³²⁷ However, it is the centrality of this literature to daily life, the functionality of these texts for everyday spiritual practice that made it so crucial to the consolidation of Byzantine hegemony in the city after its conquest. Though the works of the late-antique Church Fathers hardly constitute idiosyncratic material and were a common intellectual and spiritual heritage claimed by all Christian communities, the translation of contemporary liturgical works, lectionaries, collections of saints' lives and martyrdoms injected a canon of Constantinopolitan-orientated material into the provincial environment. It was these translations which served as a key to altering the spiritual norms of both local Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Christian communities, an intrusion which was designed to consummate the alignment of local Chalcedonians with the spiritual, cultural, and temporal hegemony of the Byzantine Empire and promote the conversion or marginalisation of those who were outside of communion with the Imperial Church. They notionally offered, as Roberts aptly puts it, 'true knowledge', which could 'ward off error introduced by the outsider'.³²⁸

With regards to the alignment of provincial Chalcedonian communities, the aim was not to 'hellenize' those who were already in communion with the Imperial Church. The process permitted works in Arabic or Syriac and did not prioritise the use of Greek in daily life or in liturgical practice above all else: rather, it seems to have aimed to promote the use and availability of specific works which engendered the Constantinopolitisation, as Brock terms it, or Byzantinisation, as Treiger prefers, of the daily norms of provincial Chalcedonian communities through their local language, through which local Melkite practices 'were gradually adapted to and/or abandoned in favour of practices of Constantinopolitan origin'.³²⁹ The injection of hagiographical collections and individual saints' lives derived from the Byzantine synaxaria and menologia, as well as lectionaries 'according to the arrangement of the Greeks' or 'the rite of the Greeks',

³²⁴ Ibid., 23.

³²⁵ Ibid., 83-119.

³²⁶ Mugler, "Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā", 190.

³²⁷ Ibid., 190.

³²⁸ Roberts, *Reason and Revelation*, 150.

³²⁹ Treiger, "The Eucharist in Eleventh-Century Jerusalem: New Evidence on the Hagiopolite Communion Rite from Arabic Christian Sources," 511. R. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Liturgical Press, 1992).

though not devoid of local idiosyncrasies, by and large ensured a temporal and spiritual uniformity with the Empire. The correct saints were now to be commemorated on the correct days, the festal year was now arranged from September to August, and the appropriate readings were performed during daily services at the correct time. The translation of liturgical texts also ensured proper spiritual practice and the profound and lasting influence of exposure to such liturgical translations into Syriac and Arabic has been well illustrated in a recent study conducted by Treiger. Drawing on Melkite hagiographical and liturgical textual evidence, Treiger has demonstrated a clear shift in eucharistic practices, whereby Melkite communities ‘abandoned the practice of receiving communion in two kinds, in favour of receiving communion simultaneously in both kinds’, following the Byzantine reconquest, a change which reflects a clear switch away from the Hagiopolite tradition toward a Constantinopolitan form of administering communion.³³⁰ This ‘important—and hitherto neglected—aspect of Byzantinization’ nicely illustrates the success of imperial intrusion in the liturgical norms of provincial Chalcedonian communities. The translation and promotion of a particular canon of sacred literature gave a powerful impetus to transformations which brought Melkites communities throughout the Empire’s eastern frontier in line with the standard practices and of the Imperial Church, a process which fundamentally attached and connected them to the confessional norms of the Empire, and which consolidated the cultural and political hegemony of Constantinople in the process.

The translation movement in Antioch, which facilitated efforts to Byzantinize the liturgy and ritual practices of Melkites in the region, also worked coterminous with attempts to marginalise those not in confessional communion with the Byzantine Church, such as the West Syrian Jacobites and the Miaphysite Armenians. Promoting a normative spiritual environment which favoured Chalcedonians necessarily entailed alienating those who did not confessionally align themselves with the Empire. If there was a right way of doing things according to the norms of Imperial hegemony, there was, by default, a wrong way of doing things. The injection of sacred texts which promoted this ‘correct’ way not only served to consolidate an imperial Chalcedonian confessional hegemony but marginalise and unsettle local non-Chalcedonian Armenian and Syriac communities. It appears clear that this process, much like the translation of material to align provincial Chalcedonian communities, did not gain steam until the beginning of the eleventh century. Though the habitation and contact of Miaphysite Armenians with this region far precede the tenth and eleventh century, with an observable presence since the fifth century, Step‘anos Tarōnec’i suggests the period immediately after the Byzantine capture of Antioch also witnessed a flourishing of Miaphysite foundations in and around this urban centre. After reflecting on the historic role of Armenians in the city of Antioch, evidence which may well reflect a contemporary interest linked to increased Armenian habitation in the region at his time of composition, Taroneci’s records the establishment of new Armenian

³³⁰ Ibid., 523., D. Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem* (Oxford University Press, 2018)., A. Binggeli, “Un ancien calendrier melkite de Jérusalem (Sināi syr. M52N),” in *Sur les pas des Araméens chrétiens: Mélanges offerts à Alain Desreumaux*, ed. F. Briquel Chatonnet and M. Debié (Geuthner, 2010), 181–94., R. Ousterhout, “Sacred Geographies and Holy Cities: Constantinople as Jerusalem,” in *Hierotopy: The Creation of Sacred Spaces in Byzantium and Medieval Russia*, ed. by A. Lidov (Indrik, 2006), 98–109., P. Bradshaw and M. E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation*. (Liturgical Press, 2012).

ecclesiastical hierarchies in Northern Syria and Cilicia during the Catholicosate of Xaçik I (973-92) and his activities:

In the days of lord Xaç'ik, patriarch of Armenia, this people of Armenia spread and extended across the regions of the west, to the extent that he consecrated bishops for it in Antioch of Syria, in Tarsus of Cilicia, and in Sulind, and in all these districts.³³¹

The annexation of Syria appears then to have generated the growth of new Miaphysite ecclesiastical foundations in a key urban centre. It certainly suggests that we can associate the late tenth and early eleventh centuries as a period of Armenian movement into these regions and the establishment of new foundations in important regional centres. In Book 13 Chapter 5 of his *Chronicle*, Michael the Syrian records that the Armenians had emigrated into northern Syria in the time of the Emperor Basil.³³² This memory supports the assertion that this period was marked by multiple successive phases of movement to this strategic region. Holmes has suggested this movement likely served the purpose of repopulating the area following the significant displacement of existing Muslim populations.³³³

Though traces of these new Miaphysite foundations are themselves hard to trace, a new Armenian interest in the region is reflected in the work of Aristakēs Lastivertsi, who, as Weitenberg points out, afforded a great deal of reverence to the region in chapter 6 of his *History*.³³⁴ During Romanus III's campaign into northern Syria in 1028, Lastivertsi recorded:

Յառաջին ամի իւրոյ թագաւորութեանն զօրաժողով լինի եւ ճանապարհ առնէ ի կողմանս Անտիոքացոց եւ կամէր երթալ ի վերայ քաղաքին որ կոչի Հալպ առնուլ աւերել զնա: Եւ եկեալ հանդիպի լերինն որ կոչի Սեաւ եւ տեսանէ անդ բազմութիւն վանորէից եւ զմենաստանս մենակեցաց որք ի մարմնի գոյով զանմարմնոցն բերէին զնմանութիւն: ³³⁵

In the first year of his reign, (Romanus III) assembled troops and took the road to the region of the Antiochans, and he wanted to go against the city which is called Aleppo, to take and destroy it. He came upon the mountain which is called Seaw (Black) where he saw a multitude of cenobites and anchorites who, though existing in body, bore similarity to the incorporeal. ³³⁶

Aristakēs goes on to record how the monks were seen as heretics by Romanus because he ‘greatly approved of the declaration of Chalcedon and hated all orthodox (non-Chalcedonian) believers’.³³⁷ We can infer from this that the community of the Black Mountain also encompassed both Armenian Miaphysite and Chalcedonian foundations early in the eleventh century. This certainly seems to be the contention of Matthew of Edessa, who, writing about the reign of Basil II, described how the emperor had gone to the

³³¹ *Step'anos Tarōnec'i*, 295.

³³² *Chronique de Michel le Syrien III*, 133.

³³³ Holmes, “How the East Was Won in the Reign of Basil II,”.

³³⁴ J. Weitenberg, “The Armenian Monasteries in the Black Mountain,” in *East and West in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean I: Antioch from the Byzantine Reconquest until the End of the Crusader Principality*, ed by K. Ciggar and M. Metcalf (Peeters, 2006), 80.

³³⁵ *Patmut'inn Aristakisi*, 42.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, trans. L. Read.

³³⁷ *Ibid.*, 43.

Black Mountain and received a secret baptism whereby he became like a ‘father to the land of the Armenians’.³³⁸

The contemporary evidence suggests that Miaphysite communities in recently annexed localities did not meet immediate difficulties under imperial rule and were well integrated into a confessionally heterogeneous environment prior to the death of Emperor Basil II. Crucially, however, evidence from Aristakēs offers us a hint of a more hostile imperial policy toward the non-Chalcedonian communities of the region, which began to develop concurrently with a new translation programme which consolidated the position of provincial Chalcedonian communities vis-à-vis Byzantine rule from the early eleventh century onward. The same can be said for the other non-Chalcedonian group which Romanus III encountered in the hinterland of Antioch: the West Syrian Miaphysites. Separated from the Melkites through their confessional alignment, a shift in attitude toward the position of these non-Chalcedonian Christians appears to have occurred. Drawing on the contemporary sources, namely the *Vita* of Yuhannān VII Bar Abdun embedded in Michael the Syrian’s *Chronicle*, a shorter version of the same *Vita* written by Michael of Tinnīs (c. 1000–1051) in the pages of the Arabic History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria; and the Greek synodal decree issued in 1030 by the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Alexios the Studite, Gyllenhaal highlights the shift between the integration and efflorescence of Syriac Jacobite communities in urban centres including Antioch and Melitene prior to and after a dramatic change in imperial policy sponsored by Romanos III and Patriarch Alexios the Studite in a ‘program of conversion for Syrian Orthodox churchmen and their integration into the Chalcedonian hierarchy’.³³⁹ It is striking then that one of our Melkite translators, Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā, was a signatory of the patriarch Alexios the Studite’s decree, imposing restrictions on West Syrian Jacobite Christians throughout the eastern frontier.³⁴⁰ Gyllenhaal reminds us that this imperial policy was not always implemented with uniformity or indeed without opposition from local ecclesiastical elites. His analysis suggests that some leading Chalcedonian figures in Antioch refused to endorse this switch in imperial policy, and the evidence of the continuation of both Syriac Jacobite and Miaphysite Armenian foundations, like the monastic communities of Šuxr Xandarea and Paṛlah in the vicinity of Antioch, also highlights that such policy did not force wholesale conversion or complete repression of Miaphysite communities.³⁴¹ Though we should bear this in mind, the evidence which connects a policy of marginalizing Miaphysite communities in provincial centres with individuals active in the Melkite translation movement re-emphasizes the wider processes to which the production of hagiographical collections, lectionaries and liturgical texts in Syriac and Arabic belonged. It certainly supports the contention of Treiger that the efforts to Byzantinize the liturgy of the Melkites went ‘hand in hand’ with efforts to curb the activity of their ecclesiastical rivals.³⁴²

³³⁸ Uṛhayec’i, *Žamanakagrut’inn*, 50.

³³⁹ Gyllenhaal, “Byzantine Melitene and the Social Milieu of the Syriac Renaissance,” 232.

³⁴⁰ Mugler, “Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā,” 193.

³⁴¹ Weitenberg, “The Armenian Monasteries in the Black Mountain”.

³⁴² Treiger, “The Beginnings,” 318.

The Byzantine reconquest of northern Syria reshaped the local spiritual and confessional environment through textual production and translation. The key to this process was the mass translation of a specific canon of texts from Greek into Syriac and Arabic which swept through the city of Antioch and its environs after 969 and, particularly, from the early eleventh century onward. Led by figures such as ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Faḍl, Melkite translators made Greek patristic works, hagiographical collections and other liturgical texts available to local audiences in provincial centres and, as Mugler has argued, their dissemination served imperial interests.³⁴³ This process of translation consummated the intrusion of the Empire into the norms of local spiritual life and served to orientate populations towards a normative Chalcedonian imperial centre.³⁴⁴ The practices of local Melkite communities were adjusted and transformed in a process of normalisation which was also connected to attempts to influence non-Chalcedonians in the region and alter their practices. As Sauget shrewdly observes, ‘it cannot be doubted that the liturgical influence of Constantinople followed the political vicissitudes of the Empire’.³⁴⁵

The dissemination of Greek texts and their subsequent translation by local Chalcedonians altered the provincial spiritual environment in a way which fundamentally orientated these communities to the confessional norms of the Empire, consolidating the imposition of the cultural and political hegemony of Constantinople. Though far more sporadic and disparate, the translations of Greek Constantinopolitan hagio-liturgical collections, accounts of relic transfer, and other Greek models translated by Armenian Chalcedonians at the same historical juncture map well onto the trends and patterns displayed by the Melkite material. It is likely because of the fragmentary and inaccessible nature of the surviving Armenian evidence that the significance of this material for our understanding of the processes behind the Empire’s intrusion into the spiritual norms of Armenian localities and its enduring influence has not previously been fully exploited or recognised. However, when it is placed in conversation with the Arabic and Syriac Chalcedonian material produced in and around Antioch following its re-capture, we can make greater sense of the Armenian evidence. The Armenian evidence, just as in the case of the Chalcedonian communities in Northern Syria, indicates that the injection of the same prescribed canon of Greek Constantinopolitan literature from the tenth century onward and the co-operation of various Chalcedonian actors in its translation functioned to orientate provincial Christian populations toward an imperial centre and reinforcing the cultural and political hegemony of Constantinople in the process.

³⁴³ Mugler, “Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā”, 195.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., 195.

³⁴⁵ Sauget, *Premières recherches*.

Text and Translation as a Tool of Constantinopolitan Spiritual Authority: The Armenian Case

Progressing from the foundation provided by the investigation of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in chapter 1, which highlighted that the entry of these previously unattested martyrs into the Armenian tradition was stimulated by an active Armenian Chalcedonian translation and veneration milieu, this chapter has attempted to embed this evidence within a wider spectrum of Chalcedonian translation activity during the very late tenth and eleventh century. By putting the disparately surviving Armenian material in conversation with Syriac and Arabic evidence, the more fragmentary evidence for Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity can be placed within a much wider trans-regional translation phenomenon commonly engaged in by Chalcedonian Christian communities living throughout the Byzantine Empire's eastern frontier. The impetus behind the production of this material was underpinned by a process of textual dissemination and translation stimulated by the expansion of Byzantium, reliant on both imperial infrastructure and on the co-operation and initiative of the Chalcedonian communities which received these texts and translated them.

The dissemination and translation of Greek textual material, injected into provincial settings to be used in daily spiritual practice, followed the vicissitudes of Empire's expansion in the tenth and eleventh century and, alongside population relocation, ecclesiastical disruption, administrative change, and legal and fiscal transformation, the dissemination of this prescribed canon of sacred literature in Greek and its translation by Chalcedonian communities was one of the key tools conceived to consummate the intrusion of the Empire into the norms of local spiritual life and reorientate its Christian populations towards a normative Constantinopolitan imperial centre. This Chalcedonian translation activity not only injected new commemorations and feast days into the local provincial environment, but facilitated the intrusion of the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople into the norms of provincial Christian communities in Northern Syria, Northern Mesopotamia, Eastern Anatolia, and the Caucasus during the tenth and eleventh century, and served to construct, reinforce, and maintain a shared trans-regional, imperial space through standardised practices.

This chapter has argued that the translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092, the emergence of textual evidence for this cult in the Armenian tradition, and, more broadly, the activities of an Armenian Chalcedonian translation milieu operating throughout the late-tenth and eleventh century can be understood and framed as products of this wider imperial process. By bringing this evidence together through the device of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*, this chapter has drawn attention to an active Armenian Chalcedonian translation and veneration milieu in the late-tenth and eleventh century that carried distinctly different objectives from the translation activities of Grigor II Vkasasēr.

3

Graeco-Armenian Translations after Manzikert: Demarcation and Continuation

The period after 1071 has traditionally been considered one of collapse for the Byzantine Empire in Anatolia, the Caucasus, and Northern Syria. Contemporary sources record their shock at the devastating impact of the Seljuk Turks, culminating in the defeat of the Byzantine army at Manzikert and the disintegration of the Empire's eastern frontier. After the blinding of the emperor Romanus IV, and the accession of the emperor Michael VII in 1071, *The Continuation of the Chronicle of John Skylitzes* remarked on the state of the Empire:

Since the peace treaties with Diogenes were left in abeyance and unratified ... Surging out of Persia *en masse* the Turks marched into the Roman themes and lay waste to them, for there was no one to oppose them. They did not invade in scattered bands, as they had done before, and clear off straight away, but assumed control over everything in their path.³⁴⁶

The impression left by primary historiographical sources like the *Continuation* tend to reinforce the idea of an Empire in terminal decline, experiencing the rapid collapse of its eastern frontier and a marked downturn in its fortunes. The enduring idea of imperial collapse after 1071 has led to the assumption that the many Armenians constituting considerable populations within the Empire's East were unwilling to maintain their contact with the Byzantine Empire after Manzikert and took the opportunity to re-assert their independence. According to Garsoïan, the effects of a 'semi-mythological pattern of betrayal, resentment, and hostility' projected by Armenian historiographical works present the Byzantine Empire as 'the root of all evil... bent on the destruction of Armenian realms and on the eradication of their faith'.³⁴⁷ In the period

³⁴⁶ McGeer and Nesbitt, *Byzantium in the Time of Troubles*, 139.

³⁴⁷ Garsoïan, "The problem of Armenian integration", 122-124.

after 1071, Garsoïan argues, Armenians took advantage of this fracturing situation to pursue their own ambitions beyond the reach of Constantinople and soon thereafter ‘turned away from Byzantium’.³⁴⁸ However, this enduring narrative of collapse and of subsequent Armenian separation has given way more recently to new ways of thinking.

Reassessing Armeno-Byzantine Relations after Manzikert: Current Trends

In *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia, ca. 1040-1130*, Alexander Beihammer convincingly advocates for a more centrifugal model for the post-Manzikert Byzantine East, whereby the years between 1071 and 1095 led to the emergence of localised power systems which interweaved with both the Byzantine and nascent Seljuk empires. Beihammer shows how reductive arguments for a ‘Byzantine versus Turkish Asia Minor’ have framed the second half of the eleventh century as a contest between indigenous defenders and aggressive foreign invaders.³⁴⁹ The contention in this argument is that the political situation of the Byzantine East was ofcourse significantly altered in the two decades after Manzikert, but that it was not a case of immediate collapse or the replacement of one imperial power with another. The utility of this model for the present discussion is that it allows for the possibility of exploring enduring forms of contact between the Empire and Armenian populations living in its fractious eastern frontier after 1071. Without the presumption of an immediate collapse, we can allow for the reality of varied levels of continued connection.

This re-thinking of the broad framework of the collapse of the eastern frontier after Manzikert has also been complimented by critical reassessments of the Armenian historiographical sources which have primarily informed scholarly interpretations surrounding Armeno-Byzantine relations in the post Manzikert environment. Greenwood’s 2017 article *Aristakēs Lastivertc’i and Armenian Urban Consciousness* set out to tackle what he describes as the ‘unhappy narrative’ of this period and, in a short but deep-diving analysis, Greenwood demonstrates how the *History* by Aristakēs offers a crucial reflection on the emergence of an urban consciousness amongst Armenian communities in the eleventh century linked implicitly to the expansion of the Byzantine Empire and challenging a long-term scholarly contention that has traditionally framed urban spaces as an alien element in the medieval Armenian experience.³⁵⁰ Drawing on understudied colophon and epigraphic evidence to support his reading of Aristakēs, Greenwood’s reflection on the historical experience of Armenian communities living in the post Manzikert Byzantine East is defined by expressions of urban and literary culture which were a product of a lived environment indelibly marked by transformations stimulated by the expansion of the Byzantine Empire:

“Hitherto, Aristakes has been treated as an Armenian author, and to the extent that he writes in Armenian and contemplates the fates of cities and districts of Armenia at the hands of the Seljuks, that is undeniable. But Aristakes was apparently born and brought up in a part of Armenia that had been taken over by Byzantium at the start of the eleventh century. He shows a particular concern for the fates of the urban

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 122-124.

³⁴⁹ Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia*, 1-21.

³⁵⁰ Greenwood, “Aristakes Lastivertc’i,” 88.

populations of western and central Armenia – of Arcn, Kars, Melitene and Ani – all of which had been under direct Byzantine control in the 1060s before falling to the Seljuks. Does this not make him a witness to provincial life and culture within the Byzantine empire? If so, then Aristakes needs to be thought of as a Byzantine author quite as much as an Armenian one, making his reflections on urban communities and identities as relevant for the study of eleventh-century Byzantium as for eleventh-century Armenia.”³⁵¹

In his 2018 thesis, *Situating the History Attributed to Aristakēs Lastivert‘i, 1000–1072*, Nik Matheou’s approach to this key source shares a great deal with Greenwood’s approach and goes further by providing a new and dynamic critical apparatus with which to better understand the *History*.³⁵² This complete reappraisal of the source brings greater consideration to the aims and ideological horizons of the composition and seeks to place the work within the context of the agency and historical situation of its author who was educated within and influenced by a profoundly Byzantine provincial environment during the eleventh century. In doing so, Matheou implements an effective critique on the methodologically nationalist appropriation of this eleventh century Armenian source by drawing our attention to the circumscribed use of the *History* in projecting a singular, national reading of Armenian history which has contributed implicitly to an idea of imperial collapse and separation which frames scholarly interpretations of Armeno-Byzantine relations after Manzikert.³⁵³

In 2017, Tara Andrews’ foundational study on the Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: *History as Apocalypse in a Crossroads of Cultures: Matthew of Edessa and His Chronicle* brought much needed re-assessment to the second key historiographical source which has largely informed scholarly reflections of Armeno-Byzantine relations after Manzikert.³⁵⁴ This twelfth century source informs much of our understanding of the Armenian experience of the eleventh century, though as a later text commenting on earlier events, it reflects as much about twelfth century attitudes as it does about earlier realities. Setting the composition into the context of its creation and the apocalyptic ideological horizon of its narrative, Andrews challenges the reader to rethink the hostility which is often assumed to be inherent in Matthew’s impression of the Byzantine Empire in his survey of eleventh century events, particularly after 1071. Speaking to the enduring interest in Byzantium in the compositional context of early twelfth-century Edessa, Andrews argues that Matthew’s *Chronicle* demonstrates that:

“Events in the capital (Constantinople) were still of sufficient interest to the Armenian community of northern Syria to be included among the documents that Urhayec‘i had at his disposal. The inclusion of these events also provides strong circumstantial evidence for the strength or weakness of the effective influence of Byzantine rulers in the region at particular points in time.”³⁵⁵

³⁵¹ Ibid., 101.

³⁵² Matheou, *Situating the History Attributed to Aristakēs Lastivert‘i*.

³⁵³ For an earlier attempt at reassessment see R. W. Thomson, “Aristakes of Lastivert and Armenian Reactions to Invasion,” in *Armenian Karin/Erzerum: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, ed. R. Hovannisian (Mazda Publishing, 2003). 73-88.

³⁵⁴ Andrews, *Matt‘ēos Urhayec‘i and His Chronicle*, 74-100.

³⁵⁵ Andrews, *Matt‘ēos Urhayec‘i*, 100

Andrews' work is arranged in terms of interactions between Armenians and their neighbours, and her chapter examining exchange with Byzantine Empire does not follow the narrative of loss and dislocation which is the hallmark of Armenian source based studies on the second half of the eleventh century.³⁵⁶ Through a new reading of the *Chronicle*, this study presents a fresh reflection on Armenian-Byzantine interactions in terms of evidence for varied degrees of reception, exchange and co-operation rather than endemic antagonism.³⁵⁷ In this approach, complex interplays and the multiple experiences of Armenian communities are put at the forefront of the argument and wholesale assertions about antagonism and resentment are qualified. As Andrews, Greenwood, and Matheou have proven, there is more valuable information concerning the enduring nature of Armeno-Byzantine relations after Manzikert in the works of Aristakēs Lastiverc'i and Matt'ēos Urhayec'i which can be unlocked by re-reading them within a more nuanced and thoughtful framework.³⁵⁸

This re-assessment trend has also been accompanied by the promotion of neglected source material which can offer entirely new perspectives on the nature of Armeno-Byzantine relations in the post 1071 provincial environment. In a study focused on reconstructing connections between the Empire and its eastern frontier in the decade after Manzikert, Werner Seibt has demonstrated how seal evidence can reveal new possibilities to interpret, correct, and augment the historical realities of this period. The seals themselves shed light on the maintenance of contact between the Imperial centre and its Armenian provincial populations between 1071 and 1081, primarily through titles and military service.³⁵⁹ It was Korobeinikov who, in 2010, posed the idea that Armenian colophons could offer a new approach to this period, both *vis-à-vis* the situation in the Empire's east, but also in terms of contact between Armenians and the Byzantine Empire. Korobeinikov used just one Armenian colophon (in M 7729) dated to the period between 1071-1095, but demonstrated its effectiveness as a source showing the recognition of imperial authority by an Armenian elite near Theodosiopolis/Karin in 1079, even though the city itself was no longer under direct Byzantine control.³⁶⁰ Korobeinikov argues that through the lens of Armenian colophons 'one should treat with caution the blood-curdling descriptions of the Turkish invasions found in the Byzantine and Armenian (historiographical) sources. For these incursions had yet to break Byzantine power in Armenia, and extensive areas were more or less unscathed'.³⁶¹ In the last decade this ongoing scholarly conversation has begun to entirely re-evaluate and nuance our interpretation of Armeno-Byzantine relations during the closing decades of the eleventh century, through both the reassessment of familiar source material and the promotion of largely neglected source material.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., 101-120

³⁵⁷ Ibid., 101.

³⁵⁸ See this framework also in T. Andrews, M. Rózsa, K. Prajda, L. Read, and A. Anđelović, "Re-Evaluating the Eleventh Century through Linked Events and Entities," *Historical Studies on Central Europe* 4 (1) (2024): 217-45.

³⁵⁹ Seibt, "The eastern frontier of Byzantium in the decennia after Mantzikert, 25–32.

Korobeinikov, "Raiders and Neighbours: The Turks (1040–1304)," 706

³⁶¹ Ibid., 701.

Graeco-Armenian Translations after Manzikert: Traditional Trends and New Possibilities

The treatment of Armenian translation activity in the decades immediately after the battle of Manzikert has, so far, remained within the traditional scholarly framework of Armeno-Byzantine relations after 1071. Through selective engagement with the surviving evidence and through a circumscribed presentation of the activities of the Grigor II Vkasēr, the translation of Greek hagiographic, patristic, and liturgical material into Armenian after Manzikert has been constructed as a singular, nationally inspired activity which facilitated the separation of Armenian communities from the Empire and fed the intellectual foundations of a new Armenian polity in Cilicia which emerged in the last decades of the eleventh century. Armenian hagiographical and liturgical translations viewed under the aegis of Vkasēr, who undertook his work in the fragmented environment of the post Manzikert Byzantine East, have been constructed as a means through which Armenian communities were able to emancipate themselves from the pressure placed upon them by the Byzantine Imperial Chalcedonian Church. As Gevorgyan puts it, Vkasēr stabilised and legitimised the Armenian Church by codifying and standardising feasts days and commemorations in Armenian through the translation of hagio-liturgical collections in a process which demarcated Byzantine encroachment and provided a basis for the codification of Armenian liturgical collections in the Cilician Kingdom of Armenia from the twelfth century onward.³⁶² In this model, the translation of Greek material into Armenian in the decades after 1071 has been presented as a device of separation from the Empire and as an initiation of a new intellectual movement which would coalesce in the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia.³⁶³

There is no doubt that for Armenian Miaphysites the translation activity of Vkasēr was a bedrock from which a distinctly Cilician Armenian culture would emerge. However, we should be conscious of the fact that this translation programme does reflect the continued currency of a coherent library of Greek Constantinopolitan knowledge to the pontiff of the Armenian Miaphysite Church in the fracturing post-Manzikert Byzantine east. After all, Grigor had himself been moulded by a life filtered through a distinctly Byzantine intellectual and cultural lens. Vkasēr's work continued to rely on Byzantine liturgical and hagiographical material, co-operation with Constantinople, and many of his translations display a temporal and authoritative deference to the Byzantine Empire. Take for example the content of his colophon attached to his translation of *The Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles by John Chrysostom* made in Constantinople in 1077, which is dated according to anno mundi, anno domini, the reign of the Emperor Michael VII and, strikingly, the term of Patriarch of Constantinople Kosmas I:

In the six thousandth five hundredth and first year of the creation of the world and in the one thousandth and seventy seventh since the coming of our Saviour (1077), and according to the Haykazan era of Xosrov, the five hundredth and twenty fifth (1076/7), in the Kingship of Michael Doukas, in the Patriarchate of Kozmas, believer in two natures...³⁶⁴

³⁶² Gevorgyan, "Grigor II Vkaseri Naxajēnac T'argmanakan," 95.

³⁶³ Ibid., 95. Ter Petrosyan, *Hay Hin T'argmanakan Grakanut'wn*, 10.

³⁶⁴ Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 1315, ff. 452r., trans L. Read.

As the studies of Renoux, Cowe, Gevorgyan, Avdalbegyan, Vardanyan and others have demonstrated, many of the enduring pulses of Byzantine influence found in extant Armenian liturgical and hagiographic manuscripts from the thirteenth century onward are the consequence of the activity of Grigor Vkakasēr and his own lived experience interacting with a process of textual translation from Byzantine collections which manifested itself in the context of contact with the Empire during the late eleventh century. We should exert caution with how far we accept that his activity represents an outright and conscious rejection of said Byzantine influence through the melding of these traditions with Syriac, Latin, and Armenian currents.

As the previous chapter has highlighted, however, there is also a wider spectrum of translation activity to consider after 1071 and, as the introduction to this chapter has hopefully illustrated, there is a more fluid and constructive scholarly model of post-Manzikert Armeno-Byzantine relations within which to situate and account for this translation activity in the closing decades of the eleventh century. The *Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* not only provides a device to rethink which Armenians were producing translations during the tenth and eleventh century and why, and to better understand how the Byzantine Empire used a system of text distribution and translation as a tool for shaping and conditioning the lived realities of Christian communities throughout its eastern frontier via Chalcedonian translators, but it also offers the potential to moderate a traditional scholarly model which frames translations from Greek into Armenian in the fracturing post-Manzikert Byzantine East solely as tools of separation from the Byzantine Empire. This chapter seeks to stress the ways in which evidence for the continued translation of hagiographical and liturgical texts from Greek models by Armenian Chalcedonians, as well as evidence for the proliferation of traditions surrounding the cult of saints and the performance of the liturgy, can provide a fresh way of reflecting on the enduring nature of Armeno-Byzantine relations after Manzikert as a point of continuing contact and shared influence. This is not to suggest that we should in any way replace a model of late-eleventh century Armenian translation activity as separation with a model for late-eleventh century translation activity as contact, rather this chapter aims to put forward a more dynamic model: one in which we can acknowledge that translations of Greek hagiographical, patristic, and liturgical texts became a medium through which some Armenians could resist Byzantine hegemony after Manzikert, but also one in which we can recognise its significance as a device through which Armenian Chalcedonians continued to participate in and respond to a shared Byzantine cultural and spiritual hegemony. Whilst political loyalties may have wavered and many Armenians undoubtedly turned away from the Empire at the close of the eleventh century, for many other Armenians, Byzantine ideas, habits of thought, and modes of practice continued to condition daily life.

Maintaining Contact or Losing Touch? Armenian Chalcedonians and the Byzantine Empire after 1071

The treatment of Armenian Chalcedonian participation in the political, cultural, and spiritual milieu of the Byzantine Empire during the closing decades of the eleventh century has also been tempered by the broad scholarly interpretation which has so far shaped our understanding of Armeno-Byzantine relations at this historical juncture. Garsoïan tackled the question of Armenian Chalcedonian participation in the Byzantine Empire in her seminal work: *The problem of Armenian integration into the Byzantine Empire*. In this lengthy and nuanced discussion, Garsoïan established subdivisions of Armenian identity in tenth- and eleventh-century Byzantium: i) the Armenian Chalcedonian Greeks speaking elite; ii) the wider Armenian Chalcedonian population (Τζῆτοι); iii) the Miaphysite Armenian elite; iv) the wider Miaphysite Armenian population. Drawing her article to its conclusion, Garsoïan argues that the majority of Armenians within the Empire remained Miaphysite.³⁶⁵ This, she suggests, represented an ‘imperial failure’ to assimilate these elites through conversion, arguing that the relocated Armenians ultimately ‘chose a path different from Byzantium’ and maintained ‘a sullen antagonism’ toward the Empire.³⁶⁶ To this point, Garsoïan adds that apart from the small Armenian Chalcedonian elite which was successfully absorbed, most of the Armenian Chalcedonian population were kept at arm’s length primarily because of their continued use of their own language in liturgical settings. In this model Armenian Chalcedonians supposedly found themselves in a liminal space; rejected by Armenian Miaphysite on account of their confessional identity and rejected by Greek-speaking Chalcedonians on account of their “Armenian-ness”.³⁶⁷ Cowe has reiterated the fact that Chalcedonian Armenians were not welcomed ‘by their co-religionists because of tensions against their ethnic identity’, arguing that at the same time their ‘rejection of their ancestral creed often had the effect of fomenting enmity against them’ from Armenian Miaphysite.³⁶⁸ The seminal 1980 study of Arutjunova-Fidanjan *Armjane-chalkidonity na vostočnych granicach Vizantijskoj imperii*, advanced a series of similar arguments, coming to the conclusion that Armenian Chalcedonians, ‘whilst retaining their Armenian characteristics in the linguistic, every-day and cultural aspects, came to be remote from their countrymen by virtue of the blind wall of religious discrepancies, and their co-religionists (Georgians and Greeks) showed them distrust and discredit just because of their ethnic and cultural isolation’.³⁶⁹ Garsoïan argued that ‘as a result of their double rejection, Armenian Chalcedonians seem to have remained in a sort of limbo vis-à-vis their relationship with the Empire’.³⁷⁰

This sense of a relationship in limbo is further compounded following the battle of Manzikert by the idea that Armenian Chalcedonian political activity was characterised by a growing sense of distance

³⁶⁵ Garsoïan, "The Problem of Armenian Integration", 111-115.

³⁶⁶ Ibid., 116.

³⁶⁷ Ibid., 116.

³⁶⁸ S. P. Cowe, "Armenian Integration to the Sebastia Region, Tenth-Eleventh Centuries," in *Armenian Sebastia/Sivas: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, ed. R. Hovannisian (Mazda Publishing, 2004), 135

³⁶⁹ V. A. Arutjunova-Fidanjan, *Armjane-chalkidonity na vostočnych granicach Vizantijskoj imperii (XIC)* (Hayasatan Publishing House, 1980), 192-195.

³⁷⁰ Garsoïan, "The Problem of Armenian Integration," 108.

from the Empire. Armenian Chalcedonian-Byzantine relations after Manzikert have traditionally been accessed through the lens of the semi-autonomous lordships which emerged in the centrifugal environment of the former Byzantine East. This is particularly true in the case of Philaretos Brachamios, a Byzantine Chalcedonian commander of Armenian descent who, from 1071 onward, began to amass his own power base in the vacuum that was created in southern and eastern Anatolia around the strongholds of Marash, Lykandos, Samosata, and Melitene in the ensuing imperial instability following Manzikert.³⁷¹ Subsequently, as Beihammer explains ‘this potentate managed to unite a large part of the local Armenian and Syrian aristocracy, the most important urban centres of the region, and the ecclesiastical leadership under the umbrella of his authority. Thus, he maintained a semi-independent status vis-à-vis the imperial government while impeding the penetration of these areas by Turkmen groups. Philaretos gradually extended his sway over the cities of Cilicia and the two key points in this Byzantine frontier region, Antioch and Edessa’.³⁷² Philaretos maintained his hold on regional power until 1084 with the Seljuk conquest of Antioch, after which much of his lordship fragmented. In the cities of Melitene and later Edessa however Philaretos was succeeded by other Armenian Chalcedonian members of his inner circle including Theodoros/T’oros in Melitene and then Edessa and Gabriel in Melitene.³⁷³ In his Chronicle, Matthew of Edessa describes Philaretos in the following manner:

In this period the impious and most evil prince Philaretos rose to tyranny, who was indeed the eldest son of Satan, for when Diogenes fell [this] venomous man, who was indeed a fore-runner to the Antichrist, tyrannised the land, demonic and capricious in his malicious behaviour. He began to make war against the Christian faithful, because he was an unbeliever in Christ, with no Armenian and no Roman recognising him, [although] he held the Roman religion and customs, and through his paternity and maternity he was Armenian, and from infancy he had been placed with his father’s brother in the monastery called Zōrvri-Kozeṛn in Hisn-Mansur district. He came from the desert and became filth of the desert; he took over many lands and cities and mercilessly destroyed many great princes and he came and dwelled in Mšar.³⁷⁴

Matthew is unequivocal in his perception of Philaretos as a lawless individual, who, despite adhering to Chalcedonian doctrine, was beyond the control of even the Empire. As Andrews reminds us Matthew was a ‘staunch defender of and adherent to the Armenian Miaphysite church throughout the Chronicle’, so it should perhaps not surprise us that he took such a dim view of this individual who did not share his confessional identity.³⁷⁵ However, Andrews also urges caution when assuming that Matthew’s view of Chalcedonian Armenians was monolithic. To describe Matthew as uniformly anti-Chalcedonian is, as Andrews argues, a simplistic description of Uṛhayec’s attitude toward ecclesiastical matters that does not do justice to his portrayal of various people, whether Chalcedonian or non-, throughout the Chronicle’.³⁷⁶

³⁷¹ Andrews, *Matt’ēos Uṛhayec’i*, 64.

³⁷² Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia*, 285.

³⁷³ Andrews, *Matt’ēos Uṛhayec’i*, 65.

³⁷⁴ *Žamanakagrut’iwn*, 206; English translation by Andrews, *Matt’ēos Uṛhayec’i*, 65.

³⁷⁵ Andrews, *Matt’ēos Uṛhayec’i*, 141.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 141.

Nonetheless, the chronicle of Matthew of Edessa tends to dominate our impression of these fragmentary lordships, and his spin on Philaretos' rule does, at very least, suggest that these Armenian-Chalcedonian lordships operated beyond the reach of Constantinople. The fact that Philaretos and later Gabriel sought affirmation of their rule by the Seljuk Sultan Malik-Shah by the mid 1080s tends to add to the impression of their progressive distancing from the Empire after 1071.³⁷⁷ Arutjunova-Fidanjan argues that after a century in loyal service to the Empire, the collapse of the Empire's eastern frontier in the 1070s, because of growing dissatisfaction with the Empire's inability to protect against 'oriental nomads', Chalcedonian Armenians, having lost both 'social status' and 'ethnic originality', turned away from the Empire.³⁷⁸ In this post-Manzikert environment, Arutjunova-Fidanjan classifies the Armenian Chalcedonians into three distinct groups which originated from 'hatred' for the Byzantine Empire: i) 'The first one 'stayed in Armenian to become dependent on the Georgian Catholicos', ii) the second 'transgressed into Cilicia to be subsequently obliterated in the struggle against the supporters of national independence' iii) the third moved to the western parts of the empire.³⁷⁹ Leaving the rigid nature of these categorisations aside, it fails to account for those Armenian Chalcedonians who continued to live in the fracturing eastern frontier, and continued to look to the Empire in their daily lives, even as political loyalties became increasingly untenable.

Though the Armenian Chalcedonian lordships which emerged in the fragmentary regions that comprised the Empire's eastern frontier grew increasingly further away from the direct control of the Byzantine Emperor, these semi-independent zones of influence continued to implement elements of rule and legitimacy 'related to the Byzantine administrative system and court hierarchy' which connected them to the Empire through a 'common political ideology rooted in Constantinopolitan imperial concepts' according to Beihammer.³⁸⁰ Philaretos, T'oros, and Gabriel all relied on, at least nominally, recognising imperial sovereignty and receiving imperial titles which endorsed their rule. As Andrews observes, Philaretos 'acknowledged Byzantine suzerainty in 1078 to the new emperor Nikephoros Botaneiates, who had been a comrade-in-arms in the years leading up to the battle of Manzikert'.³⁸¹ His rule over his territories was acknowledged in return by Botaneiates through the grant of the Byzantine title of Domestikos of the East, and was later acknowledged by Alexios Komnenos through his confirmation of Philaretos' office and his promotion to the ranks of *sebastos* and *protosebastos*.³⁸² Gabriel too continued to consolidate his power in Melitene through his Byzantine titles *δουκὸς* and *πρωτοκουροπαλάτης* (*doux* and *protokouropalates*).³⁸³ There is no doubt that these titles 'were still important signifiers of legitimacy, warranting his claims to political authority over the aforesaid regions and projecting a semblance of imperial rule embodied by his person'.³⁸⁴ This pattern is, it should be stressed, not unique in its modality of contact with Empire – Miaphysite

³⁷⁷ Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia*, 288.

³⁷⁸ Arutjunova-Fidanjan *Armjane-chalkidonity*, 192-195.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 192-195.

³⁸⁰ Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia*, 289.

³⁸¹ Andrews, *Matt'ēos Uṙhayec'ī*, 64.

³⁸² Ibid., 64.

³⁸³ **Gabriel of Melitene** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/156290/>): **Seal 33**, N. Oikonomides, *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 107; **Seal 70**, Oikonomides, *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 108

³⁸⁴ Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia*, 286.

Armenian lords such Marem of Tsamandos also continued to carry the imperial title of *kouropalātēs*.³⁸⁵ As Beihammer points out however ‘there is no scrap of evidence’ indicating that any of the Chalcedonian Armenian elites were acting on behalf of the emperor or were supported by Byzantine troops.³⁸⁶ The evidence leaves the impression that despite nominally relying on Byzantine titles and imperial ideology, these lordships were largely beyond imperial control. Relying primarily on the accounts of Matthew of Edessa, Armenian Chalcedonian contact with the Byzantine Empire after 1071 has largely been viewed through the lens of these upper elites, who took advantage of the fragmentary and centrifugal developments in the former Byzantine East to establish their own bases of power, deploying imperial titles and maintaining ‘a substrate of imperial traditions’ to ensure their legitimacy, but for all intents and purposes being entirely independent of any means of Constantinopolitan influence.³⁸⁷ Through this lens, Armenian Chalcedonian contact with the Empire after 1071 has been defined by its progressive political distancing.

In contrast to this model for loosening political contact between Armenian Chalcedonian led lordships and the Byzantine Empire based on adherence to and use of Byzantine titles, the confessional ties which bound Chalcedonian communities to Constantinople and a wider Byzantine spiritual and cultural *oikoumene* articulated through the production of hagiography, the commemoration of saints, and the performance of the liturgy which continued in the context of a long-term process of textual dissemination and translation from Greek Constantinopolitan models, provides another mode through which to view the state of the relationship between Armenian Chalcedonians and the Empire and its development after 1071. As Beihammer has argued ‘the Byzantine-Armenian (Chalcedonian) nobility residing in the places of Philaretos’ former realm preserved a strong sense of cohesion relying on a common religious identity’.³⁸⁸ It was this confessional identity that fundamentally continued to be a point of contact which linked Armenian Chalcedonian operating in the fracturing post-Manzikert former Byzantine east to the Empire through liturgical performance, sacral commemoration, and calendrical arrangement, which ensured the continued recognition and currency of imperial spiritual authority, and which continued to set them apart from the practices of their Miaphysite Armenian, West Syrian, or Islamic neighbours.

The contemporary Armenian evidence suggests that hagiographical and liturgical translations from Greek Constantinopolitan models formed a key medium through which the relationship between the Imperial centre and provincial Christian communities was mediated throughout the eleventh century. This process of dissemination and translation was designed, first and foremost, to provide a uniformity of spiritual practice. New hagiographical collections brought new saints, to be commemorated in a prescribed arrangement designed to re-orientate Armenian communities toward a normative Constantinopolitan centre. The injection of hagiographical and liturgical material via Chalcedonian Armenian translations of Greek models and the subsequent use of that material in a provincial context ensured a temporal and

³⁸⁵ T. F. Mathews with T. M. Van Lint, “The Kars-Tsamandos Group of Armenian Illuminated Manuscripts of the 11th Century,” in *Der Doppeladler: Byzanz und die Seldschuken in Anatolien vom späten 11. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert*, ed. N. Asutay-Effenberger and F. Daim (Römanisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums: 2014), 87.

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 286.

³⁸⁷ Ibid., 3.

³⁸⁸ Ibid., 289.

spiritual continuity between those communities and the Empire at large. The correct saints were now commemorated on the correct days, the liturgical year was now arranged according to the practices of the Church of Constantinople, and the appropriate readings were performed during daily services at the correct time. As with the Melkite communities of Antioch, the aim was clearly not to ‘hellenize’ provincial Chalcedonian Christian communities despite the impression given by previous scholarship in Armenian studies. The translation of works into Syriac, Arabic, and Armenian suggests that the use of Greek in daily life or in liturgical practice was not prioritised above all else: rather, it seems to have centred on the promotion and use of works arranged according to the rite of the Church of Constantinople which provided confessional continuity and communion with its spiritual authority.³⁸⁹ In doing so the Empire sought to provide a new common sense to the lived environment by introducing prescribed norms for spiritual practice. As long as Chalcedonian communities continued to translate the hagiographical and liturgical collections which promoted this spiritual common sense and aligned their commemorative and liturgical practices according to their content, as long as this common spiritual sense continued to carry currency amongst the populations which received it, the Byzantine Empire, I would argue, continued to be a source of spiritual and cultural authority and continued to play a role in the lived realities of Chalcedonian Armenians after Manzikert. The translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in 1092 and the ‘book of lections’ of Čortuanel (M 7729) in 1079, appear to testify exactly to the fact that Greek Constantinopolitan textual model and their translation continued to condition Armenian Chalcedonian textual practices in the decades after 1071. In doing so they suggest the continued currency of the trans-regional process of dissemination and translation, highlighted in chapter 2, which played a key role in shaping Armeno-Byzantine relations during the Empire’s expansion from the tenth century onward. However, they remain the sole surviving, securely datable, and identifiable textual sources to support this argument. We may be tempted to suggest they are isolated cases which do not support the contention that hagiographical production, the veneration of the cult of saints, and the performance of the liturgy meant that Constantinopolitan spiritual authority continued to hold currency for Armenian Chalcedonians or provided a broad uniformity of spiritual practice which continued to act as a mode of contact between Armenian Chalcedonians in the fracturing eastern frontier and the Empire as it had done during the preceding century. To get a better and more secure sense of how a long-term process of textual dissemination and translation continued to reinforce a lived reality of spiritual uniformity between Armenian Chalcedonians and the Byzantine Empire in the decades immediately following 1071 we can look to other evidence.

Performing the Liturgy

After moving from the imperial capital to the Black Mountain near Antioch c.a 1050, the Constantinopolitan monk Nikon penned his *Taktikon* in the late eleventh century. The *Taktikon* is a rich composition comprising a letter collection recording correspondences with monks and other ecclesiastical

³⁸⁹ Treiger, “The Eucharist in The Eucharist in Eleventh-Century Jerusalem,” 511. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992).

figures in and around Antioch, as well as several *typika* (foundation documents) for monasteries in the region.³⁹⁰ Nikon was himself a proponent of the Constantinopolitanisation of the provincial spiritual environment and the process of hagiographical and liturgical textual standardisation which followed the Empire's expansion during the tenth and eleventh century.³⁹¹ Unsurprisingly, the letters overwhelmingly address issues of ecclesiastical practice and provide a valuable source of reflection on the relationship between Arabic and Armenian speaking Chalcedonian Christians and the Empire in late eleventh-century Northern Syria. Within this text, Nikon preserves a letter exchange between the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, the patriarch of Jerusalem, and the monastic community of Saint Symeon *Thaumaturgos* on the Black Mountain concerning the spiritual practices of Armenian Chalcedonians (c.a 1080's).³⁹² The letter of the monk Gerasimos reads as follows:

Τούτους δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἡμῶν τοὺς λεγομένους Τζάτους, ὅπου ἂν εἰσιν καὶ εἰς οἷον κατοικοῦσιν τόπον, ἀπὸ πανταχόθεν ἐξερευνήσαντες εὗρομεν αὐτοὺς χάριτι Χριστοῦ ἀνεπιλήπτους εἰς τὰ τοιαῦτα, εἰς τε τὰ περὶ πίστεως ὁμοίως καὶ εἰς τὰ σχίσματα καὶ παρασυναγωγάς. Καὶ γάρ ὁ μητροπολίτης τῆς ἐνορίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς χώρας Μεσοποταμίας, ἐν ᾧ καὶ οἰκοῦσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄνωθεν χρόνων, οἱ καὶ διὰ τὰς ἐπιδρομὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐσκορπίσθησαν τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰς διαφόρους χώρας, ἀλλ' ὅμως, καθὼς καὶ εἶπαμεν, ὁ μητροπολίτης αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας πατριαρχοῦντος χειροτονεῖται, ὡς θρόνος ὑπάρχων πάσης Ἀνατολῆς. Καὶ ἔνθεσμον καὶ κανονικὸν αὐτῶν ἐστὶν τὸ ἱερατεῖον καὶ ὅλον αὐτῶν τὸ σύστημα καὶ ἔξω πάσης χάριτι Χριστοῦ ὑποψίας.

Καὶ ὅμως αὐτοῦ πάλιν τὸν βίον τοῦ μεγάλου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάβα ἐντυχόντες, εὐρήσετε τούτους συνοικοῦντας τὸν μέγα, καὶ εἰς τὴν Θεόχτιστον ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιτραπῆναι παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐν τῇ Ἀρμενίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ψάλλεσθαι τὴν ἀκολουθίαν, τοὺς δὲ Ἑλληνιστὰς παραμίαν πάλιν ψάλλειν, καθὼς καὶ οἱ ἐνταῦθα ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν ψάλλουσιν τῇ τῶν Ἀρμενίων διαλέκτῳ καὶ οἱ Ἑλληνισταὶ παραμίαν, εἰς διαφόρους δὲ χοροὺς, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν δύο ἐκκλησίας, μόνον τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ἑλληνιστὶ λέγουν, καθὼς καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις πατὴρ ἡμῶν Σάβας παρέδωκεν...³⁹³

Concerning our brothers called *Tzatoi*³⁹⁴, wherever they might be and in whatever place they reside, after having searched everywhere, we have found them, by the grace of Christ, blameless in this regard, both in matters of faith and likewise in schisms and ecclesiastical assemblies. And since the Metropolitan of their jurisdiction and of the land of Mesopotamia, where they have lived since the beginning of time - but because of the attacks of peoples some were separated from them in various lands - nevertheless, as we said, their Metropolitan, who is ordained by the Patriarchate of the Antiochenes, as a seat of the entire East. Their priesthood and their entire apparatus is lawful and canonical and, by the grace of Christ, beyond all suspicion.

And looking again at the life of our great father Sabas, you will find that they lived together with the great one, and in the God-created Church it was permitted by the saint that the liturgy be sung in the Armenian language while the Greeks sang separately, as also our brothers here sing in the Armenian

³⁹⁰ Nikon, *Das Taktikon*.

³⁹¹ J. Glynias, "Byzantine Monasticism on the Black Mountain West of Antioch in the 10th-11th Centuries," *Studies in Late Antiquity* volume 4, issue 4 (2020): 408–451.

³⁹² For Gerasimos, see: S. Noble and S. Treiger, *The Orthodox Church in the Arab World, 700–1700: An Anthology of Sources* (Northern Illinois University Press, 2014), 20.

³⁹³ *Das Taktikon*, 882-884.

³⁹⁴ R. W. Thomson, "Tzatoi," *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. Alexander Kazhdan (Oxford University Press, 1991).

language and the Greeks apart, but in a separate choir on account of not having two churches. They (the Chalcedonian Armenians) only say the *Trisagion*³⁹⁵ in Greek, as our holy father Sabas entrusted to us...³⁹⁶

This is an exceptionally valuable source in the context of the present argument. It is the first instance that we really begin to get a sense of how the process of textual dissemination of Greek hagiographical and liturgical material and its subsequent translation into Armenian shaped the participation of Armenian Chalcedonians within the wider Byzantine spiritual *oikoumene* from a non-Armenian perspective. It is worth noting that this is also an exceptional insight into how Armenian Chalcedonians living in Northern Syria and Mesopotamia were integrated into a regional church hierarchy under the oversight of the Patriarch of Antioch at the end of the eleventh century. Regrettably, the letter does not divulge any more specific details as to the parameters of ‘Mesopotamia’, nor the size or composition of the Armenian Chalcedonian under the oversight of the Metropolitan. Gerasimos does, however, note that they were spread much more widely throughout the fracturing eastern frontier of the Empire and that, rather significantly, they were all performing the liturgy and their daily spiritual practices according to the norms of the Constantinopolitan rite and the prescribed rules of the Imperial Chalcedonian hierarchy, but in Armenian alongside those performing in Greek including those Armenian Chalcedonians living in Gerasimos’ own monastic community in Northern Syria. This offers a vital reflection of lived practice, one which invites reflection on the types of material being used by Armenian Chalcedonians which would a) permit them to perform the liturgy correctly and b) do so in their own language. It maps very well onto the underlying mechanisms and goals behind the process of dissemination and translation highlighted in Chapter 2 which was designed to construct a spiritual uniformity through a prescribed textual canon, but not to hellenize the performance of festal commemoration or liturgical practice. This example allows us to, at least tentatively, go beyond an assumption that the process reflected by the translation of texts, like the *Martyrdom* and the ‘book of lections’ of Ćortuanel, provided a foundation for the construction of a common spiritual environment that connected Armenian Chalcedonians to a wider Byzantine *oikoumene*, to actually seeing how the production of liturgical texts in the Armenian language shaped their devotional practices around the normative modes of a Constantinopolitan centre, mediating their access to and permitting their participation in a shared spiritual environment that connected them to other Chalcedonians throughout the fracturing eastern frontier and, more broadly, a common Constantinopolitan spiritual norm. It suggests the surviving textual material in Armenian is indeed merely scratching the surface of evidence for Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity which rendered Greek collections into Armenian for liturgical and commemorative practice. Though we have no surviving material, evidently this process included Armenian Chalcedonians communities active in Northern Syria and Mesopotamia in the eleventh century alongside the textual evidence from Eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus. It likewise suggests that this translation

³⁹⁵ This is a crucial detail, emphasising the fact Chalcedonian Armenians did not recite the Trisagion with the miaphysite addition: ‘Ο σταυρωθεὶς δι’ ἡμᾶς.

³⁹⁶ *Das Taktikon*, 882-884, Trans L. Read.

activity must have also included other liturgically arranged texts into Armenian to permit the complete performance of the liturgy beyond the hagiographical (the Armenian *Martyrdom*), and the homiletic ('book of lections' of Ćortuanel) materials, a contention which finds further support in Melkite translation activity from Northern Syria which includes the above genres, but also the Greek *Triodion* and *Praxapostolos* into Syriac. Nikon's evidence weaves the Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity identified in the last chapter into a wider uniform spiritual common sense maintained and reinforced by common liturgical performance established by translation activity. In doing so, the *Taktikon* demonstrates the continued currency of a normative mode of spiritual practice underpinned by textual translation in a region becoming increasingly distant from Constantinopolitan political control after 1071.

The Iconography of Byzantine Provincial Seals and the Cult of Saints after Manzikert

If Nikon's *Taktikon* can help us to stress the idea that the spiritual common sense promoted by a process of text and translation continued to act as a source of continuity and connection between Chalcedonian Christians living throughout the fracturing eastern borders of the Byzantine Empire after 1071, and that their daily lives were still conditioned by a wider spiritual *oikoumene* promoted by the Church of Constantinople, we can utilise the rich corpus of surviving sphragistic evidence deriving from the same post-Manzikert environment to get a better impression of how the translation of hagiographical collections and the transformation of traditions surrounding the cult of saints continued to play a particularly tangible role in maintaining and manifesting a sense of spiritual uniformity and connectivity between Chalcedonian Armenians and their co-religionists. Werner Seibt has already demonstrated how seal evidence can shed light on the maintenance of contact between Chalcedonian Armenian living in the fracturing eastern frontier and the Imperial centre between 1071 and 1081, primarily through the use of titles which reflect continued military service or Imperial recognition.³⁹⁷ However these valuable carriers of personal piety have yet to be mobilised in a conversation which utilises them to reflect on a wider shared spiritual uniformity between Chalcedonian Armenians and the Empire consolidated through the veneration of a particular canon of saints after 1071.

In the context of the expansion of the Byzantine Empire during the tenth and eleventh century, the use of lead seals for securing official correspondences between a burgeoning new civil, military, and ecclesiastical provincial administration and the imperial capital became increasingly widespread. It is for this reason that we are fortunate to have an abundance of surviving lead seals from this period. Traditionally stamped on the reverse with an inscription bearing the owner's name and titles, often accompanied by an intercessory prayer, the obverse of these small pieces of lead carried designs which provide a rich source for tracing transformations in personal iconography. Far from being a programmatic process of reproducing a generic image to accompany any given seal, they provide a dynamic reflection of developing traditions surrounding the cult of saints throughout the Empire at different historical junctures and, as

³⁹⁷ Seibt, "The eastern frontier of Byzantium in the decennia after Mantzikert," 25–32.

Cotsonis argues, provide a unique and important means of investigating various aspects of the cult of saints in the Byzantine world'.³⁹⁸ The following table contains a corpus of seals belonging to contemporary Chalcedonian Greek notables, commanders, power brokers, and prospective claimants to the imperial throne operating in the Eastern frontier just prior to and after 1071:³⁹⁹

Chalcedonian Greek Seals 1071-1095

<u>Name</u>	<u>Saint (Seal no. ref PBW/DO)</u>	<u>Date Range</u>
Romanos IV ⁴⁰⁰	St Theodoros (PBW 1692)	1055-1065
	St Theodoros (PBW 1693)	1055-1065
	St Theodoros (PBW 5290)	1055-1065
	St Theodoros (PBW 5291)	1055-1065
Nikephoros III ⁴⁰¹	St Demetrios (PBW 853)	1074 – 1077
	St Demetrios (PBW 2771)	1074 – 1077
	St Demetrios (PBW 3008)	1068 – 1074
	St Demetrios (PBW 4739)	1068 – 1074
	Archangel Michael (PBW 6755)	1078
Alexios I Komnenos ⁴⁰²	St Demetrios (PBW 501)	1078-1081
	St Demetrios (PBW 2565)	1078-1081
	St Demetrios (PBW 4487)	1078-1081
	St Demetrios (PBW seal 3024)	1074-1077
	St Demetrios (PBW 220)	1078-1081
	St Demetrios (PBW 460)	1078-1081

³⁹⁸ Cotsonis, *The Religious Figural Imagery of Byzantine Lead Seals II*, 53.

³⁹⁹ Seals have been selected under the following criteria i) Secure date range of no more than twenty years prior to Manzikert and not after 1100, ii) individuals can be geographically situated as active in service to the Byzantine Empire in the eastern themes proximate to the dating of their seal iii) Available in online repositories. Further information will be provided in footnotes. The seals have been referred to either by their reference number in Prosopography of the Byzantine World or the Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Seal database.

⁴⁰⁰ **Romanos IV** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/108215/>) **Seal 1692**, K.M. Konstantopoulos, *Byzantiaka molyrdoboulla tou en Athenais Ethnikou Nomismatikon Mouseion* (Athens, 1917), no. 622 a; **Seal 1693**, I. Jordanov, *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, vol. 2: *Byzantine Seals with Family Names* (Agato, 2006), 128. **Seal 5290**; Jordanov, *Corpus 2*, no. 167, **Seal 5291**, Jordanov, *Corpus 2*, 128.

⁴⁰¹ **Nikephoros III** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/107947/>) **Seal 853**, G. Zacos and A. Vegler, *Byzantine Lead Seals I* (J. J. Augustin, 1972), no. 2690; **Seal 2771**, J. Nesbitt and N. Oikonomides, *Catalogue of Byzantine seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art 3: West, Northwest and Central Asia Minor and the Orient* (Dumbarton Oaks, 1996), no. 86. 18; **Seal 3008**, Zacos and Vegler, *Byzantine Lead Seals I*, no. 2689; **Seal 4739**, V. Laurent, *La collection C. Orghidan* (Paris: 1952), no. 235; **Seal 6755**, N.P. Lichačev, *Molivdovny Grečeskogo Vostoka*, (Moscow, 1991), 99, no. 2

⁴⁰² **Alexios Komnenos I** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/106238/>) **Seal 501**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, C. Morrisson and W. Seibt, *Sceaux byzantins de la collection Henri Seyrig* (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1991), no. 125, **Seal 2565**, V. Laurent, *Le Corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin II. L'administration centrale* (CNRS, 1981), no. 934; **Seal 4487**, I. Jordanov, "Byzantine Seals from the Village of Melnitsa (district of Elkhovo, Bulgaria)," *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 7 (2002): no. 3; **Seal 3024**, Zacos and Vegler, *Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 2704; **Seal 220**, J. Nesbitt and N. Oikonomides, *Catalogue of Byzantine seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art 1: Italy, North of the Balkans, North of the Black Sea* (Dumbarton Oaks, 1991), no. 1. 15; **Seal 460**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, C. Morrisson and W. Seibt, *Henri Seyrig*, no. 53, **Seal 4487**, Jordanov, "Byzantine Seals from the Village of Melnitsa," no. 3.

	St Demetrios (PBW 4487)	1078-1081
Gregorios Pakourianos ⁴⁰³	St Georgios (DO 1951.31.5.380)	After 1081
Andronikos Doukas ⁴⁰⁴	Theotokos (PBW 2798)	1072-1077
Alexandros Kabasilas ⁴⁰⁵	St Demetrios (PBW 6695)	Late 11 th C
Euthymios Karabitziotēs ⁴⁰⁶	Theotokos (PBW 762)	1060-1080
Georgios Serblias ⁴⁰⁷	St Nikolaos (PBW 5664)	Late 11 th C
Nikolaos Akapnes ⁴⁰⁸	St Nikolaos (PBW 4217)	After 1070
Leon Iasites ⁴⁰⁹	St Theodoros (PBW 3098) St Georgios (PBW 2560)	1065-1080
(Nikephoros) Basilakes ⁴¹⁰	Theotokos (PBW 3009)	1060-1080
Samuel Alousianos ⁴¹¹	Theotokos (PBW 887)	1060-1080
Joseph Tarchaneiotēs ⁴¹²	St Demetrios (PBW 516)	1072-1073

The seal imagery primarily bears late-antique military saints, primarily Saint Theodoros, Saint Demetrios, Saint Georgios, and the archangel Michael perhaps unsurprising choices for the military and civilian administration of the eastern frontier. As Cotsonis has pointed out in his recent and ongoing study of religious figural images on Byzantine seals from the 6th to 15th century, the use of religious figural imagery on surviving seals increased dramatically in the eleventh century. Based on a representative corpus of some

⁴⁰³ **Gregorios Pakourianos** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/107203/>): BZS.1947.2.1225: *Dumbarton Oaks, Coins and Seals Collection* (Dumbarton Oaks)

⁴⁰⁴ **Andronikos Doukas** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/106267/>): BZS.1958.106.1144: *Dumbarton Oaks, Coins and Seals Collection* (Dumbarton Oaks)

⁴⁰⁵ **Alexandros Kabasilas** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/106237/>): **Seal 6695**, BZS.1951.31.5.2025: *Dumbarton Oaks, Coins and Seals Collection* (Dumbarton Oaks).

⁴⁰⁶ **Euthymios Karabitziotēs** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/152801/>): **Seal 762**, W. Seibt and M.-L. Zarnitz, *Das byzantinische Bleisiegel als Kunstwerk* (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997) no. 2.2.1.

⁴⁰⁷ **Georgios Serblias** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/159565/>): **Seal 5664**, I. Jordanov, *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, vol. 2, 369.

⁴⁰⁸ **Nikolaos Akapnes** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/155234/>): **Seal 4217**, V. Šandrovskaja and W. Seibt, *Byzantinische Bleisiegel der Staatlichen Eremitage mit Familiennamen, 1 Teil: Sammlung Lichačev – Namen von A bis I* (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005) 30, n. 36.

⁴⁰⁹ **Leon Iasites** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/154246/>): **Seal 2560**, W. Seibt, *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich I. Teil, Kaiserhof* (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978) 140; **Seal 3098**, BZS.1955.1.3062 *Dumbarton Oaks, Coins and Seals Collection* (Dumbarton Oaks).

⁴¹⁰ **(Nikephoros) Basilakes** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/107948/>): I. Jordanov, *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, 80.

⁴¹¹ **Samuel Alousianos** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/108235/>): **Seal 887**, A.-K. Wassiliou and W. Seibt, *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich, II. Teil: Zentral- und Provinzialverwaltung* (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003), 244, n. 42.

⁴¹² **Joseph Tarchaneiotēs** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/107457/>): **Seal 516**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, C. Morrisson and W. Seibt, *Henri Seyrig*, no. 161.

7000 seals, Costonis has observed that 81.3% of surviving mid to late eleventh century seals employed religious figural imagery compared to just 44.1% in the previous century, with 70 % of those seals bearing images of saints.⁴¹³ Costonis points out however that only 4.3 % of the 3,000 saints found in the tenth-century *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* appear on Byzantine seals from this period, a statistic which reinforces the notion that the patterns of selection displayed by seal iconography were developed out of a conscious process of selection from a relatively small canon of saints and religious figures based on contemporary taste in personal piety and cult traditions.⁴¹⁴ By the eleventh century, placing a religious figure, particularly a saint, on a seal was commonplace, but the preponderance of saints Theodoros, Georgios, Demetrios amongst individuals at the centre and periphery of the Empire in the late eleventh century reflects another wider transformation in iconographic selection detected by Cotsonis during this period, who has demonstrated a decline in the use of the Theotokos in favour of the increasingly dominant use of late-antique military saints in the tenth and eleventh centuries.⁴¹⁵ Further to this, Cotsonis highlights an iconographic transformation undergone by these saints who began to emerge as implicit military figures on seals for the first time in the tenth and eleventh century.⁴¹⁶ In short, the occurrences identified in the above table are consistent with the wider transformations of iconographic tendencies on seals witnessed throughout the Empire during this period. However, the selection displayed by these seals becomes more instructive for the present conversation when it is compared to the seals of Armenian Chalcedonian figures operating in the same increasingly unstable conditions of the eastern frontier during the same period

Chalcedonian Armenian Seals 1071-1095⁴¹⁷

<u>Name</u>	<u>Saint (Seal no. ref PBW/DO)</u>	<u>Date Range</u>
Philaretos Brachamios ⁴¹⁸	St Theodoros (PBW 536)	1081-1090
	St Theodoros (PBW 704)	Late 11 th C
	St Demetrios (L), St Theodoros (R) (PBW 775)	1070
	St Theodoros (PBW 1667)	1071-1090
	St Theodoros (PBW 3888)	1078-1081
	St Theodoros (PBW 3889)	1078-1081

⁴¹³ Cotsonis, *The Religious Figural Imagery of Byzantine Lead Seals II*, 58.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., 65.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid., 70-71. M. White, *Military Saints in Byzantium and Rus, 900–1200* (Cambridge University Press, 2013)

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., 102-123.

⁴¹⁷ Seals have been selected under the following criteria i) Secure date range of no more than twenty years prior to Manzikert and not after 1100, ii) individuals can be geographically situated as active in service to the Byzantine Empire in the eastern themes proximate to the dating of their seal iii) Available in online repositories iv) Confessional identity supported by secondary literature. Further information will be provided in footnotes where necessary. The seals have been referred to either by their reference number in Prosopography of the Byzantine World or the Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Seal database.

⁴¹⁸ **Philaretos Brachamios** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/108167/>): **Seal 536**, Cheynet, C. Morrisson and W. Seibt, *Sceaux byzantins de la collection Henri Seyrig*; **Seal 704** - J-Cl. Cheynet, “Sceaux byzantins des musées d’Antioche et de Tarse,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 12 (1994): no. 56; **Seal 775**, J-Cl. Cheynet and J-F Vannier, *Études prosopographiques* (Publications de la Sorbonne, 1986), 67; **Seal 1667**, Cheynet and Vannier, *Études prosopographiques*, 69; **Seal 3888**, Cheynet and Vannier, *Études prosopographiques* 69; **Seal 3889**, *Spink Auction 135: Byzantine Seals from the collection of George Zacos III* (London, 1999), 123; **Seal 3890**, I. Jordanov, *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, 103; **Seal 5907**, V. Laurent, *Les sceaux byzantins du Médaillier Vatican* (Vatican City, 1962), no. 113.

	St Theodoros (PBW 3890)	1081-1090
	St Theodoros (PBW 5907)	1078-1081
Gabriel of Melitene ⁴¹⁹	St Georgios, St Nikolaos, St Ioannes Prodromos (PBW 33)	Ca. 1090
	St Georgios, St Nikolaos, St Ioannes Prodromos (PBW 70)	Ca. 1090
Krakourates ⁴²⁰	St Eudoxius (PBW 707)	Late 11 th C
T'oros of Edessa ⁴²¹	St Theodoros (PBW 30)	1090-1098
	St Theodoros (PBW 4355)	1074
	St Theodoros (PBW 4356)	1074
	St Theodoros (PBW 4357)	Late 11 th C
T'at'oul of Marash ⁴²²	St Theodoros (PBW 3891)	Late 11 th C
	St Theodoros (PBW 3892)	Late 11 th C
Constantine of Kárkár ⁴²³	St Theodoros, St Georgios (DO 58.106.3263)	After 1080
Apusahl Arcruni ⁴²⁴	St Demetrios, St Theodoros (PBW 3887)	After 1060
	St Demetrios (PBW 3887)	
Atom Arcruni ⁴²⁵	St Georgios (PBW 5846)	After 1060
Apl'arip Arcruni ⁴²⁶	St Georgios (PBW 452)	Late 11 th C
	St Georgios (PBW 6722)	

Philaretos Brachamios adopted St Theodoros and St Demetrios on the reverse of his administrative seals, the latter saint was also adopted by his son Elpidios.⁴²⁷ As the semi-independent ruler of Edessa, T'oros

⁴¹⁹ **Gabriel of Melitene** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/156290/>): **Seal 33**, N. Oikonomides, *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 107; **Seal 70**, Oikonomides, *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 108

⁴²⁰ **Krakourates** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/154110/>): **Seal 707**, Seibt, "The eastern frontier of Byzantium," 28.

⁴²¹ **T'oros of Edessa** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/156191/>): **Seal 30**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, *Sceaux de la collection Zacos (Bibliothèque nationale de France) se rapportant aux provinces orientales de l'Empire byzantin* (Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2001), no. 34; **Seal 4355**, V. Šandrovskaja and W. Seibt, *Byzantinische Bleisiegel der Staatlichen Eremitage mit Familiennamen, 1 Teil*, no. 62; **Seal 4356**, V. Šandrovskaja and W. Seibt, *Byzantinische Bleisiegel*, no. 45; **Seal 4357**, V. Šandrovskaja and W. Seibt, *Byzantinische Bleisiegel*, no. 46.

⁴²² **Ta't'oul of Marash** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/155751/>): **Seal 3891**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, "Thathoul, archonte des archontes," *Revue des études byzantines* 48 (1990): 233; **Seal 3892**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, "Thathoul," 233.

⁴²³ **Constantine of Kárkár** (<https://www.doaks.org/resources/seals/byzantine-seals/BZS.1958.106.3263/view>), Seibt, "The eastern frontier of Byzantium," 30.

⁴²⁴ **Apusahl Arcruni** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/152249/>) **Seal 3887**, *Spink Auction 132. Byzantine Seals from the collection of George Zacos II* (London, 1999), no. 121.

⁴²⁵ **Atouemes Arcruni** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/159384/>): **Seal 5846**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, "De Tziliapert A Sebaste," *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* vol. 9 (2006): 219- 220.

⁴²⁶ **Apl'arip Arcruni** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/152247/>): **Seal 452**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, C. Morrisson and W. Seibt, *Sceaux byzantins*, no. 40, **Seal 6722**, J.-Cl. Cheynet, C. Morrisson and W. Seibt, *Sceaux byzantins*, no. 44.

⁴²⁷ Dédéyan, *Les Arméniens*, fig. 87.

adopted St Theodoros, the same saint chosen by his Chalcedonian Armenian namesake T'oros, also known as T'at'oul of Marash. On Gabriel of Melitene's seals from 1090, we find the three saints Nikolaos, Georgios, and Ioannes Proedromos (John the Baptist). Constantine of Kaḱkaí, modern day Gerger, a Byzantine-Armenian commander who built a semi-autonomous power base in the region toward the end of the 1080s, adopted both saints Theodoros and saint Georgios on his seals.⁴²⁸ Apusahl (Kouropalates, Proedros), the son of the late king of Vaspurakan, Yovhannēs Senek'erim, who was active as a Byzantine representative in Sebastia in the period immediately before and after 1071 elected to adopt Demetrios and Theodoros, whilst his brother Atom (*proedros*) Arcruni and their relative Apllarip (possibly a nephew or great-nephew) chose Saint Georgios for the obverse of their seals. The stand-out example in the context of the present conversation is saint Eudoxios commemorated on the seal of the enigmatic Krakourates ἄρχων τῶν ἀρχόντων (archon of the archons), operating in Commagene at the close of the eleventh century, the implications of which we will return to shortly.

The seal material shows a concordant pool of selection between Chalcedonian Armenian military and administrative figures operating in the fragmented post-Mantzikert Byzantine East and their co-confessional colleagues, based on selection from a particular pool of the same popular late antique military saints. The immediate conclusion that we might take from this concordance is that it provides evidence for Armenian Chalcedonian following the same patterns of personal piety established by common devotional practices surrounding the cult of saints specific to dominant trends punctuating the milieu of tenth and eleventh century Byzantine Empire. However, we should be conscious to caveat this conclusion by reflecting on the greater variety of potential reasons behind the choices on Chalcedonian Armeno-Byzantine seals, allowing for both reflections of bigger trends and more personal motivating factors. In the tenth-century *History of the House of Arcrunik'*, the Armenian historian Tovma Arcruni recalls his ancestor, King Gagik Arcruni I of Vaspurakan consecrated a shrine to 'the valiant soldier Saint George', which suggests that a family cult dedicated to him was active from at least the early tenth century.⁴²⁹ Dedeyan has demonstrated that the Arcruni family exported a number of their relics and local cults with them to their new areas of habitation in and around Sebasteia and Cilicia following the exchange of the Kingdom of Vaspurakan with the Byzantine Empire during the eleventh century, including the relics of Saint Peter and a piece of the Holy Cross.⁴³⁰ We might assume that evidence for the use of Saint Georgios on the seals of Atouemes and Apllarip Arcruni suggest that this well attested family cult was also transported with the Arcruni as they moved into the service of the Byzantine Empire. Their seal iconography may then reflect a more personal and familial emphasis behind this expression of personal piety rather than an imperial trend influenced one, though these need not be mutually exclusive categories.

Where evidence for the use of Saint Georgios suggests the continued selection of a saint based on familial tradition, the appearance of saints Demetrios and Theodoros on the seals of Apusahl is far more

⁴²⁸ Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia*, 293.

⁴²⁹ T'ovma Arcruni, *History of the House of the Arcrunik'*, trans. R. W. Thomson (Wayne University State Press, 1985), 315.

⁴³⁰ Dédéyan, *Les Arméniens*, 311 – 312.

indicative of an alteration to expressions of personal piety in response to transformation in confessional identity. During the reign of Constantine X, both Apusahl and Atouemes Arcruni arrived in Constantinople to profess Chalcedonianism and agreed to an act of union with the Byzantine Imperial Church. As Matthew of Edessa records, the brothers brought with them the vardapet Yakob K'arap' nec' i (Sanahnec' i), who according to Edessa 'went a little to the Roman side concerning the duality of Christ'.⁴³¹ Matthew of Edessa tells us that this prospective act of union was apparently interrupted by the young Armenian ex-king Gagik II, who wrote his own uncompromising, confession of faith repudiating the Byzantine Imperial Church in favour of his ancestral Armenian Church.⁴³² Andrews has recently reiterated a point stressed by Mahe that the incident is unlikely to have happened as Urhayec' i reports: 'Gagik appeared in Constantinople, made a profession of faith, and left angry and irritated. Urhayec' i reports no further attempts by Constantine X to intervene in Armenian ecclesiastical affairs, although the pressure he had previously exerted on the Armenian princes and clerics had been constant. Was he really convinced of the truth of Armenian orthodoxy, or did Gagik leave the court angrily because he had finally been coerced into an act of union? Perhaps Urhayec' i adopted a version of events developed by Sanahnec' i, in which he chose to salvage Gagik's reputation by denying the union and substituting his version of an uncompromising confession of faith by the last king of Armenia'.⁴³³ If we take the account of Matthew of Edessa with a pinch of salt as advised, the very least we can say is that the confessional identity of the Arcruni family shifted in the mid-eleventh century toward a conscious profession of Chalcedonianism. It also appears that their descendant Apllarip followed suit. A twelfth-century colophon reflecting on his localised rule in the late eleventh century records that:

Apllarip, from among the Armenian princes from the house of Vaspurakan (Arcruni), being faithful, prudent, and brave in military affairs, was sent by the autokrator Alexios to the districts of Cilicia to rule the capital of Tarsus and Mamistra. He came there and ruled them according to their native regulations and laws. And he remained faithful to the Greeks, and he built temples of prayer in the mountainous and plain districts...⁴³⁴

The choices of Demetrios and Theodoros in the seal of Apusahl, who otherwise do not appear in the commemorative choices of the Arcruni family before this moment may be far more indicative of an active effort to model his seal iconography and personal piety on the most popular active cults of commemoration engaged in by his Chalcedonian Greek contemporaries promoted by a shift in his confessional identity. Perhaps for Atouemes and Apllarip, the continued choice of Saint Georgios provided a convenient option which drew on an established family tradition but also sat comfortably with the popularity of Saint George amongst their Chalcedonian contemporaries.

⁴³¹ Andrews, *Matt' eos Urhayec' i*, 152.

⁴³² Ibid., 149.

⁴³³ Ibid., 149.

⁴³⁴ Garsoïan, "The Problem of Armenian Integration", 86, trans. Garsoïan.

To further emphasise the significance of the concordance in the above tables we can draw a comparison to the, admittedly smaller, corpus of seals belonging to contemporary Armenian Miaphysites in service to the Byzantine Empire in the mid to late eleventh century:

Miaphysite Armenian Seals 1071-1095

<u>Name</u>	<u>Saint</u>	<u>Date Range</u>
Grigor Arsakides ⁴³⁵	No Iconography (PBW 3282)	1051-1058
Apelgariphes Arsakides ⁴³⁶	St Gregory, Archbishop of Greater Armenia (PBW 3493)	Mid to Late eleventh century
Marem ⁴³⁷	Theotokos (with Armenian intercessory prayer) (PBW 779)	After 1071
Gagik II ⁴³⁸	St John Chrysostom (with Arm)	1071-1073

The former Armenian King Gagik II, who we encountered openly defending his Miaphysite identity before the Emperor Constantine in the *Chronicle* of Matthew of Edessa, adopted John Chrysostom alongside his titles *kuropalates* and *doux*, sometime during his term Byzantine *doux* of the theme of Charsianon attested by his manifold imperial titles in a second seal with no iconography: *prōtoproedros*, of the imperial bedchamber, *megas komēs* of the stable and *megas doux* of Charsianon (*πρωτοπρόεδρος, ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος, μέγας κόμης τοῦ στάβλου καὶ μέγας δοῦξ Χαρσιανοῦ*).⁴³⁹ Marem, the daughter of the former Armenian King Gagik-Abbas of Kars, and Kouropalates of the city of Tsamandos until 1078 adopted the image of the Theotokos, of the Virgin of the Blachernitissa type, with an accompanying Armenian inscription bearing her name and title ‘Marem is Kourapalat’ (Մարեմիս է կուրապալատ) and an intercessory prayer in Greek: Mother of God, come to the aid of Maria Kuropalatissa (Θεοτόκε βοήθει Μαρία κουροπαλατίσση).⁴⁴⁰ Marem is also attested to in a contemporary colophon dated to the late 1070s:

⁴³⁵ **Grigor Arsakides** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/153036/>) **Seal 3282**, E. McGeer, J. Nesbitt and N. Oikonomides, *Catalogue of Byzantine seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art* 4, no. 76.

⁴³⁶ **Apelgariphes Arsakides** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/152244/>) **Seal 3493**, W. Seibt, “Arsakides-Arsakuni armenische Aristokraten in byzantinischen Diensten,” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 44 (1994): 349-359.

⁴³⁷ **Marem** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/154455/>): **Seal 779**, Mathews with Van Lint, “The Kars-Tsamandos Group of Armenian Illuminated Manuscripts of the 11th Century,” 85.

⁴³⁸ **Gagik II** (<https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/107098/>): Seibt, “The eastern frontier of Byzantium,” 25-26.

⁴³⁹ Seibt, “The eastern frontier of Byzantium,” 25-26. W. Seibt, “War Gagik II. von Grossarmenien ca.1072–1073 Μέγας δοῦξ Χαρσιανοῦ?,” in *Tò Ἑλληνικόν: Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis*, 2 vols, II (New Rochelle, 1993), 159–68.

⁴⁴⁰ C. Hannick, “Use and abuse of the ‘image’ of the Theotokos in the political life of Byzantium (with special reference to the iconoclast period),” in *Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, ed. M. Vassilaki (Ashgate, 2005). 77 – 89.

Ի հինգհարիւրերորդի քսաներորդի եաւթներորդի ամի թուարեւութեան Հայոց ի թագաւորութեանն Յունաց Միխայիլին որդւոյ Տուկծին կայսերն Հռոմոց ի կուրապաղատութեանն Մարեամայ բարեպաշտի և հգաւրի մեր Պատրիկի և տեառն որդւոյ, յամն աստուածապատիւ և հոգևոր տէրանց մերոց Հայոց կաթողիկոսաց տեառն Գրիգորի և տեառն Գեորգայ եւ Սմբատ Պատրիկ որդի Վահրամայ ցանկացաւ եղէ աստուծային տառիս սրբոյ Աւետարանիս:⁴⁴¹

In the five-hundredth and twenty-seventh year of the Armenian era, in the kingship of the Greeks of Michael, son of Doukas, Kaiser of the Romans, in the office of the *kurapatat* (Kouropalates) of the pious and powerful Marem, our Patrikios and daughter of our Lord, in the years of our divinely honoured and spiritual lords, the Katholikoi of Armenia, Lords Grigor and Georg, I, Smbat *patrikios*, son of Vahram, became desirous of the divine letters of this holy Gospel.⁴⁴²

The enigmatic Apelgariphes, *anthypatos*, *patrikios*, *vestes*, and *strategos* of Seleukeia, selected Saint Gregorios archbishop of Great Armenia (Ο ἅγιος Γρηγόριος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Μεγάλης Ἀρμενίας), the only surviving instance of Gregory the Illuminator's appearance on the iconography of a Byzantine lead seal. We know very little about Apelgariphes, other than the fact that his surname Arsakides, the Greek form used to refer to members of the Armenian Pahlavuni family, tell us that he was a member of a prominent Armenian Miaphysite family in service to the Byzantine Empire in the eastern frontier during the eleventh century. He was a relative of Grigor Pahlavuni Magistros, the Armenian *doux* of Taron and Mesopotamia whose seals do not adopt any iconography. Dedeyan refers to Apelgariphes as both an uncle and nephew of Grigor at different points of his study *Les Arméniens entre Grecs Musulmans et Croisés*, but the scholarly consensus seems to suggest Apelgariphes was active in the mid to late eleventh century and so was a descendent rather than an ancestor of Grigor Magistros. Dedeyan has attributed this occurrence to the personal devotional tendencies of the Pahlavuni family, who claimed Gregory the Illuminator as their ancestor.⁴⁴³

There is a striking absence of the late-antique military saints which are so commonly distributed amongst Chalcedonians figures in the civil and military administration of the eastern frontier. It is crucial to firstly stress that this is not evidence for Miaphysite Armenians using religious figures which did not appear on the seals of Chalcedonians in service to the Empire - both the Theotokos and John Chrysostom are attested to on the seals of Chalcedonian figures in imperial service earlier in the eleventh century, albeit far less frequently than the more predominant use of the military saints⁴⁴⁴ - nor is it evidence that Chalcedonians were commemorating uniquely 'Chalcedonian' saints, or that Armenian Miaphysite were commemorating uniquely 'Miaphysite' saints, all of the saints in these tables had an entirely cross-confessional resonance. Rather what we see here is a different reflection of choice which speaks to different responses to growing cult trends throughout the Empire in the context of the post-Manzikert Byzantine East. Armenian Chalcedonians clearly leant more into the newly dominant use of late antique military saints

⁴⁴¹ Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 275, f. 268r.

⁴⁴² Ibid., trans. L. Read.

⁴⁴³ Dédéyan, *Les Arméniens*, plates.

⁴⁴⁴ Cotsonis, *The Religious Figural Imagery of Byzantine Lead Seals II*, 71-72., 61.

which linked their iconographic choices and personal piety more closely to the choices of their co-confessionals than with their Armenian Miaphysite colleagues in service to the Empire.

Commemorating Saint Eudoxius: Maintaining Confessional Continuity after Manzikert

Seals acted as carriers of personal piety and as reflections of the role of devotional iconography in the act of conscious self-representation. The uniformity displayed by the Chalcedonian seal material is distinct. Comparison between the seal iconography of Chalcedonians active in the Byzantine East before and after Manzikert serves to illustrate the fact that Armenian Chalcedonians were buying into the same patterns of personal piety embedded in contemporary sphragistic trends which reflects a popular tendency particular to tenth and eleventh-century Byzantium characterized by the trans-regional veneration of a canon of late-antique military saints. When it comes to the cult of saints, evidence for such a broad trans-regional uniformity and reception is particularly striking. We should bear in mind that, for the most part, traditions surrounding commemoration and veneration of saints find their origin in a highly localised environment, in which saints met the spiritual needs of their local community and were memorialized by that same community. What we see throughout the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and eleventh century is the distinct transportation of a group of military saints beyond their local environment, whereby acts of personal and communal devotion surrounding the cult of saints were injected into the lived environment of communities throughout the broad geographical span of the Empire. But how was this uniformity of saintly taste that we encounter on the seals achieved and why was it still present in locations becoming increasingly distant from the imperial centre at the end of eleventh century?

Transforming local patterns of personal piety and communal cult traditions in the provincial localities of the eastern frontier to correspond to the tastes of a Constantinopolitan centre required the injection of material which reinforced such tendencies and encouraged their adoption by provincial Christian communities. This should firstly give us pause to acknowledge the role that seals themselves played in this process. As carriers of iconographic preferences and as tools used in support of the new developing Byzantine infrastructure throughout the eastern frontier, seals would have provided a powerful visual reinforcement of which particular saints were favoured and actively promoted throughout the wider Empire. As regions throughout the eastern frontier were progressively annexed and their populations were gradually absorbed into imperial service during the tenth and eleventh century, seal material provided a point of reference which signalled the direction for conscious devotional choices on their own seals. In this more material regard, we can also draw a connection to the foundation of new Chalcedonian eparchies formed on former Armenian royal patrimonial lands detailed *Notitiae Episcopatum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*. Let us recall that in *Notitia* 10, we find the new diocese of Hagios Georgios emerging alongside the new thematic system in the region Vaspurakan. In his *Répertoire Des Monastères Arméniens*, Michel Thierry also draws our attention to the foundation of monastery of St T'oros (Theodoros) in Berdak, just south of Theodosiupolis in the tenth or eleventh century – which appears to be concordant with the

type of establishing of foundations recorded in the *Notitiae Episcopatum*.⁴⁴⁵ We can assume that, to a degree, the conscious selection of iconography amongst Armenian Chalcedonians in the Byzantine Empire displayed on the seals was, at least in part, also encouraged by the devotional underpinnings of new Chalcedonian sees which now punctuated the lived environment of the Caucasus, Anatolia, Northern Mesopotamia, and Northern Syria, during the eleventh century.

The consistency that we find on seal iconography naturally required more foundational building blocks which provided the necessary tools for understanding the traditions surrounding those saints in order to incorporate them into personal and communal devotional practices. The uniformity in iconographic selection appears to link well with the type of transformation and conditioning of the local spiritual environment engendered by the dissemination and translation of hagiographical literature and traditions surrounding the cults of saints highlighted throughout in the second chapter of this thesis. Cotsonis argues that changing approaches to hagiographical production in the literary and spiritual milieu of the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and eleventh century underpinned concurrent developments in seal iconography. As he points out: the increasing tendency toward hagiographical collection and *metaphrasis* from the ninth century onward, culminating in the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* and the Metaphrastic *Menologion* and in the incorporation of daily hagiographic readings into an increasingly standardised liturgical office, maps neatly onto ‘a watershed mark for the depiction of saints on seals’ with a ‘critical turning point is the 10th century, a time when the largest percentile increase occurred, from 28.4% to 58.5%, that is, more than a 100% increment’.⁴⁴⁶ To this Cotsonis adds the observations that the expansion of the Empire in the tenth and eleventh century brought many localities in Cappadocia, Syria, and the Caucasus associated with the saints which made up the prescribed Constantinopolitan hagiographical collections back under imperial control for the first time in three or more centuries and in doing so generated increased mobility of veneration at their cultic sites and a wider engagement with them throughout the Empire.⁴⁴⁷ It was then the expansion of the Empire which brought interest in regional saints back into their original setting. Setting this against the backdrop of the tenth century campaigns of Nikephoros II Phokas and John I Tzimiskes and the reconquest in Asia Minor and Syria, Cotsonis argues that the trend exhibited by the seals in favour of late antique military saints in particular mirrored a shift toward the increasing militarisation of Byzantine society.⁴⁴⁸ Cotsonis draws an implicit connection between hagiographical textual production and the expansion of the Empire as underlying processes which converged and manifested themselves in common patterns of personal piety based primarily on late-antique military saints. In essence, sphragistic evidence appears to be a pretty strong indicator of underlying hagiographical, spiritual, and political activity. Alexandre Roberts has also drawn a connection between the use of certain saints on Byzantine administrative seals and the developing hagiographical textual tastes of Melkite communities in Antioch, highlighting the role of seal iconography as a measure of Byzantine

⁴⁴⁵ M. Thierry, *Répertoire Des Monastères Arméniens* (Brepols, 1993), 88.

⁴⁴⁶ Cotsonis, *The Religious Figural Imagery of Byzantine Lead Seals II*, 74.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid., 73.

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid., 131.

sensibilities surrounding the cult of saints being projected into the provincial environment and their adoption by Chalcedonian Christians, underpinned and reinforced by hagiographical production as the case of Abdallah ibn al-Fadl's eleventh century translations of *encomia* to Saints Demetrios and Nikolaos into Arabic illustrate.⁴⁴⁹

The contention is that the seal evidence which shows a clear uniformity in common patterns of devotional practice and personal piety between Armenian Chalcedonians and their co-confessionals throughout the fracturing Byzantine east after 1071 is a product of the relationship between the expansion of the Empire and the process of hagiographical dissemination and translation which followed this expansion, and which had conditioned this relationship during the preceding century. This argument manifests itself clearly in the case of Saint Eudoxios. Commemorated on the seal of the enigmatic Chalcedonian commander Krakourates ἄρχοντι τῶν ἀρχόντων (archon of the archons), operating in Commagene at the very end of the eleventh/start of the twelfth century, the appearance of Saint Eudoxios is a rare but appropriate occurrence in the schema of surviving material.⁴⁵⁰ It is, at present, the only example of Saint Eudoxios represented on Byzantine seal iconography and his appearance on the seal of Krakourates in the late eleventh century draws a connection between the commemoration of the saint and an Armenian Chalcedonian commander operating some fifty miles south of Melitene in the late eleventh century.⁴⁵¹ The translation of the *Martyrdom* in 1092, as has been reiterated throughout this chapter, had a spiritual function, one which facilitated the commemoration and memorialisation of saint Eudoxios and his companions in the localised fractious environment of the former Byzantine East. On its own, it gives us a unique perspective on the local functioning of communal commemoration amongst Armenian Chalcedonians in Melitene, and the connection between Saint Eudoxios and an Armenian Chalcedonian community living in the local urban environment of the city of his martyrdom, a relationship which had been renewed and reinvigorated by the translation of hagiographical material memorializing his martyrdom sourced from hagiographical collections which carried the norms of the Constantinopolitan rite throughout the tenth and eleventh century. In combination with the seal of Krakourates and a better understanding of patterns in the sphragistic evidence, the translation can be situated within a much wider trend, whereby the conscious selection of intercessory figures on Byzantine seals was underpinned by developments in hagiographical activity linked implicitly to the expansion of the Empire. The appearance of an Armenian translation of both an abbreviated and full version of the *Martyrdom* from Byzantine hagiographical collections injected into the provincial environment in the tenth and eleventh century and the subsequent appearance of Eudoxios on the seal of an Armenian Chalcedonian figure at the same juncture in the fracturing eastern

⁴⁴⁹ Roberts, *Reason and Revelation*, 107-108.

⁴⁵⁰ Though traditionally but erroneously identified as St. Paul of Tarsus, Seibt has argued that the epigraphy on the seal refers to Saint Eudoxios: W. Seibt, "The eastern frontier", a conclusion which has been supported by Cotsonis who has included Saint Eudoxios in his survey of seals from the eleventh century. An image of Eudoxios with a beard appears in London, British Library, Add. 11870, f. 67r. further supporting Seibt's identification.

⁴⁵¹ The identity of Krakourates has been subject to debate, Dedeyan concluded that he was likely of Chalcedonian Armenian identity, from the Armeno-Byzantine family name Kurtikios, Dédéyan, *Les Arméniens entre Grecs, Musulmans et Croisés*, 942. Seibt has recently challenged the veracity of this claim suggesting he may have been a Chalcedonian of Kurdish origin, Seibt, "The eastern frontier", 29-30.

frontier is then no coincidence. This evidence draws the exact type of connection which supports Cotsonis' and Roberts' contention that seal evidence is underpinned by patterns of hagiographical textual production and translation which accompanied the expansion of the Empire and injected contemporary Byzantine tastes that shaped personal and communal patterns of devotion amongst Chalcedonian Christians living within the eastern frontier. It suggests that the Armenian Chalcedonians who sponsored the translation of the *Martyrdom* were part of and contributed to a more active engagement with the cult of Saint Eudoxios in the contemporary Chalcedonian milieu of the eastern frontier, which was itself a local expression of a much wider contemporary confessional trend toward the increasingly active veneration of late-antique military saints promoted by a Constantinopolitan centre. The evidence for an increasingly active and diverse cult of Saint Eudoxios at the end of the eleventh century manifested in Armenian Chalcedonian text and seal material ultimately stands as testament to the long-term effects of the reception of Constantinopolitan trends surrounding the cult of saints, their consolidation through hagiographical dissemination and translation, and their continued currency amongst Chalcedonian Armenians at the end of the eleventh century.

It is through the manifestation of patterns of common veneration and popular expressions of shared cultic traditions surrounding the veneration of late-antique military saints preserved on the seal evidence that we begin to get a sense of how the process of textual dissemination of Greek hagiographical material and its subsequent translation into Armenian highlighted in the last chapter shaped the participation of Armenian Chalcedonians within the wider Byzantine spiritual *oikoumene*. Like the example from the *Taktikon*, the seal evidence allows us to move beyond the assumption that the process reflected by the translation of texts like the *Martyrdom* reflects the construction of a common spiritual environment that connected Chalcedonian Armenians to the tastes and practices of a wider Byzantine *oikoumene*, to actually seeing how the production of hagiographical texts in Armenian shaped their devotional practices around the normative modes of a Constantinopolitan centre, mediating their access to and permitting their participation in a shared spiritual environment that connected them to other Chalcedonians throughout the fracturing eastern frontier and a common Constantinopolitan spiritual common sense. The process of textual dissemination and translation which underpins the sphragistic evidence suggests that the textual practices which acted as the key tool in shaping this spiritual commonality continued to play a powerful role in maintaining and manifesting a sense of spiritual uniformity between Chalcedonian Armenians and their co-religionists after 1071.

Armenian Chalcedonians and the Byzantine Empire after Manzikert through the Lens of Translation

In contrast to a model for loosening political contact between Armenian Chalcedonian led lordships and the Byzantine Empire based on adherence to and use of Byzantine titles, the translation of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zeno, and Makarios*, the translation of the 'book of lections' in 1079, the performance of the liturgy, and trends in the commemorative practices, offer us another route into exploring how the

Byzantine Empire continued to play a role in the lives of Armenian Chalcedonians after 1071. When we combine evidence from text and seal, we are presented with a better impression of how the process of injecting hagiographical and liturgical collections into Armenian localities to be translated in the context of the Empire's expansion during the tenth and eleventh century manifested the creation of confessionally uniform practices which provided continuity between Armenian Chalcedonians and their co-confessionals. The Byzantine Empire sought to provide a new spiritual common sense to the lived environment through text and translation and this common spiritual sense continued to carry currency in the post-Manzikert Byzantine East amongst Armenian Chalcedonian populations. In so far as they continued to translate the hagiographical and liturgical collections which promoted the norms of the Church of Constantinople and continued to align their commemorative and liturgical practices according to the contents of these texts, we have evidence for the continued recognition and currency of the Byzantine Empire.

The Byzantine Empire continued to be a source of spiritual authority, mediating and conditioning the practices of Armenian Chalcedonians living in the increasingly fractious conditions of the eastern frontier in centres which were becoming increasingly distant from Constantinopolitan political control. This evidence not only provides a fresh route to consider how Armenian Chalcedonians continued to interact, react, and connect to the Byzantine Empire after 1071 beyond the political, it also brings greater nuance to a homogenising model which has thus far framed Armenian translations from Greek into Armenian after 1071 as a device of demarcation and separation from Byzantium under the aegis of Grigor Vkakasēr. For Armenian Chalcedonians, the hagiographical and liturgical practices underpinned and consolidated by a century long process of textual dissemination and translation continued to provide a key point of confessional continuity with the Church of Constantinople and those who aligned themselves with it. The translation and promotion of a particular canon of sacred literature gave a powerful impetus to transformations which brought Armenian Chalcedonian communities throughout the Empire's eastern frontier in line with the standard practices and of a wider Constantinopolitan spiritual *oikoumene*; it was a process which fundamentally attached and connected them to the confessional norms of the Empire, which consolidated a Constantinopolitan spiritual and cultural hegemony, and which continued to have meaning in their daily lives in the decades following the battle of Manzikert.

4

The Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios: Text and Translation

The *editio princeps* of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* appeared in Mkrtic' Awgerean's *Compendium of Lives and Martyrdoms* (Լիակատար վարք և վկայաբանությունս սրբոց), printed in 1810 by the Mekhitarist congregation of San Lazzaro degli Armeni in Venice.⁴⁵² This was followed in 1874 by a second edition that was prepared as part of the two-volume *Compendium of Lives and Martyrdoms selected from Ćarēntirs* (Լիակատար վարք եւ վկայաբանությունս սրբոց Հատընտիրք քաղեալք ի ճառընտրաց), edited by Ghevond Ališan and printed collectively by the Mekhitarist fathers.⁴⁵³ Although both compendiums made use of Ćarēntir manuscripts housed in the archives of San Lazzaro comprising *vitae longiores* of each text, neither work details which manuscripts were used in the editing of the individual martyrdoms or saints' lives within these printed compendiums, nor provides a critical apparatus or manuscript list to trace the origin of particular readings to specific witnesses. Based on my own archival work, it is evident that both the 1810 and 1874 editions of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* primarily made use of manuscript Venice, Mekhitarist monastery of San Lazzaro Ms. 17 (V 17), the oldest securely dateable Ćarēntir in the collection of San Lazzaro to contain a witness to the Armenian *Martyrdom*, though several variants suggest both editors also consulted other manuscripts.

The 1874 edition of the Armenian *Martyrdom* produces a very close rendering of V 17, displaying

⁴⁵² M. Awgerean, *Liakatar varke' ew vkeyabanut'inn srboč' (Compendium of Lives and Martyrdoms)* (Mekhitarist publishing house of San Lazzaro, 1810), 723-726.

⁴⁵³ L. Ališan, *Liakatar varke' ew vkeyabanut'inn srboč' hatnirk' k'atealk' i Ćarēntrac' bt 1 (Compendium of Lives and Martyrdoms selected from Ćarēntirs, Volume 1)* (Mekhitarist publishing house of San Lazzaro, 1876), 412- 421.

little variation from the manuscript which was presumably used as the base text. The 1810 edition, however, resulting from the use of other, yet unidentified manuscripts and having suffered from significant editorial interventions by Awgerean, (such as the addition of dates for the reigns of the Emperors Trajan and Diocletian), offers a text that, although presenting a number of readings traceable to V17, is a highly conflated rendering of the Armenian *Martyrdom*. Perhaps due to the deficiency of V 17, described in Chapter 1, or for reasons of choice not to integrate paratextual material, neither edition provides the colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom*, excluding crucial information concerning the compositional context of its translation from Greek into Armenian. To my knowledge, no further editions of the Armenian *Martyrdom* have been produced since 1874 and to date the text remains untranslated.

It is in the light of (i) the 150 years which have passed since the production of the last printed edition of the Armenian *Martyrdom*; (ii) the exclusion of the colophon from both previous editions; (iii) the absence of any critical apparatus in both previous editions; (iv) the lack of an edition which takes into account manuscripts from outside the Mekhitarist collection of San Lazzaro, including the earliest witness (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arménien 178); and (v) the value of the text to Armenologists and Byzantinists alike highlighted throughout this thesis that this chapter presents the first critical edition and translation of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*.

The Edition

The present edition is based on the version of the text preserved in the oldest surviving manuscript transmitting the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arménien 178, fols. 204v to 209r. Based on the analysis conducted in Chapter 1, I have argued that BnF, Arm. 178 retains a very close structural and lexical concordance with its pre-Metaphrastic Greek model, a point which is further enforced by the increasing divergence of later manuscript witnesses highlighted in the critical apparatus below. Due to the damage sustained to the only surviving pre-Metaphrastic Greek witness (BnF Suppl. Gr. 1002), BnF, Arm. 178 also represents the earliest version of the Armenian text that can be used to access the full pre-Metaphrastic Greek version on which it is based. An edition and translation of the work based on BnF, Arm. 178 then offers the most utility to those wishing to work further with the text for reasons of its early dating, its proximity to the Greek and, by extension, its significance to Byzantinists as a basis to reconstruct the pre-Metaphrastic Greek text and provide insights into how the *Martyrdom* was rewritten by Symeon Metaphrastes.

To supplement the edition I have recorded variants in the next three earliest witnesses to the Armenian *Martyrdom* that I was able to locate and examine in person for the purposes of the present study: (i) Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts Ms. 6196 (M 6196); (ii) Jerusalem, Armenian Monastery of St James, Ms. 1G (J 1G); and (iii) Venice, Mekhitarist monastery of San Lazzaro Ms. 17 (V 17). It is beyond the scope of the present study to trace the full reception and transmission history of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* or to compile a definitive list of every witness to the text. In the absence of a fully searchable manuscript database like Pinakes, such

a task remains a manual endeavour, limited by the available manuscript catalogues that sometimes do not detail foliation and do not make note of all the texts transmitted in each codex; this is the case, for example, with Matenadaran manuscript catalogue, *C'uc'ak Jerāgrac' vol. 2* which does not record the presence of the Armenian *Martyrdom* in M 6196.⁴⁵⁴ The objective of the present study is to create a new functional critical text and translation for further historical and philological study, with an apparatus that offers a sense of the divergences in the later manuscript transmission history. This apparatus will be further supplemented as and when more witnesses are located. The manuscripts have been recorded in the critical apparatus as follows:

V = Venice, Mekhitarist monastery of San Lazzaro, ms. 17 (V 17).

M = Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, ms. 6196 (M 6196).

J = Jerusalem, Armenian Monastery of St James, ms. 1G (J 1G).

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS. Arménien 178

BnF, Arm. 178, measuring 32.5 cm x 51 cm, contains 643 folios copied by the scribe Pawlos in the city of Sebasteia. Though the scribe chose not to reveal the exact time of its creation, the double column, forty-line, slanted Erkat'agir majuscule script allows us to approximate its completion to somewhere between the ninth and twelfth centuries, with Kevorkian and Armen Ter-Stépanian concluding a 12th century dating, but Artashes Mat'evosyan favouring a very late eleventh century date.⁴⁵⁵ Pawlos refers to himself in a series of sporadic intercessory interventions as both scribe⁴⁵⁶ (զրից) and owner⁴⁵⁷ (ստացող) of what he refers to as 'this book of martyrs' (վկայական մատենիս).⁴⁵⁸ He also records the names of bishop Papan, and the binder of the manuscript Kač'atur.⁴⁵⁹ The codex itself comprises a collection of saints lives and martyrdoms, with minimal illumination of initial letters. The arrangement appears not to follow a standard liturgical cycle, though the notice which preserves the date for the *Martyrdom of St Eudoxios* (6th September) follows the dating of the Church of Constantinople. The book is not ordered alphabetically as Outtier has recently suggested; rather, it was given an alphabetical contents in 1669 by François Pétis de la Croix, the Arabic interpreter of the French court, under the direction of the Armenian bishop Oskan Erewanac'i. This was presumably added after the manuscript was acquired by the French royal collection in 1668 as part of the purchase of the private library of renowned French magistrate and orientalist Gilbert

⁴⁵⁴ O. Eganyan, A. Zeyt'unyan, P. Ant'abyan, *Յուծակ ձեռագրաց Մաշտոցի Անվան Մատենադարանի, Հաւոյնք Բ* (*Catalogue of Manuscripts of the Maštoc' Matenadaran, volume 2*) (Matenadaran, 1970), 267. The Matenadaran is currently in the process of publishing new expanded versions of its existing manuscript catalogues. At present, however, the publication process has not yet reached M 6196 and so *Յուծակ ձեռագրաց Բ* must be used.

⁴⁵⁵ Kevorkian and Ter-Stépanian, *Manuscrits arméniens de la Bibliothèque nationale de France*, 590., Mat'evosyan, *Hišatakaranner*, 127-128.

⁴⁵⁶ BnF. Arm, 178., f. 44r.

⁴⁵⁷ BnF. Arm, 178., f. 212r.

⁴⁵⁸ BnF. Arm, 178., f. 212r.

⁴⁵⁹ BnF. Arm, 178., f. 586r.

Gaulmin after his death in 1665.⁴⁶⁰

The Armenian *Martyrdom* spans folios 204v to 209r according to the most recent foliation provided by the BnF and includes the crucial colophon that acts as a key *terminus post quem* for the manuscript dating, as already outlined in Chapter 1. The text itself has been missed in the catalogue of Armenian manuscripts in the BnF prepared by Kevorkian and Ter-Stépanian in 1998: *Manuscrits arméniens de la Bibliothèque nationale de France*, which mistakenly labels ff. 202v-209r as the Armenian version of *the Sermon of Nectarios of Constantinople on the Martyrdom of T'eodoros of Tiro*. Though the sermon does indeed begin on f. 202v it ends on f. 204v where the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* begins. This appears to be an error which may find its origins with the scribe Pawlos, who copied the name T'eodoros in several small rubrics under the main text on ff. 202v - 204v, to aid readers to quickly identify the content of the text on each folio. Pawlos, however, continued to copy the name T'eodoros several pages into the narrative of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* before switching to the correct name of Eudoxios in the final folios of the text.

Venice, Mekhitarist monastery of San Lazzaro MS. 17 (V 17).

V 17 was copied in 1224 in the monastery of St Gregory the Illuminator by the hand of the priest T'adeos at the behest of a certain Konstanin Vanarayr. It measures 29.5 cm x 10.5cm and consists of 564 folios arranged in 41-line double columns written in minuscule Bolorgir script with Erkat'agir majuscule capitals in red ink at the opening of each text.⁴⁶¹ Beyond Konstanin, the marginalia scattered throughout the manuscript bears testament to a number of later owners including the Baron K'ristostour and Lord Simon and records the name of the illuminator: Lazar Vardapet, who was responsible for the marginal illuminations which accompany the start of each text.⁴⁶² The exact location of the monastery of St Gregory the Illuminator is not specified, but a later colophon recording the names of Queen Margaret of Lusignan, the wife of King T'oros III of Armenia, appears to associate the community with Xarberd (Ի Խարբերդ), which would place the monastery near modern-day Elâzig, north east of Melitene.⁴⁶³ The manuscript itself is a Čarēntir, and so contains a mixture of patristic, hagiographical, and homiletic texts designed to facilitate liturgical practice arranged according to the heortological cycle of the Armenian Miaphysite church.

The Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* is found at folios 199r - 202v. Its variants are largely identical to those found in M 6196, suggesting a common ancestor in their transmission history. This manuscript was certainly used in the compilation of both the 1810 and 1874 editions of the Armenian *Martyrdom* and it is the next earliest witness after BnF, Arm. 178 which I have been able to locate. Due to the loss of the final folio, only the first half of the colophon survives, but several

⁴⁶⁰ For Outtier claim see: "The Armenian Homiliaries. An Attempt at an Historical Overview," 119. Kevorkian and Ter-Stépanian, *Manuscrits arméniens de la Bibliothèque nationale de France*, 590.

⁴⁶¹ B. Sargisyan, *Մայր Յուզակ Հայերեն Ձեռագրաց մատենադարանին Մխիթարեանց ի Վենետիկ, հասոյր P* (*Grand Catalogue of the Armenian Manuscripts of the Mekhitarist Library in Venice*) (Mekhitarist publishing house of San Lazzaro, 1924), 4 - 5.

⁴⁶² Ibid., 4 - 5.

⁴⁶³ Ibid., 35.

later owners evoked the intercession of the saints in the margins of the text, including a prayer on behalf of the monastic community of St Gregory the Illuminator.⁴⁶⁴

Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, MS. 6196

M 6196, a Čarēntir produced in Ahlat, contains a copy of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* penned by the scribe Nerses in 1227.⁴⁶⁵ Measuring 50 cm x 33 cm, the codex is composed of 612 folios with 38-line double columns written in minuscule Bolorgir script.⁴⁶⁶ Though the main text was copied by the single hand of Nerses, a second hand, that of Sargis, can be recognised in a number of sporadic marginal notes.⁴⁶⁷ The book was owned by a certain Vardan Vardapet who presumably also commissioned the manuscript, as hinted by the number of intercessional prayers for Vardan inserted throughout by Nerses.⁴⁶⁸ The codex comprises a selection of texts typical to the Čarēntir collections such as the patristic writings of John Chrysostom, Ephrem the Syrian, Yovhannes Mandakuni, and Gregory of Nyssa; New Testament excerpts from the Gospel of John and the Epistle of Pseudo-Dionysius to Timotheus; as well as martyrological texts including the martyrdom of Saint Demetrius of Thessaloniki and The History of Vardan and the Armenian war by Elišē.⁴⁶⁹

The Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* appears between folios 236r and 239v, though its presence is not recorded by the relevant Matenadaran manuscript catalogue, *C'uc'ak Jeragrac' vol. 2*.⁴⁷⁰ Like BnF, Arm. 178 this witness contains the colophon of the Armenian *Martyrdom*, but presents an additional line invoking the intercession of the saints on behalf of Vardan Vardapet 'the owner of this book', a scribal intervention which is further supplemented by various marginal notes beneath the main text also invoking the intercession of the saints on behalf of both scribe and owner.⁴⁷¹

Jerusalem, Armenian Monastery of St James, MS. 1G (J 1G)

J 1G represents the third volume of a monumental four-part Čarēntir produced at the behest of the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem Polos Karnec'i in the monastery of Saint James in 1418 CE, where it has remained until the present day.⁴⁷² The manuscript measures 56 cm x 43,7 cm and consists of 528 folios in double-column 48-line Bolorgir script, supplemented with capital Erkat'agir script in red to denote the beginning of each text. Two hands were responsible for copying the manuscript; the scribe Yovhannes, who wrote folios 1r to 148v, and the scribe Manuel, who copied folios 149r - 528v.⁴⁷³ The manuscript is

⁴⁶⁴ Venice, Mekhitarist monastery of San Lazzaro Ms. 17 (V 17), f. 199 v.

⁴⁶⁵ Eganyan, Zeyt'unyan, Ant'abyan, *Յուծակ ձեռագրաց*, 267.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid., 267.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid., 267.

⁴⁶⁸ Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 6196 (M 6196), f. 239 v.

⁴⁶⁹ Eganyan, Zeyt'unyan, Ant'abyan, *Յուծակ ձեռագրաց*, 267.

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid., 267.

⁴⁷¹ M 6196, f. 239 v.

⁴⁷² N. Bogharian, *Մայր Յուծակ ձեռագրաց Սրբոց Յակոբեանց, Հատար Ա (Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts, Volume 1)* (Jerusalem, 1966), 24.

⁴⁷³ Ibid., 24.

composed in the standardised fashion of the Armenian Miaphysite Church and contains hagiographical, homiletic, and panegyric material for liturgical practice throughout the year.

The Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* is found at folios 418r - 424r. While the colophon is retained, it appears in a considerably altered form which invokes the intercession of the saints on behalf of the scribe Manuel, his parents, and the owner of the manuscript, the ‘Catholicos Polos’, this being the Patriarch Polos Karnec‘i who commissioned the codex toward the end of his tenure as head of the Armenian Church in Jerusalem.⁴⁷⁴

Principles of Edition and Translation

This edition presents a slightly modified diplomatic transcription of the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* as it is found in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arménien 178, recording in the critical apparatus variants found in M 6196, V17 and J 1G. The following principles have been adopted in the preparation of the text:

- The layout of the text has been replicated as found in BnF, Arm. 178, maintaining paragraph and folio breaks.
- All abbreviations have been expanded.
- The *scriptio continua* has been normalised according to standard word division.
- Spelling has been retained as found in the manuscript.
- Punctuation has been maintained as found in the manuscript (‘ , : , , , °)
- The first letter after every verĵaket (full stop) has been capitalised, as well as letters at the beginning of each paragraph and all proper nouns.

The translation has been prepared on the principle of reflecting the original Armenian text as faithfully as possible, preferring this in most cases to an interpretive translation based around clarity of English expression. In a small number of instances, additional words or phrases have been inserted in square brackets to assist meaning. A hybrid approach has been adopted for the translation of proper names. Well-known places and persons, such as Melitene or Trajan, have been translated in their familiar anglicised form. Other proper nouns have been transliterated as they appear in the text according to the Hübschmann-Meillet system, such as the location of the estate of Eudoxios: Kupati. The names of the saints and court titles have been transliterated according to their Greek form.

⁴⁷⁴ Jerusalem, Armenian Monastery of St James, Ms. 1G (J 1G), f. 424r.

[204 v, col 2] Ի ժամանակին յայնմիկ թագաւորեալ⁴⁷⁵ Տրայիանոսի: Բարիատեացն սատանայ արկ ի սիրտ նորա խորհուրդ չարութեան, յարուցանել հալածանս ի վերայ եկեղեցւոյն Աստուծոյ: Եւ նեղէին ամենայն ուրեք զհաւատացեալսն ի Քրիստոս⁴⁷⁶ եւ ստիպէին զոհել անշունչ դիւաց⁴⁷⁷:

Եւ նստեալ յատենի ամպարիշտ բռնաւորն⁴⁷⁸, հրաման տայր⁴⁷⁹ ընդ ամենայն⁴⁸⁰ գաւառս⁴⁸¹ եւ ընդ քաղաքս զոհել Աստուածոցն: Մանաւանդ զայնոսիկ որ ի Քրիստոս կէին բարեպաշտութեանք: Չհեծելազաւրս առաքելով ընդ աշխարհս⁴⁸² ամենայն ի ձեռն նամակաց: Չի տանջանաց մատնեցին քրիստոնեայքն ուր եւ զոցին:

Մատուցեալ ոմն իշխան⁴⁸³ Ռովմէլոս⁴⁸⁴ անուն, ասէ ցթագաւորն: Հրաման բարեպաշտութեան ձերոյ հզաւր եւ պատուական է: Բայց զոմանս յերեւելեաց⁴⁸⁵ պատուաւորաց պաղատանդ⁴⁸⁶ առաքեա ի գաղիլեացւոց⁴⁸⁷ գաւառն առ քաջամարտիկ եւ արիագոյն զինուորսն:

Ասէ թագաւորն ցիշխանն Ռովմէլոս⁴⁸⁸, երդուեալ ի փրկութիւն Աստուծոցն զի բարի⁴⁸⁹ են խորհուրդք քո: Եւ հրամայեաց զնալ հնգից արանց ի մեծամեծաց պաղատանն

[204 v, col 2] In the time of the reign of Trajan, Satan, the hater of good, cast evil designs into his heart to raise persecutions upon the Church of God. And they harassed all those who were believers in Christ and forced [them] to sacrifice to lifeless idols.

And having seated a tribunal, the evil tyrant gave the order to all districts and cities to sacrifice to the gods, chiefly those who lived by devotion to Christ, by dispatching riders with missives throughout the land so that the Christians would be subjected to torture wherever they might be found.

A certain prince named Romylos was present, and said to the Emperor, “Your pious order is powerful and reverend, but send certain ones from among your eminent and honoured courtiers to the province of Gaul to the warlike and brave forces”.

The Emperor said to the prince “Romylos, by the salvation of the Gods your counsel is good.” And he ordered five of the greatest men of the court to go, sending many things with them.

⁴⁷⁵ թագաւորելով M, V, J

⁴⁷⁶ ուրեք զքրիստոնեայսն եւ ստիպէին J

⁴⁷⁷ դիւացն M, V, պատկերաց J

⁴⁷⁸ թագաւորն M, V

⁴⁷⁹ տալով M, V, J

⁴⁸⁰ տալով յամենայն M, V

⁴⁸¹ գեաւոյս M, V

⁴⁸² աշխարհսն, M, V

⁴⁸³ իշխանացն M, V, J

⁴⁸⁴ Ռոմէլոս J

⁴⁸⁵ յերեւելի M, V, J

⁴⁸⁶ պաղատանն V

⁴⁸⁷ Գալիլեացւոց M, V, J

⁴⁸⁸ Ռոմէլոս J

Բարոնք M, V

[205 r, col 1] առաքելով նոցա⁴⁹⁰ ինչս բազումս: Գրեալ եւ հրովարտակ⁴⁹¹ ընդ նոսա որ ունէր աւրինակ զայն:

Տրայիանոս սեբաստոս⁴⁹² միշտ յաղթող ինքնակալ⁴⁹³ կայսր հռովմայեցոց⁴⁹⁴: Պատուական դասուց զինուորացի եւ զաւրագլխացի⁴⁹⁵: Կոմսից երկոտասան ազգաց, ուրախ լինել հրամայէ մեր քաջութիւնս ի ձեռն պատուիրանաց⁴⁹⁶ մերոց, երեւելի եւ գլխաւոր իշխանացի⁴⁹⁷ պաղատանս մերոյ զոր խորհեցաք ի միասին ծանուցանել ձեզ վասն Աստուածոցն բարերարութեան: Որք զարիական քաջութիւնս եւ զգաւրութիւնս շնորհեն ամենեցուն: Եւ վասն այնորիկ պարտիմք առատացուցանել⁴⁹⁸ զնձայս նոցա եւ զգոհս: Եւ սիրել զնոսա⁴⁹⁹ յամենայն մտաց եւ ի զաւրութենէ: Չի ելանել⁵⁰⁰ ձեզ⁵⁰¹ ի պատերազմ, վաղվադակի յաղթող երեւեսցիք⁵⁰² ի վերայ թշնամեաց ձերոց, որք են ի կողմանս արեւելից: Ընկեցեալ զսպառազինութիւն նոցա, եւ զամենայն գործիս⁵⁰³ զինուց⁵⁰⁴ զինուորութեան: Յարձակեսցիք ի վերայ նոցա: Իսկ նոցա առժամայն արհամարհեալ զհրամանս թագաւորին յաղթեցին հակառակորդաց⁵⁰⁵ դառնալով⁵⁰⁶ ի պատերազմէն: Եւ տեսեալ թագաւորին արհամարհելով⁵⁰⁷ զհրամանս իւր ի նոցանէն, բարկացաւ յոյժ, եւ հրամայեաց նոցա ելանել ի հայրեն ի գաւառէն իւրեանց եւ երթալ ի կողմանս

[205 r, col 1] Having also written a decree which, through them, enclosed the order in this manner:

Trajan Sebastos, victorious Emperor and Caesar of the Romans, to you soldiers and commanders of honourable rank, the leaders of the twelfth legion, he is pleased to authorise our integrity through the commands of our eminent and principal courtiers who have counselled in unison, to notify you concerning the benefaction of the gods, who grant valour and courage to all. And concerning this matter, we are obliged to multiply the gifts and sacrifices to [the gods] and to worship them with all mind and strength. So that when you go into battle soon you will be victorious over your enemies in the East. Having stripped them of their arms and all of their military equipment, may you dispatch them. But having disdained the order of the Emperor from the beginning, they turned away from combat, and the enemies triumphed.

And having seen such disdain for his orders, the Emperor was greatly angered by them and ordered them to go out from the province of his father,

⁴⁹⁰ նորա M, V

⁴⁹¹ Հրովարտակս, V

⁴⁹² Տրայիանոս միշտ M, V, J

⁴⁹³ թագաւոր M, V, J

⁴⁹⁴ հռովմայեցոց J

⁴⁹⁵ դասուց զաւրագլխացի M, V դասուց զինուորաց եւ զաւրագլխաց J

⁴⁹⁶ Պատուաւորաց J

⁴⁹⁷ գլխաւորաց իշխանաց J

⁴⁹⁸ հատուցանել M, V

⁴⁹⁹ զնա J

⁵⁰⁰ ելանելով M, V, J

⁵⁰¹ ձեր M, V, J

⁵⁰² Երեւիցիք J

⁵⁰³ գործի M, V, J

⁵⁰⁴ զինո, V, գործիս զինուորութեան J

⁵⁰⁵ Հակառակորդացն J

⁵⁰⁶ դառնալ M, V, J

⁵⁰⁷ արհամարհեալ M, V, J

[205 r, col 2] հայոց ի քաղաքն Մելետենէ⁵⁰⁸: Համարեցաւ այնու անարգել զնոսա: Եւ նոցա⁵⁰⁹ զարհուրեալք⁵¹⁰ ի սպառնալեաց բռնաւորին⁵¹¹ Տրայիանոսի, եկին ի նախասացեալ գաւառն զի մի բարկացեալ կորուսցէ⁵¹² զնոսա: Եւ էր թիւ զաւրաց նոցա մետասան հազար արանց սուսերամերկաց⁵¹³:

Յայնժամ տեսեալ իշխանին Ռովմելոսի⁵¹⁴ որ ունէր զպատիւ պրոպոսիտոսութեան: Ասէ ցթագաւորն: Ո՞վ թագաւոր, այնպէս կարծեցեր դու⁵¹⁵, իմաստութեա՞ն ինչ գործ գործեցեր դու զայդ առնելով⁵¹⁶:

Ասէ ցնա թագաւորն, ուրեմն եւ դո՛ւ խաբեցար յաղանդոյ մոլորութեան նոցա: Եւ ի նոցա՞ աստուած⁵¹⁷ պաշտութեան ճանապարհն իցես⁵¹⁸: Ասէ ցնա Ռովմելոս⁵¹⁹, յիմար եւ անզգայ եւ արբեալ չարին մոլորութեամբն: Դու զքո սնոտի ջանսդ որ⁵²⁰ ունիս առ կուռսդ⁵²¹ անմռունչսդ⁵²² պատմեա ինձ եւ մի բամբասեր զիմ կատարելութիւն հաւատոյդ⁵²³:

Եւ բարկացեալ թագաւորն հրամայեաց մահակաւք հարկանել զնա, եւ ասէ ցնա, տեսցուք այսուհետեւ թե աւգնեսցէ⁵²⁴ քեզ Քրիստոսն քո զոր ասես:

Ասէ սուրբն Ռովմելոս⁵²⁵ անդնդային վիշապ եւ կեղծաւոր, ո՞չ իմացար եթե չարչարանքդ քո զոր կարծ ես զարհուրեցուցանել զիս ճողոպրեն

[205 r, col 2] to Armenia, to the city of Melitene. He considered dishonouring them. Being fearful of the threats of the tyrant Trajan; they came to the aforementioned region so that he would not destroy them. And the army numbered eleven thousand sword-bearers.

At that time, prince Romylos, who held the honour of *Praepositus*, having witnessed this, appealed to the Emperor: “O Emperor, do you think it wise, doing what you have done in this way?”

And the Emperor said to him in response, “Have you been deceived by their false heresy? And do you follow the path of worship of their God?”

And Romylos said “You are foolish, stupid, and drunk on the evil of your own folly, do not tell me of your futile care which you have for idols and do not talk idly to me about the perfection of your faith.”

And having angered the Emperor, he was sentenced to be tortured and beaten and he said to him “Let us see henceforth if your Christ will help you as you say”

Saint Romylos replied “Deceitful serpent from the depths, you do not know that your torments which you suppose frighten me, free me

⁵⁰⁸ Մելետենի M, V, Մելիտինի J

⁵⁰⁹ նոքա M, V

⁵¹⁰ Չարհուրեալ J

⁵¹¹ թագաւորին J

⁵¹² կոտորուցէ M, V

⁵¹³ արանց պատերազմողաց սուսերամերկաց M, V

⁵¹⁴ Ռովմելոսի J

⁵¹⁵ դու թէ, M, V, J

⁵¹⁶ իմաստութեան գործ գործեցեր զայդ առնելով J

⁵¹⁷ Եւ յաստուած

⁵¹⁸ մոլորութեան նոցա: Ասէ ցնա Ռովմելոս M, V

⁵¹⁹ Ռովմելոս J

⁵²⁰ զոր M, V, J

⁵²¹ կուռս M, V

⁵²² անմռունչս M, V, J

⁵²³ հաւատոյս M, V, հաւատոցս J

⁵²⁴ Աւգնէ J

⁵²⁵ Սուրբն անդնդային M, V, սուրբն Ռովմելոս անդնդային J

[205 v, col 1] զիս եւ փրկեն զիս ի կոց ⁵²⁶
մոլորութենէ⁵²⁷, եւ զգեցուցանէ ինձ զանապական
զգեստն զոր պարգեւէ ⁵²⁸ Քրիստոս սիրելեաց
իւրոց:

Եւ բարկացեալ թագաւորն հրամայեաց սրով
բառնալ զգլուխ նորա:

Եւ կատարեցաւ սուրբն Ռովմէլոս բարի
խոստաւանութեամբ ⁵²⁹ յամսեանն
Սեպտեմբերի⁵³⁰ ի չորրորդում⁵³¹ աւուրն⁵³² յաւուր
շաբաթու ի փառս Աստուծոյ:

Եւ յետ այնորիկ մեռաւ Տրայիանոս⁵³³, եւ ⁵³⁴ յետ
ժամանակաց⁵³⁵ անցելոց, յարեաւ այլ թագաւոր
Դիոկղետիանոս ⁵³⁶ անուն, որ ո՛չ գիտէր ⁵³⁷
զԱստուած: Մանաւանդ զի որք ⁵³⁸ ի Քրիստոս
հաւատային դարձուցանել ջանայր:

Եւ նստեալ նորա ի բարձր բեմի եւ առաքեաց
հրովարտակ ընդ ամենայն ⁵³⁹ գաւառս առ
իշխանս ⁵⁴⁰ եւ առ ⁵⁴¹ դատաւորս եւ ⁵⁴²
զաւրագլուխս: դարձուցանել զամենեսեան ի
կոցն մոլորութիւն⁵⁴³:

Եւ ընկալեալ զայսպիսի հրաման իշխան
քաղաքին Մելետինիոյ ⁵⁴⁴ որում անուն էր
Պոնտիանոս, զի եւ նա հեղդենացի⁵⁴⁵ էր ազգաւ:

Եւ հրամայեաց քարոզ կարդալ ընդ ամենայն
հրապարակս եւ ընդ գաւառն ⁵⁴⁶, եթե որք ոչ
կամիցին հաւանել հրամանաց ինքնակալին եւ

[205 v, col 1] and deliver me from the heresy of idols.
Christ clothes me in pure robes which he gifts to me
out of his love.

And having been angered, the Emperor ordered for his
head to be severed by the sword.

And the martyrdom of saint Romylos was completed
in the month of September on the fourth day, on
Saturday, for the glory of God.

And after the death of Trajan and after the passing of
time came another Emperor, named Diocletian, who
did not know God. He tried especially to convert those
who believed in Christ.

And having seated his high tribunal, he sent an edict to
all the provinces, Governors, judges, and commanders
to convert all [the Christians] to the worship of idols.

And the edict was recieved by the Governor of
Melitene who was called Pontianos, Greek by birth.

And he ordered the edict to be read throughout all the
public places and throughout the region that those who
did not wish to acquiesce to the commands of the
Emperor and

⁵²⁶ եւ փրկեն ի կոցն M, V, J

⁵²⁷ պղծութենէ M, V

⁵²⁸ պարգէ M, V

⁵²⁹ Խոստաւանութեամբ ի Քրիստոս յամսեանն J

⁵³⁰ Հոկտեմբերի M, V

⁵³¹ ԺԹ M, V

⁵³² յաւուրն M, V, J

⁵³³ Ամբարիշտն Տրայիանոս J

⁵³⁴ իսկ J

⁵³⁵ բազում ժամանակաց J

⁵³⁶ Դիոկղետիանոս J

⁵³⁷ ճանաչէր M, V

⁵³⁸ Եւ որ M, V

⁵³⁹ յամենայն J

⁵⁴⁰ յիշխանս M, V, J

⁵⁴¹ ի M, V, J

⁵⁴² Եւ ի M, V, J

⁵⁴³ ի հաւատոցն ի կոցն խաբէութիւն: M, V

⁵⁴⁴ Մելետենոյ M, Մելիտենոյ V, J

⁵⁴⁵ Հելլենացի M, V, Հելենացի J

⁵⁴⁶ գաւառս M, J, գաւառսն V

զոհել աստուածոցն, անողորմ տանջանալք եւ սրով զրաւեցին⁵⁴⁷ ի կենացս:

Եւ ամենեցուն քրիստոնէիցն⁵⁴⁸ լուեալ զայսպիսի սպառնալիս բռնաւորին: Վաղվաղակի

[205 v, col 2] խուճապեալք յերկիւղէն⁵⁴⁹ տագնապէին⁵⁵⁰: Եւ թաքուցանէին զանձինս իւրեանց զի մի ի բռնն անկցին անաստուած դատաւորին⁵⁵¹: Չի ուր եւ գտանէին նեղէին, եւ մեծամեծ տանջանս ի վերայ ածելով⁵⁵² ստիպէին զոհել աստուածոցն, եւ երկիր պագանել անշունչ պատկերացն:

Եւ եկեալ արք ոմանք չարախաւսութիւն առ իշխանն մատուցանէին, վասն Մարինոսի որ Եւդոքսիոսն կոչեցաւ, որ էր⁵⁵³ ի դասէ⁵⁵⁴ Պոլիմեկիոնացն⁵⁵⁵, որ պատուեցաւ ի կոմսութեան իշխանութեամբ⁵⁵⁶, եւ ասէին եթե ոչ խոնարհի երբեք հնազանդ լինել⁵⁵⁷ թագաւորական⁵⁵⁸ հրամանաց⁵⁵⁹, եւ աստուածոցն⁵⁶⁰ զոհս⁵⁶¹ ոչ մատուցանէ այլ զխաչեալն⁵⁶² խոստովանի աստուած, եւ ի նա հաւատացեալ է: Եւ լուեալ զայս դատաւորն⁵⁶³ հրամայեաց արանց հնգից զաւրականաց խնդրել զնա ուր եւ գտանիցեն⁵⁶⁴ բերել յատեան դատաստանի⁵⁶⁵: Եւ եկեալ նոցա ի գեւղն⁵⁶⁶ յորում բնակեալն⁵⁶⁷ էր նա, եւ հարցանէին վասն նորա:

sacrifice to the gods will be subject to bitter tortures and be put to death by the sword.

And all of the Christians, having heard the threats of the tyrant, suddenly

[205 v, col 2] were greatly alarmed, panicking out of fear and they concealed themselves so that they would not fall into the hands of the godless Governor. They inflicted great torture upon those [Christians] which they found and forced them to worship the gods and prostrate themselves before lifeless idols.

Then certain accusers came before the Governor concerning Marianos who is also Eudoxios, who, from the office of the *Primikérios* was honoured with the authority of the *Komēs*, and they said: “He does not humbly obey the imperial decrees, nor does he worship the gods, but rather the crucified one who he acknowledges as a god and worships him.” Hearing this, the Governor ordered five soldiers to search for him and, upon finding him, to bring him to the court of judgement. Having come to the estate in which he was residing, they enquired about him.

⁵⁴⁷ զրաւեցից J

⁵⁴⁸ քրիստոնէիցն, M, V, J

⁵⁴⁹ յերկիւղէ M, V, J

⁵⁵⁰ տագնապէին M, V, J

⁵⁵¹ բռնաւորին J

⁵⁵² ածելին J

⁵⁵³ է J

⁵⁵⁴ դասուէ J

⁵⁵⁵ Պոլիմեկիոնացն M, V, պոլիմիկիոնացն J

⁵⁵⁶ իշխանութիւնն M, V

⁵⁵⁷ ոչ հանի երբեք M, V

⁵⁵⁸ թագաւորական իշխանութեան M, արքունական J

⁵⁵⁹ հրամանացն J

⁵⁶⁰ զաստուածոցն M, V

⁵⁶¹ զոհսն M

⁵⁶² զխաչեալն M

⁵⁶³ դատաւորին M, V, J

⁵⁶⁴ գտանիցի եւ բերել M, V զոցի եւ բերեալ J

⁵⁶⁵ դատաստանին M, V, J

⁵⁶⁶ գեւղն, M, V, J

⁵⁶⁷ բնակեալ M, V, J

Ասեն⁵⁶⁸ արքն ցնոսա⁵⁶⁹, աւանիկ զոր դուքն խնդրէք շրջի ի դաշտիան⁵⁷⁰ որ կոչի Կուպատիա⁵⁷¹: Եւ գնացին առ նա:

Իսկ նորա յառաջագոյն իմացեալ⁵⁷² զգալուստ⁵⁷³ նոցա գնաց ի լեւոնն⁵⁷⁴ եւ նստէր անդ տեսանելով զնոսա: Եւ տեսեալ զի⁵⁷⁵ փութանակի խնդրէին զնա եկեալ ի տուն իւր եւ փոխեալ⁵⁷⁶ զհանդերձս

[206 r, col 1] իւր եւ զգեցաւ հանդերձ աղքատի, եւ եկեալ ի տեղի մի հանդիպէր նոցա: Եւ ասեն ցնա զինուորքն զիտիցե՛ս⁵⁷⁷ արդեւք թէ ուր իցէ բնակեալ կոմսն Մարինոս որ կոչի Եւդոքսիոս⁵⁷⁸: Ասէ ցնոսա: Վասն որո՞յ իրաց⁵⁷⁹ խնդրէք⁵⁸⁰, եւ կամ զի՞նչ բանք իցեն ձեր ընդ նմա⁵⁸¹ ասացէք ինձ եւ ես ցուցից զնա ձեզ:

Ասեն ցնա, իշխա՛նն խնդրէ զնա: Եւ նա ասէ ցնոսա, վասն որո՞յ իրի խնդրէ զնա:

Ասեն ցնա: Վասնզի ո՛չ հնազանդի⁵⁸² հրամանաց ինքնակալին, եւ աստուածոցն ոչ զոհէ:

Ասէ ցնոսա, եկայք ի տուն իմ եւ հանգերուք փոքր մի եւ ես ցուցից զնա ձեզ:

Եւ երբ⁵⁸³ ի տուն իւր, եւ ասէ ցամուսին իւր, պատրաստեա ճաշակելոցս առ մեզ: Եւ նորա եղեալ առաջի նոցա սեղան, ճաշակեցին եւ ասեն ցնա արդ ցոյց զոր խնդրեմքն⁵⁸⁴ զկոմսն Եւդոքսիոս⁵⁸⁵: Եւ նա ասէ ցնոսա, զոր խնդրէքն ես եմ:

The men said to them “The one which you seek, he wanders in the plain which is called ‘of Kupati.’” And they went to him.

But he, having learned before that they were coming for him, went up to the mountain and sat there. Observing them and having seen that they were seeking him with haste, he went into his house and changed his attire

[206 r, col 1] and putting on pitiful clothing he went to that place and the soldiers asked him: “Do you know where the *Komēs* Marianos, the one who is also Eudoxios, is residing?” And he said to them “For what reasons do you enquire? What words might you have with him? Tell me and I will show him to you.”

And they said to him “The Governor seeks him.” And he said to them “For what reason does he seek him?” And they said to him: “Because he does not obey the decrees of the Emperor and he does not sacrifice to the gods” and he said to them, “Come into my house and rest a little, and I will show him to you.”

And he brought (them) into his house and said to his wife “Prepare us a meal” And having put it before them on his table, they ate and then they said “Now, show the one we seek, the *Komēs* Eudoxios.” And he said to them “I am the one that you seek.”

⁵⁶⁸ Ասենին M, V

⁵⁶⁹ արք ոմանք J

⁵⁷⁰ դաշտիանդ, M, V, J

⁵⁷¹ Կուպատիայ M, V

⁵⁷² զխորհուրդ J

⁵⁷³ զալստեան J

⁵⁷⁴ լեւոն M, V

⁵⁷⁵ զնոսա զի J

⁵⁷⁶ փոխեաց M, V

⁵⁷⁷ զիտ J

⁵⁷⁸ Եւդոքսիայ M, V

⁵⁷⁹ իրի M, V

⁵⁸⁰ խնդրէք զնա M, V, J

⁵⁸¹ նա V, J

⁵⁸² հաւանի M, V

⁵⁸³ երբ տարաւ զնոսա M, V, երբ զնոսա J

⁵⁸⁴ ցոյց մեզ զկոմսն M, V

⁵⁸⁵ Եւդոքսիայ, M, V Եւդոքսիա J

Ասեն ցնա արքն ընդէ՛ր գայդ արարեր: Եթե կամիս երթամք⁵⁸⁶ առ իշխանն եւ ասեմք եթե ոչ⁵⁸⁷ գտաք զնա: Եւ դու զանիւացիր եւ թաքոյ զանձն քո զի մի ըմբռնեսցիս եւ անկցիս ի ձեռս իշխանին: Ասէ ցնոսա ո՛չ⁵⁸⁸ արարից գայդ այլ եկից զկնի ձեր բայց փոքր մի համբերեցէք ինձ: Եւ կոչեաց⁵⁸⁹ զամուսինն իւր եւ ասէ

[206 r, col 2] ցնա վասն տան⁵⁹⁰ իւր⁵⁹¹ յարինել զամենայն ըստ խրատու⁵⁹² իւրոյ:

Ասէ ցնա, ես⁵⁹³ ո՛վ կին դու փոխելոց եմ ի սնոտի եւ յանցաւոր կենաց աստի ի մշտնջենաւոր եւ յաւիտենական կեանսն: Եւ այլ ո՛չ եւս տեսանելոց ես զիս ի մարմնի աստ: Արդ զոր ասեմ քեզ լուր ինձ, եւ մի յեկանելն⁵⁹⁴ իմ ի մարմնոյ աստի, ողբս⁵⁹⁵ առեալ արտասուեսցես ի վերայ իմ: Այլ զգեցիր դու զգեստ⁵⁹⁶ հարսանեացն⁵⁹⁷ քոց, եւ վառեալ լապերս եւ ջահս եւ առեալ ամանս⁵⁹⁸ մաքուրս⁵⁹⁹ ժողովեա զարիւն⁶⁰⁰ իմ: Եւ առեալ զգլուխ իմ եւ զմակարիոսի որդւոյն մերոյ⁶⁰¹ եւ ուրախել, եւ զայս արա⁶⁰² որպէս հարսն Քրիստոսի:

Եւ ասացեալ նորա զայս, առեալ զնա զինուորացն, նստեալ ի վերայ երիվարին իւրոյ: Եւ զգեցեալ զգեստս ազնիւս⁶⁰³ եւ պայծառս, եւ տարան զնա առաջի⁶⁰⁴ դատաւորին:

And the men said to him “Why did you do this? So that you wanted us to depart to the Governor and report that we could not find him? You have concealed yourself, so that you would not be seized and fall into the hands of the Governor”

He said to them “No! I did not do that, but I will come with you, only allow me a short while.”

And calling his wife, he put his house in order.

And he said to her “O wife, I am transforming from this vain and sinful life to a perpetual and eternal life, but you will see me no longer in corporeal form.

Now I say, if you should hear news of me, do not shed tears over me leaving my corporeal form, but dress in your bridal clothing and light lanterns and torches and prepare a fine pouch to collect my blood and take my head and our son Makarios and rejoice. Do these things as a bride of Christ.”

And having instructed her, the soldiers took him sitting upon his horse and dressed in fine and bright clothing, and they brought him before the Governor.

⁵⁸⁶ արարեր ահաւասիկ զնամք առ M, V

⁵⁸⁷ ասեմք ոչ, M, V

⁵⁸⁸ Ասէ ոչ, M, V

⁵⁸⁹ կոչեալ M, կոչեցեալ V

⁵⁹⁰ տանն M, V

⁵⁹¹ իւրոյ M, V, J

⁵⁹² խրատու J

⁵⁹³ ցնա ով M, V

⁵⁹⁴ եւ յեկանելն M, V եւ մի եկանելն J

⁵⁹⁵ մի ողբս, M, V իմում աստի ողբսառեալ J

⁵⁹⁶ զգեցիր զգեստ M, V, J

⁵⁹⁷ զհարսանեացն M

⁵⁹⁸ անանութ M, V

⁵⁹⁹ մաքուր M, V

⁶⁰⁰ զարիւնս J

⁶⁰¹ Իմոյ M, V

⁶⁰² արայ J

⁶⁰³ զգեստ ազնիւ M, V

⁶⁰⁴ տարան առաջի J

Եւ ասէ բռնաւորն, ուրախէր փառաւորեալ կոմս
Եւդոքսիէ⁶⁰⁵:

Եւ ասէ Եւդոքսիէ ⁶⁰⁶ ուրախելեր եւ դու ո՛վ
բռնաւոր: Եւ ասէ ցնա դատաւորն⁶⁰⁷ իմացա՛րով
կոմս եթէ վասն որոյ գործոյ խնդրէաք զքեզ:

Եւ նա ասէ⁶⁰⁸, պատմեա՛ ինձ ով դատաւոր զի
զիտացից վասն⁶⁰⁹ որոյ խնդրէին զիս:

Իշխանն ասէ, վասն այնորիկ կոչեցի⁶¹⁰ զքեզ զի
հաւանեցիս ⁶¹¹ հրամանաց ինքնակալին: Եւ
զոհեցես աստուածոցն:

Իսկ ⁶¹² սուրբ վկայն ծիծաղելով ի վերայ
անմտութեան բռնաւորին⁶¹³ ասէ:

[206 v, col 1] Եւ վասն⁶¹⁴ այնորիկ զգեցեալ եմ
հանդերձս ⁶¹⁵ պատուականս, եւ պայծառս եւ
նստեալ ի վերայ սպիտակ երիվարի,⁶¹⁶ եւ եկեալ
կամ առաջի քո յոյզ բեմի⁶¹⁷:

Ասէ դատաւորն, երդուեալ յաստուածսն
ամենայն, եթէ լսէ թագաւորն վասն
հնազանդելոյ⁶¹⁸ քո կայսերական հրամանին⁶¹⁹ եւ
զոհելոյ աստուածոցն յերկրորդական յաթոռ ⁶²⁰
թագաւորութեան⁶²¹ իւրոյ նստուցանէ զքեզ:

Ասէ երանելին, ես յուսացեալ եմ ի տեր
յաւիտենական⁶²² կենացն արժանի լինել, եւ երկիր

And the tyrant said “Greetings glorious *Komēs*
Eudoxios.”

And Eudoxios replied “Greetings to you also, O
tyrant.” And the Governor said to him “Do you
understand *Komēs*, for what reason we seek you?” And
he responded, “Tell me oh Governor, that I might
know for what reason they sought me.”

The Governor said, “I called you so that you may
accept the decrees of the Emperor and so that you may
worship the gods.”

But the holy martyr replied, taunting the foolishness of
the Governor:

[206 v, col 1] “So, for this reason, I dressed in fine and
bright robes, sitting upon a white horse to stand before
your tribunal.”

The Governor replied, “By the gods, if the emperor
hears about your obedience to imperial decree and
sacrificing to the gods, he will seat you as second in his
kingdom.”

The blessed one replied, “I am hoping to be worthy of
eternal life and to worship

⁶⁰⁵ Եւդոքսիայ M, V

⁶⁰⁶ Եւդոքսիայ M, V, նա J

⁶⁰⁷ ասէ ցնա դատաւորն J

⁶⁰⁸ ասէ երանելին պատմեա M, V, J

⁶⁰⁹ դատաւոր վասն M, V, J

⁶¹⁰ կոչեցաք M, V

⁶¹¹ հնազեցիս J

⁶¹² եւ J

⁶¹³ դատաւորին M, V

⁶¹⁴ Եւ եւ վասն M, V

⁶¹⁵ զհանդերձս J

⁶¹⁶ երիվարիս M, V, J

⁶¹⁷ քո բեմիս M, V քո բեմիդ J

⁶¹⁸ հնազանդութեան M, V

⁶¹⁹ հրամանացն M, V

⁶²⁰ աթոռ M, V, J

⁶²¹ թագաւորութեանն M, V

⁶²² յուսացեալ եմ յաւիտենական J

պագանել ճշմարիտ աստուածութեան⁶²³ նորա: Եւ բռնաւորն ուրախ լինէր կարծէր⁶²⁴ եթէ վասն աստուածոցն ասիցէ զայն:

Ասէ ցնա դատաւորն, փառաւորեալ⁶²⁵ եւ քաջ⁶²⁶ կոմս⁶²⁷ վաղիւն⁶²⁸ եկեաջիր⁶²⁹ ի տաճար աստուածոցն⁶³⁰ եւ ընդ մեզ երկիր պագցես նոցա⁶³¹:

Ասէ ցնա կոմսն⁶³², որո՞ց⁶³³ եւ քանոյ⁶³⁴ աստուածոց հրամայես⁶³⁵ զոհել:

Իշխանն ասէ, Դիայ եւ ի Ապողոնի եւ մեծին Արտեմեայ⁶³⁶: Կոմս⁶³⁷ ասէ, երի՛ց հրամայեցեր հաւատալ այնպէս եւ ես հաւատամ ի հայր եւ յորդի եւ ի սուրբ հոգին: յերրորդութիւնն անբաժանելի:

Իշխանն ասէ, որպէս արհամարհելով զհրաման թագաւորին⁶³⁸ ասացեր զայդ: Բազումք⁶³⁹ ի զինուորակցաց իւրոց այնուհետեւ ժողովէին⁶⁴⁰: առ նա: Եւ կացեալ արաջի սրբոյն:

[206 v, col 2] Ասէ բռնաւորն այժմ որ ոչ կամի ի ձենջ հաւանել հրամանաց ինքնակալին, լուծցէ զգաւտի⁶⁴¹ զինուորութեան իւրոյ եւ դիցէ⁶⁴² առաջի իմ:

Իսկ երանելին Մարինոս որ Եւդոքսիոս⁶⁴³, նախ քան զամենեսին լուծեալ⁶⁴⁴ զգաւտի իւր եւ ձգեաց⁶⁴⁵ առաջի բռնաւորին:

true divinity.” The tyrant was pleased, believing that he was speaking about his gods.

Then the Governor said to him “Glorious and brave *Komēs*, come tomorrow to the temple of the gods and worship them with us.”

The *Komēs* asked “To which and to how many gods do you command me to sacrifice?”

The Governor replied, “To Zeus, Apollo, and the great Artemis.” The *Komēs* said, “You ordered me to confess in this way to three, and so I confess the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the undivided Trinity.”

The Governor said, “You say this as though you despise the royal decrees.” A multitude from his army gathered near him and stood around the saint.

[206 v, col 2] The tyrant said “Those among you who do not wish to obey the decrees of the emperor, untie his military belt and place it before me.”

But the blessed Marianos who is Eudoxios, before all others, untied his belt and placed it before the tyrant.

⁶²³ պագանել աստուածութեան J

⁶²⁴ կարծելով M, V, J

⁶²⁵ փառաւորեալ M, V

⁶²⁶ քաջ J

⁶²⁷ կոմս M, V

⁶²⁸ վաղիւ M, V

⁶²⁹ եկեացես J

⁶³⁰ ի տաճար եւ ընդ J

⁶³¹ աստուածոցն J

⁶³² Սուրբն J

⁶³³ ասէ կոմսն այդ M, V

⁶³⁴ քանի M, V, J

⁶³⁵ հրամայեցես J

⁶³⁶ Արտեմեա V, J

⁶³⁷ Սուրբն J

⁶³⁸ ինքնակալին M, V, J

⁶³⁹ եւ բազումք M, V

⁶⁴⁰ ժողովեալէին M, V

⁶⁴¹ զգաւտի իւր M, V

⁶⁴² զինուորութեան դիցէ M, V

⁶⁴³ Եւդոքսիոսն կոչեցաւ M, V

⁶⁴⁴ լուծանէր M, V

⁶⁴⁵ ձգէր M, V, J

Եւ տեսեալ դասակցաց նորա զոր⁶⁴⁶ արար, լուծին եւ նոքա ամենեքին⁶⁴⁷ զգաւտիս իւրեանց եւ ընկեցին առաջի բռնաւորին⁶⁴⁸: եւ էին նոքա արք հարիւր եւ չորք, եւ ասէին ցբռնաւոր, մեք զինուորեալ եմք յերկնային զինուորութիւնս հրեշտակաց⁶⁴⁹:

Յայնժամ տեսեալ իշխանն⁶⁵⁰ զհամարձակութիւն եւ բազմութիւն⁶⁵¹ նոցա, սարսեաց ի նոցանէ: եւ գրեաց ի ձեռն նամակաց առ թագաւորն, եթե զբազմութիւնս զայս կորուսանեմք ասէ: Այլ որ ոչ համարձակի⁶⁵² հակառակ հրամանաց ձերոց եւ անարգել զաստուածսն⁶⁵³:

Եւ լուեալ թագաւորն⁶⁵⁴ զայնոսիկ հրամայեաց զայն⁶⁵⁵ որք յառաձագոյն լուծին զգաւտիս իւրեանց սրով կատարել⁶⁵⁶: Եւ զայսն անպատու հաս արձակել: եւ ընկալեալ դատաւորին⁶⁵⁷ զհրամանս թագաւորին արձակեաց զնոսա:

Իսկ զերանելին Եւդոքսիոս հրամայեաց մատուցանել ի բեմն իւր: Եւ ասէ ցնա դատաւորն⁶⁵⁸: Մարիանէ՛ կոմս, յայսմհետէ

[207 r, col 1] ի բաց արա ի քէնէ⁶⁵⁹ զխորհուրդս յիմարութեան, եւ հաւանեա հրամանաց թագաւորին եւ հաւատա աստուածոցն բարերարութեան⁶⁶⁰ : Չի մի՛ պէսպէս չարչարանաւք նեղեցից զքեզ:

And having witnessed his actions, his comrades, to a man, all untied their belts and threw them before the tyrant. And they numbered one hundred and four.⁶⁶¹ And they said to the tyrant “We soldiers are the heavenly forces of angels.”

Upon seeing their boldness and abundance, the Governor shook before them. And he wrote a letter to the Emperor stating: “We must destroy this multitude, so that no one else will be so bold as to oppose your commands and dishonour the Gods.”

And hearing this, the Emperor ordered that those who had cast off their belts be executed and the others were to be set free, unpunished. And having received these commands from the Emperor, the Governor released them.

But the blessed Eudoxios was presented before his tribunal, and the Governor said to him “*Komēs Marianos*,

[207 r, col 1] admit openly the foolishness of your intentions and accept the orders of the Emperor, believe in the beneficence of the Gods and I will not subject you to various cruel torments.”

⁶⁴⁶ դասակցաց զոր J

⁶⁴⁷ ամենեքեան J

⁶⁴⁸ զգաւտի իւր եւ ձգեաց առաջի բռնաւորին: եւ էին նոքա M, V

⁶⁴⁹ չորս եւ ասէ ցդատաւորն մեք դասաւորեալ եմք յերկնային զինուորութիւնս հրեշտակաց J

⁶⁵⁰ իշխանին M, V, J

⁶⁵¹ զբազմութիւն M, V, J

⁶⁵² կարեկալ M, V

⁶⁵³ զկուռս J

⁶⁵⁴ թագաւորին M, V, J

⁶⁵⁵ զայնոսիկ J

⁶⁵⁶ սպանանել J

⁶⁵⁷ թագաւորին M, V

⁶⁵⁸ Եւ ասէ ցնա: Մարիանէ J

⁶⁵⁹ ի քէն M, V, J

⁶⁶⁰ յիմարութեան զի մի պէսպէս չարչարանաւք M, V

⁶⁶¹ A scribal error. The number 104 should read ‘1104’: the established number of soldiers martyred in the *vita longior* version in Greek. This number distinguishes the long versions of the *Martyrdom* from the short version in both Greek and Armenian which maintain that 1134 soldiers were martyred.

Պատասխանի ետ երանելին եւ ասէ: որո՞ւ
չարչարանաւք հաւանեցուցանել զիս կամիս
բռնաւորն⁶⁶² ասէ հրով եւ ձիթով բանդիւ եւ սրով:
Սուրբն ասէ: ասա ինձ ո՛վ դատաւոր⁶⁶³ ո՞ր իցէ⁶⁶⁴
բարի փախչելի⁶⁶⁵ յանցանաց⁶⁶⁶ հրոյն զոր ծով եւ
գետք ոչ կարէն շիջուցանել եթէ յայսմ⁶⁶⁷ հրոյ⁶⁶⁸
զոր սակաւ ջուր շիջուցանէ: զձիւթն⁶⁶⁹ որ անանց
հրով⁶⁷⁰ եռայ եթէ յայդմանէ, որ դոյզն մի փայտիւ
հալի եւ անցանի: Չապտա՞կն հոգեղեն եւ
բոցեղեն գուարթոնցն: Եթէ զապտակ⁶⁷¹
ապականացու եւ տկար արանց:
Չսառնամանի՞քն որ ոչ ունի ջերմութիւն, եւ
կլրճումն ատամա՞նց, եթէ զքո սպառնալիսդ:
Չբա՞նդս զայս զսակաւ ժամանակեայս եթէ զայն
որ յաւիտենիցն է եւ ոչ անցանէ⁶⁷²:

Արդ իմացիր զայդոսիկ զոր ասացի քեզ եւ
հաւատա, ⁶⁷³ թէ աստուծոց քոց եւ ո՛չ զոհեմ եւ ո՛չ
անշուշ կռոց երկիր պագանեմ: Այլ զոր կոչես դու
ապողողն ⁶⁷⁴ կորուստ է եւ ⁶⁷⁵ խաբէութիւն: Եւ
Արտեմիս մայր կորստեան: եւ երեքին ⁶⁷⁶ դուք
խաբիչք թագաւորն դիոկղետիանոս ⁶⁷⁷ եւ դու
բռնաւոր եւ հայր ձեր սատանայ:

The blessed one offered an answer and said “By which
torments do you wish to persuade me?” and the tyrant
replied “By fire, pitch, imprisonment, and the sword.”
And the saint responded “Tell me, O Governor, which
is best? To flee from the fire of transgression which
both sea and rivers do not have the power to extinguish
or from this fire, which can be extinguished with but a
little water? The pitch which is the boiling imperishable
fire or the pitch which does not melt but a little wood
and is extinguished? The spiritual and fervent beating
which is bliss or the corrupted and feeble beating of
men? The ice cold which does not have warmth and
the gnashing teeth or your threats? This imprisonment
which is but a little time or that which is forever and
will never pass?

Now you understand that which I have said to you and
believe that I will not sacrifice to your gods nor worship
your lifeless idols! The one which you call Apollo, he is
ruinous and deceitful! Artemis, mother of misfortune!
And all of you three tricksters, Emperor Diocletian,
you, tyrant, and your father Satan.

⁶⁶² դատաւորն M, V

⁶⁶³ բռնաւոր M, V, J

⁶⁶⁴ է M, V

⁶⁶⁵ փախչելին M, V, J

⁶⁶⁶ յանանց M, V, J

⁶⁶⁷ յայժմ M, V, յայսմ հրոյս որդոյ զնմի ջրով հալի J

⁶⁶⁸ հրոյս M, V, J

⁶⁶⁹ եթէ զձիւթն M, V

⁶⁷⁰ հրովն M, V

⁶⁷¹ զապտակն M, V

⁶⁷² Չբանդս զայս թէ զայն որ յաւիտենից ոչ անցանէ
M, V

⁶⁷³ հաւատայ M, V

⁶⁷⁴ ապողինար M, V

⁶⁷⁵ կորուստ եւ ապականութիւն խաբէութիւն M, V, J

⁶⁷⁶ Երեքեան M, V, J

⁶⁷⁷ Դիոկղիտիանոս M, V, J

[207 r, col 2] Եւ թարկացեալ դատաւորն ասէ:
 Զպատուական աստուածսն մեր⁶⁷⁸
 թշնամանեցե՛ր, եւ արդ մեր երեքինս⁶⁷⁹ ով եմք:
 Եւդոքսիոս ասէ, ասացի քեզ եթե դու եւ
 թագաւորն քո⁶⁸⁰ եւ հայրն ձեր սատանայ: Այլ տէս
 եւ ծանիր ով անդնդային վիշապ որ քեզ եւ
 թագաւորին քո⁶⁸¹ եւ հաւր⁶⁸² ձերոց⁶⁸³
 սատանայի⁶⁸⁴ պատրաստեալ է հուրն
 յաւիտենական եւ խաւարն արտաքին եւ
 հրեշտակք տանջողականք :

Դատաւորն ասէ, զիս թո՛ղ անարգեցեր ա՛յ
 կեղծաւոր, զթագաւորն զաստուածսն ընդէ՛ր
 յանդգնեցար հայիոյել:

Սուրբն ասէ, նման լիջիք դուք աստուածոցն
 ձերոց, որք անշունչք եւ անբանք են⁶⁸⁵:

Եւ թարկացեալ թագաւորն⁶⁸⁶ եւ եղծեալ գոյն
 երեսաց նորա հրամայեաց ի չորից կողմանց
 լարիւք պարգել զնա, եւ արջառաջդաւք⁶⁸⁷
 տանջել⁶⁸⁸: Եւ երանելին հայեցեալ յերկինս եկաց
 յաղաթս եւ ասէ⁶⁸⁹:

Շնորհեա՛, Տէր, որ ի քեզ են յուսացեալ
 ուրախութիւն⁶⁹⁰ յերկինս եւ յերկրի:

Շնորհեա՛, Տէր, ամենեցուն որ⁶⁹¹ խնդրեն ի քէն
 յիշելով⁶⁹² զիս յաւգնականութիւն, ի նեղութիւն⁶⁹³
 կամ ի պատերազմի կամ ի ծովու կամ ի մրրկեալ
 լերինս կամ ի հոգւոյ մոլորութենէ չարչարեալք
 կամ ի ճանապարհի կամ ի բանդի եւ այրեաց եւ
 աղբատաց եւ ի ծերութենէ

[207 r, col 2] And having been greatly angered, the
 Governor said “You contest our honourable gods and
 now what of we three?”

Eudoxios said: “I said to you, of you and your Emperor
 and your Father Satan. Listen and know this: the
 dragon of the deep is near at hand for you, your
 Emperor, and your father Satan, the eternal fire, the
 outer darkness, and the tormented angels.

The Governor said, “Not only have you dishonored me
 O devious on, but you are so impudent as to curse the
 Emperor and the gods?”

The saint replied: “You all resemble your gods, which
 are breathless and irrational.”

And the Governor was angered, and his face turned
 colour. He ordered that he be stretched on four sides
 by rope and tortured with a bullwhip. And the blessed
 one looked to the heavens, stood in prayer, and said:

Grant Lord, to those who have placed hope in You, joy
 in Heaven and on the Earth.

Grant Lord, to all those who invoke You through my
 memory, help in times of distress, whether in war, or at
 sea, or in stormy mountains or those tormented by
 confusion of the soul, or on the road, or in prison and
 the afflicted and the poor and from the perils of old age

⁶⁷⁸ աստուածսն արհամարհեցեր թշնամանեցեր M,
 աստուածսն թշնամանեցեր V, J

⁶⁷⁹ Երեքեանս M, V, J

⁶⁸⁰ թագաւորն M, V

⁶⁸¹ քում J

⁶⁸² հաւրն J

⁶⁸³ ձեր J

⁶⁸⁴ թագաւորին պատրաստեալ M, V

⁶⁸⁵ անմռունչք: J

⁶⁸⁶ բռնաւորն M, V, J

⁶⁸⁷ աջլաւք M, V, J

⁶⁸⁸ տանջել զնա M, V

⁶⁸⁹ յերկինս ասէ M, V

⁶⁹⁰ զխաղաղութիւն M, յուսացեալ յերկինս եւ V

⁶⁹¹ որք M, V

⁶⁹² խնդրեն յիշելով V

⁶⁹³ Նեղութեան M, V

[207 v, col 1] վտանգելոց եւ ծանրացելոց վիրաւք բեռամբ⁶⁹⁴ մեղաց: Եւ որք գայցեն ի տեղի վկայութիւն իմոյ ուր հեղու⁶⁹⁵ արին իմ վասն անուան⁶⁹⁶ քո⁶⁹⁷, եւ յիշատակ իմում ողբալով եւ արտասուաւք⁶⁹⁸ խնդրեսցեն զողորմութիւն իւրեանց⁶⁹⁹:

Շնորհեա՛ նոցա Տեր զաւգնութիւն⁷⁰⁰ եւ կատարեալ առողջութիւն, եւ փրկեա զնոսա յամենայն նեղութեանց նոցա:

Յիշեա՛ Տեր եւ զծնուդս⁷⁰¹ իմ եւ զամենայն համազգիս: Չի մի եղիցի առ նոսա մահտարածամ մարդոյ⁷⁰² եւ անասնոյ եւ ամենեցուն որք յիշեն զանուն իմ:

Շնորհեա՛ նոցա տէր խաղաղութիւն յերկինս եւ յերկրի, եւ պտղաբերեալ⁷⁰³ զայգիս եւ զանդաստանս նոցա:

Եւ որք⁷⁰⁴ խնդրեն ի քէն բարեխաւսութեամբ⁷⁰⁵ իմով եւ կարդան զիս յաւգնականութիւն⁷⁰⁶ դու ողորմեսցիս նոցա, եւ կատարեալ⁷⁰⁷ զհայցուածս նոցա ի բարի:

Շնորհեա՛ Տեր եւ զուզակցին իմոյ մասն ժառանգութեան ընդ իս ի հանդերձեալ⁷⁰⁸ յաւիտենին զի մի բարժանեսցուք ի միմեանց:

[207 v, col 1] and those who are weighed down by the burden of sins. And those who come to the place of my martyrdom, where my blood will pour in your name, and mourn in my memory and ask for mercy by lamenting.

Lord grant them aid and complete health and deliver them from all of their afflictions.

Remember Lord also my parents and all of my family. So that they will not suffer untimely death from man nor from beast and for all who remember my name.

Lord grant them peace in Heaven and on Earth and make their vineyards and fields bear fruit.

And those who invoke You through my intercession and call to me for aid, may You have mercy upon them and fulfill their requests in good faith.

Lord also grant that they may share in my inheritance for eternity, so that we may not be separated from one another.

⁶⁹⁴ վտանգելոյ եւ ծանրացելոյ բեռամբ M, V

⁶⁹⁵ հեղաւ M, V, J

⁶⁹⁶ անուանդ M, V, J

⁶⁹⁷ քո սրբոյ M, V, քում սրբոյ J

⁶⁹⁸ արտասուելով M, V

⁶⁹⁹ խնդրեսցեն ի քէն զողորմութիւն J

⁷⁰⁰ Շնորհեա նոցա Տեր վաղվաղակի ողորմութիւն եւ աւգնութիւն եւ կատարեալ M, V Շնորհեա նոցա Տեր վաղվաղակի աւգնութիւն եւ կատարեալ J

⁷⁰¹ զծնուդսն M, V, J

⁷⁰² մարդոյ M, V

⁷⁰³ պտղաբերելոյ J

⁷⁰⁴ որ M, V

⁷⁰⁵ խնդրեն բարեխաւսութեամբ M, V, J

⁷⁰⁶ աւգնականութիւն J

⁷⁰⁷ կատարեսցես M, V, J

⁷⁰⁸ հանդերձեալն J

Եւ իբրեւ կատարեաց զաղաւթսն, հրամայեաց⁷⁰⁹ դատաւորն տանել զնոսա⁷¹⁰ ի բանդ: Եւ յետ աւուրց տասանց հրամայեաց բերել զառաջեալ⁷¹¹ զերանելին: Եւ իբրեւ բերին⁷¹², հայեցեալ⁷¹³ ի նա բռնաւորն ասէ⁷¹⁴, Եւդոքսիէ կոմս այժմ զոնեա հաւանեցա՞ր երկիր պագանել եւ զոհել աստուածոցն եթե դեռես⁷¹⁵ ի նմին յամառութեան⁷¹⁶ իցես⁷¹⁷:

[207 v, col 2] Սուրբն ասէ⁷¹⁸, ես հաւատացեալ եմ ի հայր եւ յորդի եւ ի հոգին սուրբ, յանբաժանելի սուրբ երրորդութիւնն: Եւ ես⁷¹⁹ յառաջին⁷²⁰ կուրացեալ չարին խաբէութեամբ⁷²¹ յանաւրէն կռապաշտութեան, եւ հիւանդ⁷²² եւ հոգւով եւ բնութեան⁷²³ մարմնոյ: Իսկ յորժամ արժանի եղէ վերստին լուսաման աւագանին ծննդեան⁷²⁴ եւ սուրբ մկրտութեանն, բաց անաչք իմ եւ ի մաստացայ, ողջախոհ խորհրդով⁷²⁵ սրտի իմոյ: Բայց զայս զհտասչիրով անիրաւ⁷²⁶ բռնաւոր եթէ ոչ հաւանիմ քեզ եւ ոսկիապատ անշունչ⁷²⁷ աստուածոցն եւ ոչ զոհեմ որք են գործք ձեռաց մարդկան⁷²⁸: Չի նման նոցա լիցին⁷²⁹ նոքա որք արարին զնոսա եւ ամենայն յուսացեալքն ի նոսա:

And when he completed the prayers, the Governor ordered to take him to prison. After ten days he ordered the blessed one to be brought forth and when they brought him the tyrant looked down upon him and he said: “*Komēs* Eudoxius, perhaps now you have been persuaded to prostrate yourself and give praise to the gods or will you still persist in stubbornness?”

[207 v, col 2] The saint replied: “I believe in the Father, and the Son and in the Holy Spirit. In the indivisibility of the Holy Trinity. And I was first to have been blinded by the treachery of evil, by impious idolatry, through sickness in the soul and through disease of the body. But I have been made worthy again, cleansed in the pool of birth and my eyes are opened by holy baptism and I am strengthened by the sound minded council of my heart. But through this knowledge I am not agreeable to you, unjust tyrant, and I will not sacrifice to the gold-covered lifeless idols of the gods, which are the works of the hands of men, that they might resemble those who made them and place all hope in them.

⁷⁰⁹ հրամաց տանել J

⁷¹⁰ զնա M, V, J

⁷¹¹ տասանց բերել զառաջեալ M, V

⁷¹² Եւ իբրեւ բերին ասէ Եւդոքսիէ J

⁷¹³ հայեցալ M, V

⁷¹⁴ ասէ ցնա M, V

⁷¹⁵ եթե ի նմին M, V, J

⁷¹⁶ յամառութեանն V

⁷¹⁷ կաս J

⁷¹⁸ Եւդոքսիոս ասաց M, V, Եւդոքսիոս ասէ J

⁷¹⁹ ես էի J

⁷²⁰ յառաջի J

⁷²¹ խաբէութեան M, V խաբէութենէ J

⁷²² հիւանդ էի J

⁷²³ հիւանդութեամբ M, V

⁷²⁴ ծննդեանն M, V

⁷²⁵ խորհրդաւք M, V

⁷²⁶ ով անաւրէն

⁷²⁷ անշունչ պատկերաց աստուածոցն M, անշունչ պատկերի աստուածոցն V, J

⁷²⁸ մարդոյ M

⁷²⁹ զի նման լիցին նոքա V, լիցին որք J

Եւ բարկացեալ դատաւորն հրամայեաց կապարեայ ⁷³⁰ մրճաւք ⁷³¹ հարկանել զկուրծն նորա, եւ ասէ ցնա հաւանեա ⁷³² հրամանաց ինքնակալին, եւ երկիր պագ աստուածոցն եւ ասարիս ⁷³³ ի տանջանաց ⁷³⁴:

Իսկ սուրբն զաչս ի յերկինս ⁷³⁵ համբարձեալ, եւ խնդրէր ի Տէր զառաջին կայ ⁷³⁶ մրցումն տանջանացն ուրախութեամբ կատարել:

Յայնժամ տեսեալ դատաւորին զջերմեռանդն հաւատոյ նորին ⁷³⁷ զյաւժարութիւնն, վճիռ հատանէր ի վերայ սրբոյն այսպիսի աւրինակաւ:

[208 r, col 1] ՉՄարինոս զանուանեալն Եւդոքսիոս, զերապատուեալն կոմսութեան, իշխանութեամբ եւ ոչ հաւանեալ հրամանաց ինքնակալին ⁷³⁸ եւ անպատուեալ զբարերարութիւն աստուածոցն ⁷³⁹, յետ բազում չարչարանաց, սրով ընկալցի զվճիռ մահու:

Եւ ընկալեալ սրբոյ վկային ⁷⁴⁰ զայսպիսի վճիռ ⁷⁴¹:

Եւ հասեալ ի տեղի վկայութեանն հայեցեալ տեսանէր զբազմութիւն զաւրականացն ի դասու ⁷⁴² զինուորութեան իւրոյ զի լալով եւ ողբալով երթային զկնի ⁷⁴³ նորա: Լային եւ ամենայն ժողովեալ ամբոխն ⁷⁴⁴ ընդ նոսա:

Եւ ասէ ցդահիճսն զի թողացուցեն ⁷⁴⁵ փոքր մի ժամ յաղաւթս կալ ⁷⁴⁶ Տէն մեր Յիսուս Քրիստոս:

And the Governor was angered and ordered to strike his chest with a lead hammer. And he said to him “Accept the commands of the Emperor: and lay prostrate before the gods and you will live survive your torments.”

But the saint cast his eyes to the heavens and begged the Lord to first endure the tortures and then to be martyred with joy.

When the Governor saw the ardent belief and willingness of the martyr, he passed judgement upon the saint as an example.

[208 r, col 1] And so Marianos named Eudoxius, greatly honoured with the office of the *Komēs* did not accept the orders of the Emperor. And having been dishonoured for the benefaction of the gods and after much torment he received the judgment of death by the sword.

And the holy martyr accepted such a judgement of death. Having arrived at the place of martyrdom, he looked and saw the multitude of the soldiers from the ranks of his army. Crying and lamenting, they went with his wife. They cried and all the multitude gathered around him.

And he said to the executioners “Permit a little time to stand in prayer to our Lord Jesus Christ.”

⁷³⁰ կապարեա M, V, J

⁷³¹ մրճով M, V

⁷³² հաւանեաց M

⁷³³ ասարեացիս M, V, J

⁷³⁴ տանջանացդ M, V, J

⁷³⁵ զաչսն յերկինս J

⁷³⁶ զառաջին մրցումն M, V

⁷³⁷ հաւատս վկային M, V հաւատոց վկային J

⁷³⁸ թագաւորին J

⁷³⁹ Աստուածոցն մերոց M, V Աստուածոց մերոց J

⁷⁴⁰ սրբոյն զայսպիսի J

⁷⁴¹ վճիռ մահու M, V

⁷⁴² դասուց M, V, J

⁷⁴³ զկնտ M, V, J

⁷⁴⁴ ամենայն ժողովուրդքն ընդ M, V, ամենայն ամբոխ ընդ J

⁷⁴⁵ թողացուցէր ինձ M, V թողացուցեն նմա, J

⁷⁴⁶ կալ առ Տէն M, V, J

Եւ նայեցեալ ընդ երկինս ⁷⁴⁷ տարածեաց զձեռս իւր եւ աղաթեաց այսպէս:

Տէ՛ր աստուած որ արարեր զերկինս եւ զերկիր, զծով եւ զամենայն որ ⁷⁴⁸ ի նոսա: Լուր՛ աղաչանաց իմոց, ⁷⁴⁹ եւ ունկնդիր խնդրուածաց ծառայ ի քո ⁷⁵⁰, եւ աւգնեա՛ ամենայն քրիստոնէից հաւատացելոց ⁷⁵¹ ի քեզ, եւ ամենեցուն ⁷⁵² շնորհեա զհայցուածս նոցա որք ⁷⁵³ կոչեն զիս ⁷⁵⁴ յաւգնականութիւն:

Եւ մի՛ եկեցե՛ ի վերայ երկրիս այսորիկ սով կամ սրածութիւն, կամ սասանութիւն կամ նուազութիւն պտղոց ⁷⁵⁵ եւ խաշանց ծննդոց: Եւ ամենայն հարկաւոր պիտոյից, կամ շարժ ⁷⁵⁶ դղրդմանց ⁷⁵⁷ քաղաքաց եւ շինուածոց:

[208 r, col 2] Այլ որք հաւատով գայցեն ի տեղի կատարման իմոյ եւ արտասուաւք խնդրեցէն դու Տէր զխնդրուածս սրտից նոցա շնորհեա՛ ⁷⁵⁸ վաղվադակի:

Շնորհեա՛ Տէր եւ զինուորակցաց իմոց եւ ընկերաց զխաղաղութիւն: Չի մի յաղթեցե՛ նոցա թշնամի: Եւ մի տեսցեն նոքա զամբոխ պատերազմի ⁷⁵⁹: Եւ որք ի մարտի ⁷⁶⁰ պատերազմի լինիցին մի յաղթահարեցին ⁷⁶¹ ի թշնամեաց իւրեանց: Եւ մի պատրեցին ի սրոց ⁷⁶² նոցա: ⁷⁶³ Այլ խաղաղացոյ զկեանս նոցա: Եւ խորտակեա՛ զամենայն թշնամիս ի պատերազմի հեթանոսաց: And looking to the heavens he extended his hands and

prayed in this way:

“Lord God, You who made the heavens and the Earth, the sea and everything which is in them. Hear my supplications, and be attentive to the requests of Your servant. Help all Christians who believe in You and grant all the requests of those who call to me for assistance.

And You must not come over this land with hunger or pestilence, or earthquake or scarcity of fruits or the birth of flocks and all that is necessary or cause the movement of cities and buildings:

[208 r, col 2] But may those with faith come to the place of my execution and with tears may they ask You, Lord, to immediately fulfill the requests of their hearts.

Lord grant peace also to my fellow soldiers and friends, so that their enemies do not win and they do not see the multitude of battles. And those enemies who would take up arms against them must not triumph over them nor best them by their swords. Rather, may they live peaceful lives and overthrow their heathen enemies in war.”

⁷⁴⁷ նայեցեալ յերկինս M, V, նայեցեալ ընդ յերկինս J

⁷⁴⁸ որ է J

⁷⁴⁹ մերոց M

⁷⁵⁰ խնդրուածաց իմոց եւ աւգնեա M, V, J

⁷⁵¹ ամենայն հաւատացելոց M, V, ամենայն հաւատացելոց J

⁷⁵² եւ ամենեցուն քրիստոնէից շնորհեա զհայցուածս M, V եւ շնորհեա ամենայն քրիստոնէից զհայցուածս J
⁷⁵³ որ M

⁷⁵⁴ զիս ի խորոց սրտից աւգնականութիւն J

⁷⁵⁵ պաղաքերաց M, V, J

⁷⁵⁶ շարժումն M, V, J

⁷⁵⁷ դղրդեալ M, V, դղրդման J

⁷⁵⁸ կատարեա M, V

⁷⁵⁹ պատերազմաց M, V, J

⁷⁶⁰ մարտ M, V

⁷⁶¹ յաղթահարիցին J

⁷⁶² սրոյ J

⁷⁶³ թշնամեաց իւրեանց: Այլ խաղաղացոյ M, V

Եւ յետ այսորիկ ասէ ցամուսինն իւր, քե՛ր
այսուհետեւ զաման անաւթոյն զոր ասացի քեզ,
եւ ժողովեա՛ր զարիւն իմ: Եւ առցես զգլուխ իմ
քեզ ⁷⁶⁴ ուրախութեամբ: Եւ մի՛ լալով եւ
տրտմութեամբ: Եւ մի՛ արկցես արտաւար ի վերայ
իմ վասն մեկնելոյ քոյ ինէն ⁷⁶⁵: Եւ արասցես
տապան ինձ որ կոչի ամիմնոյ: Եւ դու ննջեա ընդ
աջմէ իմմէ: Եւ դարձեալ ի ժողովուրդն էտես զոմն
ի զինուորակցաց ⁷⁶⁶ իւրոց Զինովն ⁷⁶⁷ անուն
կոչեցեալ, ողբալով զնա յոյժ:

Եւ ասէ ցնա սուրբն ⁷⁶⁸: Մի՛ ողբար վասն
բաժանելոյ քոյ ինէն զի ոչ թողից զքեզ: այլ որպէս
շրջէիր յերկրի զկնի իմ նոյնպէս եւ յերկինս ⁷⁶⁹
շրջեսցիս ընդ իս:

Եւ զայս ասացեալ եկեալ առ դահիճսն ասէ
ցնոսա:

[208 v, col 1] Որդեա՛կք այսուհետ եւ կատարեցէք
զիրամայեալսն ձեզ:

Եւ եկեալ ձայն յերկնից առ նա ասելով,
այսուհետ ⁷⁷⁰ եկ առ հայրն քո երկնաւոր: Եւ
երանել ի ես դու զի զնթացսն ⁷⁷¹ քո կատարեցեր
յերկրի եւ զհաւատսն ⁷⁷² պահեցեր, յիշելով
յաղաթս քո զամենեսեան ⁷⁷³:

Եղիցին կատարեալ ⁷⁷⁴ խնդրուածք քո վասն
ամենեցուն զոր խնդրեցեր ⁷⁷⁵ զբարութիւն: Եւ
որպէս կնդրեցերն եղիցի քեզ եւ առաւել նոցա: ⁷⁷⁶

And after this he said to his wife “Bring forth the pouch
as I told to you and collect my blood. Take my head
with joy and not with sorrow or mourning. And do not
shed tears over me because of your separation from
me. And you will make a tomb for me which is called
“immemorial”, and you will sleep right next to me.”
Having returned to the multitude he saw someone
from amongst his army, whose name was Zenon,
greatly lamenting him.

And the saint said to him “Do not mourn on account
of your separation from me, for I will not abandon you.
Just as you followed me in my earthly life, so too will
you follow me in Heaven.

And having said this and having come to the
executioners, he said to them:

[208 v, col 1] “Now sons you must complete your
commands.”

And a voice came to him from the heavens saying:
“Come to your heavenly father: and rejoice in me
because you have completed your course on Earth and
you have maintained your faith, remembering all in
your prayers.

Your requests will be fulfilled concerning all the which
you have asked and more besides:

⁷⁶⁴ իմ ուրախութեամբ M, V իմ ի քեզ ուրախութեամբ J

⁷⁶⁵ մեկնելոյ իմ իքէն J

⁷⁶⁶ զինուորաց M, V

⁷⁶⁷ Զինուն M, V Զէնուն J

⁷⁶⁸ Սուրբն Զինոնիէ M, V, J

⁷⁶⁹ եւ շրջեսցիս M

⁷⁷⁰ ասելով եկ M, V

⁷⁷¹ զնթացս M, V, J

⁷⁷² զհաւատսն քո M, V, զհաւատս քո J

⁷⁷³ պահեցեր: M, V

⁷⁷⁴ կատարեալք J

⁷⁷⁵ զոր խնդրեցեր: Այլ եթե հանդիպեսցի որ ի
պատերազմի կամի նեղութեան եւ յիշեսցէ քեզ
յամենայն սրտէ խորտակեցին թշնամիք նորա: Եւ
որք ծանրացեալ M, V

⁷⁷⁶ նոցա: Զի եթե հանդիպեսցի որ ի պատերազմի
կամի նեղութեան եւ յիշեսցէ զքեզ յամենայն սրտէ
խորտակեցին թշնամիք նորա: Եւ որք ծանրացեալ J

Եւ որք ծանրացեալ իցեն մեղաւք եւ դիմեցեն ի տանար սրբութեան քո ուր եղեալ լիցեն ⁷⁷⁷ նշխարք ⁷⁷⁸ ոսկերաց ձերոց ⁷⁷⁹ թողցի ծանրութիւն ⁷⁸⁰ մեղաց նոցա:

Եւ զայս ասացեալ եւ խոնարհեցուցեալ զպարանոցն ⁷⁸¹ առաջի ⁷⁸² դահճին, եւ ձգեալ զսուներն եհատ զգլուխ նորա: Եւ բերեալ զանաւթն ամուսնոյ նորա եւ ժողովեալ ⁷⁸³ զարիւնն: Առեալ եւ զսուրբ գլուխ նորա խնդալով եւ ուրախութեամբ, տարեալ զնշխարս ⁷⁸⁴ սրբոյն ի տեղին ուր հրամայեաց երանելին:

Կատարեցան ընթացք նահատակութեան վկային ⁷⁸⁵ Քրիստոսի Եւդոքսիոս ⁷⁸⁶ յամսեանն Սեպտեմբերի ⁷⁸⁷ ի Վեցն ⁷⁸⁸ յաւուր կիրակէի:

Եւ եկեալ կնոջ իւրոյ ⁷⁸⁹ Մանտանայի առաջի բրնաւորին ⁷⁹⁰ անարգելով ⁷⁹¹ զաստուածսն եւ զթագաւորն եւ զդատաւորն:

[208 v, col 2] Ասէ նա բռնաւորն ⁷⁹² վասն այնորիկ զայդ առնես զի եւ դու վկայեցիս ⁷⁹³ եւ պատուեցին ոսկերք քո յանմիտ Քրիստոնէից: Երդնում ⁷⁹⁴ յաստուածսն ամենայն եւ ի փառս նոցա զի ո՛չ ⁷⁹⁵ լցից զփափագումն սրտի քո:

Those who are weighed down by sins, may they turn to the temple of your holiness where the remains of your bones will be placed, [and] the grievousness of their sins will be forgiven.”

And having said this, he lowered [his] neck, before the executioner. And having stretched his neck, the sword severed his head. And his wife brought the pouch and collected the blood. Taking also the saint’s head with joy and gladness, she took the remains of the saint to the place where the blessed one had stipulated.

The processes of martyrdom of the martyr of Christ Eudoxius were complete in the month of September on Sunday the sixth.

And his wife Mandana came before the tyrant, dishonoring the gods, the Emperor, and the Governor.

[208 v, col 2] The tyrant said to her “You are doing this because you also wish to be martyred and for your bones to be honored by the foolish Christians: I swear an oath to all of the gods and their glory, I will not fulfill the desire of your heart!”

⁷⁷⁷ լինին M, V, էջէ J

⁷⁷⁸ նշխար J

⁷⁷⁹ քոց M, V, J

⁷⁸⁰ ծանրութիւնք J

⁷⁸¹ զպարանոցն իւր առաջի V զպարանոց իւր առաջի J

⁷⁸² առաջի սրոյ դահճին J

⁷⁸³ ժողովեաց J

⁷⁸⁴ զնշխարսն M

⁷⁸⁵ ճգնաւորին M, V, ճգնագգեաց վկային J

⁷⁸⁶ Եւդոքսիայ M, V, Եւդոքսիոսի J

⁷⁸⁷ Հոկտեմբերի M, V

⁷⁸⁸ սասն եւ ինն M, ԺԹ V

⁷⁸⁹ նորա J

⁷⁹⁰ դատաւորին J

⁷⁹¹ Եւ եկեալ կնոջն իւրոյ Մանտանայի անարգել զաստուածսն M, V

⁷⁹² Եւ լուեալ բռնաւորին ասէ ցնա վասն M, V, J

⁷⁹³ վկայեցիս J

⁷⁹⁴ երդուեալ M, V, J

⁷⁹⁵ նոցա ոչ M, V, J

Եւ յետ աւուրց հնգից⁷⁹⁶ անցելոց⁷⁹⁷ երեւեալ սուրբն ամուսնոյ իւրոյ եւ ասէ: Ընկեր իմ եւ զուգակից զՄակարիոս արձակեա վաղվաղակի⁷⁹⁸ յապարանս իմ, զի ունիմ ինչ ասել ընդ նմա: Եւ յարուցեալ առաւ տուն կոչեալ⁷⁹⁹ զնա եւ ասէ ցնա: Որդի⁸⁰⁰ իմ Մակարիէ, տէրն քո յապարանս իմ⁸⁰¹ կոչէ զքեզ, եւ նա⁸⁰² ուրախութեամբ եկեալ յապարանսն: Եւ տեսեալ զնա ոմանց առեալ⁸⁰³ զնա տարան առաջի դատաւորին եւ ասեն, եւ սա ընդ Եւդոքսիոս⁸⁰⁴ էր ի քում իշխանութեանդ⁸⁰⁵: Եւ տեսեալ զնա բռնաւորն ասէ ցնա: Ասա ինչ յորո՞ց ազգէ իցես⁸⁰⁶:

Մակարիոս ասէ⁸⁰⁷, Քրիստոնեայ⁸⁰⁸ եմ⁸⁰⁹: Իշխանն ասէ մի յիմարիւր եւ մի փոխել անար, այլ հաւատայ յԱստուածսն զիս ապրեցիս⁸¹⁰:

Սուրբն ասէ⁸¹¹, ես հաւատացեալ եմ⁸¹² ի թագաւորն մեծ եւ յաստուած⁸¹³ եւ յորդին⁸¹⁴ եւ ի սուրբ հոգին, եւ յուսացեալ եմ ի մի⁸¹⁵ աստուծութիւնն թե՛⁸¹⁶ յաղթեցից թշնամոյն, եւ ակն ունիմ հասանել կոչողին իմոյ վաղվաղակի:

And after five days of the saints passing, the saint appeared to his wife and said “My friend and my companion Makarios send him with haste to my estates for I have something to say to him: And she summoned him, having called to him and said “My son Makarios, your lord has called you to his dwelling.” And he came with joy. Having seen him, certain ones took him before the Governor, and they said, “He was with Eudoxius in your domain.” Having seen him, the tyrant said, “From which people might you be?”

Makarios to him said “I am Christian.” The Governor said, “Do not be foolish and do not convert but believe in the gods in order that you might live.”

The saint said “I believe in the Great King, in God, the Son and in the Holy Spirit. And I have hope in the one God in order that I might overcome my enemies, and I wait patiently to reach the one who calls me.”

⁷⁹⁶ Հնգից ի վերայ M, V, J

⁷⁹⁷ անցելոյ J

⁷⁹⁸ զՄակարիոս վաղվաղակի M, զՄակարիոս յո՛ւս վաղվաղակի V, զՄակարիոս զորդին մեր արձակեա յապարանս իմ վաղվաղակի J

⁷⁹⁹ կոչեաց M, V

⁸⁰⁰ ասէ որդեակ M, V

⁸⁰¹ իւր V, J

⁸⁰² նորա J

⁸⁰³ տեսեալ զնա ոմանց ի դատուց զինուորացն կոչեալ զնա տարան M, V, տեսեալ զնա դատուց զինուորացն կոչեալ զնա տարան J

⁸⁰⁴ Եւդոքսիայ J

⁸⁰⁵ Եւդոքսի իշխանութեանն էր : Եւ տեսեալ զնա M, V

⁸⁰⁶ ցնա: յորմէ ազգէ իցէ M, ցնա: յորմէ ազգէ իցես V, ցնա: Ասա ինչ յորմէ ազգէ ես J

⁸⁰⁷ ասաց M, V

⁸⁰⁸ քրիստոնեա M, V, J

⁸⁰⁹ եմ եւ J

⁸¹⁰ յԱստուածսն եւ ապրեցիս M, V Աստուածսն զի ապրեցիս J

⁸¹¹ ասաց M, V

⁸¹² հաւատացեալ եմ եւ հաւատամ ի թագաւորն M, V, J

⁸¹³ յաստուածն M, V, J

⁸¹⁴ յորդին միածին եւ J

⁸¹⁵ յուսացեալ ի մի M, V

⁸¹⁶ զի M, V

[209 r, col 1] Եւ լուեալ զայս դատաւորն Պոնտիանոս⁸¹⁷ հրամայեաց սրով կատարել զնա⁸¹⁸: Եւ ընկալեալ սրբոյն Մակարիոսի զվախճանս սրոյ իւրով արեամբն⁸¹⁹: Յամսեանն Սեպտեմբերի ի տասն եւ երեքն⁸²⁰: Ի փառս եւ ի գովութիւն մերոյ եւ թագաւորին Քրիստոսի որում փառք յաւիտեանս ամէն⁸²¹ :-

[Colophon] Թարգմանեցաւ պատմութիւն սրբոց վկայիցս, ի յունարէն գրոց ի հայերէն բարբառ: Ի մայրաքաղաքին Հայոց որ կոչի Մելետինի: Ի թուականիս Հայոց ի հինգ հարիւր քառասուն եւ մի:⁸²²

Ընդ որս եւ Քրիստոս բարեխաւսութեամբ սուրբ վկայից տացէ վարձս թարգմանողին եւ գրողին աշխատելոց ի սմա, ընթերցաւորաց եւ լսաւորաց եւ ստացաւորաց, եւ ինքն եղիցի արինեալ յաւիտեանս: Ամէն:⁸²³

[209 r, col 1] And hearing this, the Governor Pontianos ordered execution by sword:

And Saint Makarios accepted death by the blood of his sword in the month of September, on the 13th, for the glory and praise of our lord and king, Christ, in whom glory be forever and ever! Amen.

[Colophon] The account of these holy martyrs was translated from Greek writing into the Armenian language, in the mother city of the Armenians, which is called Melitene, in the Armenian era five-hundred and forty-one (1092).

Through the intercession of the holy martyrs and Christ, may a reward be given for the translation and the scribal work within. Readers, listeners, and owners, may it be praised forever. Amen.

⁸¹⁷ Պոնդենդիանոսի M, V, J

⁸¹⁸ կատարել: M, V

⁸¹⁹ սրոյ արեամբ M, V, սրոյ արեան J

⁸²⁰ Յամսեանն Հոկտեմբերի: M, V Սեպտեմբերի ԺԲ: J

⁸²¹ Ի փառս եւ ի գովութիւն տեառն մերոյ եւ փրկչին Յիսուսի Քրիստոսի որում փառք յաւիտեանս յաւիտենից ամէն M

Ի փառս եւ ի գովութիւն տեառն մերոյ եւ փրկչին Յիսուսի Քրիստոսի որում փառք յաւիտեանս ամէն V, J

⁸²² Թարգմանեցան պատմութիւնք սրբոց վկայիցս ի յունարէն գրոց ի հայ բարբար: ի մայրաքաղաքին Հայոց որ կոչի Մելետենի: Ի թուականիս Հայոց հինգ հարիւր եւ քառասուն եւ մեկ: M

Թարգմանեցան պատմութիւնք սրբոց վկայիցս ի յունարէն գրոց ի հայ բարբար: ի մայրաքաղաքին Հայոց որ կոչի Մելիտինի: Ի թուականիս Հայոց ՇԽԱ: V

Թարգմանեցաւ պատմութիւն սրբոց վկայիցս ի յունականէն ի մեր: ի մայրաքաղաքիս Մելետենոյ: Ի թուականիս Հայոց ՇԽԱ: J

⁸²³ Ընդ որս եւ Քրիստոս բարեխաւսութեամբ սրբոցս տացէ վարձս բարեաց թարգմանչի եւ գրչի եւ ամենայն աշխատելոցս ի սմա բանիւ շարադրելոյ եւ գրչի գրելոյ այն որ միշտ արինեալ է յաւիտեանս յաւիտենից: Ամեն: Աղաթիւք սրբոցս ողորմեա Քրիստոս Աստուած Վարդան վարդապետ եւ ստացող ի գրոցս: Ամեն: M

Ընդ որս... (remainder of V text is lost) V

Ընդ որս Քրիստոս տացէ վարձս բարեաց աշխատողացս ի սմա: Եւ բարեխաւսութեամբ սրբոյս Եւդոկսէի: Ողորմեա Քրիստոս Աստուած ստացող ի սորա տեր Պաւղոս կաթողիկոսի: եւ ծնողաց իւրոց եւ Աստուածատուր Միակեցի եւ ծնողաց իւրոց: եւ ինձ մեղապարտ Մանուէլ գծողիս եւ ծնողաց իմոց եւ այլ կարդացողաց եւ լսողաց եւ խաչատրի թխթիս կոկողին եւ որ զամէնն ասէն ամեն ամեն: J

CONCLUSION

Commemorating Saint Eudoxios in the Eleventh Century between Armenia and Byzantium

Scholarship in the field of Armenian studies has long highlighted that the eleventh century was one of the most significant periods in the transformation of the Armenian *sanctorale*, facilitated by the translation of previously unattested saints' lives and martyrologies from Greek Constantinopolitan liturgical collections. However, this transformative period, and the translation activity which stimulated it, has traditionally been associated with the translation programme of the Armenian Miaphysite Catholicos Grigor Vkasēs. The act of rendering new hagiographies and martyrologies into Armenian at the hand of Vkasēs and his translation team has been framed as both a tool of Armenian cultural revival and of separation from the Byzantine Empire in the closing decades of the eleventh century. Consequently, the current interpretive model framing this period of Armenian translation activity which introduced previously unattested feasts into the Armenian tradition in the eleventh century is one articulated in terms of the creation of a national space, serving the purpose of demarcating Armenians from the influence of the Church of Constantinople and stimulating a period of Armenian cultural renewal. Orientating itself around the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*, this study has offered a more dynamic model: one which considers and foregrounds the full range of evidence for an active milieu of Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity which also brought previously unattested saints into the Armenian tradition during the eleventh century, but which carried distinctly different objectives from the translation activities of Grigor II Vkasēs.

With the knowledge that the Armenian *Martyrdom* was translated in Melitene in 1092, based on a Greek archetype, and commissioned by an anonymous sponsor, the first chapter of this study identified that the Armenian *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* was based on a pre-Metaphrastic Greek model, drawn from a menologion for September arranged according to the liturgical cycle of the

Church of Constantinople. By considering this Greek model, the modality of its translation, the objectives of the translator, the conscious maintenance of the date of veneration, and the context behind its production, this chapter argued that the Armenian *Martyrdom* was a product of the Armenian Chalcedonian community of Melitene. Placing the Armenian *Martyrdom* within the cult dossier of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios offered further support in favour of a conclusion for Armenian Chalcedonian production. The translation of an abbreviated version of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* derived from the *Synaxarion ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* translated by the Armenian Chalcedonian Yovsēp in 991 as well as material evidence for the veneration of saint Eudoxios on the seal of the Chalcedonian Armeno-Byzantine commander Krakourates not only strengthened an argument for Chalcedonian agency in the translation of the *vita longior* version translated in Melitene in 1092, but collectively located the emergence of these saints in the Armenian tradition, previously unattested, to an active Chalcedonian Armenian milieu of translation and veneration during the tenth and eleventh century.

Progressing from the foundation laid by the investigation of the *Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* in chapter 1, which highlighted that the entry of these previously unattested saints into Armenian was stimulated by Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity, chapter 2 embedded the production of the *Martyrdom* in 1092 within a wider Chalcedonian translation milieu connected to a process of textual dissemination and translation which followed the expansion of the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and eleventh century. By putting the disparately surviving Armenian material in conversation with Syriac and Arabic evidence, the fragmentary Armenian Chalcedonian sources were connected to a much wider trans-regional enterprise commonly engaged in by Chalcedonian communities living throughout the Empire's eastern frontier. The impetus behind the translation of this material relied both on an imperial infrastructure which supported textual dissemination, but also on the co-operation and initiative of the Chalcedonian communities which received these texts and translated them. This Chalcedonian translation activity not only brought new commemorations and feast day into the local provincial environment but facilitated the intrusion of the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople into the norms of provincial Christian communities in Northern Syria, Northern Mesopotamia, Eastern Anatolia, and the Caucasus during the tenth and eleventh century, and served to construct, reinforce, and maintain a shared trans-regional, imperial space. In doing so, this chapter foregrounded an Armenian Chalcedonian translation milieu active throughout the late-tenth and eleventh century that carried distinctly different objectives from the translation activities of Grigor II Vkasēs.

Chapter 3 reflected on the way in which this translation activity continued to shape and condition the relationship between Armenian Chalcedonians and the Byzantine Empire in the fractious post-Manzikert Byzantine East. In contrast to a framework which interprets translation activity from Greek into Armenian at the close of the eleventh century as a vehicle of separation, demarcation, and cultural emancipation under the aegis of Grigor Vkasēs, this chapter highlighted the role that Armenian Chalcedonian translation activity played in the maintenance of a shared trans-regional imperial space that

continued to have meaning to Armenian Chalcedonian communities in the decades after the events of 1071. Combining evidence from text and seal offered an impression of how the process of injecting hagiographical and liturgical collections into Armenian localities to be translated in the context of the Empire's expansion in the tenth and eleventh century manifested itself in the creation of confessionally uniform practices which provided a continuity of devotion between Armenian Chalcedonians and their co-confessionalists. In so far as Armenian Chalcedonians continued to translate and use the hagiographical and liturgical collections which promoted the norms of the Church of Constantinople and continued to align their commemorative and liturgical practices according to the contents of these texts, we can argue for the continued recognition and currency of Byzantium in this environment. It is evidence which offered a fresh route to demonstrate the ways in which the Byzantine Empire continued to provide a source of spiritual authority by mediating and conditioning the practices of Armenian Chalcedonians living in the fractious conditions of the eastern frontier in centres which were becoming increasingly distant from Constantinopolitan political control. In doing so this argument placed the *Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* at the service of an ongoing scholarly conversation that has begun to re-evaluate and nuance our interpretation of Armeno-Byzantine relations at the close of the eleventh century.

150 years have passed since the production of the last printed edition of the *Armenian Martyrdom*. In response to this gap, the various challenges with previous editions, and the value of the text to Armenologists and Byzantinists alike, Chapter 4 presented the first critical edition and translation of the *Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios*. This new edition and translation will serve to support future textual and historical investigation into the text, its transmission, and its reception in the Armenian tradition

The production of the *Armenian Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios* by the Armenian Chalcedonian community of Melitene in 1092, living in the fractious post-Manzikert Byzantine East, was no doubt motivated by a desire to commemorate local saints associated with the civic environment in which those Armenians were active. However, when the translation of this text from Greek into Armenian is not viewed in isolation, the *Armenian Martyrdom* can be placed within a corpus of textual and material evidence which locates the emergence of the active veneration of these saints in Armenian and by Armenians within a specific hundred-year span implicitly connected to the activities of Chalcedonian Armenian translators which brought these saints, previously unattested, into the Armenian tradition for the first time. The creation of this text in 1092 was an act of translation underpinned by and connected to a century long process of textual dissemination and translation set within the socio-cultural and political conditions of the expansion of the Byzantine Empire in the tenth and eleventh century, whereby the imperial centre and its Chalcedonian populations actively co-operated in the construction of a shared spiritual and cultural environment through the dissemination and translation of hagiographical, patristic, exegetical and liturgical texts. The promotion of this prescribed canon of sacred literature gave impetus to transformations which not only brought new commemorations and feast days into the Armenian tradition,

as was the case with Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios who remain within the Armenian *sanctorale* down to the present day, but also attempted to align Christian communities living throughout the Empire's eastern frontier with the standard practices of a wider Constantinopolitan spiritual *oikoumene*. It was a process which was fundamentally designed to connect them to the confessional norms of the Empire and consolidate a Constantinopolitan spiritual and cultural hegemony. For the Armenian Chalcedonians venerating Saint Eudoxios and his companions in and around Melitene in the decades following the battle of Manzikert, it was a process which continued to underpin and inform their textual production and a process which continued to connect them to the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople through the acts of translation and veneration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

- London, British Library, ms. Add. 11870.
- Jerusalem, Armenian Monastery of St James, ms. 1G.
- Jerusalem, Armenian Monastery of St James, ms. 3624.
- Mount Sinai, Saint Catherine's Monastery, Arabic ms. 417.
- Mount Sinai, Saint Catherine's Monastery, Arabic ms. 528.
- Oxford, Bodleian Library ms. Arm. D.11.
- Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Cromwell 26.
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. Arménien 178.
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. Supplément grec 1002.
- Rome, Pontificio Leoniano Collegio Armeno, ms. 4 (71).
- Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1613.
- Venice, Mekhitarist Monastery of San Lazzaro, ms. 17.
- Vienna, Mekhitarist Monastery, ms. 1048.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 275.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 288.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 995.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 1315.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 1524.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 3784.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 4802.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 4804.
- Yerevan, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts (Matenadaran), ms. 6196.

Primary Sources

- Aristakēs Lastivertc‘i. *Patmut‘iwn Aristakisi Lastivertc‘woy*, edited by K.N. Yuzbašyan. Matenadaran, 1963.
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. *De Administrando Imperio*, edited and translated by G. Moravcsik and R. J. H. Jenkins. Dumbarton Oaks Press, 2009.
- Divan Hay Vimagrut‘yan*, *Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum*, vol. 1 (1965).
- George of Alexandria, *Patmut‘iwn varuc‘ sk‘anč‘eleac‘ ew dipuacoc‘ srboyn Yovhann Oskeberan Hayrapetin Kostandnupolsoy*, edited by Sargis, Archbishop of Constantinople. Venice, 1754.
- Matt‘ēos Urhayec‘i (Matthew of Edessa). *Žamanakagrut‘iwn*, edited by M. Mēlik‘-Adamean and N. Tēr-Mik‘ayelean. 1898.
- Michael Andreopoulos, *The Byzantine Sinbad*, translated by J. Beneker and C. A. Gibson, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 67. Harvard University Press, 2021.
- Michael the Syrian, *Chronique de Michael Le Syrian III*, translated by J.B Chabot. Ernest Leroux Éditeur, 1905.
- Nikon, *Das Taktikon Des Nikon Vom Schwarzen Berge*, *Griechischer Text und kirchensalische Übersetzung des 14. Jahrhunderts Vol. 11*, edited by Christian Hannick. Weiher, 2014.
- Step‘anos Tarōnec‘i, *The Universal History of Step‘anos Tarōnec‘i: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, edited and translated by T. Greenwood. Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Skylitzes, *Ioannis Scylitzae synopsis historiarum*, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis 5*, edited by J. Thurn (De Gruyter, 1973), 137.
- Symeon Metaphrastes, “De Sancto Romulo Martyre in Graecia item De Ss. Martyribus Eudoxio, Zenone, Macario Et Mciv Militibus Melitinae in Armenia Minori.” *Acta Sanctorum Volume 42: Sep. II*. (1868).
- Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano nunc Berolinensi*, edited by H. Delehay. Reproduction Anastatique, 1954.
- T‘ovma Arcruni, *History of the House of the Arcrunik‘*, translated by R. W. Thomson. Wayne University State Press, 1985.
- William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, vol.1, translated by E. A. Babcock and A. C Krey. Columbia University Press, 1943.

Secondary Sources

- Adontz, N. “Les Fêtes et Les Saints de L’Église Arménienne.” *Revue de L’Orient Chrétien* 26 (1927-1928): 74-104.
- . “Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance.” *Byzantion* 9 (1934): 715–38.
- . “Tornik le moine.” *Byzantion* 11 (1936): 143–64.

- Akinean, N. "Yovsep' Kostandnowpolsec'i T'argmanich Haysmawurk'i." *Handes Amsorya* 1-2 (1957): 1-12
- . "Kirakos Vardapet Gitnakan." *Handes Amsorya* 10-12 (1952): 481-546.
- . *Niw't'er Hay V'kayabanut'ean Usunnasirut'ean Hamar (Material for the study of Armenian Martyrdom)*. Mekhitarist publishing house of Vienna, 1914.
- Ališan, L. *Liakatar varke' ew v'kayabanut'inn srboč' batnirk' k'alealk' i čarēntrac' bt 1 (Compendium of Lives and Martyrdoms selected from Čarēntirs, Volume 1)*. Mekhitarist publishing house of San Lazzaro, 1876.
- Alwis, A. P., Hinterberger, M., Schiffer, E. *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*. Brepols, 2021.
- Andrews, T. L. *Matt'ēos Urhayec'i and His Chronicle: History as Apocalypse in a Crossroads of Cultures*. Brill, 2016.
- Andrews, T., Rózsa, M., Prajda, K., Read, L. and Anđelović, A. "Re-Evaluating the Eleventh Century through Linked Events and Entities." *Historical Studies on Central Europe* 4 (1) (2024): 217-45.
- Angold, M. "The Byzantine State on the Eve of the Battle of Manzikert." *Byzantinische Forschungen* 16 (1991): 9–34.
- Ant'abjan, P. "Tawnapatčar žolovacown." *Banber Matenadarani* 10 (1971): 102-127.
- Arutjunova-Fidanjan, V. "Some aspects of the Military Administrative Districts and of Byzantine Administration in Armenia during the Eleventh-century." *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 20 (1986-1987): 309-320.
- . *Armjane-chalkidony na vostočnych granicach Vizantijskoj imperii (XIC)*. Hayasatan Publishing House, 1980.
- Aslanian, S. "From Autonomous to Interactive Histories: World History's Challenge to Armenian Studies." In *An Armenian Mediterranean: Words and Worlds in Motion*, edited by K. Babayan and M. Pifer. Palgrave Macmillan 2018.
- Astruc, C. "Un fragment palimpseste d'une Passion prémétaphrastique inconnue de S. Eudoxios et de ses compagnons (Parisinus Suppl. gr. 1002)." *Analecta Bollandiana* 77 (1959): 42 – 53.
- Avdalbegyan, M. *Yaysmawurk' Žolovacuner*. Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1982.
- Awgerean, M. *Liakatar varke' ew v'kayabanut'inn srboč' (Compendium of Lives and Martyrdoms)*. Mekhitarist publishing house of San Lazzaro, Venice, 1810.
- Bayan, G. *Le Synaxaire Arménien de Ter Israel: I Mois de Navasard*, *Patrologia orientalis*, 5/3. 1910.
- Beihammer, A. *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia ca.1040-1130*. Routledge, 2017.
- Bingeli, A. "Un ancien calendrier melkite de Jérusalem (Sināi syr. M52N)." In *Sur les pas des Araméens chrétiens: Mélanges offerts à Alain Desreumaux*, edited by F. Briquel Chatonnet and M. Debié. Geuthner, 2010.
- Bogharian, N. *Մայր Ցուցակ Զեռագրաց Սրբոց Զանգեզուրի, Հայաստանի և (Grand Catalogue of St. James Manuscripts, Volume 1)*. Jerusalem, 1966.
- Bradshaw, P. and Johnson, M. E. *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation*. Liturgical Press, 2012.

- Braunfels, W. *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* 6. Herder, 1974.
- Bromige, T. *Armenians in the Byzantine Empire: Identity, Assimilation and Alienation from 867 to 1098*. Bloomsbury, 2023.
- Bozoyan, A. (ed.). *Patkerapaštut'yan ev Patkeramartut'yan Xndir Hayastanum ev Byuzandiyum (The Problem of Iconoclasm and Iconolatry in Armenian and Byzantium)*. NASRA, 2024.
- . “Armenian Political Revival in Cilicia.” In *Armenian Cilicia: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, edited by R. Hovannisian. Mazda Publishing, 2008.
- . “Aylazgi t'argmanič'nerə hay matenagrut'yan meġ (Foreign translators in the Armenian Literature).” *Levon Xač'ikyan at 90, Nyut'er matenadarani himnadir tnoreni cnndyan innsunamyakin nvirvac miġazgayin gitaġolovi* (9-11 Hoktemberi 2008) (2010): 277-282.
- Brock, S. “Ephrem and the Persian Martyrs in the Armenian Synaxarion.” In *Armenia through the Lens of Time: Multidisciplinary Studies in Honour of Theo Maarten van Lint*, edited by F. Alpi, R. Meyer, I. Tinti, and D. Zakarian. Brill, 2023.
- . “Syriac Manuscripts Copied on the Black Mountain, near Antioch,” in *Lingua restituta orientalis*, edited by R. Schulz and M. Görg. Harrassowitz, 1990.
- Calzolari, V. *Apocrypha Armeniaca I: Acta Pauli et Theclae, Prodigia Theclae, Martyrium Pauli*. Brepols, 2017.
- Charanis, P. *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*. Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1963.
- Chétanian, R. V. “Les citations scripturaires dans la version arménienne du XI siècle de quatre homélies de jean chrysostome sur les actes des apôtres.” *Le Muséon* 119, no. 3-4 (2006): 321–74.
- . *La version arménienne ancienne des Homélies sur les “Actes des Apôtres” de Jean Chrysostome : Homélies I, II, VII, VIII*. Peeters, 2004.
- Cheynet, J-Cl. “De Tziliapert A Sebaste.” *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* vol. 9 (2006): 213-226.
- . “La conception militaire de la frontière orientale (IX–XIII siècle).” In *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, edited by A. Eastmond. Ashgate, 2001.
- . *Sceaux de la collection Zacos (Bibliothèque nationale de France) se rapportant aux provinces orientales de l'Empire byzantin*. Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2001.
- . “Les Arméniens de l'Empire en Orient de Constantin X à Alexis Comnène (1059–1081).” In *L'Arménie et Byzance: Histoire et culture*, edited by N. Garsoïan. Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996.
- . “Sceaux byzantins des musées d'Antioche et de Tarse.” *Travaux et Mémoires* 12 (1994): 391-473.
- . “Thathoul, archonte des archontes.” *Revue des études byzantines* 48 (1990): 233-242.
- Cheynet, J-Cl., Morrisson, C. and Seibt, W., *Sceaux byzantins de la collection Henri Seyrig*. Bibliothèque National de France, 1991.
- Cheynet, J-Cl. and Vannier, J.-F. *Études prosopographiques*. Publications de la Sorbonne, 1986.
- Constantinou, S and Högel, C. *Metaphrasis: A Byzantine Concept of Rewriting and its Hagiographical Products*. Brill, 2020.

- Contin, B. "Intertwining Aristotelian Ontology and Logic with Theology: The Early Armenian Non-Chalcedonian Perspective: the Book of Beings and the Questions Addressed to the Heretical Diophysites." *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 70 (2020): 429–464.
- Cotsonis, J. *The Religious Figural Imagery of Byzantine Lead Seals II: Studies on Images of the Saints and on Personal Piety*. Routledge, 2020.
- Cowe, S. P. "Armenian Hagiography." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography I: Periods and Places*, edited by S. Efthymiadis. Routledge, 2016.
- . "The Armenians in the era of the Crusades." In *Cambridge History of Christianity*, Volume 5, edited by M. Angold. New York, 2006.
- . "Armenian Integration to the Sebastia Region, Tenth-Eleventh Centuries." In *Armenian Sebastia/Sivas: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, edited by R. Hovannisian. Mazda Publishing, 2004.
- Covakan, N. "Grigor Vkasasēr ew t'argmanut'iwkn' varuc' srboc' (*Vkasasēr and the Translations of the Lives of Saints*)." *Sion* 9-10 (1967): 430-432.
- Dagron, G. "Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'orient byzantin à la fin du Xe et au XIe siècle: l'immigration syrienne." *Travaux et Mémoires* 6 (1976): 177–216.
- Dedeyan, G. "Les Arméniens en Cappadoce aux X et XI Siècles." In *Armenian Kesaria/Kayseri and Cappadocia: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, edited by R. Hovannisian. Mazda Publishing, 2013.
- . "The Founding and Coalescence of the Reubenind Principality 1073-1129." In *Armenian Cilicia: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, edited by R. Hovannisian. Mazda Publishing, 2008.
- . *Les Arméniens entre Grecs, Musulmans et Croisés. Étude sur les pouvoirs arméniens dans la Proche-Orient méditerranéen 2 vols (1068-1150)*. Calouste Gulbenkian, 2003.
- Detoraki, M. "Greek Passions of the Martyrs in Byzantium." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography II: Genres and Contexts*, edited by S. Efthymiadis. Ashgate, 2011.
- Dorfmann-Lazarev, I. *Armeniens et Byzantins à L'époque de Photius: Deux Debats Theologiques apres le Triomphe de l'orthodoxie*. Peeters, 2004.
- Eastmond, A. "Byzantine Identity and Relics of the True Cross." *Eastern Christian Relics* (2003): 205–216.
- Eganyan, O., Zeyt'unyan, A., Ant'abyan, P'. *Յուճակն ձեռագրաց Մաշտոցի Անվան Մատենադարանի, Հատոր Բ (Catalogue of Manuscripts of the Maštoc' Matenadaran, volume 2)*. Matenadaran, 1970.
- Ehrhard, A. *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche: von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts: 1. Teil, Die Überlieferung*. J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1937.
- Findikyan, M. D. *The Commentary on the Armenian Daily Office by Bishop Step'anos Sinnec'i († 735): Critical Edition and Translation with Textual and Liturgical Analysis, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 270*. Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2004.
- . "Armenian Hymns of the Church and the Cross." *St. Nersess Theological Review* 11 (2006): 63–105.
- Franco, L. "Observations on the Methods of Metaphrastic Rewriting: The Case of the *Passio* of St James (BHG 773)." In *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*, edited by A. P. Alwis, M. Hinterberger, E. Schiffer. Brepols, 2021.

- Galadza, D. *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem* (Oxford University Press, 2018).
- Garsoïan, N. "The Byzantine Annexation of the Armenian Kingdoms in the Eleventh Century." In *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times Vol. 1, The Dynastic Periods: From Antiquity to the Fourteenth Century*, edited by R. Hovannisian. St Martin's Press, 2004.
- . "The problem of Armenian integration into the Byzantine Empire." in *Studies of the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, edited by H. Ahrweiler & A.E. Laiou. Dumbarton Oaks, 1998.
- . "Reality and Myth in Armenian History." *The East and the Meaning of History: International Conference (23–27 November 1992)*, *Studi orientali* 13 (1994): 117–45.
- Gevorgyan, D. "Grigor II Vkasērī Naxajēnac T'argmanakan Šaržum (The Translation Movement Initiated by Grigor II Vkasēr)." *Banber Matenadarani* 34 (2022): 93–112.
- Ghazarian, J. *The Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia during the Crusades: The Integration of Cilician Armenians with the Latins, 1080–1393*. Curzon Press, 2000.
- Gippert, J. "Palimpsests from the Caucasus: Two Case Studies." In *Palimpsests and Related Phenomena across Languages and Cultures* edited by J. Gippert, J. Maksimczuk and H Sargsyan. De Gruyter, 2024.
- Glynias, J. "Byzantine Monasticism on the Black Mountain West of Antioch in the 10th-11th Centuries." *Studies in Late Antiquity* volume 4, issue 4 (2020): 408–451.
- Grand'Henry, J. "La méthode de révision d'une version patristique arabe ancienne chez Ibrāhīm fils de Yūḥannā d'Antioche." *Annales du Département des Lettres Arabes*, 6B (1991–1992): 161–172.
- Greenwood, T. "Composing World History at the Margins of Empire." In *Global Byzantium: Papers from the Fiftieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, edited by L. Brubaker, R. Darley & D. Reynolds. Routledge, 2022.
- . "Social Change in Eleventh-Century Armenia: The Evidence from Taron." In *Social Change in Town and Country in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, edited by J. Howard-Johnston. Oxford University Press, 2020.
- . "Armenian Space in Late Antiquity." In *Historiography and Space in Late Antiquity*, edited by P. Van Nuffelen. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- . "Aristakes Lastivertc'i and Armenian Urban Consciousness." In *Byzantium in the Eleventh Century*, edited by M. Lauxtermann and M. Whittow. Routledge, 2017.
- . "Imagined past, revealed present: A Reassessment of Պատմութիւն Տարօնյ (History of Tarōn)." *Travaux et Mémoires* 18 (2014): 377–392.
- Gyllenhaal, D. "Byzantine Melitene and the Social Milieu of the Syriac Renaissance." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* Vol. 75 (2021): 205–236
- Halfter, P. *Das Papsttum und die Armenier im frühen und hohen Mittelalter: von den ersten Kontakten bis zur Fixierung der Kirchenunion im Jahre 1198*. Böhlau, 1996.
- Halkin, F. *Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca I-III*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1957.
- . *Novum Auctarium Bibliothecae hagiographicae Graecae*. Société des Bollandistes, 1984.

- . *Douze récits byzantins sur Saint Jean Chrysostome*, Subsidia hagiographica 60. Société des Bollandistes, 1977.
- Hamada, K. “Old Issues in the New Regime: The Revival of Religious Controversies Between Byzantines and Armenians after the Fall of the Bagratid Kingdom.” In *Armenia and Byzantium without Borders*, edited by E. Bonfiglio and C. Rapp. Brill, 2023.
- Hannick, C. “Use and abuse of the 'image' of the Theotokos in the political life of Byzantium (with special reference to the iconoclast period).” In *Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, edited by M. Vassilaki. Ashgate, 2005.
- Hinterberger, M. “Language.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*, edited by S. Papaioannou. Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Høgel, C. “Euthymios the Athonite, Greek-Georgian and Georgian-Greek translator – and Metaphrast?” *Mélanges Bernard Flusin, Travaux et Mémoires* 23/1 (2019): 353–364.
- . “The Authority of Translators: Vendors, Manufacturers, and Materiality in the Transfer of the Barlaam and Josaphat along the Silk Road.” *Postscripts* 8.3 (2012): 221–241.
- . “Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement.” In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography. II: Genres and Contexts*, edited by S. Efthymiadis. Ashgate, 2011.
- . “Hagiography under the Macedonians: The two recensions of the Metaphrastic menologion.” In *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, edited by P. Magdalino. Brill. 2002.
- . *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization*. Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002.
- Holmes, C. *Basil II and the Governance of Empire, 976–1025*. Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . “How the East Was Won in the Reign of Basil II.” In *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, edited by A. Eastmond. Ashgate, 2001.
- Hoyland, R. “Agapius of Manbiḡ, Qusṭā ibn Lūqā and the Graeco-Roman Past: The Beginnings of Christian Arabic and Muslim Historiography.” *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 16, 1–2 (2021): 7–41.
- Hunger, H. *Anonyme Metaphrase zu Anna Komnene, Alexias XI–XIII. Ein Beitrag zur Erschließung der byzantinischen Umgangssprache*, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 15. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981.
- Hutter, I. “Le copiste du Métaphraste. On a Centre for Manuscript Production in Eleventh-Century Constantinople.” In *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito. Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia Greca Cremona, 4 - 10 ottobre 1998*, ed. G. Prato (Gonnelli, 2000).
- Ibrahim, H. “Some Notes on Antonios and His Arabic Translations of John of Damascus.” In *Patristic Literature in Arabic Translations*, edited by B. Roggema and A. Treiger. Brill, 2020.
- Jones, L. “Medieval Armenian Identity and Relics of the True Cross (9th–11th centuries).” *Journal for the Society for Armenian Studies* 12 (2003): 43–53.
- Jordanov, I. *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria, vol. 2: Byzantine Seals with Family Names*. Agato, 2006.
- . “Byzantine Seals from the Village of Melnitsa (district of Elkhovo, Bulgaria).” *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 7 (2002): 33–59.

- Kazhdan, A. and Wharton Epstein, A. *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Los Angeles, 1985.
- Kellner, K. H. *Heortology: A History of the Christian Festivals from their Origin to the Present Day*. Paul, Trench, Trübner & co, 1908.
- Kevorkian, R. H. and Ter-Stépanian, A. *Manuscripts arméniens de la Bibliothèque nationale de France. Catalogue*. Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1998.
- Konstantopoulos, K. M. *Byzantiaka molyvdoboulla tou en Athenais Ethnikou Nomismatikon Mouseion*. Athens, 1917.
- Korobeinikov, D. “Raiders and Neighbours: The Turks (1040–1304).” In *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire, c. 500–1492*, edited by J. Shepard. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Laurent, V., *Le Corpus des sceaux de l’empire byzantin II. L’administration centrale*. CNRS, 1981.
- . *Les sceaux byzantins du Médailler Vatican*. Vatican City, 1962.
- . *La collection C. Orghidan*. Paris, 1952.
- Lemerle, P. *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin*. Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1977.
- Lichačev, N. P. *Molindovuly Grečeskogo Vostoka*. Moscow, 1991.
- Lidov, A. “Hierotopy. The creation of sacred space as a form of creativity and subject of cultural history,” In *Creation of Sacred Spaces in Byzantium and Medieval Russia*, edited by A. Lidov. Indrik, 2006.
- Luzzi, A. “Synaxaria and the Synaxarion of Constantinople.” In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography II: Genres and Contexts*, edited by S. Efthymiadis. Ashgate, 2011.
- McGeer, E., Nesbitt, J., and Oikonomides N. *Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art, Volume 4: The East*. Dumbarton Oaks, 2001).
- MacEvitt, C. “The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: Apocalypse, the First Crusade and the Armenian Diaspora.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 61 (2007): 157-181.
- Magdalino, P. “The Liturgical Poetics of an Elite Religious Confraternity.” In *Reading the Byzantine Empire and Beyond* edited by T. Shawcross and I. Toth. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Malherbe, A. J. “A Physical Description of Paul.” *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 79, No. 1/3: Christians among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday (1986): 170-175.
- Mat‘evosyan, A. *Hayeren Jer‘agreri Hišatakaranner 5–12 dd (Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 5th – 12th Century)*. Haykakan SSH Gitut‘yunneri Akademiayi Hratarakč‘ut‘yun, 1988.
- Matheou, N. “Hegemony, Counterpower, and Global History: Medieval New Rome and Caucasia in a Critical Perspective.” In *Global Byzantium: Papers from the Fiftieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, edited by L. Brubaker, R. Darley & D. Reynolds. Routledge, 2022.
- . *Situating the History Attributed to Aristakēs Lastiverc‘i, 1000-1072*. PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2018.
- Mathews T. F. with Van Lint, T. M. “The Kars-Tsamandos Group of Armenian Illuminated Manuscripts of the 11th Century.” In *Der Doppeladler: Byzanz und die Seldschuken in Anatolien vom späten 11. bis zum*

13. *Jahrhunder*, edited by N. Asutay-Effenberger and F. Daim. Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums: 2014.
- McGeer, E. and Nesbitt, J. *Byzantium in the Time of Troubles*. Brill, 2020.
- Mugler, J. "Ibrāhīm ibn Yūḥannā and the Translation Projects of Byzantine Antioch." In *Patristic Literature in Arabic Translations*, edited by B. Roggema and A. Treiger. Brill, 2020.
- Migne, J. P. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Graeca vol. 115: Symeonis Logothetae*. Apud Garnier Fratres, 1899.
- Nesbitt, J. and Oikonomides, N. *Catalogue of Byzantine seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art 3: West, Northwest and Central Asia Minor and the Orient*. Dumbarton Oaks, 1996.
- . *Catalogue of Byzantine seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art 1: Italy, North of the Balkans, North of the Black Sea*. Dumbarton Oaks, 1991.
- Neville, L. *Authority in Byzantine Provincial Society 950–1100*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Nikolaishvili, S. "The Georgian Milieu and the Metaphrastic Menologion: Three Accounts about Symeon Metaphrastes." *Interface* 9 (2022): 70-94.
- . "Georgian Manuscript Production and Translation Activities in the Christian East and Byzantine Empire." *Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7 (2021): 41- 75.,
- Noble S. and Treiger, S. *The Orthodox Church in the Arab World, 700–1700: An Anthology of Sources*. Northern Illinois University Press, 2014.
- Odorico, P. "Une appropriation impossible. Textes et formes littéraires entre Byzance et l'Occident." In *Proceedings of the Plenary Sessions of the 24th International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, edited by E. Fiori and M. Trizio. Venice Ca Foscari University Press, 2022.
- . "La cultura della sillogé: 1) Il cosiddetto enciclopedismo bizantino. 2) Le tavole dei saperi di Giovanni Damasceno." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 83 (1990): 1-23.
- Oikonomides, N. *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals*. Dumbarton Oaks, 1986.
- Ousterhout, R. "Sacred Geographies and Holy Cities: Constantinople as Jerusalem." In *Hierotopy: The Creation of Sacred Spaces in Byzantium and Medieval Russia*, edited by A. Lidov. Indrik, 2006.
- Outtier, B. "The Armenian Homiliaries. An Attempt at an Historical Overview." In *Manuscript Cultures 13: Homiletic Collections in Greek and Oriental Manuscripts*, edited by J. Gippert and C. Macé. University of Hamburg Press, 2019.
- Papaioannou, S. "Authors (with and excursus on Symeon Metaphrastes)." In *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*, edited by S. Papaioannou. Oxford University Press, 2021.
- . *Christian Novels from the Menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes*. Harvard University Press, 2017.
- Papavarnavas, C. *Gefängnis als Schwellenraum in der byzantinischen Hagiographie: Eine Untersuchung früh- und mittelbyzantinischer Märtyrerakten*. De Gruyter, 2021.
- . "The Secret that Led Them to Martyrdom: The Role Swap between a Christian Reader and a Pagan Flute Player" (forthcoming).
- Petrosyan, E. *Համադրական Յայտմունք (The Synoptical Haysmanurk)*, 12 vols. Etchmiadzin, 2008–11.

- Pogossian, Z. “Relics, Rulers, Patronage: the True Cross of Varag and the Church of the Holy Cross on Alt‘amar.” In *The Church of the Holy Cross of Alt‘amar*, edited by Z. Pogossian and E. Vardanyan. Brill, 2019.
- Rapp, C. “Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians, Seventh to Tenth Centuries.” In *Bosphorus: Essays in Honour of Cyril Mango*, edited by S. Efthymiadis, C. Rapp, and D. Tsougarakis. Adolf M. Hakkert Press, 1995.
- Roberts, A. M. *Reason and Revelation in Byzantine Antioch: The Christian Translation Program of Abdallah Ibn Al-Fadl*. University of California Press, 2020.
- Renoux, Charles. *Le Lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie Le Čašoc‘ II: Édition Synoptique des Plus Anciens Témoins*, Patrologia orientalis, 48/2 (1999).
- . “Une influence du rite byzantin sur la liturgie arménienne: un pentecostaire arménien” *L’Arménie et Byzance, Byzantina Sorbonensia* 12 (1996): 187-190.
- . *Le Lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie Le Čašoc‘ I: Introduction et liste des manuscrits*, Patrologia orientalis, 44/4 (1989).
- . “Le Čašoc‘, Typicon-Lectionnaire Origines et Évolutions.” *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 20 (1986-1987): 123-152.
- . “Čašoc‘ et Tōnakan arméniens: dépendance et complémentarité,” *Ecclesia Orans* 4/2 (1987): 169–201.
- . “Les Fêtes et Les Saints de L’Église Arménienne de N. Adontz.” *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 14 (1980): 287-305.
- . *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121 II: Édition comparée du texte et de deux autres manuscrits. Introduction, textes, traduction et notes*, Patrologia orientalis, 36/2 (1971).
- . “Liturgie de Jérusalem et lectionnaires arméniens. Vigiles et année liturgique.” *La prière des heures, Lex Orandi* 35 (Paris: 1963): 167–199.
- Sahner, C. *Christian Martyrs under Islam: Religious Violence and the Making of the Muslim World*. Princeton University Press, 2018.
- Sargisyan, B. *Մայր Յուզկոյ Հայերէն Չեռագրաց մատենադարանին Միլիթարիստիկ ի Վեներիկ, հւանդ Բ* (*Grand Catalogue of the Armenian Manuscripts of the Mekhitarist Library in Venice*). Mekhitarist publishing house of San Lazzaro, 1924.
- Seibt, W. “The eastern frontier of Byzantium in the decennia after Mantzikert—can seals help reconstruct developments?.” *SBS* 12 (2016): 25 – 32.
- . “Arsakides-Arsakuni armenische Aristokraten in byzantinischen Diensten.” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 44 (1994): 349-359.
- . “War Gagik II. von Grossarmenien ca.1072–1073 Μέγας δούξ Χαρσιανοῦ?.” In *Tò Ἑλληνιστὸν: Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis*, 2 vols, II. New Rochelle, 1993.
- . *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich I. Teil, Kaiserhof*. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.

- Seibt, W. and Zarnitz, M.-L. *Das byzantinische Bleisiegel als Kunstwerk*. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997.
- Sevčenko, N. P. “Synaxaria and Menologia.” in *A Companion to Byzantine Illustrated Manuscripts*, edited by V. Tsamakda. Brill, 2017.
- . *Illustrated Manuscripts of the Metaphrastian Menologion*. University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Schiffer, E. “Rewriting the *Life* of St John Chrysostom in Tenth-Century Byzantium.” In *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*, edited by A. P. Alwis, M. Hinterberger, E. Schiffer (Brepols, 2021).
- . “Zur Umarbeitung rhetorischer Texte durch Symeon Metaphrastes.” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 42 (1992): 143–55.
- Shepard, J. “Constantine VII, Caucasian Openings and the Road to Aleppo.” In *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, edited by A. Eastmond. Ashgate, 2001.
- Spink Auction 132. Byzantine Seals from the collection of George Zacos II*. London, 1999.
- Spink Auction 135: Byzantine Seals from the collection of George Zacos III*. London, 1999.
- Sprecher, C. J. *Emperor and God: Passion Relics and the Divinisation of Byzantine Rulers, 944-1204*. Heidelberg University Publishing, 2024.
- Šandrovskaja, V. and Seibt, W. *Byzantinische Bleisiegel der Staatlichen Eremitage mit Familiennamen, 1 Teil: Sammlung Ličbačev – Namen von A bis I*. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005.
- Širinyan, E. “Surbgrayin naxakrt’ut’yunnerə hay matenagrut’yan meġ (Scriptural precedents in Armenian Literature).” *Eġmiacin*, 79 (1) (2022): 33-47.
- Taft, R. *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History*. Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Ter-Petrosyan, L. *Hay Hin T’argmanakan Grakanut’inn (Ancient Armenian Translations)*. St. Vartan Press, 1992.
- . “P’orj Hay Hin ew Miġnadaryan t’argmanakan grakanut’yan parberac’man (An Attempt at Periodizing Ancient and Medieval Armenian Translated Literature).” *Eġmiacin*, 39 (4) (1982): 45-52.
- Thierry, M. *Répertoire Des Monastères Arméniens*. Brepols, 1993.
- Thomson, R. W. “Aristakes of Lastivert and Armenian Reactions to Invasion.” In *Armenian Karin/Erzerum: Historic Armenian Cities and Provinces*, edited by R. Hovannisian. Mazda Publishing, 2003.
- . “Tzatoi,” *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, edited by Alexander Kazhdan. Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Todt, K-P. “Antioch in the Middle Byzantine period (969-1084): The Reconstruction of the City as an Administrative, Economic, Military and Ecclesiastical center.” *Topoi Orient-Occident. Supplément 5: Antioche de Syrie. Histoire, images et traces de la ville antique*, (2004): 171 – 190.
- Torosyan, V. *Հայոց Կաթողիկոսական Բշխանությունը (The Authority of the Armenian Catholicosate - Mid-11th Century – Early 12th Century)*. Matenadaran, 2018.
- Treadgold, W. *Byzantium and its Army*. Stanford University Press, 1995.

- Treiger, A. "The Eucharist in Eleventh Century Jerusalem: New Evidence on the Hagiopolite Communion Rite from Arabic Christian Sources" *Journal of Byzantine Studies* vol. 72 (2023): 511-532.
- . "The Beginnings of the Graeco-Syro-Arabic Melkite Translation Movement in Antioch," *Scrinium* 16, 1 (2020): 306-322.
- . "Greek into Arabic in Byzantine Antioch: 'Abdallāh ibn al-Faḍl's »Book of the Garden« (Kitāb ar-rawḍa)." In *Ambassadors, Artists, Theologians: Byzantine Relations with the Near East from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Centuries*, edited by Z. Chitwood and J. Pahlitzsch (Propylaeum, 2020).
- . "Sinaitica (1): The Antiochian Menologion Compiled by Hieromonk Yūḥannā Abd al-Masīḥ," *Christian Orient, Journal of Studies in The Christian Culture of Asia And Africa*, vol. 8 (2017): 215 – 252.
- Van Esbroeck, M. "Description du répertoire de l'homélaire de Muš (Maténadaran 7729)." *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 18 (1984): 237 – 280.
- . "La structure du répertoire de l'homélaire de Mush." *Mjāzgayin hayerenagitakan gitaḡolov, Zekowc'owmner* (1982) 282-303.
- . "Salomon de Makenots." *Armeniaca, Mélanges d'études arméniennes* (1969): 33–44.
- Van Lint, T. M. "The Formation of Armenian Identity in the First Millennium." *Church History and Religious Culture* 89, no. 1 (2009): 251-278.
- . "Armenian." In *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*, edited by S. Papaioannou. Oxford University Press, 2021. 607.
- Vardanyan, R. *Hayoc' Tonac'uyc' (4-18rd darer)*. Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1999.
- Vryonis, S. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*. University of California Press, 1986.
- . "The Will of a Provincial Magnate, Eustathius Boilas (1059)." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 (1957): 263 – 277.
- Wassiliou-Seibt, A. and Boersema, G. "The Orthodox Monastery of the Virgin of Arayi: Evidence for Byzantine Ecclesiastical Policy in Greater Armenia (1045–1064)." In *Armenia and Byzantium without Borders*, edited by E. Bonfiglio and C. Rapp. Brill, 2023.
- Wassiliou A. and Seibt, W., *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich, II. Teil: Zentral- und Provinzialverwaltung*. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003.
- Weitenberg, J. "The Armenian Monasteries in the Black Mountain." In *East and West in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean I: Antioch from the Byzantine Reconquest until the End of the Crusader Principality*, edited by K. Ciggar and M. Metcalf. Peeters, 2006.
- White, M. *Military Saints in Byzantium and Rus, 900–1200*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Zacos, G. and Veglery, A. *Byzantine Lead Seals I*. J. J. Augustin, 1972.
- Zakarian, D. "King Vasil's Holy Sign of War." In *Armenia and Byzantium without Borders*, edited by E. Bonfiglio and C. Rapp. Brill, 2023.
- Zanetti, U. "Apothegmes et Histoires Édifiantes dans le Synaxarie Arménien." *Analecta Bollandiana* 105. Brepols, 1987: 167-200.

Zilliacus, H. "Zur stilistischen Umarbeitungstechnik des Symeon Metaphastes." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 38 (1938): 333-349

Online Resources

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae : a Digital Library of Greek Literature. (Irvine, Calif. :TLG, 2001) available at: <https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/index.php>

The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity Database (University of Oxford, 2017) available at <http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/>

Prosopography of the Byzantine World, 2016 (King's College London, 2017) available at <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk>.

Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Seals Online Catalogue (Dumbarton Oaks, DC) available at: <http://www.doaks.org/resources/seals>

Interview

Mardirossian, A. "En sacrifiant l'Arménie, Poutine commet la même erreur que l'Empire byzantin face aux Turcs", *Le Figaro*, 3rd May, 2023: <https://www.lefigaro.fr/vox/histoire/en-sacrifiant-l-armenie-poutine-commet-la-meme-erreur-que-l-empire-byzantin-face-aux-turcs-20230503>.

Image Copyrights

Image 1: The Martyrdom of Saint Eudoxios

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1613. f. 18r. © *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*.

Image 2: The Martyrdom of Saints Eudoxios, Romylos, Zenon, and Makarios

London, British Library, Add. 11870, f. 67r. © *British Library*. Image obtained from open access publication: Papavarnavas, C. *Gefängnis als Schwellenraum in der byzantinischen Hagiographie: Eine Untersuchung früh- und mittelbyzantinischer Märtyrerakten*. De Gruyter, 2021, with permission of C. Papavarnavas.