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## EDITOR'S PREFACE

For more than half a century since its publication in 1908, Nicholas Adontz's monumental thesis on Armenia in the Period of Justinian has proved to be both a landmark and a guidepost in the field of Armenian studies although its general inaccessibility, either from the rarity of procurable copies, or from linguistic difficulties, has made of it far too often a semi-legendary document rather than a useful tool. Perhaps as the result of this fortuitous isolation as well as of external circumstances, Adontz's first and probably greatest work did not lead to an immediate proliferation of studies along the lines that he had traced. He, himself, was to develop a number of them in later works such as his articles on the Armenian Primary History, Mesrop Mašt'oce, Koriwn, P'awstos Buzand, and Movses Xorenac̣i; on the date of the Christianization of Armenia; on the Iranian aspects of Armenian society; and, as late as his postumously published History, on pre-Achaemenid Armenia ${ }^{1}$. But it is only relatively recently that the works of such distinguished contemporary armenologists as Gérard Garitte, Cyril Toumanoff, and the late Hakob Manandian have developed a number of problems in mediaeval Armenian history significantly beyond the point reached by Adontz at the turn of the century, and these scholars have not failed to acknowledge their indebtedness even where they have outstripped him ${ }^{2}$. Not even a Marxist presentation which of necessity challenged many of Adontz's premises and interpretations prevented A.G. Sukiasian from admitting that "... the admirable work of N. Adontz ... remains to this day one of the most authoritative works on Armenian feudalism "'s. Such tributes are all the more impressive if we remember that they are addressed to the first major work of a young scholar composed at a time when a number of crucial studies on Late-Roman, Byzantine, and Iranian history as well as on the historical geography of eastern Anatolia were still to be written.

The scope of Adontz's encyclopaedic work is not conveyed adequately by even a full quotation of his title, since, far from restricting himself to the reign of Justinian, or to an investigation of the naxarar system, he went on to scrutinize nearly every aspect of ancient and mediaeval

[^0]Armenia - geographical, political, religious, administrative, social, and intellectual - while giving simultaneously an extensive analysis of all the available sources. Perhaps the clearest index of the breadth of Adontz's information is the all too clear incompetence of a single individual to edit his work; a team of specialists - historians, geographers, archaeologists, philologists, anthropologists, and ethnographers - would have been necessary to do it justice.

The value of Adontz's work for a new generation of scholars is not, however, limited to being a source of rare information to be exploited for reference; his methods and insights into the crucial problems of early Armenian history may yet prove more useful than even the enormous material accumulated by him. His application of critical scholarly methods to Armenian studies, and particularly his recognition of the dangers inherent in purely literary sources, have led to considerable work on the re-evaluation and re-dating of many Armenian historical documents, a task in which he continued to participate energetically, and which is by no means completed. His simultaneous use of the techniques of varied disciplines while stressing the maintenance of the historian's rigorous chronological criterion, and his comparative method of juxtaposing the information of all relevant sources, Classical, Armenian, and Oriental, provided a workable blueprint for attacking the difficulties characterizing Armenian historiography. His ground breaking qualitative and quantitative analyses of Armenian social structure, reaching beyond superficial generalities, provided us with some of the first detailed information and with a framework for further research.

Particularly illuminating is Adontz's constant refusal to be led astray by the conscious or implicit assumptions of his sources that ancient Armenia was a simple, undifferentiated, and unchanging entity, rather than the complicated aggregation of varied components whose geographic, political, and even religious particularism must be recognized even in periods of seeming unification, and whose characteristics and interests must be accounted for and balanced anew in each successive period. On numerous occasions Adontz's hypotheses have required development or rectification, but his basic conclusions repeatedly reached beyond the theses then current to what would prove to be the crux of a problem: beyond the familiar division of Armenia between the Graeco-Roman and Iranian worlds to the paramount importance of the elaborate nexus of family traditions
and loyalities, "dynastic" as well as "feudal", as shown in Toumanoff's recent Studies; beyond the double strain of Armenian Christianity, Syriac as well as Hellenic, to the relationship of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to the naxarar structure, and its influence on the political evolution of the country, as I hope to demonstrate in a forthcoming work. Professor Garitte already observed the value of Adontz's inspired guesses when his own publication of the new Greek version of the Life of St. Gregory repeatedly vindicated Adontz's hypothetical corrections of Marr's readings in the Arabic version ${ }^{4}$.

It is self evident that a book written more than sixty years ago should now be superseded in a number of instances: Armenian archaeology was all but non-existent at the time, so that the Urartian aspects of Armenian history were perforce ignored, though Adontz himself rectified a considerable part of this lacuna in his Histoire d'Arménie; new epigraphic material both in Armenia and in Iran has added significantly to our knowledge of both countries, and new editions of Iranian texts have altered a number of etymological derivations; the Erwandian-Orontid dynasty identified by Manandian ${ }^{5}$ has altered radically our knowledge of the Hellenistic period; the lengthy survey of Diocletian's administrative reforms while perhaps still useful to Adontz's Russian contemporaries, now seems superfluous; and a number of his conclusions as to the «feudal» nature of the Armenian naxarar system rest on antiquated interpretations of European feu-dalism.

The entire book bears the marks of hasty publication, whether in the more superficial details of faulty proofreading, insufficient and often exasperatingly inadequate references, as well as the absence of the indispensable map, whose omission was regretted by the author, or in the far more fundamental aspects of occasionally confused, repetitive and contradictory organization, dubious etymologies, overstatements, and premature conclusions. The involutions of Adontz's style in a language not native to him add nothing to the clarity of the presentation.

Yet Adontz himself anticipated much of the criticism which must attend a pioneer venture by disclaiming any pretension to a definitive study. '"... in publishing this work we are very far from any illusion as to its perfection. Armenian philology is still at a stage where the

[^1]presentation of any interpretation or theory as unchallengeably correct is out of the question. Students of Armenian antiquity can only grope their way toward many historical problems by way of more or less successful hypotheses; some of these may be corroborated at a later date, others will fall by the way. ... . Our clarification of the naxarar system should bring a ray of light into the darkness which hangs over the Armenian past ... and should prove a starting point for a scholarly analysis of the extensive subsequent period of Armenian history ... " ${ }^{6}$. On these terms, the value of his work has diminished but little in the intervening half-century, notwithstanding the necessary alterations. It remains a mine of information for the specialist, and a source of seminal ideas for those re-interpretations and further investigations the author had requested. As such it is a fitting reminder that in every generation it behoves dwarfs to take advantage of the shoulders of the giants who have preceded them.
\[

*     *         * 

\]

The instinct of every translator running the ominous gauntlet between the Charybdis of inaccuracy and the Scylla of unreadability is to open with his own apologia. This temptation is all the stronger in the case of Armenia in the Period of Justinian, since, as I have already indicated, Russian was not Adontz's native language. Unlike Armenian, which has three steps in the demonstrative-relative system (hic, iste, ille), Russian shares with most European languages a two step system. As a consequence of Adontz's shift from the one to the other, his writing abounds with cases of ambiguous antecedents, not all of which can readily be resolved from the context. His complicated and often awkward sentence structure is particularly foreign to English usage; the paragraphing is often erratic. Nevertheless the text has been consistently respected, and alterations held down to a minimum even where some awkwardness ensued. Aside from the introduction of occasional elucidations such as "Xosrov II of Armenia" for "Xosrov", the subdivision of unmanageable sentences, the clarification of antecedents, and the correction of minor misprints, no liberties have been taken with the original.

The only significant difference between this edition and the Russian one lies in the realm of quotations from primary sources. Following the fashion of the day, Adontz often gave lengthy paraphrases rather

[^2]than direct quotations. In several instances where this method seemed awkward or unnecessary, the original quotation has been re-introduced, each case being duly recorded in the notes. To facilitate the reading, all extensive quotations in foreign languages have been shifted from the text to the notes and replaced by their English translations. Since so much of the value of Adontz's work lies in his vast collection of sources, many of which still remain extremely scarce even for the specialist, it has seemed useful to include in the notes the texts of a number of passages to which Adontz merely referred, all such additions being set off by square brackets. Furthermore, a series of Appendices containing in extenso, or in their relevant portions, the main documents, Classical and Armenian, used by Adontz, has been added to this edition to allow the reader to draw his own conclusions from the material.

In many instances the editions used by Adontz were either superseded or, in the case of some Armenian documents, unobtainable; these have been replaced by more recent or accessible ones. All such substitutions have been noted in the Bibliography. Similarly, the English versions of Classical sources found in the Loeb Classical Library have been used wherever possible for the sake of convenience, but any significant differences between their translations and the ones given by Adontz have been recorded. Additional notes by the editor are indicated by letters as well as numbers eg. 1a.

A full scale re-edition of Adontz's book to bring its manifold aspects in line with their modern scholarship would have entailed a major re-writing of the book, and would consequently lie well beyond the scope of this edition and the competence of its editor. Consequently it has seemed best to leave Adontz's text substantially as he composed it, adding only, wherever possible, some indication in the notes as to the agreement or disagreement of subsequent investigators, new material, need for rectification, or corroborative evidence. The new Bibliographical Note attempts to provide some, albeit cursory, indication of the relevant works published since 1908. Finally, it is hoped that the Bibliography, which follows Adontz's lead in reaching beyond the limits of Justinianic Armenia to include a number of problems implicit or explicit in his text, will provide still more comparative material and criteria for a further re-evaluation of some of his conclusions.

All those who have had the occasion to experience it will readily
recognize the eternal nightmare of inconsistency in transliteration, especially in the case of proper names which have reached us in multiple versions. In the kaleidoscopic world of eastern Asia Minor is a locality to be identified by its Classical, Armenian, Persian, Syriac, Arabic, or Turkish name? Which is the preferable transliteration system to be used for the name of an author writiug both in Armenian and in Russian? The most that this edition can hope to claim is an attempt to bring a little order into what can only be called Adontz's systematic inconsistency. Wherever possible, Armenian terms have been given according to the prevailing Hübschmann-Meillet system, Arabic ones according to the spelling of the Encyclopedia of Islam, the Persian ones according to Christensen's L'Iran sous les Sassanides, 2nd edition (Copenhagen, 1944) with minor alterations, Russian ones according to the system of the U.S. Library of Congress, Georgian ones according to Toumanoff's Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown, 1963), and Turkish toponyms according to the Office of Geography, Department of the Interior, Gazetteer No. 46: Turkey (Washington, 1960). For the sake of convenience, author's names have been given a single form, e.g. Manandian, irrespective of the alterations required by the diverse languages in which they wrote, the form selected being wherever possible the one more generally familiar. In all cases of ambiguity alternate versions have been given. For Armenian toponyms, the Armexian form has generally been preferred for localities in Persarmenia, and the Classical (preferably Greek rather than Latin) for the western section of the country which was part of the Eastern Roman Empire, except in the case of familiar names where such a procedure would entail unwarranted pedantry. For all the occasions on which these guide lines have failed, as they needs must, I can only appeal to the sympathetic indulgence of my colleagues.

The precious geographical sections of the book carry their own particular series of problems. The map envisaged by Adontz was never published, and nearly every locality in eastern Anatolia has experienced at least one name change since 1908. Consequently Kiepert's and Lynch's maps to which Adontz normally refers are of but limited value to the modern reader, since no concordance of earlier and contemporary names exists to my knowledge. The identification of many ancient sites remains controversial in spite of the extensive investigations of Markwart, Honigmann, Eremyan, and many others. In Appendix V some attempt has been made to
coordinate the information on toponyms, giving where relevant and possible their ancient Classical and/or Armenian name, the modern equivalent, the coordinates given in the U.S. Office of Geography, Gazetteer No. 46 , and a reference to the appropriate sheet of the USAF Aeronautical Approach Chart (St. Louis, 1956-1958) and the Turkish General Map. Where this has proved impossible, the available information will be found in the relevant notes.

Finally, I should like to express my thanks to my friends and colleagues, professors Seeger Bonebakker, Associate Professor of Arabic Studies, Tibor Halasi-Kun, Professor of Turkic Studies, Karl H. Menges, Professor of Altaic Philology, and Ehsan Yar-Shater, Hagop Kevorkian Professor of Tranian Studies, all of Columbia University, as well as professors Gérard E. Caspary, Associate Professor of Mediaeval History at Smith College, Wendell S. Johnson, Associate Professor of English Literature at the University of the City of New York, and Norma A. Phillips, Assistant Professor of English Literature at Queens College of the City of New York, for their help and patience on the many occasions when I was forced to turn to them for assistance. I am most grateful to Professor Emeritus Sirarpie der Nersessian of the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, both for her suggestion that I undertake this edition and for the help and encouragement she has so often given me. To my constant advantage, I have also benefited from the vast knowledge and inexhaustible kindness of Monsieur Haig Bérbérian of the Revue des Eitudes Arméniennes. Finally, my thanks are also due to Dr. Robert Hewsen for his help with questions of Armenian geography, and to my students Dr. Linda Rose, Messers, Krikor Maksoudian and Jack Vartoogian for the endless hours they spent in the thankless tasks of verifying references, hunting out copies of rare works, and proofreading. For the many flaws which such an edition must perforce still contain, the responsibility remains of course mine alone.

Nina G. Garsoïan.
New York, July 3, 1967.
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## INTRODUCTION

The period of Justinian, which is the subject of this study, has a particular importance for the history of Armenia as well as that of Byzantium. We conceive this epoch as including more than the actual reign of Justinian; consequently we will give the name of the great emperor to the interval of time which divides the Roman and the Byzantine periods, and marks the transition from the ancient to the medieval state. There are, to be sure, various scholarly opinions as to the initial date of the Byzantine era: the age of Constantine the Great, the period of the division of the Empire by Theodosius I, or the epoch of Justinian. But these disagreements are not mutually exclusive. The foundation of Constantinople at the beginning of the fourth century followed by the transfer to it of the centre of political life, and the division of the Empire into two halves at the turn of the fourth to the fifth century, both mark separate and very important moments in the gradual trend toward a new period. In whatever way we characterize Byzantine culture and political structure, as distinct from that of Antiquity, we cannot deny that the appearance of those elements whose sum is called Byzantine occurred as the result of close ties with the civilization of the Orient. Consequently, the transfer of the capital to the East and the subsequent separation of the eastern half of the Empire from the western should be seen as significant steps in the orientalization of the state.

The reign of Justinian marks the period of the last efforts to save the imperial tradition of the past. The great imperialist sought to unify once again the scattered portions of the Empire, and he dreamt of recreating its past greatness. Brilliant successes in internal and external policy appeared to justify the hopes of the Emperor, and, for a time, it seemed as though the greatest period of Roman power had been reborn. Single individuals, however, are not fated to turn back the wheels of history. The dreams of Justinian were not realized and his aspirations, in the final reckoning, probably brought about the opposite results. During the struggle to preserve Roman tradition and to save the Roman spirit, the ancient pagan conception of the world was imperceptibly transformed into one which was both Christian and Byzantine. Justinian himself personified a type of ruler in
whom we find juxtaposed traits characterizing emperors of the Roman and of the Byzantine periods. The split in political life which had taken place at the time of the acceptance of Christianity had now become so wide that the century of Justinian should be acknowledged as the boundary marking the end of Antiquity and the inauguration of the new, Byzantine, era of history.

In choosing this particular period of transition as a subject for research, we have been moved by a conviction of its primary importance for the history of Armenia. Strictly speaking, Armenian history begins with the consolidation of Christianity in Armenia. If we mean by history the scholarly discipline through which we are able to uncover the past of a given people to a sufficient degree and with sufficient characteristics to grasp its spiritual aspect, then history in this sense may be said to have existed in Armenia only from its Christianization. The pre-Christian life of Armenia is obscure, at least in the present state of historiography. All we possess are isolated facts, fragmentary and occasionally circumstantial information concerned for the most part with the relations between Armenia and the neighbouring powers. This type of material can perhaps cast a dim and indirect light by which the general traits of political life may be perceived, but it is totally incapable of illuminating the factual and internal aspects of lifea.

The best witnesses and interpreters of the historical life of a nation are its language and literature. Historical knowledge reaches solid ground at the moment when documents in the language of a particular people become available. From this point of view, Armenian historiography, in the strict sense, begins with its period of literacy. Among the Armenians, interest in writing coincided with the establishment of Christianity in the country at the beginning of the fourth century, and the final elaboration of the alphabet belongs to the beginning of the fifth century. The first written documents, or rather the first monuments of bistorical literature which have reached us, cannot be dated earlier than the end of the fifth century. The earliest documents of Christian literature looked primarily toward the SyroPersian ecclesiastical world; a closer relation with the Byzantine Church began only in the sixth century.

The three periods just mentioned: the early fourth, the fifth and the sixth centuries, have the same significance for the Armenians as they had for Byzantium. They are the outstanding moments
in the trend toward Byzantinization. With its introduction to Christian culture, Armenia became a part of the broader Byzantine world. What was the aspect of Armenia on the eve of the formation of the Byzantine Empire - what were the conditions, especially the political situation of the country when she entered into the sphere of imperial concern - these are the basic problems to be investigated in the present work; this investigation, as we have already said, has been dictated by an interest not only in the history of Armenia, but also in that of Byzantium.

The Byzantine Empire was far from being a homogeneous organism from an ethnic or even a cultural point of view. The unity of the state was not based on a single core, or on the superiority of a particular ethnic group over the rest of the population. No barrier separated the victors from their subjects here, as had been the case among the Romans. The Greek nation was unquestionable in a special position through its strength and importance, but it would not be correct to say that Byzantine culture was its creation. For a many-sided study and exact characterization of this period it is indispensable to take into consideration everything that various ethnic groups brought into the common treasury of political and spiritual life. Among these groups one of the first places belongs to the Armenian world and to the eastern border in general. Its contribution to the common life of the Empire was great. On the other hand, it is equally true that the eastern nations drawn into the orbit of imperial life fell in their turn under the powerful influence of the imperial culture. In this sense, the relation of Armenia to Byzantium is that of a part to the whole. To trace Armenian elements in Byzantium and Byzantine elements in Armenia is a problem of equal interest to Armenologists and Byzantinists; both aspects are indispensable. Much can be overlooked through the assumption of an exclusively imperial point of view, while a narrowly Armenian outlook is equally dangerous. Imperial as well as local standards must be used for a correct evaluation of the facts.

In addition to their general imperial interests, the Armenians also had their own national and highly characteristic life. We cannot limit ourselves to the investigation of only those sides of Armenian life which related to the Empire. For the specific purpose of studying Armenian elements in Byzantium, and to fulfill simultaneously the requirements of the independent discipline concerned only with

Armenia, it is more profitable to begin with the general situation of Armenia. For this reason we shall take the Armenian lands in toto and investigate not only the parts subject to Byzantium, but also those within the Persian orbit.

Although partitioned politically, Armenia presented a single unit from every other point of view. To be sure, the superimposed political structure transformed the face of the nation, and the political conditions of the separate parts of the country brought about corresponding alterations in their internal life. From the fall of the Arsacids, political fragmentation became the norm, a situation which affected other aspects of life and hindered the development of a unified national spirit whose absence is continually cited by Armenian historians as the main cause of the woes which afflicted Armenia. Nevertheless, certain common elements, the foremost among them being language, writing, and a historical tradition, existed and served as the cement for a national unity which transcended political and territorial frameworks. For a correct interpretation of Armenian history it is indispensable to reckon with these conditions and to consider the fate of the component parts of Armenia both jointly and singly, that is to say in their common and separate settings. Otherwise, mistakes arising from incorrect generalizations and from the transfer to the nation as a whole of what was true only of a particular part, are inescapable. In the present work the Armenian lands have been analyzed according to their political divisions and status, and a corresponding map has been prepared ${ }^{1}$.

The material on which we have based our study is of varying value and origin. It has been drawn both from national and foreign sources. While we acknowledge the full value of the data on Armenia found in Classical literature, we do not share the negative outlook on the Armenian material adopted by many scholars. We have avoided all bias in favour of either Classical or Armenian sources, and in doubtful cases we will treat the available material equally critically, irrespective of its origin.

The unsatisfactory character of the evidence found in Armenian literature can be explained by the particular fate of the country: the spiritual life of the Armenian people underwent such drastic alterations and was subjected to such contingencies that on occasion it seemed to break off altogether and lose all ties with the past. Disruptive political upheavals broke the chain of history to such a degree that
the next generation was sometimes as ignorant or helpless as regards its not very distant past as we ourselves. The partition of the country and the frequent interruptions in the normal course of its life hindered the development and preservation of a unified tradition. As soon as the political storms subsided, however, and the period of adversity passed; when life returned to its customary tenor, an interest in the past awoke, and the study of those documents which had survived the disturbance began in order to find a tie with Antiquity and to link the present with the past. At such times, the thoughts which turn to days gone by tend to be romantic; the less it is possible to grasp the outlines of the past, the more dimly familiar figures rise from the darkness of time, the stronger the affirmation of the romantic mood. The men of the Bagratid period did not observe accurately the heartening aspects of their own times, or the brilliance to which the documents now uncovered bear witness. Their thoughts turned to the past, to the days when the Arsacid kings were ruling and the Holy Illuminator was at the height of his activity. Under these circumstances it is impossible to expect from them a correct outlook and an understanding of their native land. The literary documents of their ancestors were re-worked in accordance with contemporary moods and outlooks. Works unsuited to a particular point of view were forgotten or destroyed. Numerous documents perished, victims of factional strife caused by the absence of confessional or political unity. The results of such conditions were, on the one hand, the early creation of historical stereotypes which have been repeated by credulous writers, and, on the other, the maintenance of an open field for subjective interpretations filled with the unavoidable attendant errors of either archaizing later phenomena or re-interpreting ancient facts in the light of subsequent outlooks and interests. : To untangle these questions, to untie all these artificial knots, is a task for the literary historian. We have not avoided such investigation and we have tried to give what answers we could, insofar as this was required by the course of our work, but the historical aspect of disputed problems remains our primary interest. Therefore, we have concentrated on the degree of authenticity and the relative antiquity of factual materials without going each time into details of literary criticism. We have tried to find materials suited to our research stripped of the editorial conventions and elaborations with which they have reached us. Disregarding traditional schematizations, we have prized only historical value even when it did not coincide with literary worth.

The problem of analysis has been complicated by the fact that the historical documents had to be considered not merely from the point of view of general accuracy, but, more particularly, from that of their relation to the period investigated by us. In order to determine the suitable moment for the development of events, it has often been necessary to have recourse to the genetic method of investigation, i.e. to illuminate a historical problem through a study of its successive phases of development leading up to the period interesting us. This method has provided a way through confusing and occasionally irreconcilable evidence, and has demonstrated that the contradictions were often derived from a failure to maintain the chronological sequence and from the intermingling of data relating to different periods and places. As a result, our work has occasionally gone outside its framework, perhaps to the detriment of its organization. Without the genetic outlook, however, it would have been difficult to grasp the fundamental traits of the ecclesiastical organization and of the naxarar system in Armenia during the period under consideration, even though making full use of the existing materials. Yet it must be remembered that the naxarar system was an extremely characteristic component in the historical life of the Armenians and a factor of major importance. The real end of political independence in Armenia came not with the fall of the Arsacid or Bagratid royal dynasties, but with the destruction of the naxarar houses in the period of the Mongolinvasions ${ }^{12}$. Through our investigation of naxarar society and of the internal structure of western Armenia we have been able to trace the constants in the conditions of the Armenian lands during the period concerning us. These are indispensable for the understanding of political and other events to which we will devote the next section of our work.

In conclusion, it is perhaps necessary to mention that in publishing this work we are very far from any illusion as to its perfection. Armenian philology is still at a stage where the presentation of any interpretation or theory as unchallengeably correct is out of the question. Students of Armenian antiquity can only grope their way toward many historical problems by way of more or less successful hypotheses; some of these may be corroborated at a later date, others will fall by the way. As for our own work, we are filled with the feeling which may be expressed in the words of one of the investigators of European feudalism, "Für eine Zeit, in welcher die Quellen aus Fragmenten bestehen, wird niemand das allein Richtige gefunden zu haben glauben " ${ }^{1 \mathrm{~b}}$.

## THE POLITICAL DIVISION OF ARMENIA


#### Abstract

The historical setting of Armenia and her position among the surrounding nations - The partition of Armenia: Western or Byzantine Armenia, and Eastern or Persian Armenia - The line of demarcation from Dara to Theodosiopolis and beyond it to the Black Sea - The main points on this line and the frontier defense posts - Dara and Nisibis, Pheison, Attachas, and the Kleisurai, Akbas, Chlomarōn and Afumòn, Kitharizōn and Artalesōn - Erēz and Olnut - The site of *Artalia-Endires Theodosiopolis and Du - Bol and Pharangion - Sałagom and Ok'ałē - Tzanika and Tayk ${ }^{〔}$ - Egeria.


Physical environment is one of the main concerns of the discipline which deals with external bistory. It is generally acknowledged that the physical setting in which a nation develops constitutes one of the conditioning factors of its historical evolution. Here are to be found the motivating circumstances which determine the particular aspect of a nation and its individual historical path. For this reason, it is understandable that an analysis of this setting must precede all other historical investigation.

In the case of Armenia, as in that of every country which has not been fated to play a leading role in world politics, such an analysis has a particular significance. By physical environment we mean, of course, not only the geographical setting, but also the general historical setting; that is to say, we include in it not only the whole of the natural conditions of the country, but also its position among surrounding territorial units. Armenia was set in the midst of a group of small countries to which she was culturally and ethnically related to some degree: Iberia, Albania, Atropatenë, Syria, and Cappadocia, and her fate was similar to theirs. The territorial extent of these countries did not remain unchanged; boundaries often shifted, and they were set in any given period by the interaction of the contemporary powers. Armenian settlements spread or contracted in various directions according to cultural and political circumstances. From the moment of its appearance on the historical stage, Armenia
found herself in the midst of powerful rival states. Their influence on the internal life of Armenia was enormous; time and again political forces distorted the organic growth of the country, breaking and altering the natural course of its development. The centers and the entire character of Armenian cultural life frequently changed as a result of the political domination of another state. These changes brought about re-settlements of population and sent forth ethnic waves into corresponding directions. Scholars have often seen Armenia where this geographical term could no longer be justified by a former ethnic content, and, on the contrary, they have overlooked or failed to give sufficient weight to the presence of Armenians in other regions.

At first the Armenian movement pushed eastward and reached its maximum extent in this direction under the Arsacids. Before the acceptance of Christianity in Armenia, the possessions of the Armenian Arsacids reached as far as Ganjak, the capital of Atropatenē; that is to say, they included at least half of ancient Media ${ }^{1}$. To be sure, only the political boundaries reached this far, but their ethnic justification based on the pressure of Armenian elements on the frontier of Atropatene should also be acknowledged. At a later date the tide turned in the opposite direction. In the epoch of Justinian this westward trend increased, and an important part of Cappadocia was Armenized to such a degree that the name Armenia was officially given to it. These shifts in Armenian population as well as the transfers of the center of political life resulted from pressure on the opposite border of Armenia and a corresponding loss of part of her territory. Similar periods of ethnic ebb and flow also occurred on the southern and northern borders of Armenia so that these frontiers were likewise characterized by a lack of stability. Under these circumstances, the determination of Armenia as a territorial unit among the adjacent countries - Iberia, Albania, Atropatenē, Syria, and Cappadocia -, and the tracing of their territorial inter-relations in a historical perspective, consistent with the varying evidence of each period, poses a problem whose complication requires a special investigation. Our task is limited here by the framework of the era of Justinian, which is our chief concern, and consists in a preliminary outline of the historical setting within which the life of the Armenian people took place in this period.

The continuous rivalry between the Romans and the Persians for
the domination of Armenia brought about her division between the two contestants towards the end of the fourth century and the subsequent abolition of the Armenian kingship. This division of the country in accordance with the terms of the treaty [of 387] was maintained during the following period, and up to the end of the sixth century, when the central provinces of Armenia passed from the Sasanians to Byzantium ${ }^{12}$. The political partition of the country into eastern and western halves resulted in a split in the life of the Armenian people corresponding to the differences between the Byzantine and Iranian empires. The influence of the dominant state was reflected in the political structure of the regions of Armenia subject to it and was felt in many other aspects of Armenian life. Thus, for example, the inconsistent and clearly ambivalent attitude of the Armenians toward those events in the common life of the Church, which were then perturbing the whole of the civilized world, must be studied and explained in the light of the dissimilar political conditions existing within the country. It is well known that the ruling powers, not only in Byzantium but also in Persia, often intruded in the sphere of ecclesiastical life and exerted pressure to bring about a solution of dogmatic disputes favourable to various political considerations. Consequently the rigorous delimitation of the Byzantine and Persian spheres of influence in Armenia has not only a geographical but also a cultural interest ${ }^{\mathrm{lb}}$.

The boundary line between the Byzantine, or, as it was called in the Orient, the Roman and the Persian parts of Armenia passed next to Theodosiopolis-Erzurum in the north and Nisibis in the south; the former city remained in Roman territory and the latter in Persia. Opposite Nisibis and a little to the north on the Byzantine side stood the village of Dara, transformed into a fortified city in the time of the emperor Anastasius and named Anastasiopolis after him. According to a contemporary historian, Dara lay 98 stadia from Nisibis and 28 stadia from the Persian border ${ }^{2}$. At the present time, the unimportant village of Dara, or Kara-dara, stands on the ruins of the city and is at approximately the same distance from NusaybinNisibis. Twenty eight stadia are approximately $41 / 2$ versts [ca. 3.21 miles], so that Dara stood almost exactly on the frontier ${ }^{3}$.

Nearer Armenia, the Byzantine-Persian frontier lay along the Nymphios river on whose bank stood the city of Martyropolis, one of the important frontier posts. The historian [Procopius] writes,

In the part of Armenia called Sophanene there is a certain city known as Martyropolis which lies on the very bank of the Nymphius River, quite close to the enemy, because the Nymphius River at that point divides the Romans from the Persian territory. For across the river lies the territory of Arxanene [Arzanene], which has been subject to the Persians from early times ${ }^{4}$.

The same account is repeated elsewhere,
[Martyropolis]... This city lies in the land called Sophanene, two hundred and forty stades distant from the city of Amida toward the north; it is just on the river Nymphius which divides the land of the Romans and the Persians ... . This river [the Nymphius] is one very close to Martyropolis, about three hundred stades from Amida ${ }^{5}$.

Elsewhere Procopius reckons the distance from Martyropolis to Amida as "a little more than one-day's journey ... for an unemcumbered traveller". This coincides with the previous calculation of 240 stadia, since a day's march as a unit of measurement is given as 210 stadia by the same author ${ }^{6}$.

Not far from Martyropolis, about 100 stadia from the city, stood the village of Attachas ${ }^{7}$, while ancient Amida stood on the site of the present Diyarbakir, also called Kara-Amida in Turkish ${ }^{8}$. Martyropolis is identified with Miyafarkin, a city located not far from the Batmansuyu on one of the slopes of the mountain spur running from the mountains of Sasun toward Amida, and At't'a $\chi$ is still found. in the mountains north of Miyafarkin ${ }^{82}$. The Batmansuyu, one of the main tributaries of the Tigris, must be identified with the ancient Nymphios which flowed past Martyropolis. This city stood 240 stadia from Amida, while the Nymphios lay 300 stadia from the same city. It is evident, therefore, that Martyropolis, despite Procopius' term " à $\gamma \chi$ orác $\omega$ ", did not stand directly on the river but was separated from it by a distance of about 10 versts [ca. 6.89 miles]. Miyafarkin still stands in this relation to the Batmansuyu.

In Armenian documents the city's name is given as Np'rkert and its foundation is attributed to bishop Marut'a, who presumably built it in honour of the relics of the martyss which he had gathered ${ }^{9}$. This account is found in connexion with the name of the city, "Maptvp-o-тódıs", which can be rendered as "the city of the martyrs". The Armenian form neferkert [Np'rkert] corresponds to the

Syrian mefrkt, while the Armenian muharkin and the Syrian mefarkin are equivalent to the Arabic miyyafarkin; the first of these form should be considered the more ancient. The last syllable kert, kat is a well known Iranian word meaning city, and it is likely that the first part of the name likewise conceals a local word ${ }^{10}$. The forms cited unquestionably have a common origin.

The Mareptik-ōn of the Byzantine author Menander Protector may perhaps also be associated with these forms unless, it refers to the Armenian Mardpetakan. According to the story of Menander, the Persian king Xusrō I deliberately detained the imperial envoy at Dara, while he himself setting out " through the provinces [ $\left.\kappa \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \mu a \tau \alpha\right]$ called Arrestōn and Mareptikōn reached Persarmenia" "11. This account seemingly referred to Arzenē [Arzanenē] and Miyafarkin: Xusrō I was on his way from Dara to Armenia and indeed he reached the districts of Bagrewand and Tarōn, as is evident from the historian's subsequent account. The king's route lay through Arzanenē and past Miyafarkin, so that these localities might seem identifiable with the above mentioned ' $A \rho p \in \sigma \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$ and $M \alpha-\rho \epsilon \pi \sim \tau \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu$ (instead of ${ }^{\prime} A \rho \rho \epsilon \sigma \omega \hat{\nu}$ and $\left.M a-\pi \epsilon \rho-\kappa \iota \tau \omega \nu \nu\right)$. Saint-Martin was of the opinion that the former locality should be identified with the Armenian Arest, though he refused to give an explanation for the latter ${ }^{12}$. The term " $\kappa \lambda \grave{\iota} \mu a$ ", however, is more suited to the familiar province of Rंštunik' than to Arest, an unimportant town on the shore of Lake Van. According to Menander, Xusrō reached Bagrewand and Tarōn. If the itinerary of the Persian king has been transmitted accurately by the historian, Xusrō must have followed the eastern shore of the lake to go from Dara to Tarōn by way of Bagrewand. Both Restunik' and Mardpetakan lay along this route. We must suppose that Xusrō, went from the neighbourhood of Dara to R'štunik', circled the lake and entered Mardpetakan; there he turned left into Bagrewand and went down into Tarōn. In such an interpretation, Arrestōn and Mareptikōn must be identified with Rštunik' and Mardpetakan, which are well known provinces in the region of Vaspurakan ${ }^{12 \mathrm{a}}$.

In the Armenian Geography, the river Nymphios is called K'alirt' and, in agreement with Procopius, it is given as the frontier separating Roman and Persian territory. According to the description given in the Geography, the following districts were to be found in the province of Aljnik':
... Np'ret and Aljn between which flows the river K'ałirt' called Šit'ma, which means " bloodthirsty ", by the Arabs.

The K'atirt' springs from the mountains of Salin and Sasun, it flows down to separate Np'rkert from K'łimar and thus serves as a boundary between the Romans and the Persians, and it is called Sit'it'ma that is to say bloodthirsty ${ }^{13}$.

Joshua the Stylite knows of a river named Kala $\theta$ in the neighbourhood of Amida, which corresponds to the K'ałirt'. The river is familiar to John of Ephesus who says that the Persian fortress of Akbas [Okbas] stood on the opposite shore from Miyafarkin ${ }^{14}$. Another writer describes in similar terms " Okbas, a very strong fortress, situated on a precipice on the bank opposite to Martyropolis" ${ }^{15}$. Since this fortress stood on the bank of the Nymphios and was besieged by the Roman general Iohannes ${ }^{16}$, it must have belonged to the Persians. From this information we may associate ancient Akbas with the modern Anōšarvān-Kala ${ }^{162}$. According to John of Ephesus, the Persians had long wished to build a fortress on the Akbas mountain but had been unsuccessful because it stood within a few miles of the Roman frontier, and the Romans interfered. At last, taking advantage of a favourable opportunity, they carried out their plan, but the fortress was soon taken and destroyed by the Romans. This story is set in the reign of Xusrō I Anōšarvān, and the city obviously owed its name to Anōšarvān, its founder.

Besides Akbas, the Persians had two additional fortified posts along the frontier: Afumōn and Chlomarōn [K'limar] ${ }^{17}$. The Roman armies operated primarily against these three points during the long wars which began at the end of the sixth century and which incidentally closed with the transfer of Arzanene to Byzantium at the accession of Xusrō [II] in 591. The site of Afumōn is precisely known; a small settlement at the foot of mount Iliǧe [Lice], whence springs one of the streams that form the Batmansuyu, bears the name of Fum to this day ${ }^{17 a}$. Chlomarōn lay not far from Afumōn. In 568 the Roman general Philippicus, who was besieging Chlomarōn, lifted the siege as the result of a false alarm, fled to Afumōn, and, having crossed the Nymphios, reached Amida ${ }^{18}$. It follows, therefore, that the besieged fortress of Chlomarōn lay east of Fum. As one of the frontier posts it lay on the defense line Akbas-Afumon and was probably in the neighbourhood of the present Nerjiki and the Talori deresi ${ }^{18 a}$. The description in the Armenian Geography points in the same direction
since, according to it, the K'ahirt' river separated both the province of Arzanenē-Aljnik' from Miyafarkin and the latter from ChlomarōnK'limar. This is possible only if Chlomarōn lay across the river and to the north of Miyafarkin, since the river circled the city from the north-east, and Aljnik' lay on the east bank opposite Miyafarkin ${ }^{19}$. Chlomarōn and Afumōn lay in Persian territory. In 578 Maurice took Afumön and placed a garrison there, but up to that time it had belonged to the Persians ${ }^{19 \mathrm{a}}$.

Opposite the Persian fortresses, on the other side of the river stood the equally strong Roman posts. In addition to Martyropolis and Attachas, the Romans possessed Pheison [Fis] with its inaccessible passes. Procopius describes it as follows,

As one goes westerly from Martyropolis, there is a place called Pheison, which is also situated in Armenia, in the section called Sophanene, a little less than a day's journey distant from Martyropolis. Beyond this place, at about the eight milestone, precipitous and altogether impassable mountains come together to form two passes, very close to one another which they are wont to call cleisurae. And when travellers go from Persarmenia to Sophanene, either from the Persian territory itself or by way of the fortress of Citharizon [Kitharizon], it is necessary for them to get there by way of these two passes. The natives call the one of them Illyrisum and the other Saphchae.

According to the same historian the emperor Justinian fortified Pheison and the Kleisurai with new buildings and placed a garrison there so as to close the pass entirely to the enemy ${ }^{20}$. Indeed there is even today a small village named Fis not far from Miyafarkin, between Hani and Hasras. To the north of it for the whole of a mile stretch the mighty ruins of an ancient fortress which were visited in 1861 by Taylor, the British consul in Diyarbakir ${ }^{21}$.
The Kleisurai were in the neighbourhood of Fis. During his retreat from Afumōn to Amida, Philippicus, built on the way the fortresses of Phathachon and Alaleisos in the Izala mountains, and placed garrisons there ${ }^{21 \mathrm{a}}$. These fortifications should undoubtedly be identified with the famous Kleisurai. The name of one of them was rendered Olor [Oloray] in Armenian, Haloras in Syrian, and is met as Haluris in Arab writers ${ }^{22}$. The branches of the chain of the Armenian Taurus which stretch in a great are along the Murad-su
from the Euphrates to the shores of Lake Van and beyond, reach down toward Fis from the north. The top of the are is marked by the tall range of the Chevtla [Çotela-Akcakara] and Darkosh and it drops to the Lice in the region of the sources of the Tigris; spurs reach down from it all the way to Fis itself ${ }^{22 a}$. This is the region in which the passes are to be sought, according to the information of Procopius and of the Armenian writer Vardan. The Kleisurai formed the only passage through which Sophanenē could be reached from the north. At the present time, the road connecting the region of Diyarbakir with the valley of the Murad-su runs along the line Fis (or Hani) - Lice - Sahverdiyan. Below Sahverdiyan, near the source of the Ziban-Tigris, is found a curious passage in the form of a natural tunnel with stalagtite caves. The river breaks through the tunnel which is two miles long and eighty feet high ; the present name of the place is Bakireyn. From Sahverdiyan the road rises abruptly into the mountains, and at a considerable height cuts through a bare, rocky, pass which marks the watershed of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Beyond the pass, the road enters the gorge of the Züllkarneyn [Berklinzülkarneynsuyu] and descends along the mountain slopes to the Murad-su near the village of Timur-aga on the very edge of the river ${ }^{22 \mathrm{~b}}$. At Bakireyn, as well as at the entrance of the Zülkarneyn, ruins of ancient fortifications and of watch posts guarding the passes have been found. These are the very gorges which are to be identified with the ancient Kleisurai ${ }^{23}$.

Having clarified the position of the Kleisurai and of the Persian fortress of Afumōn opposite them, we can determine exactly the frontier of the two empires on the upper Nymphios, and in the basin of the Tigris in general. It lay along the western tributaries of the Nymphios: the Lice - the Kulp-su - the Batmansuyu.

In the valley of the Arsanias-Euphrates and beyond it in the direction of Theodosiopolis, the Byzantine territory adjoined Persia in the provinces of Asthianenē and Chorzanē [Chorzianenē, Korzenē] along the fortified line Kitharizōn-Artalesōn.

And at the place named Citharizon [Kitharizon] which is in Asthiane, as it is called, he [Justinian] established a fortress which had not existed before, a huge and extraordinarily impregnable stronghold, situated in a hilly region. He also brought into it an abundant supply of water and made all other proper arrangements for the inhabitants, ... .

As one goes from Citharizon to Theodosiopolis and the
other Armenia, the land is called Chorzane ; it extends for a distance of about three days' journey, not being marked off from the Persian territory by the water of any lake or by any river's stream or by a wall of mountains which pinch the road into a narrow pass, but the two frontiers are indistinct. So the inhabitants of this region, whether subjects of the Romans or of the Persians, have no fear of each other, nor do they give one another any occasion to apprehend an attack, but they even intermarry and hold a common market for their produce and together share the labours of farming. And if the commanders (aj $\rho \chi o \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ) on either side ever make an expedition against the others, when they are ordered to do so by their sovereign, they always find their neighbours unprotected. Their very populous towns are close to each other, yet from ancient times no stronghold existed on either side. It was possible, therefore, for the Persian King to proceed by this route with comparative ease and convenience in passing through Roman territory, until the Emperor Justinian blocked his way in the following manner. There was a town in the middle of the region named Artaleson which he surrounded with a very strong wall and converted into an impregnable fortress; and he stationed there detachments of regular troups ... ${ }^{24}$.

It follows from this that Kitharizōn and Artalesōn were points through which ran the line of demarcation between the two empires, to one was assigned the defense of Asthianenē, and to the other that of Chorzanē. These two provinces lay side by side, contiguous with Persian territory, the latter adjoining the former in the north, on the side facing Theodosiopolis. Procopius counted four days' journey from Kitharizōn to Theodosiopolis, while Chorzanē stretched for a journey of only three days from the same point toward Theodosiopolis. Hence Chorzane did not reach all the way to the city but fell short of it by a day's journey. At approximately this distance (about 40 kilometers) from Erzurum, the ancient Theodosiopolis, we find the Harhal and Haç mountains forming a wall around the sources of the Keli or Ličik [Perisuyu]. This natural boundary closed Chorzanē from the north, and indeed we have evidence that the town of Mormeran [or Morran], situated at the foot of these mountains, was considered to be on the border of Chorzanē ${ }^{25}$. Thus, the province of Chorzanē corresponded to the valley of the Keli river. According to the definition of the Armenian Geography, Chorzanē [Xorjayn] was the region through which the river Gayl flowed down past Kołoberd. Gayl was the ancient name of the river which is now named Keli [Perisuyu]
after the ancient fortress of Koł or Kolo-berd. According to Procopius, Chorzanē reached southward to Asthianene, while the Armenian Geography placed Chorzane in the north-eastern part of Armenia IV, that is to say, in the region which also included Asthianenē. To the west of Chorzane lay Pałnatun or Pałankatun, "the province of Pałan ", on one of the tributaries of the Keli, with the city of Patin [Bagin] which has survived to this day as a small settlement near the town of Peri. South of Pałnatun lay Balahovit, the district of the present Balu [Palu], on the Murad-Arsanias ${ }^{26}$.

Concerning Asthianenē [Hašteank'], the Geography merely records that the sources of the Tigris lay in it, and the center of Asthianene was shifted by this work into the valley of the Arsanias ${ }^{26 a}$. In such a position it lay to the south of Chorzane, in full agreement with Procopius' description and, since it stretched along the Murad-su, it must have borne the same relation to Chorzane as Balahovit, further west to Pałnatun. The width of the strip occupied by Asthianenē along the river, i.e. the position of its boundary with Chorzanē, is important for our determination of the location of the fortresses of Kitharizōn and Artalesōn. If we bear in mind the fact that the disposition of provinces usually depended on natural frontiers mountains or river systems - it might be natural to suppose that Asthianenee occupied the valley of the Göyniksuyu. Certain other considerations, however, compel us to admit that the entire course of this river did not lie in Asthianenē, but that its source was found in Chorzanē or in the neighbouring provinces of Persian Armenia ${ }^{27}$.

On the Persian side Aršamunik' adjoined Asthianenē. Vahan Mamikonean, seeking help from Asthianenē, set out for Aršamunik' and halted at the village of Erēz ${ }^{28}$. Erēz evidently stood right on the border of Asthianenē since historians assign it either to Aršamunik' or to Asthianenē. Passing through Anzitenē and Balu in 1001, the emperor Basil [II] crossed over the Koher mountains and from there entered the province of Arsamunik' at the town of Erēz ${ }^{282}$. The Koher are undoubtedly the present Karer [Kârix] mountains on the right bank of the Göyniksuyu. On the opposite bank from them, stands the village of Ołnut [Ognut], the historical Elane, also called Elnut and Olmut. In 1056 a Prince Ivanee [son of Liparit], lord of the town of Erēz in Aršamunik', making the most of a favourable opportunity, marched on the castle of Ełanc and took it by deception, but soon after he was punished for this enterprise and imprisoned
in Elnut ${ }^{29}$. In both these cases the stories refer to one and the same castle since the historian John Mamikonean testifies to the identity of the two names ${ }^{30}$, and according to the account of Aristakēs Lastivertẹi, the place seized by Prince Ivanē lay not far from Erēz.
£azar [P'arpecii] is acquainted with a village of Olin, or Olin according to the old transeription, near Erēz. After a night attack on the Persian camp near Erëz, Vahan Mamikonean went to spend the night in Olin. This settlement must evidently have been very near Erēz if, as the historian puts it, Vahan had sufficient time to make the attack, carry out a massacre, and finally go forward to it [Olin] " to spend the rest of the night" ${ }^{31}$. Both in distance from Ereez and in name, Olin coincides perfectly with the fortress of Olnut - Olnu-berd. Some six or seven versts [ca. 4 miles] below Olnut is found a locality given on Kiepert's map as Aziran and on Lynch's as Azizan. Both readings probably result from incorrect renderings of the Turkish diacritical marks on the correct form Arizan ${ }^{32}$. It seems as though we are here on the trail of the historical Erēz. All the facts coincide: Ariz-an, across the Koher - Kârir mountains (in agreement with Asolik), is near Olin - Olnut and on the border of Asthianene and Aršamunik'. We know from Łazar P'arpec̣i that Olin lay north of Erëz, since after the night battle near Ereèz, Vahan Mamikonean reached Olin and marched forth from it to Valaršapat and further on to Dwin. This account also agrees with the location of Arizan, which lies south of Olnut.

The identification of Erēz with modern Arizan is conditioned by the problem of the position assigned to the upper course of the Göniksuyu. The difficulty is that Vahan Mamikonean reached Erëz from the neighbourhood of Karin [Erzurum] (from the village of Arcat'i [Arzunti ?], which still exists north of Erzurum), but the road from Eizurum to Arizan follows the bank of the Göniksuyu from its source all the way to Arizan - Olnut, and this was probably also true in Antiquity. In any case, the road could not lie further east since the lofty ranges of the Bingöl daǧlari rise there. Before reaching Erēz, Vahan had had to pass through the upper valley of the Göniksuyu, if he reached the border of Asthianenē only at Erēz, the upper reaches of this river obviously could not lie in Asthianenē. Nor could they belong to the neighbouring district, since in that case Vahan would have come to Erēz through Asthianenë, that is to say through Roman territory, and this contradicts the evidence of the historian who says
that the Mamikonean prince had not crossed the frontier: he wished only to go " in the direction of the frontier of Asthianene [Hašteank'] ", that is to say into Aršamunik', and in fact "he went toward the border of Asthianenē, came and stopped in the district of Aršamunik' in the village of Erëz ". According to the Armenian Geography, Aršamunik' lay north of Tarōn near the Srmane mountains, the present Bingöl. From all these indications Aršamunik' may be defined as the district of the Bingoll stream and the upper reaches of the Göniksuyu ${ }^{32}$.

South of Aršamunik', a narrow band between Tarōn and Asthianenē formed the next district of Palun [Palunik'], with its capital Kowark or Kowars, now Guvers near Boğhan, which determines the position of Palun along the course of the Menaskut. The Armenian Geography is not familiar with Palun and attributes its territory to Tarōn ${ }^{32 \mathrm{~b}}$. Incidentally, [Asolik], the historian of the house of Tarōn, who is thoroughly familiar with the topography of both Palun and Tarōn, lists the city of Porpēs as part of Tarōn, whereas Porpēs, the present Borbas, stood on the Menaskut river south of Kowars and was, therefore, part of Palun. Zenob Glak, another local historian, assigns Kowars, which he himself acknowledges to be the capital of Palun, to the lands of the Mamikonean, that is to say to Taronn ${ }^{33}$. What seems to have occured is that Palun passed to the Mamikonean family at a later date, and consequently failed to be included in the Geography as an independent district. In the west Palun bordered on Asthianenē and was separated from it by the natural boundary of the Navšan pass ( 4,636 feet) ${ }^{33 \mathrm{a}}$. Both Aršamunik' and Palun unquestionably lay in Persian, that is to say in Eastern Armenia, since they are mentioned as taking part in the fifth century rebellion against the Persians. Both districts formed the extreme border strip of this portion of Armenia.

Thus the line of demarcation between Eastern and Western Armenia ran from Fum, over the Çotela mountains, through the Navšan pass, to Arizan - Ołnut; then, crossing the Göniksuyu, it went up the right bank of the river to the western slopes of the Srmanc-Bingöl mountains. Along such a line the frontier coincides with the mountain range running from the Euphrates to the Bingöl. This coincidence between the political and natural boundaries justifies our conclusions.

The problem of the location of Kitharizōn and Artalesōn remains unsolved. It is evident to us that the districts in which they were
situated were divided from each other along the line Erēz-Ołnut, by the Kârir mountains facing them. The border land open on all sides, described by Procopius, must be the valley irrigated by the Göyniksuyu. According to the indications found in Procopius, the fortress of Kitharizōn should be sought in the Kârir mountains and must be identified with one of the modern fortified localities, Sheikh-Selim-kala, Aznaberd, or Astłberd (i.e. the fortress of Sheikh-Selim, the castle of Azn, or the castle of Astl), which are found not far from each other on the northern slopes of these mountains ${ }^{33 \mathrm{~b}}$.

Artaleson, according to the account of the same historian, should then be sought further north, nearer to Manałi. The Armenian form of 'A $A \rho \tau \lambda \epsilon \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu$ must have been *artali-s, *artali-k', a form similar in composition to mardati-k', manali-k', the names given to the districts adjoining Chorzanē. Mardalik' extended along the northern slopes of the Bingöl in the north, as did Aršamunik' in the south. The original stream of the Araxes, the Mure, now called Eğri or Aras, had its source in this district, and in the west, Mardałik' adjoined the Mełedux range, identified with the Harhal mountains, which we have already mentioned. In the north it was separated from Karin by the AycPtkunk' mountains, which correspond to the mountain range forming a half-moon south of Erzurum ${ }^{34}$. Thus, Mardalik' embraced the watershed of three rivers: the Aras, the Ličik [Perisuyu] and the Tuzlasuyu. Furthermore, the Harhal range provided a natural wall for Mardałik', and for Persian or Eestern Armenia at the same time ${ }^{34}$ a. Manralik' [sic], in the west, and Chorzanē, in the south, abutted the Harhal mountains at an angle. In our opinion the part of Chorzanē touching Manralik' and Mardalik' at the Harhal mountains must have born in antiquity the related name of *Artalia-Artalik' and have contained the similarly named fortress of ' $A \rho \tau \alpha \lambda \epsilon \sigma-\omega ิ \nu$.

The village of ' $A \rho a \beta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu$, mentioned in Xusrō Anöšarvān's campaign of 576, has the same location as Artalesōn. In that year Xusrō entered Armenia through Aren and Miyafarkin, crossed the provinces of Bagrewand and Tarōn, and, having advanced toward Basean, broke into Roman Armenia on the side of Theodosiopolis. Taking the Romans by surprise,
he established a camp in the village called Arabesson, in the province south of the city [Theodosiopolis] while the Roman troops, as many as were to be found there at the time, spread to the north in the province called * at the foot of the mountain ${ }^{35}$.

Judging from its surroundings Arabessōn is none other than Artaleson. The narrator of the above campaign relates that the Persian king highly prized the strategic position of Theodosiopolis, which dominated Armenia and Iberia, and tried to obtain mastery of it. To achieve this, Xusrō's plan apparently was to cut off Theodosiopolis from the nearest fortified posts, Artalesōn and Kitharizōn. For this purpose he halted south of Theodosiopolis in the neighbourhood of the locality which we have called *Artalia. On the basis of this we believe that Arabessōn is merely a distortion of Artalesōn, ('Apaß $\beta \sigma \sigma-\hat{\omega} \nu$ instead of ' $A \rho(\tau) a \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma-\omega \nu)$. This distortion obviously reflects the influence of the name of the famous Cappadocian city of 'Apá $\beta \iota \sigma \sigma o s$. The locality which we have identified as *Artalia is known at the present time by the name of Endires, which is probably the Turkish pronunciation of Artales. Here, at the foot of the Haç mountain, stood the fortress of Artaleson, approximately in the neighbourhood of the modern Melikân ${ }^{36}$.

The distance between Artalesōn and Kitharizōn was not great, approximately a day's journey. Before the campaign of Dwin in 542, Roman troops had been distributed among the frontier posts: one regiment stood at Kitharizōn, another, not very far from it in Chorzanē, specifically at Artaleson, and the third at Fis. The regiment from Chorzane crossed the frontier first without informing the others; the one from Kitharizon, having heard of this, followed on the very next day; but the troups stationed at Fis heard of the invasion only late since "[they] had encamped far away from the rest of the army" ${ }^{37}$. Consequently we see that Kitharizōn lay closer to Artalesonn than to Fis - a situation which in no way contradicts our conclusions as to the position of Kitharizōn and Artalesōn. According to one interesting indication, Kitharizonn was situated between Syria and Armenia ${ }^{38}$. If Armenian claims reached as far as Nisibis, then it is understandable that the Syrians allowed similar exaggerations. If, according to this theory, we take the Murad-Arsanias as the frontier of Syria, we will have to shift Kitharizōn to the banks of the Murad. The small settlement of Darizoa now found in Çapakçur might perhaps be identified with Kitharizōn (from k-Tariz, with the dropping of the first vowel) ${ }^{38,}$, but we think it more likely that the historian included into Syria all five Armenian satrapies, one of which is known to have been Asthianenē. In such a case it becomes understandable that Kitharizon, 羅which lay on the northern border of Asthianene, should
have been considered as having stood between Syria and Armenia.
Past Mardatik', in the region of Theodosiopolis and beyond, the frontier ran along the mountain range stretching from Theodosiopolis to the Çoruh river. To the right of Erzurum, the Deveboynu, and the Kargapazari mountains follow each other toward the north ${ }^{38}$ a, The latter turn toward the west at the peak of Kandil ( 10,230 feet), their northern most and highest point, to merge with the Dumlü range. The Dumlü extends above Exzerum toward the banks of the Çoruh above Sper. Basean, and the districts of Tayk': Buxa and Ok'ałē, facing Roman Karin and Sałagom, bordered the frontier on the Persian side. On the frontier itself, directly opposite Theodosiopolis, stood the village of Du which served simultaneously as the frontier between Karin and Basean. We know from the History of Vahan Mamikonean that the Persian commander pursuing the Armenian rebels stopped in the village of Du , which the historian Łazar P'arpeci calls the frontier between the two kingdoms. Vahan, the leader of the rebels, was stationed not far off in the village of Mknarinč. Another Persian general named Hazarawuxt, followed in Vahan's steps and came to the villages of Giwlik and Vardašēn in the district of Ok'alē. By this time, Vahan was already beyond the frontier in the Roman district of Šałagom, though still close to Hazarawuxt. The Persian pursuit proved unsuccessful and they went down from Ok'ale to the village of Du in Basean, while Vahan crossed to the Mamikonean village of Calik and planned to advance in the direction of Asthianene ${ }^{38 e}$. The villages mentioned above still exist. Du, near Enzurum, at the foot of the Kargapazari mountains is called Tuy according to the modern pronunciation, which is probably a genitive form. It consists of two settlements, greater and lesser Tuy, almost side by side. A little to the east, stands the village of Kurnuȩ, which is undoubtedly to be identified with the historical Mknarinč, whose distance from Du , calculated by the historian as two parasangs (twelve kilometers), corresponds to the location of Kurnuç. North of mount Kandil, on the frontier itself, stood and still stands ancient Całki [Zağki] (genitive of calik-flower). Two other villages are located higher in the valley of the Tortum çayi, in the vicinity of the city of Tortum itself, and are called by their ancient names of Gelik and *Vardišēn. These villages determine the location of Ok'ałē as well as that of the Roman district of Sałagom, which lay " nearby - (innn... $p$ \{ifu) ", and therefore, on the other side of the mountains, in the valley of the Serçeme deresi, between Karin and Sper ${ }^{39}$.

Facing the Roman fortress of Theodosiopolis on the Persian side, stood the castle of Boł, Bol-berd, in the province of Basean, not far from Theodosiopolis. The wives of the Kamsarakan princes captured by the Persians at the time of Vahan Mamikonean were imprisoned there ${ }^{39}$. Bol is likewise well known to western historians and it played an enormous part in the political events of the sixth century. Its location is not exactly known. According to one indication it stood in Basean, according to another, "near the border of Theodosiopolis " ${ }^{40}$. It is usually associated with the modern Hasankale, the site of the former city of Vałaršakert, where the kat'olikos Nersēs [III] the Builder had erected a church dedicated to the Mother of God ${ }^{41}$. It is unlikely, however, that ancient Bołberd should subsequently have been called Vałaršakert, since this name cannot by its very nature be late in origin, unless the Persian king Vałarš (Valarses, 484-488) rebuilt the fortress of Boł to offset Anastasius' fortification of Theodosiopolis, and renamed it Vałaršakert (the city of Vałarš). In view of the similarity in sound of their names, it seems more profitable to seek Boł closer to the neighbouring district of Buxa in the region of Tayk'. Buxa occupied the source of one of the branches of the Oltuçayi in the vicinity of Basean, and a fortress called Buğakale still exists in the Kargapazari mountains, on the border of the two districts. If Buğa is derived from Buұa, Buğakale, must be the ancient Bołberd ${ }^{42}$.

The region of Pharangion, where gold was mined for the Persian king, was indissolubly tied to the political fate of Bołberd. We know that this region lay in Armenian territory, near the border of Tzanika [Canet'i], where the Boas or Voas river had its source. The Boas corresponds to the Voh of the Armenian Geography and is none other than the Çoruh, or rather the upper course of this river. The sources of the Çoruh are found in the neighbourhood of Ispir. Ancient sources relate that gold mines, which had interested Alexander the Great, were to be found in Suspiritis. According to these indications, Pharangion must coincide with the Armenian Sper, the classical Suspiritis, and the denunciation of Vahan Mamikonean in an affair dealing with the extraction of gold probably refers to the mines of Sper. Pharangion was Persian property. Under Kavad, the supervision of the gold mining was given to an Armenian named Simeon, who later under Justinian, went over to the Romans and handed Pharangion over to them. At the same time Prince Isaac Kamsarakan
also surrendered to them the fortress of Bol ${ }^{43}$. To be precise, the Persians, at Pharangion, bordered not on Roman but on Can [Tzan] lands. Tzanika or Khaldia, the land of the Tzans or Khaldians, was a mountainous province consisting of the Parhar range, which lay between the Çoruh, and of the coastal strip of the Black Sea as far as Trebizond. In the valley of the Cुoruh, Tzanika bordered on Persian territory and on the province of Tayk' from PharangionIspir, to the fortress of T'uxars, now Hars ${ }^{43}$. Beyond this point Tzanika adjoined the district of Klarjet'iin Gugark‘ along the Ardanuẹ river.

Still further, the Çoruh river entered Egr (Egeria), according to the description of the Armenian Geography; there, it flowed through the districts of Nigal, Mruł, and Mrit, and finally emptied into the sea ${ }^{44}$. In our opinion the name of Nigal has been preserved in that of the small Murgulsuyu river which flows into the Çoruh from the left side, below Artvin. One of the tributaries of the Adzharis-Tskali is the Marat, which bears the same name as the Mrit, and the Mrul may be connected with the Imerehevi deresi (Mer-uli) ${ }^{44 \mathrm{a}}$. In other words, the three districts coincide with the valleys of the streams bearing the same names on the lower Çoruh, between the mouth of the Imerehevi deresi and the sea. These districts made up the province of Egeria par excellence. The name Eger-Egeria, has survived to this day in the form Adzhar-ia, with the usual transformation of the guttural $g$ into a palatal dzh. The term Egeria is also used by the Armenian Geography in a broader sense to designate the entire eastern shore [of the Black Sea] from Abkhazia all the way to Trebizond and to include Tzanika [Canet'i] as well. The eastern bank of the Çoruh along which lay Tayk' and Klarjet'i belonged to the Persians. In fact we cannot tell whether Tayk' was restricted to the eastern bank of the river or whether it also included part of the west bank, a conclusion which some indications seem to support ${ }^{45}$. In the latter case, the foot of the Parhar range should be taken as the frontier line of the Persian possessions, and Tzanika should begin beyond this pointTzanika, and in general Egeria, in the broader sense, were left to their own devices. Procopius found the Tzans "settled on Roman territory" but still enjoying freedom ${ }^{46}$. The Tzans were finally conquered and forced to recognize the imperial authority only under Justinian, who built the fortress of Petra on the border of Lazika, on the sea shore at the northern estuary of the Çoruh. In terms of
the limits of influence of the emperor and of the Persian king rather than in terms of their actual territorial possessions, Petra may be taken as the border of the Empire in this period. In actual fact, however, a bitter struggle for the mastery of this border was carried on with varying success between the two rulers during the entire century ${ }^{46}$ a.

Thus from Nisibis to the Çoruh, the lands of Armenia were divided into two halves: Western (or Roman) and Eastern (or Persian) Armenia, along the line which we have just traced.

## V

## ADMINISTRATION : WESTERN ARMENIA BEFORE JUSTINIAN

The general structure of the Empire - Civilian and military powers, and their instruments.
I. Armenia I and II in the administrative hierarchy - Their military position The dux Armeniae - The contingents under his command and their size - The distribution of troops within the country - Military garrisons, primary and secondary - The ranks of the military commanders - The position of the dux Armeniae in the military hierarchy - His officium - The Codicillus dignitatum of the vicar of Pontica and of the $d u x$ Armeniae.
II. The administrative and legal position of the Satrapies and of Armenia Interior The institution of foederati based on a foedus non aequum - Variations in this institution - The meaning of foederati in the Byzantine Empire - The satraps as foederati - Characteristics of an alliance with the Empire - The creation of satrapal law Aspects of a treaty marking entrance into the Empire - Armenia Interior as a civitas foederata - Her incorporation into the Empire, its terms, and the treaty on which they were based - Freedom from taxation and from the aurum coronarium - The problem of the фópoi $\delta \eta \mu$ óvior - The comes Armeniae - The rank of count and the limits of his legal powers - The problem of the $\delta \eta \mu$ órıa áp $\rho \in \nu$ aкá - The relation of the comes to the naxarars - The naגarar system in Armenia Interior.

Diocletian has rightly been identified as the creator of the internal structure of the Roman Empire as it is found in the period of Justinian ${ }^{1}$. His renovation of the entire administrative machinery was continued by his successors and received particular stimulation at the time of Theodosius I. The results of this activity spread over a full century are known from the famous Notitia Dignitatum, a document dating from the beginning of the fifth century ${ }^{2}$. This document contains nothing but a detailed listing of all the dignities and offices of the civilian and military administration of the Empire, yet it provides us with a clear idea of the administrative machinery created by the Christian emperors, and which can best be described by the term bureaucracy. The principle of autocracy proclaimed by the

Empire could only produce such a system suited to the aims of absolutism, since the creation of an extensive network of officials would provide a larger number of instruments through which power could operate. On the other hand, the division of power among numerous officials hierarchically subordinated to one another increased the control maintained over them and, therefore, precluded the possibility of opposition.

In the Notitia Dignitatum, civilian authority is separated from the military and constitutes a separate administration. This reform is attributed to Constantine the Great ${ }^{3}$. From the civilian point of view, the whole Empire was divided into four prefectures headed by praetorian prefects (praefecti praetorio). These prefectures were subdivided into dioceses governed by substitutes for the prefects (vicarii praefectorum). Finally the dioceses in turn were divided into provinces, each of which had its governor called praeses, äpx $\rho \boldsymbol{\nu}$ in Greek.

In the eastern part of the Empire were found the Praefectus praetorio Orientis, and the Praefectus praetorio Illyrici. The first of these, i.e. the prefecture of the East, contained five dioceses: Oriens, Aegyptus, Asiana, Pontica, Thracia. Eleven provinces, among which were included the Armenian lands: Armenia I, Armenia II, as well as Pontus Polemoniacus, made up the diocese of Pontica:

Sub dispositione viri spectabilis vicarii dioceseos Ponticae provinciae infrascriptae: 1. Bithynia, 2. Galatia, 3. Paflagonia, 4. Honorias, 5. Galatia Salutaris, 6. Cappadocia prima, 7. Cappadocia secunda, 8. Helenopontus, 9. Pontus Polemoniacus, 10. Armenia prima, 11. Armenia secunda ${ }^{3 a}$.

At the head of Armenia I and II stood praesides subordinated to the vicar.
The military divisions of the Empire did not always coincide with the civilian ones. The highest power there was divided between military commanders known as magistri militum. There were five such commanders in the eastern half of the Empire according to the Notitia Dignitatum. Of these, two were in the capital, magistri militum praesentales, and three in the provinces: in Thrace, Illyricum, and the East, magistri militum per Thracias, per Illyricum, per Orientem. The magistri militum had the same military authority as the praetorian prefects in the civilian sphere.

The offices below that of the magistri were filled by dukes and counts, duces, comites rei militaris. Within this hierarchy, these were the equals of the vicars, since both made up the rank of spectabiles, but the territories under their authority were noticeably smaller than the dioceses. From this point of view, the dukes were rather the equivalent of provincial governors. We do not know the precise relation of the dukes or counts to the magistri militum; there is no indication on this subject in the Notitia. We presume that they were subordinated to them, but how and to what degree is unclear ${ }^{4}$.

The dukes as well as the magistri militum were in charge of a certain number of military contingents. The forces of the magister militum per Orientem were defined as follows:

Sub dispositione viri illustris magistri militum per Orientem: Vexillationes comitatenses decem...
Auxilia palatina duo...
Legiones comitatenses [IX]...
Item pseudocomitatenses [XI] ${ }^{5}$.
As is well known, the regular army was composed of legions. The Notitia Dignitatum distinguishes three categories of legions: palatinae, or court, comitatenses, or camp, and pseudo comitatenses, or quasi-camp. Originally the first two terms designated soldiers of the imperial guard, the former served at court, the latter during campaigns, and at that time their number was limited. Subsequently both palatinae and comitatenses outgrew their etymological sense and made up the core of the active army as opposed to the border or garrison troops, milites limitanei. Legions organized according to the pattern of the comitatenses but not enjoying equal priviledges were called pseudo comitatenses. They did not receive a majus stipendium as did the palatinae and comitatenses. According to the Epitoma Rei Militaris of the military writer Vegetius Renatus (383-450), a legion consisted of 6,100 infantrymen and 726 cavalrymen. Johannes Lydus, a writer of the sixth century, likewise gives 6,000 men in a legion, and according to his information, a vexillatio was a cavalry squadron of 500 horsemen, while an ala was a detachment of 600 horsemen ${ }^{6}$. In the Notitia Dignitatum, there are mentions of vexillationes palatinae and vexillationes comitatenses, but there are no references to vexillationes pseulo comitatenses. At that time the cavalry had seemingly been removed from the first two eategories to form separate squadrons, while it
remained part of the pseudo comitatenses as before. According to the explanation of Vegetius, the auxilia were troups drawn from foreigners in the Empire ${ }^{7}$.

From this we obtain:
10 vexillationes of 500 each giving 5,000
9 comitatenses of 6,000 each giving 54,000
10 pseudo comitatenses of 6,000 each or 60,000
From 726 to 500 horsmen each or 7,260 to 5,000
2 auxilia, the number in which is indeterminate.
Bearing in mind the fact that legions were not always at full strength, we may still say that an army of up to 100,000 men, in round numbers, stood under the orders of the magister militum per Orientem ${ }^{73}$. This army was presumably spread through the provinces in divisions headed by viri spectabiles, duces or comites rei militaris ${ }^{8}$. This assumption would provide solution for the problem of the relation of the duces to the magistri, and this is the system found in the Western Empire, where the dukes and counts were subordinated to the magister, as the Notitia Dignitatum indicates, "sub dispositione viri illustris magistri peditum praesentalis; comites limitum infrascriptorum sex, duces limitum infrascriptorum decem" sa. No such indication exist, however, for the Eastern Empire, and the military forces which were at the disposal of the dukes and military counts are not included in the number of legions placed " sub dispositione magistri", a circumstance which argues rather in favour of a certain independence on the part of the dukes as military leaders.

There was only one duke in the diocese of Pontica with its eleven provinces, the dux Armeniae whose power extended over three provinces, Armenia I and II and Pontus Polemoniacus. Nothing is known of the military organization of the other provinces or dioceses. In the diocese of Oriens, in which there were fifteen provinces, only some of them had special dukes: dux Palestinae, Foenices, Arabiae Euphratensis et Syriae, Osrhoenae, Mesopotamiae ${ }^{\text {8b}}$. The remaining provinces, in which no special military officials were stationed, probably came under the direct supervision of the magister militum, and his own troups were disposed in these particular provinces.

The subordination of the dukes to the magistri expressed itself more in judicial matters than in specifically military ones. Soldiers accused of capital offenses were under the jurisdiction of either the
magister or of the duke, depending on the army to which they belonged. When a duke or a military count was the accused, the matter was heard by the magister in person. Hence the magistri had legal jurisdiction over the dukes ${ }^{9}$.

According to the Notitia Dignitatum the Dux Armeniae disposed of the following forces:

Sub dispositione viri spectabilis ducis Armeniae.
Equites sagitarii, Sabbu.
Equites sagitarii, Domana.
Praefectus legionis quintadecima Apollinaris, Satala.
Praefectus legionis duodecima fulminatae, Melitena.
In Ponto:
Praefectus legionis primae Ponticae, Trapezunta.
Ala Rizena, Aladaleariza.
Ala Theodosiana, apud Auaxam.
Ala felix Theodosiana, Siluanis.
Et quae de minore laterculo emittuntur:
Ala prima Augusta Colonorum, Chiaca.
Ala Auriana, Dascusa.
Ala prima Ulpia Dacorum, Suissa.
Ala secunda Gallorum, Aeliana.
Ala castello Tablariensi constituta.
Ala prima praetoria nuper constituta.
Cohors tertia Ulpia miliaria Petraeorum, Metita.
Cohors quarta Raetorum, Analiba.
Cohors miliaria Bosporiana, Arauraca.
Cohors miliaria Germanorum, Sisila.
Ala prima Iovia felix, Chaszanenica.
Ala prima felix Theodosiana, Pithae.
Cohors prima Theodosiana, Ualentia.
Cohors Apuleia civium Romanorum, Ysiporto.
Cohors prima Lepidiana, Caene-Parembole.
Cohors prima Claudia equitata, Sebastopolis.
Cohors secunda Ualentiana, Ziganne.
Cohors, Mochora.
Officium autem habet ita:
Principem de scola agentem in rebus.
Numerärios et adiutores eorum.
Commentariensem.
Adiutorem.
A libellis siue subscribendarium.
Exceptores et caeteros officiales.
Dux Armeniae VII (evectiones) ${ }^{9 a}$.

Under the $d u x$ Armeniae there were:

> 2 regiments of archer cavalry
> 3 legions, or counting 6,000 men a piece $=18,000$ men.
> 11 divisions of cavalry, at 600 each $=6,600$ men.
> 10 cohorts of infantry, at 600 each $=6,000$ men.
of these, the cavalry, two legions, six divisions or alae, and four cohorts were stationed in Armenia. The remainder, one legion, five divisions, and six cohorts were stationed in Pontus Polemoniacus.

The main forces were concentrated at Satala in Armenia I, and in Melitenē, the metropolis of Armenia II. One legion was stationed in each of these cities. In addition, one regiment of equites sagitarii apiece was stationed at Domana, near Satala, and, nearer to Melitenē, at Saba-Şepik near Arapkir. The cohorts and alae were distributed among other points already familiar to us in the country. One cohort apiece stood in Analiba, Arauraca, Sisila, Metita; one ala each in Chiaca-Ciaca, Dascusa, Aeliana, (probably Arna), Suissa, Tablariensis. The ala prima praetoria must have been stationed at the place called ad praetorium in the Itineraries ${ }^{10}$.

The components of the army of the dux Armeniae found in the Notitia Dignitatum were very ancient in date. Its core, the fifteenth and twelfth legions had been transferred to Armenia together with other contingents during the Roman-Parthian wars in the days of Corbulo and Tiridates and probably remained in Armenia after that time for the defense of the country at its two main strategic points, Satala and Melitenē ${ }^{10 a}$. Both legions and their titles, Apollinaris and Fulminata, were known to Cassius Dio, who placed them in Cappadocia, evidently meaning Lesser Armenia by this ${ }^{11}$. In the Itinerarium Antonini we read, "Satala leg. XV Apollinaris" ${ }^{11 \text { a }}$ which indicates the sources used by the compilers of itineraries. Procopius testifies to the fact that the twelfth legion had stood at Melitenē from ancient times ${ }^{12}$. The ala prima Augusta Colonorum probably took its name from the city of Koloneia [Colonia], founded by Pompey. The ala Auriana was named either after the city of Auria in Spain, or after its first commander. According to Tacitus, the ala Auriana had been sent to protect the banks of the river which flowed between Rhaetia and Noricum ${ }^{13}$. The cohort quarta Raetorum was composed of the same Rhaetians and was stationed at Analiba. The cohort quinta Raetorum was to be found in Egypt. The ala prima Ulpia Dacorum bore the name of Ulpius Trajanus, who had conquered
the Dacians and raised several divisions among them. The cohors tertia Ulpia Petraeorum, which had been transferred to Metita in Armenia, not directly from Dacia, but from the city of Petra, had the same origin.

Miliaria, as an adjective applied to a cohort, miliaria Petraeorum, miliaria Bosporiana, miliaria Germanorum, meant, according to the explanation of Vegetius, that the given cohort consisted of a thousand picked soldiers. A legion usually numbered ten cohorts of which one, usually the first, outshone the others in the number and quality of its soldiers and contained 1105 foot soldiers and 132 auxiliary horsemen ${ }^{14}$. Concerning the location of these troops, we must note that the rubric of the Notitia Dignitatum lists three main posts in Pontus: Trapezus, Auaxa and Siluana, and four in Armenia; while the text adds a fourth post in Pontus, Aladaleariza, to the three already listed. The evidence of the rubric is supported by the sketch appended to the text, where only three fortresses are indicated. We must conclude, therefore, the text is incorrect ${ }^{15}$.

Of the garrison posts, Trapezos was a famous city at the mouth of the Pyxites river, now the Değirmendere. Auaxa is unquestionably the present village of Avaza or Avsa, standing according to Lynch, at the foot of the Kolat dağlari, among the sources of the Pyxites ${ }^{15 a}$. Siluanis, the ablative case of Siluana, is probably the Solonenica of the Itinerarium Antonini, this, in turn, is the adjectival form of Salona. Siluanis should perhaps be identified with the village of Süle at the source of the Harmut-su [Gümüşane deresi], near Kalecik, where the ruins of an ancient fortress can still be seen ${ }^{16}$. To the west of the Kolat dağlari lie the Zigana daǧlari, and the road from Trebizond to Ardasa [Torul] crosses the Zigana pass at 6,640 feet. A Roman cohort stood at the entrance to the pass at the little settlement of Zigana, which still bears its ancient name. Ancient Mochora stands to this day east of Zigana, and was also the station of a Roman cohort ${ }^{16}$ a. Chaszanenica is equivalent to the Gizenica of the Tabula Peutingeriana (cf. Chiaca $=$ Ciaca) and may be related to the modern Hadzana, a village on the Değirmendere ${ }^{17}$. Ysiportos, ( $=$ to the " $Y_{\sigma \sigma o v} \lambda_{l \mu \dot{\eta} \nu}$ of Arrian, later Susarmia, now Surmene) is a port on the Black Sea east of Trebizond ${ }^{18}$. Kainē Parembole (Kaıv ${ }^{\prime} \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta}=$ new camp) is hardly a proper name. Pithia and Sebastopolis are thought by some
scholars to be the Laze fortresses of Pitiunt and Sebastopolis, but it has rightly been objected to this that those fortresses were not yet subject to the Romans at the time of the composition of the Notitia Dignitatum and that the power of the dux could not have extended so far ${ }^{19}$. The connexion of Pithia with the Thia of the Itinerarium Antonini is probable. Sebastopolis, Ualentia and Kainē Parembolē, all localities with names that replaced the indigenous ones, remain unidentified ${ }^{19 a}$.

The commanders of the armed forces stationed at Sabbu, Domana, Satala, Melitenē, Trapezos, (Aladaleariza), Auaxa and Siluana were of a different rank from the commanders of the remaining units, namely of the cohorts and the alae. The names of the former are listed in the laterculus maius and those of the latter in the laterculus minus. Laterculus was the name of the official list or register of all administrative and court officials, with the indication of their office, rank, and title. Appointment to a given rank was made by the emperor himself by means of a special diploma, the codicillus dignitatum, in which the mandata principi, that is to say the authority and nature of the given office as well as its outward signs, insignia, were clearly defined. After this the name of the newly appointed official was inscribed in the Laterculus. A personal petition to the Emperor was required to obtain the diploma, and he presented it in a solemn audience. For lesser offices, however, such diplomas were presented not by the Emperor but by the Quaestor. The differentiation between the Laterculus maius and the Laterculus minus, the greater and lesser register, was made in accordance with this practice. In the first were recorded the names of officials appointed directly be the Emperor, and it was kept by the first secretary (primicerius notarium) in his own chancery. The lesser Laterculus contained the list of offices filled at the discretion of the Quaestor and was kept in his office ${ }^{20}$. Among the officials subordinate to the Dux Armeniae, the commanders of all ten cohorts and of eight (out of ten) of the alae were listed in the Laterculus minus, or, as this was expressed, "de minore laterculo emittentur". On the other hand, the commanders of two of the alae, those at Auaxa and Siluana, together with the prefects of the legions and of the cavalry belonged in the Laterculus maius ${ }^{20 \mathrm{a}}$.

The Dux Armeniae himself occupied a position of honour in the hierarchical list; he belonged in the rank of spectabilis. The earlier
designations of rank, the senatorial clarissimus, and the equestrian perfectissimus had undergone radical transformations [by this period]. With the disappearance of the equestrian order, the title of perfectissimus became the prerogative of officials of the lowest category. The senatorial clarissimus acquired three levels or grades: the first and highest: clarissimus et illustris, the second: clarissimus et spectabilis, and the third: merely clarissimus. From these developed the subsequent ranks of illustris, spectabilis, clarissimus and perfectissimus. Among the illustres were all the praetorian prefects and magistri militum; among the spectabiles were the vicars and the military dukes and counts; among the clarissimi were the provincial governors (praesides) and the prefects of the legions. Hence, the Dux Armeniae, like all the other dukes, was assigned the title of spectabilis, the second in order of importance. By his side, as by the side of every representative of authority, was to be found a certain staff of assistants, his officium, or as we would say his chancery. At the head of this officium stood a princeps, who was in charge of the chancery. He was chosen from the schola of the agentum in rebus, as is indicated in the case of the officium of the Duke of Armenia. This schola was a sort of militia of 100 or more men, agentes in rebus, who carried official messages in the provinces and were under the authority of the minister of the court (Magister officiorum). The chancery of the Duke was divided into departments (scrinia) which controlled different branches of the administration: the numerarii - officials in the department of finances, the commentariensis - the head of the department of capital affairs, the a libellis - who received the petitions addressed to the Duke, the exceptores - executive officials, and others ${ }^{21}$.

The Notitia Dignitatum has preserved the description of the identifying insignia of each office, presented to the corresponding person together with the imperial diploma (codicillus dignitatem). From these we give the insignia of the vicar of Pontica and of the Duke of Armenia ${ }^{21 a}$. The insignia of the vicar consisted in eleven figures representing the eleven provinces subordinate to the vicar of the diocese. These figures were differentiated from one another by the combination of their colours. Above them lay a book on a stand; this was the liber mandatorum, and next to it a column which in most cases bears two effigies (the emperor and empress?), but occasionally four, as is the case for the vicar of the diocese of Asia.

The insignia of the Duke of Armenia consisted in the tracing of
the seven fortresses, four Armenian and three Pontic, where the representatives of the military authorities listed in the Laterculus maius had their station. The stations of officials listed in the Laterculus minus were not shown on this insignia. The Duke of Armenia had a liber mandatorum without a stand, as was the custom for all dukes. Officers of the rank of illustris had a portrait on the binding of the book presumably that of the emperor, while other officials had the following inscription instead of the portrait:

> FL
> INTALL COMORD PR

The first attempt to explain the puzzling letters was made by the famous scholar Pancirol who read:

> Felix liber
> iniunctus notariis tribunis a laterculo continens mandata ordine primicerii 21 b

Böcking offered a different deciphering :
> felicitatis laetitiaue
> qui imperatorii numinis, tutela Augustorum larium
> Civitates omnes maiestati obediant regiae domini populi Romani ${ }^{21 \mathrm{e}}$

In addition he refered to a curious passage in the history of Cedrenus who, speaking of the division of the Empire between Honorius and Arcadius, states that the cipher KONOB on Roman coins should read "civitates omnes nostrae obediant venerationi" ${ }^{22}$. Might this serve as a key for the deciphering of the mysterious letters on the liber mandatorum? The reading of the last part seems plausible, but in general the riddle still awaits a solution ${ }^{22 a}$. Next to the book lies a rolled sheet of parchement, whose meaning is likewise unknown.

## II

At the time when the lands of Lesser Armenia formed an organic part of the Empire, and had adhered to it through all the ties of
political life, the provinces of the former Greater Armenia, i.e. the Satrapies and Armenia Interior, bore the characteristics of independent possessions, externally attached to the Empire but entirely autonomous in internal life and organization ${ }^{22 \mathrm{~b}}$.

From a general administrative point of view, the legal position of these provinces may be said to belong to the category of component units of the Empire defined from antiquity as being allied (foederatae) and free (liberae). The precise relations of allied territories to the Romans were determined by the terms of a treaty binding them to the Empire, as is shown by the very term, foedus non aequum. Through this treaty the inferior party won for itself certain autonomous privileges upon its entrance into the composition of the Empire. Similar privileges were enjoyed by the so called free nations (liberae), which were differentiated from allied or federated ones by the fact that they received their liberties directly from the highest, imperial, authority, whereas the freedom of the foederati was based on a treaty. To express this in legal terms, the foederati enjoyed their liberty as a legal right, while the free nations received theirs by decree. The nature of the self-government left to the foederati consisted in: libertas - administrative independence, and autonomia - legislative power and judicial competence. They were acknowledged complete masters in their own territory, were free from taxation, did not have a Roman governor, and did not maintain a Roman garrison. The main obligation binding them to the Empire was that of furnishing armed contingents and in general rendering military aid to the Empire. Such is the theoretical formulation of the question. In practice, however, the prerogatives just noted and granted de jure for free nations were differently interpreted in specific instances. Side by side with autonomous nations free from taxation (av̇róvouol кaì фóp $\omega \nu$ $\dot{a} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \bar{s}$ ) or liberae et immunes) were found others which, although considered free were compelled to furnish contributions to the imperial treasury. Accordingly, a distinction was made between civitates foederatae, civitates liberae et immunes and civitates stipendiariae, i.e. nations who were ( $\ddot{\nexists \sigma \pi \sigma \epsilon \nu \delta o t, ~ \sigma v \mu \mu \alpha \chi \iota к o i ́) ~ a s ~ o p p o s e d ~ t o ~ o t h e r s ~ w h o ~ w e r e ~}$


At the end of the ancient world and during the period of slow but definite transition from a Roman to a Byzantine state, the meaning and position of the foederati, as of many other ancient institutions, may have been altered to conform to the new governmental setting ${ }^{232}$.

Furthermore, the term фoı $\delta \rho$ átoı was in use during the troubled period of the influx of new elements and of ferment within the old; it was used for those autonomous ethnic groups settled on the periphery of the Empire, which pressed upon it from various sides, and occasionally entered into peaceful relations with it. The Emperors established friendly contacts with them and skilfully used their strength for their own purposes. The army of Justinian was composed of a mosaic of regiments of different nations which were jointly designated by the term foederati to distinguish them from the Empire's own forces, the regular army or $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega \tau \alpha \iota$.

During the African expedition, the army operating against the Vandals consisted, according to a contemporary of, " " $\kappa \tau \in \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ каi фо८ঠєрá $\tau \omega \nu$ ". The author goes on to clarify:

Now at an earlier time only barbarians were enlisted among the foederati, those, namely, who had come into the Roman political system, not in the condition of slaves, since they had not been conquered by the Romans, but on the basis of complete equality. For the Romans call treaties with their enemies "foedera". But at the present time there is nothing to prevent anyone from assuming this name, .... . ${ }^{24}$

The author notes that time rarely preserves the significance of a name, for circumstances and meanings change continually while men carelessly go on using the same words. Procopius is evidently of the opinion that the term foederatus had outlived its original meaning, but the nature of the change remains unexplained. The historian apparently draws only on the etymology of the Latin term for his observation, and disregards the legal sense of foederati, or civitates foederatae, as small groups which had entered the Empire on the basis of an unequal alliance (foedus non aequum).

Concerning the settlement of Thrace by the Goths, the same historian says that
... with the emperor's permission, they settled in Thrace; and during part of this time they were fighting on the side of the Romans, receiving pay from the emperor every year jusz as the other soldiers did and being called "foederati"; for so the Romans at that time called them in the Latin tongue, meaning to shew, I suppose, that the Goths had not been defeated by them in war, but had come into peaceful relations with them on the basis of some treaty; ... ${ }^{25}$.

Evidently the Goths rendered aid to the Empire without surrendering their independence. Such a relationship to the Empire entirely justifies the name of foederatus in the full sense of the word and indicates that its use in the period of Justinian is to be explained both by the survival of this term and the suitability of a concept which was not yet obsolete. The inaccurate use of the term objected to by Procopius does apparently occur in the particular case cited by him case and his criticism seems warranted. During the African campaign persons not of foreign background are mentioned as heads of foederati, although the foederati usually served under their own leaders. The actual composition of the foederati in the given case is not known. It is possible that the troop contingents themselves were foreign but that on this occasion they fought under Roman commanders. Dorotheus, the commander of the Armenian regiments under consideration, is listed among the nine leaders of the foederati, where he is given the first place ${ }^{26}$. Dorotheus' actual position was that of magister which Justinian had recently created in Armenia, and he fought as such against the Persians. He was then sent to Africa after the conclusion of the peace of $532{ }^{26 a}$. As we shall see later, both native Armenian divisions and contingents from the imperial army were at the disposal of the magister of Armenia. The regiments transferred to Africa together with Dorotheus were evidently of the same mixed composition. If this practice was also followed in the case of other commanders of foederati, the blame addressed by the historian to those who assumed illegally the name of foederati becomes understandable.

The fact that Armenian regiments were included among the foederati is important in its own right regardless of the case under discussion, which may or may not be justifiable. If we study the meager evidence available on the administration of the Satrapies and of Armenia Interior, we can easily observe a basic similarity between them and the foederati. Procopius tells us that,
... in the other Armenia, which extends inside the Euphrates River as far as the city of Amida, five Armenian satraps held the power, and these offices were always hereditary and held for life. However, they received the symbols of office only from the Roman Emperor. It is worth while to describe these insignia, for they will never again be seen by man. There is a cloak made of wool, not such as is produced by sheep, but gathered from the sea. Pinnos the creature is called on which
this wool grows. And the part where the purple should have been, that is, where the insertion of purple cloth is usually made, is overlaid with gold. The cloak was fastened by a golden brooch in the middle of which was a precious stone from which hung three sapphires by loose golden chains. There was a tunic of silk adorned in every part with decorations of gold which they are wont to call plumia. The boots were of red colour and reached to the knee, of the sort which only the Roman Emperor and the Persian King are permitted to wear.

Roman soldiers, however, never fought under the orders of the king of the Armenians or of the satraps, but these rulers conducted their wars independently. But at a later time, during the reign of Zeno, some of the satraps decided to array themselves openly with Illus and Leontius, who had revolted against the Emperor. Consequently, when the Emperor had reduced Leontius and Illus to subjection, he left in the former status only one satrap who held a very inferior province which was not of any importance, in the region called Belabitine ; all the others he removed and no longer permitted them to transmit the office to those connected with them by kinship, but he ordained that on each occasion different men of the Emperor's choosing should succeed to these offices, just as is the rule in all the other offices of the Romans. Even so, these officials were not in command of Roman soldiers, but only of a few Armenians, as had been customary previously ${ }^{27}$.

From the little information given here we know that the Satrapies were not, strictly speaking, conquered lands, but that the satraps were rather the allies of the Emperor, though not on a basis of equality. The fundamental traits characterizing them as well as foederati are complete autonomy without supervision from the Roman authorities, and military service rendered to the Empire. The Satrapies were miniature kingdoms ruled by their own princes, who were the equals in rank of kings. The insignia sent to them by the Emperor indicated royal power; the porphyra or purple cloak and the red boots were part of the regalia of the highest rank. Similar signs of distinction were conferred by the Emperor on the king of the Lazes, who received in addition to a white cloak, tunic and shoes, a diadem of Roman type and a belt covered with pearls ${ }^{28}$. The Armenian princes also wore a belt, but we do not know whether they received it from the Emperor. The same is true of the satrapal diadem.

The nature and origin of the power of the satraps are to be sought
in the complex of legal relationships, known under the general name of naxarar system, which flourished in Armenia, especially in the period of the Arsacids. The satraps were Armenian naxarars of the same type as their kinsmen who ruled in other parts of Armenia. From the point of view of native political theory, they were the vassals of either the Armenian or the Persian king, while at the same time, the nature of their political authority corresponded to that of foederati in Imperial law. The basis for their autonomy should not be connected with the incorporation of the Satrapies into the Empire; it is rather to be found in the politico-social system prevailing in Armenia ${ }^{28}$ a. The absence of Imperial limitations on the freedom of the Satrapies is not the result of magnanimity, it merely reflects the restraints imposed on the Empire by the particular circumstances of its age-old struggle with the Persians for the control of Armenia. A consideration of the sympathies of the country, which might sway it toward one or the other party in the struggle and thus determine its outcome, was far from negligible. According to Armenian sources, the satraps broke of their own accord with the Armenian kingdom. after the fall of king Aršak II, and gave themselves voluntarily to the Greek emperor ${ }^{29}$. We cannot fail to identify this voluntary transfer of allegiance as being in reality the treaty whereby the recognition of the Emperor's sovreignty by the Armenian satraps guaranteed their own existing rights and liberties. No outstanding political perspicacity was needed to solve the problem of the Satrapies in a manner favourable to the Empire. To receive the Satraps with a grant of autonomy was to gain in their person an advantageous support against the Persians. To refuse to receive them, or to attack their liberties, was to drive loyal allies to the side of the Persian king.

The treaty underlying the incorporation into the Empire of Armenia Interior, the neighbour of the Satrapies, is even more clearly visible from the history of the events. According to an account preserved by Procopius, the last Armenian king of the Arsacid dynasty had made before his death a will dividing his realm between his two sons Aršak and Tigran, the latter's share being four times larger than his brother's. Offended by such an injustice, Aršal turned to the Roman emperor Theodosius II for support and attempted to set aside his father's will. Tigran, in turn, sought the protection of the Persian king, fearing the vengeance of the Emperor. "Arsaces meanwhile still feared the hostility of the Persians and of his brother and resigned
his own kingship in favour of the emperor Theodosius, on certain
 are given by Procopius in another of his works. There they are put into the mouth of the Armenian princes displeased with Justinian's policy who came to the Persian court and stated, among other things, in their petition to king Xusrō I that,

Arsaces, the last king of our ancestors, abdicated his throne willingly in favour of Theodosius, the Roman emperor, on condition that all who should belong to his family through all time should live unhampered in every respect, and in particular should in no case be subject to taxation ${ }^{31}$.

The speakers asserted further that these conditions had been adhered to until the conclusion of the peace of 532 between the Persians and the Romans.

According to this account, the circumstances of the downfall of the Armenian Arsacids are presented in a very different light from that found in the Armenian sources which have reached us. It has been suggested that the tale transmitted by the Byzantine historian is not to be trusted. To be sure, doubts as to the names and individuals mentioned in the story are unquestionably possible, and it will still be necessary to determine the relative value of Procopius' Byzantine and Faustus' Armenian version. A recent investigator has even claimed that the entire story is pure invention and that this tale has been drawn by Procopius from highly dubious sources, most likely from the mouth of the Armenian princes themselves, whose national pride could not allow them to concede that the idea of the partition of Armenia had originated among the partitioning powers ${ }^{32}$. Even if we accept this opinion, for which there is no foundation the most valuable part of the story cannot be disregarded, and the opinion itself is groundless.

The evidence of Procopius on the last days of the Arsacids does not in fact contradict all that we know from other sources. According to the national version the valiant prince Manuel Mamikonean, regent for the powerless princelings Aršak and Vałaršak, wrote before his death " a letter to the Greek emperor and entrusted to him king Aršak and the land of Armenia" ${ }^{33}$. Furthermore the feuds of the princes Aršak and Tigran in Procopius are very reminiscent of the enmity between the kings Aršak and Xosrov in the History of Faustus. The crux of the matter does not lie in the manner in which the partition
of the Arsacid realm took place, whether it be according to the intentions of the interested parties or as a result of local disputes over the crown. The important fact is that after the partition, one part of Armenia adhered to the Empire on the express condition that the Arsacid forms should be preserved in the country, that is to say, it should remain free and be subject to no taxation. These are unquestionably the specific conditions under which the Armenians lived until Justinian. Let us even concede that Procopius' account is based on someone's invention, we still cannot deny that this invention must have reflected the actual state of the country since the historian is able to assert, by means of the Armenians' petition, that they had benefited from the above mentioned privileges up to his time. To enjoy this exeptional position in the Empire was, in Roman terminology, to be a federated territory. Consequently, Interior Armenia was a country as free as the autonomous Satrapies ${ }^{33}$ a.

One of the priviledges of the foederati was freedom from taxation ${ }^{33 b}$. Reliable evidence as to the financial relations of the Armenian territories to the Empire is extremely scarce. There is an imperial decree from 387 addressed to Gaddana, satrap of Sophanenē, in which the tribute to the crown is demanded:

> The same Augustuses [Valentinian, Theodosius and Arcadius] to Gaddana, Satrap of Sofanena.

> We decree that the crown gold shall be returned and restored to those persons from whom it appears that it was illegally taken away, so that according to the practice of ancient custom, all satraps shall have the right to provide from their own resources for the customary offering of the crown to Our Serenity, in accordance with the devotion which they owe to the Roman Empire ${ }^{33 \mathrm{e}}$.

The imperial decree was evidently the result of abuses against the Satrapies, countenanced by agents of the imperial power. A few years earlier, specifically in 384, a decree had been promulgated by the same emperors rigorously forbidding the forcible exaction of the aurum coronarium in the Empire in general ${ }^{34}$. Whether as a result of the separate status of the Satrapies, or for some other reason, this imperial decree had probably not been applied there, and a special rescript was needed to return the aurum coronarium collected in the Satrapies and to allow the satraps to operate in their own way. The tribute known as aurum coronarium differed from
other official taxes in that it was a voluntary tribute and not required by law. In one of the decrees of Julian for the year 362 it is flatly stated that " aurum coronarium munus est voluntatis" " ${ }^{35}$. The term itself derives from the fact that originally gold crowns had been presented to the Emperor on the occasion of a victory or of some celebration. Such gifts were especially tendered by free communities and friendly nations bound to the Empire through confederation, who expressed their good will and friendschip in this manner. The Romans occasionally solicited " $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a ́ v \omega \nu \quad \chi \rho v \sigma \omega \hat{\nu}$ " themselves as soon as they had overcome a foe ${ }^{36}$. A trustworthy source informs us that "That which the inhabitants of Rhodes paid to the Romans is called $\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a \nu \iota \kappa o ̀ v \tau \epsilon \in \epsilon \sigma \mu a$ since they were autonomous". The negligible sum which they gave each year to the Romans was considered by them not as " a tribute to victors", but rather as " a crown to friends " ${ }^{37}$. Voluntary obligations to the Empire of a similar type were also borne by the Saracen tribes of Mesopotamia. The leaders and princes of the Saracen tribes came before Julian the Apostate in Mesopotamia, during his campaign in the East, and showed their respect by the presentation of a gold crowns ${ }^{38}$. The tradition of the coronae was still alive in the sixth century. The Gothic king Theodatus made peace with Justinian on the condition, among others, that he would send the Emperor a gold crown of three hundred pounds' weight ${ }^{39}$. There can be no doubt that the corona of the satraps mentioned in the edict of Theodosius I cited above, belonged to this category of crowns. It was a spontaneous tribute from autonomous satraps to their sovereign. Although voluntary, and non-compulsory in character, the corona became a requirement, hallowed by time and custom, and served as an attractive symbol of the dependence of the satraps on the Empire.

Since we are led to believe that the presentation of the crown gold marked the whole of the financial obligations of non-equal allies, and since the autonomy of the satraps was maintained until Justinian, they should have been free of all other monetary obligations up to that time at least. There is, however, one piece of evidence which runs counter to this. During the Roman-Persian war of 502, the Persian king Kavadh advanced to besiege Martyropolis. The inhabitants of the city, realizing the hopelessness of resistence, decided to surrender. Together with Theodore, satrap of Sophanenē, they came out to meet the king " bearing in their hands the public taxes
of two years, (фópovs ... $\delta \eta \mu$ oriovs) " ${ }^{40}$. How is this passage to be understood? Theodore, one of the successors of Gaddana as satrap of Sophanenē, had his seat in the capital of Martyropolis. Although he was a vassal of the Emperor, Theodore surrendered to the Persians in order to save his lands from devastation, and to propitiate the king presented him with some kind of tax for two years in advance. Were these фópor, taxes, destined for the imperial treasury? Perhaps this was the traditional corona in the form of currency, i.e. the aurum coronarium. Should this interpretation prove unacceptable and the $\phi$ ópol $\delta \eta \mu \circ \sigma i o u$ prove to be different from the corona of vassality, we will have to acknowledge that Zeno's alterations in the structure of the Satrapies had been very profound indeed. We have quoted earlier the actual passage in which Procopius says that the Emperor Zeno had abrogated the sovereign rights of the satraps in punishment for their participation in the rebellion of Leontius and Illus in 485, thereafter the satrapal power was transmitted to one or another individual at the discretion of the Emperor. Perhaps from this time on the satraps appointed by the Emaperor were also liable to a new tribute called фópor ס $\eta \mu \mathrm{morio}$. Legally this would imply the demotion of the Satrapies from the level of foederati to that of civitates stipendiariae; that is to say that they had been deprived of their immunitas. As yet this problem remains unsolved 40 a.
 of the edicts of Anastasius for the year $496{ }^{40 \mathrm{~b}}$. We do not know whether they have anything in common with the фópol $\delta \eta \mu o \sigma i o l$. Judging from its name, Anastasius' demand referred to the Armenians in general and probably to the other, i.e. to the non satrapal, parts of Imperial Armenia.
Interior Armenia, from the point of view of status, ressembled the position of stipendiary territories. She differed from the Satrapies in that a representative of the Imperial power had his seat there. After the division of Armenia, says Procopius, " the Roman Emperor always appointed a ruler for the Armenians, whomever he wished and whenever he wished. And they used to call this ruler even to my time the Count of Armenia (Comes Armeniae)" " ${ }^{41}$. The Armenian sources likewise speak of this fact. According to them, after the death of the last king Aršak, the Greeks did not give him a successor but placed their possessions in the hands of counts ${ }^{42}$.

With the abolition of the royal power, certain transformations occurred in the political life of Armenia. But this did not bring any particular changes in the framework of legal relationships existing within the country. Strictly speaking the transformation affected the interests of the reigning dynasty rather than those of the country. Once the power of the Arsacid kings had been set aside, the Emperors exercised great caution and avoided any measures which might injure the interest of the country or the national pride of the Armenians and drive them to the Persian side. They refrained from any attempt to interfere in the internal order of the country so that the social structure and the political institutions below the level of the crown remained untouched. The authority of the count was so defined that it was in harmony with the rights of the local feudal lords (naxarars) ${ }^{42 a}$.

Unfortunately, the nature of the count's office is not known to us in its entirety. All that we know authoritatively is that the Count of Armenia had no military forces at his disposal ${ }^{43}$, hence he was a representative of the civilian authorities. From the local point of view the Count was the equivalent of the Marzpan, the highest civilian authority in Oriental or Persian Armenia, who shared the rule of the country with the naxarars. If we only knew the exact position of the Count in the Imperial hierarchy we might perhaps be able to outline his duties with greater precision. The Count of Armenia was obviously not included in the Notitia Dignitatum, since his office was created somewhat later than the composition of this famous document which took place in 410-413. However, other counts are to be found in it. In view of the obvious trend toward uniformity and symmetry in administrative institutions observable in the legal enactments of the Emperors, we are probably justified in comparing the Count of Armenia with one of the classes of counts found in the Notitia Dignitatum.

Leaving aside the Occident and concentrating on the Orient, we find counts located in Egypt, Isauria and the diocese of Orient:

> Comes limiti AAgypti
> Comes per Isauriam
> Comes Orientis 43 a .

The first two are not comparable to the Count of Armenia since they exercised military authority, while the Count of Armenia discharged
only civilian duties. The Count of Isauria was simultaneously invested with plenary military and civilian powers, and therefore bore the title of " Comes rei militaris per Isauriam et praeses". In the hierarchy of military offices both the Isaurian Count and the Egyptian Count were assimilated to such dukes, such as the dux Arabiae and the dux Mesopotamiae, who were stationed along the frontier and were assigned the defense of the Empire from the perpetual threat of the Sasanians.

The $d u x$ Armeniae, in the north, belonged to the same category of officers, since he was entrusted with the duty of defending the frontier along with the other dukes.

The Comes Orientis differed radically from these counts. He was above all an official with civilian competence and corresponded in rank and duties to the vicars of the dioceses. He replaced the vicarius praefecti Orientis in the diocese of the East. As early as the period of Constantine the Great, special commissioners (comites provinciarum) had occasionally been sent to the provinces. The Count of the Orient, who alone survived from that period was descended from these commissioners; the type of his duties gradually assimilated him to an ordinary vicar, but he preserved the ancient title. The vicar was not a mere surrogate of the prefect. Since he was directly appointed by the Emperor, he occupied an independent position within the limits of his diocese and shared in the rights and plenary powers of the prefect. His duties consisted primarily in the supervision of the provincial governors (praesides), the collection of taxes, and in legal jurisdiction. The vicars had the right to render judgments vice sacra (in the name of the Emperor) and to communicate directly with him ${ }^{44}$. The Comes Orientis, just like the vicars, belonged to the rank of spectabiles.

From the nature of his office the Comes Armeniae belongs with the Comes Orientis, and thus with the vicars of dioceses ${ }^{45}$. Since Armenia was not reorganized along the lines of an Imperial province, there can of course be no question of absolute similarity, but insofar as it is possible and necessary to equate the Comes Armeniae with one or another of the official positions, his identification with the Comes Orientis should not be considered unsuitable. The Comes Armeniae may not be lowered to the level of a provincial governor (praeses), since the territory under his authority far exceded the dimensions of a province. To raise him to the rank of pretorian prefect is equally unwarranted from the reverse considerations. All that remains for
us is to admit the identification of the count's authority with that of a vicar. With regard to the Comes Armeniae the part of provincial praesides was played by those hereditary princes who possessed and ruled their districts or provinces on the basis of the naxarar system. In his relation to these princes, the Comes, as the representative of higher authority, was the equivalent of the [Persian] Marzpan, as we have already said ${ }^{45}$ a.

If we identify the Comes Armeniae with a vicar, the limits of his authority become clear. Of the three categories of duties assigned to the vicar, of which we spoke above, the most important, particularly with reference to the Count of Armenia, was his obligation to collect state taxes where they existed. This aspect of the matter is highly problematical. The edict of Anastasius relating to $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \in \nu \iota a \kappa \grave{\alpha}$ $\delta \eta \mu o ́ \sigma \iota a$, cited above proclaims as follows:

## To Anthemius Praetorian Prefect:

... all revenues, and among them the so called Armenian ones must be paid [in thirds on three occasions, namely the Kalends of January, the Kalends of May and at the end of the indiction ${ }^{46}$. The revenue is to be divided in three equal parts and no deferment is granted to the payers in the interval of payments. In view of the fact that the Armenian payment[ $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \mu a \tau a]$ was paid in two installments [катаßoдaîs] those who paid in this way, if they desire to choose their former custom; are permitted in the future to continue paying in two instalments, in halves, and to pay the second half in the September following the indiction. But if any wish to pay the Armenian tribute in thirds, to them is granted a delay of the month of September following the indiction. Upon the preservation of the former system, however, the payments are to be made customarily at the beginning of each indiction as is evident from the very name ${ }^{46}$.

The payments discussed here can hardly concern the province of Lesser Armenia, since this territory had long since been fused with the Empire and it is unlikely that any variation from the general system, even over the terms of payment would be tolerated there. The Imperial admonitions deal rather with Interior Armenia under the authority of the Count, and their inclusion in an edict addressed to the Pretorian prefect, merely demonstrates the subordination of the Count to the Prefect and reinforces our thesis on the hierarchical position of the Comes Armeniae as a kind of vicar.

At the beginning of the reign of Justinian a powerful movement against the Imperial power sprang up in Armenia Interior and the dissatisfaction of the country turned into open rebellion. The main cause of the disturbance, according to the words of a contemporary, was the oppressive taxation:

Acacius ... secured the command over the Armenians by the gift of the emperor. ... and ordained that they should pay an unheard-of tax of four centenaria ${ }^{47}$.

Therefore, the emperor sent Sittas against them from Byzantium. ... So he came to Armenia ... and exerted himself to calm the people and to restore the population to their former habitations, promising to persuade the emperor to remit to them the payment of the new tax ${ }^{48}$.

To the same period belongs the petition of the Armenian princes to the King of Persia containing their grievances against Justinian and the referrence to the treaty between Aršak and Theodosius $\mathrm{II}^{48}$ a. How is the evidence of $\dot{a} \rho \mu \in \nu \iota a \kappa \grave{\alpha}$ $\delta \eta \mu$ óvia to be reconciled with the statement of the Armenian princes regarding their immunity from taxation up to the time of Justinian? Either the taxes mentioned in the edict of Anastasius applied to Lesser Armenia and not to Interior Armenia, or we have not understood the terms of the Arsacid treaty with sufficient precision. Who were the persons included in the designation "all who should belonged to his [Aršak's] family", and whose interests were protected by the treaty? ${ }^{48 \mathrm{~b}}$ Are those to be protected the entire Armenian population subject to Aršak, i.e. Armenia in toto, or the heirs of the Arsacids, in the strict sense of the word, or even those naxarar houses in general whose representatives had attempted to enter into marriage alliances with the Arsacids? It is possible that the position of the nobility had really deteriorated, and that the privileges of this hitherto free class had been limited. The indignant princes accuse Justinian of breaking the treaty by laying on them an imposition which had not existed before, " $\phi$ ópov
 four centenaria or four hundred pounds of gold. The Roman pound was somewhat smaller than ours; four hundred pounds of gold at a value of approximately 500 rubles would be equivalent to 200,000 rubles in our money ${ }^{49}$ a. If this tribute was laid on the nobility (the naxarars), it must have been a land tax, but such an extremely high
rate of taxation is impossible for Interior Armenia which consisted of nine small districts and probably as many princely houses. For the same reason, four centenaria of gold cannot be interpreted as an additional tribute levied on the whole country above and beyond the legal taxes ( $\tau \dot{a} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\rho} \mu \mu \nu \iota a \kappa \alpha ́)$. Even if we suppose that these four centenaria represent the entire revenue drawn from Armenia by the government, we must still acknowledge that such an imposition was oppressive for the country. If the tax of four centenaria was really imposed by Akakios in the period of Justinian, then we must admit that the Armenians were indeed free from taxation before that time and that the account of the treaty is not a legend "called into being by the pride of the Armenian princes" as has been suggested by a certain scholar ${ }^{49 \mathrm{~b}}$.

Nothing is known of the other functions of the Count of Armenia. On the problem of jurisdiction in the country, the beginning of an early decree of Justinian, dating from 529 is interesting. In it the right of appeal to the Emperor is given, among other provinces and districts, to Armenia and to the Nations, i.e. to the Armenian provinces and to the Satrapies ${ }^{50}$. It is not clear whether the right was guaranteed to them anterioribus legibus or whether Justinian himself extended it to the Armenians. Since this decree antedates the reforms of Justinian in Armenia, it is probable that the situation had existed before him, and this decree demonstrates the dominion of the Emperor over an allied nation in the legal sphere.

The administrative authority of the Count must have expressed itself in his relations with the local naxarar powers, but we have no immediate information on this subject. In the absence of other Imperial institutions in the country, it is evident that the functions taken over by the governors (praesides or archontes) in other provinces were left here to the naxarars. Unfortunately, we also lack evidence on the division of the country among the native holders of power. Ancient documents have not preserved for us the names of the princely houses whose possessions lay in the western portion of Armenia. We know that the district of Sper belonged to the Bagratid princes ${ }^{51}$. There is evidence for believing that Karin became an Arsacid domain, at least from the time of the partition of Armenia. In the days of Manuēl Mamikonean, and under his guidance, the young kings Aršak and Vałaršak had consolidated their power in Karin ${ }^{52}$. Even earlier, when the same Mamikonean prince had risen against Varazdates,
one of the last Arsacid kings, their confrontation had taken place on a field near Karin, a circumstance which might be interpreted as an indication that Karin belonged to the Arsacids ${ }^{53}$.

The Arsacid house was of course not suppressed, after its loss of the crown. The descendents of the former kings continued to enjoy the privileges of ruling princes on a par with the other princely families. So-called " men of the Ostan" or "Ostanik", are often mentioned in the history of the fifth century rebellion; these are the " men of the court", the former "king's men " ${ }^{54}$. They participated in the events of this period and are found in the camp of prince Vasak of Siwnik'. The naxarar cavalry served in separate contingents, each under the command of its prince, but although historians list by name the leaders of the princely clans participating in the revolt of the fifth century, they have not a single word to say about the commanders of the ostanik' regiments, except for one mention of a certain Zandałan, from an Ostanik' house ${ }^{55}$. The Armenian Atrormiza, whom the Persians appointed to replace Vasak, was also of Arsacid descent, judging from his surname, Aršakan, which is the Persian equivalent of the Armenian Aršakuni ${ }^{56}$.

The obstinate and incomprehensible silence of Armenian authors concerning the descendents of the Arsacid kings is broken by the information of foreign writers who assert that the Arsacids continued to play an important part in the destiny of their country. The Armenian princes who led the Armenian revolt against the Byzantine authorities at the beginning of the reign of Justinian stressed before the Persian king that they were "descendants of Arsaces", and Procopius also notes the names of the leaders of the revolt, John and "Artabanes son of John of the Arsacidae" ${ }^{57}$. Artabanes, together with his brother, moved to Byzantium where he was soon to become one of the leading figures in the Empire ${ }^{57 a}$. The blessed Thomas the deacon, renowned for his ascetic life, who likewise lived in the time of Justinian, " was educated from his childhood in royal fashion and was issued from the house of the Arsacids, from a certain Barbar'i who was once the most powerful, great, and illustrious patrician in the East", according to John of Ephesus ${ }^{58}$. Another Armenian ascetic also named Thomas, whose father was " olim vir nobilissimus et regibus familiaribus", had a wife Maria, "amplissima et clarissima gente Arsacuniorum natam, quae ut ajunt stirps regia nobilissima fuerat ${ }^{" 5}$. These examples remove all possible doubt that the Arsacid house
outlived its loss of the kingship at the beginning of the fifth century. Karin was undoubtedly numbered among the ancestral provinces of the Arsacid princes.
The names of the princely houses with possessions in other parts of Interior Armenia have not been preserved. In the documents which have reached us they are named according to the districts they ruled: the princes of Sper (or Bagratids), of Manaliks, of Daranałiks, of Ekełeac, of Karin, also of Mardałik, of Xorjayn, of Derjan and even of Kamax, after the famous city ${ }^{60}$.

Daranalik' and Ekeleac are usually given as possession of the Church. Faustus of Byzantium, the historian of the events of the fourth century says that in the days of the kat'olikos Nerses I, the Church possessed vast estates consisting in fifteen districts, among these he listed Ayrarat, Tarōn, Bznunik' and Sophenē in addition to the two already mentioned ${ }^{61}$. It seems to us that the words of the historian should not be taken to mean that these districts belonged to the Church in their entirety; this would not agree with the remainder of our evidence, but rather that Church, or more exactly religious estates, were scattered though them side by side with princely ones. We know that Ekeleac̣ formed the patrimony of the patriarchal house of Gregory the Illuminator, the Pahlawuni ${ }^{62}$. At the death of the kat'olikos Sahak I (A.D. 439), his estate passed to his daughter, the wife of Hamazasp Mamikonean, in the absence of a male heir ${ }^{63}$. Hence, the Mamikonean apparently added Ekełeac to the rest of their inheritance. Certain sources, which seem to indicate that a branch of the Mamikonean house distinct from the ones in Tarōn and Tayk', also existed in Imperial Armenia, support this interpretation. According to the historian Elišē, " a certain man, Vasak by name, from among those Mamikonean who are found in the service of the Greeks, (that is to say in the Imperial part of Armenia) ... was a collaborator of the other Vasak [of Siwnik']', in the fifth century ${ }^{64}$. Furthermore, one of the active participants in the rising of 536 in Interior Armenia, the son-in-law of the Arsacid John, was named Vasak [Bassakos], and he is also the leader of the embassy of Armenian princes to King Xusrō I ${ }^{65}$. This "energetic man" must have been an offspring of the Mamikonean; his is a traditional Mamikonean name, and he exhibits the belligerent spirit so characteristic of this illustrious princely clan. From the sense of the speech made by the Armenian ambassador before Xusrō I, Vasak was one
of the princes who came from the part of Armenia subject to Justinian. Later he was reconciled with Justinian and moved to Byzantium together with the other rebels. If we admit the existence of a branch of the Mamikonean clan in Imperial Armenia, on the basis of this evidence, then in all likelihood we must seek it in Ekełeac ${ }^{66}$.

The status of the Armenian territories outlined here lasted until the period of Justinian when it underwent radical transformations.

## VI

## THE REFORM OF JUSTINIAN IN ARMENIA


#### Abstract

The character of Justinian and of his reign - His imperialist policy - His reforming activity - The military reorganization of Armenia - The concentration of military powers in the hands of the magister militum per Armenian - The decree of Justinian creating the office of magister militum per Armeniam - The information of Malalas relevant to this event - Analysis of the decree - Date of the decree - The nature of the magister's power - His army and his officium - The dukes subordinated to him - The military occupation of the country - The system of defense, the fortresses of Justinian: Martyropolis, Kitharizōn, Artalesōn, Karin-Theodosipolis, Bizana-Leontopolis, Tzumina-Justinianopolis, Satala, Koloneia, Baiberdōn, Areōn, Lysiormon, Lytararizōn, Sebasteia, Nikopolis, Melitenē - The churches erected by Justinian - Fundamental aspects of the technique of fortification: the defenses of Theodosiopolis according to Procopius and in the Armenian tradition - Types of fortifications.


The accession of Justinian marks an era remarkable from many points of view in the history of the development of the Empire. Justinian belongs among those who come to the throne with a definite ideology and with a clear idea of the problems to be attacked. From the very first year of his reign he undertook a series of reforms which affected in various ways the life of the state. His reforming activity extended equally to the field of legislation and of judicial and administrative codification. Educated in the Roman tradition and nourishing an almost slavish admiration for the Roman past, he cherished hopes of recreating the fallen glories of the Empire, of the return of the ancient days of the Caesars and Augusti. In the eyes of the Emperor, the colossal structure of the Roman state had a firm foundation on the force of arms and on the law which assured its unity and might; they were the roots of Roman prosperity. Going still further, Justinian believed that they provided the strength on which any government should rest. In his own words, "Summa rei publicae tuitio de stirpe duarum rerum, armorumque atque legum, veniens vimque suam exinde muniens felix Romanorum genus " ${ }^{1}$.

Basing himself on this interpretation, Justinian concerned himself
primarily with the military power of the Empire and with the improvement of its legal structure. A dedication to arms and law as the bases of the state leads inevitably to imperialism in foreign policy and to absolutism in internal affairs. Thus Justinian in his idealization of Roman antiquity was carried away by the unrealizable dream of bringing back the glory of the past. He was entirely filled with the illusion that he could revive the long dead Roman spirit, consequently he undertook on one hand extensive conquests, and on the other the centralization and consolidation of his power on the basis of Roman tradition. His long reign was passed in constant wars, now in the East, now in the West. Shifting the legions from one end of the Empire to the other, Justinian fought the Persians and conquered the small, semi-independent nations lying beyond the imperial frontiers: the Arabs of Mesopotamia, the Armenians, the Tzans and the Lazes. He defeated the forces of the new peoples surging into the lands of the Western Empire and conquered the kingdoms of the Goths, the Vandals and the Moors in Italy, Africa and even Spain.

The brilliant characteristics of Justinian and his imperialistic policies are shown by Procopius in two speeches which he puts into the mouths of the Gothic and Armenian ambassadors to King Xusrō I of Persia:
... he [Justinian] is by nature a meddler and a lover of those things which in no way belong to him, and is not able to abide by the settled order of things, he has conceived the desire of seizing upon the whole earth, and has become eager to acquire for himself each and every state ${ }^{2}$.

Equally bitter are the words of the Armenians. Having recalled the innumerable misfortunes Justinian had brought upon various nations, the Armenians exclaim with indignation,

The whole earth is not large enough for the man; it is too small a thing for him to conquer all the world together. But he is even looking about the heavens and is searching the retreats beyond the ocean, wishing to gain for himself some other world ${ }^{3}$.

The accuracy of this characterization taken from the pen of a contemporary who had thoroughly studied Justinian may be seen from the words of the emperor himself, as the dreaded conqueror proclaims,
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... after so many expenses and wars, God has granted us the possibility of making peace with the Persians, of subjecting to ourselves the Vandals, the Alans, and the Moors, and of conquering all Africa and Sicily. We likewise cherish the greatest hopes that, with God's help, we shall succeed in extending our power over those other lands within the limits of the two oceans which were ruled by the ancient Romans and subsequently gradually slipped away through their negligence ${ }^{4}$.


The Empire spent enormous efforts, both material and spiritual, on military undertakings of such grandiose conception, and as the Imperial frontiers spread, so grew and was realized the tendency toward centralization. The principle of the concentration of power was part of Justinian's concept, it was proclaimed often and quite unambiguously from his first decrees. Justinian was a born despot. This trait of his character is admirably displayed in the instructions promulgated by him for the review of former legislation and the working out and formulation of his famous Code. The principles of the sacred personality of the Emperor and of the divine origin of his power are proclaimed in them. The Emperor is the incarnation of law and justice; power is a gift received by him from above : "imperium quod nobis a caelesti maiestate traditum est". In which case, the Emperor continues, "what can be greater or more sacred than the imperial majesty?" ${ }^{5}$. He is the exclusive source and instrument of the law. Not only the right of promulgating the law but the capacity for its interpretation is the unalienable prerogative of the highest power ${ }^{6}$. In all cases where doubts arise, or there is an obscurity in the meaning of the law, it is indispensable to turn to the ruler, and he, "numine caelesti erecta emendabat et in competentem formam redigebat" ". Indeed

[^3]inclinations are raised to the level of principles, his practical aims given theoretical bases. These helped him establish his leadership in the creation of a vast yet centralized power within the Empire.

With this aim Justinian undertook a number of administrative reforms. As the reformer himself said, the direction in which all these changes should tend was, " ut nostro moderamine recte gubernatur et firme custodiatur" ${ }^{9}$. This is the motto which lay at the base of the provincial reforms of Justinian and which is likewise relevant to the reorganization of the Armenian lands.

The changes which Justinian initiated in Armenia are unquestionably inspired first of all by the over-all spirit of imperialism, and they served the interests of the unification and consolidation of the Empire. The concept of consolidating the parts of the Empire, at least in the one-sided understanding found in all autocrats, required the obliteration of the characteristics which distinguished the Armenian provinces from the rest of the Empire; it stressed the necessity of removing their individual aspects. It was imperative to transform them from semi-independent nations into an ordinary imperial province conforming to the general pattern.

In addition to the general reasons underlying the whole of Justinians reforming activity, particular motives, relating to the specific political circumstances, were present in each separate case. The immediate pretext for the military re-organization of Armenia was the Persian war. Justinian took up the reins of government at the height of the war begun under his predecessor. The imperial army had just suffered a defeat at the hand of the Armenian princes under Persian domination. The lack of success of Roman arms was attributed to the unsatisfactory defense of the frontier provinces. It was blamed on the forces of the Dux Armeniae and of the native princes who, as the war had demonstrated, were incapable of withstanding a concentrated Persian attack on the Imperial territory. Furthermore, the naxarar contingents of Interior Armenia and of the Satrapies did not come up to requirements of a rigorous discipline because of their heterogeneous composition and leadership. They would have found it difficult to operate in conjunction with the regular armies of the $D u x^{93}$.

According to the historian Procopius, the Count of Armenia was unable to repel the invasion of the enemy, because he had no troops at his disposal. Justinian, therefore, having realized that such a disorganized Armenia could easily be captured by the Persians,
abolished the office of Count; placed a strategos in Armenia ( $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ oे
 of troops, enough to repel enemy attacks. These were the measures taken by the Emperor in so-called Greater Armenia ${ }^{10}$. As for the autonomous Satrapies, we learn from the same historian that they were left to their own devices and dispensed with Roman help since they had their own troops drawn from among the Armenians The satraps, however, also admitted their helplessness in the face of enemy attack.

And when this came to the knowledge of the emperor Justinian, he immediately did away with the title of Satrap and appointed in these provinces two Dukes, as they are called; and he put under them a very large force of regular Roman troops to assist them in guarding the Roman frontier ${ }^{11}$.

The actual decree according to which these changes took place has fortunately been preserved:

The Emperor Justinian to A. Zeta, vir illustri and master of the army for Armenia, Pontus Polemoniacus and the Nations:

Having, through God's grace, received the Roman power, and having considered this matter with solicitous care and vigilant concern, we have found it necessary to create by the present law a special military commander for parts of Armenia, Pontus Polemoniacus and the Nations. We chose with complete confidence for a post of such responsibility thy highness which has so commended itself to us through its former activity. We entrust to thy care certain provinces, namely Greater Armenia, which is called Interior and the Nations (namely Anzetena, Ingilena, Asthianena, Sophena, Sophanena, in which lies Martyropolis, Balabitena) as well as First and Second Armenias and Pontus Polemoniacus, together with their Dukes. And the Count of Armenia is to be abolished altogether. We entrust [to thee] certain legions, not only those which are now being constituted, but also those chosen from the ones in the capital, those in the East, and certain other regiments. Furthermore, the number of soldiers in them shall not be diminished, for we have formerly added many to them without burdening the republic or raising expenditures. Now, however, we withdraw some of them, but in such a way that even after this subtraction more shall remain than there were before our blessed time ${ }^{11 \mathrm{a}}$.

The chronicler John Malalas knew and made use of this law. He gives certain details which complete and clarify the official proclamation. We, therefore, give his account in full:

In the abovementioned year of the reign of Justinian, Ztittas (Sittas) was sent to Armenia as stratelates. Before that time there was no stratelates in Armenia but there were dukes, governors and counts. The Emperor gave to him troops from two [sources], from the capital and from the East. Having assumed the office, he, with the sacred authorization, recruited for himself native stratelate scriniae, having obtained from the Emperor the right to admit natives to military service because of their familiarity with the localities in Armenia. The Emperor authorized this and transferred to him also the rights of the Armenian dukes, counts and their hypatoi, consisting formerly garrison soldiers. All former powers were abolished. But he received four regiments from the stratelates of the East. The frontier defenses of the Romans became mighty from that time, for he was a warlike man. He was the same man who married Comito the sister of the empress Theodora, ${ }^{12}$.

It is evident, both from the official document and from the historical account that, the crux of the military reorganization of the frontier consisted in the reunion of all the Armenian lands under the power of a single commander who was a general or master of the army [magister militum].

The office of magister militum was the highest military rank in the Empire. There were only five such magistri in the whole of the Empire: two in the capital, one in the East, and two in the West. The appointment of such an important official in Armenia testifies to the importance given to the eastern frontier of the Empire at that time. The actual decree of Justinian speaks of the subordination of the dukes to the new commander, while Malalas asserts that all previously existing authorities were to be abolished with the appointment of the new general. The information of the historian is incorrect and based on a misunderstanding. Several dukes and counts did not exist at the time when a military commander was appointed for Armenia; the historian has evidently confused the situation before the military reorganization with the one created by the civilian reorganization which followed the military one by a few years, specifically in 536.

The precise year in which the military commander was appointed is not known since the date of the decree is missing. Judging from
the opening words of this official document, " cum Romanorum nobis sit delatum imperium ", it was promulgated immediately upon or soon after the accession of Justinian ${ }^{13}$. By 530, at the time of the battle near Satala against the Persians, Dorotheus, a skilfull man experienced in military affairs was the strategos of Armenia, while Sittas, one of the Byzantine commanders in chief, was at the head of all the troops stationed in Armenia ${ }^{14}$. One of these two personnages occupied the position of military commander which Justinian had created. Although Dorotheus is called strategos of Armenia, the term by which Procopius renders the Latin title, magister militum, Sittas' name leaves no doubt that he was the one invested with the power of magister. The title, " magister militum per Armeniam et Pontum Polemoniacum et gentes", was entirely appropriate for him as general in chief of the entire army. As for Dorotheus, he must have been the Dux Armeniae. At this time, Belisarius was magister militum per Orientem. In 531, Belisarius suffered a defeat near Kallinikos, and Justinian, displeased, recalled him to the capital, having relieved him of his functions as magister of the East; " but Sittas, as had been decreed by the Emperor Justinian, went to the Eiast in order to guard that portion of the empire ${ }^{115}$. And indeed, soon after, Sittas appeared at the head of a Roman army in the village of Attachas, to render assistance to Martyropolis, which was then besieged by the Persians ${ }^{16}$. It would seem therefore that Sittas had been transferred to replace Belisarius as commander of the East. Malalas also testifies that Justinian having heard of the defeat near Kallinikos, "wrote to Sittas, the magister militiae praesentalis, who was then staying in Armenia, and ordered him to journey to the East to participate in the war. Sittas occupied the territories of the Persians and, having crossed the Armenian mountains, came to Samosata " ${ }^{17}$.

According to the same historian, a special official was assigned to the theatre of the war to make an investigation. As a result of his report, Justinian dismissed Belisarius from his military command and appointed Munda in his place as stratelates of the East ( $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta$ $\left.\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \tau \eta \nu \dot{a} v a \tau o \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime}\right)^{18}$. What happened to Sittas at this point is not altogether clear. Malalas also knows of his operations near Martyropolis ${ }^{19}$, but according to his indications, the stratelates of the East was Dorotheus. In this capacity the latter took a certain fortress in Persarmenia ${ }^{20}$ and repelled an attack of the Sabirian Huns ${ }^{21}$. The battle near Kallinikos took place in Holy Week, on Saturday

April 19th, which corresponds to the date of Easter for the year 531, and Sittas left Armenia after this battle. Whether he was appointed commander of the East, as Procopius asserts, or whether he returned to the capital because the post was given to Munda, as Malalas reports, does not affect our discussion. What is important and uncontrovertible is that Sittas remained in Armenian as magister until 19 April, 531. We also know that he was in Armenia the preceding year, 530, and fought with the Persians near Satala ${ }^{21 a}$. As a result of all that has been said, it follows that the military reorganization of Armenia, which is associated with the appointment of Sittas as magister militum per Armeniam, must be placed in the period between the accession of Justinian in 527 and 530 ; the most likely date is 529 .

In contradiction to Malalas, " all former powers " were not abolished in this reorganization. Only the office of Count of Armenia, and the autonomy of the Satrapies were abolished. Not only the praesides, or civilian governors of Armenia I and II, but also the Dux Armeniae remained untouched. In the place of the Count and the Satraps, three new Dukes were appointed and subordinated to the military commander or magister. The latter may be compared with present day governor generals by virtue of the scope and nature of his powers.

Considerable military forces and an officium were at the disposal of the magister per Armeniam. Unfortunately, precise information as to their composition is lacking. The information of Malalas as to the scriniarii is curious ${ }^{21 \mathrm{~b}}$. The scriniarii or officiales served in one of the officia or in its departments, the scriniae. The officium of a magister consisted of his staff and chancery. The officials wore military dress, and their office was referred to as militia; nevertheless they were not considered to be part of the army. Originally, the officials apparently had also had military duties. Thus, in the Notitia Dignitatum it is said of the officium of the magistri of the capital and of Thrace (magister militum praesentalis et mag. mil. per Thracias et Illyricum) that " in numeris militat et in officio deputatur " ${ }^{21 \mathrm{c}}$. The seriniarii of the magister of Armenia were of the same type, since Sittas had specifically requested it. The passage from Malalas shows that Sittas' petition to the Emperor had included two requests: first, that he be given the power to form an officium from the natives, that is to say the Armenians; and second, that they, the scriniarii recruited by the magister, be allowed to " militare" ( $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma a l$ ). Sittas, the newly appointed. commander, who had
previously been in Armenia and begun his military career there, clearly realized that without the co-operation of the local forces it would be difficult for him to carry out the responsible role assigned to him. It is even possible that he was no stranger to the East by descent. Sittas or Tzittas was apparently a nickname; the name of the general was Ursicius. Such is the name given to the important official and commander married to Comito, Justinian's sister-in-law and Theodora's sister, in an interesting document which has recently come to light ${ }^{22}$. We know from Malalas that this official, the brother-in-law of Theodora, must be identified with Sittas.

Sittas' legitimate request met with the highest approval, and the scriniarii recruited among the natives were perhaps included among the numeros novos mentioned in the Imperial decree. In addition to the numeri novi, the army of the commander of Armenia, also comprised " segregati de praesentalibus, orientalibus et aliis agminibus" 22 ; that is to say certain detachments taken from the legions under the command of the magistri of the capital and of the East (magistri mil. praesentalis et per Orientem) and transferred to the commander of Armenia. In the Notitia dignitatum regiments of Armenian archers (sagittarii Armeni) are listed among the troops stationed in the capital, while to following legions : prima Armeniaca, seconda Armeniaca, and the Transtigritani are found among the eastern contingents ${ }^{22 b}$; these are perhaps the regiments of which the abovementioned segregati were composed in whole or in part. Malalas likewise asserts that the
 кai $\mathfrak{a} \nu \alpha \tau \circ \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ ", i.e. praesentalibus et orientalibus; and furthermore, as he says himself, four legions were drawn from the latter ${ }^{23}$. In place of the "numeri novi et allia agmina" of the decree, the historian refers to scriniarii and " rov̀s vinátovs(?)" who were " кабтрıбıavov̀s oтpatıш́тas" (castrensiani milites). These should perhaps be taken as being one and the same, and this might confirm the hypothesis that the novi numeri refer to the scriniarii and that the allia agmina are, therefore, to be identified with the milites castrensiani ${ }^{24}$.

It is difficult to determine the size of the army of the magister of Armenia. We know that in 530 Sittas fought the Persians near Satala, with fifteen thousand soldiers at his disposal ${ }^{25}$. Somewhat later, at the time of the campaign of Dwin, the active army, composed of the forces of Valerianus, magister of Armenia, and Martinus, magister of the, East, was reckoned as thirty thousand men ${ }^{26}$. It is, however,
dangerous to measure the Imperial forces in the East according to these figures; the two magistri cannot have disposed of an army numerically inferior to that of the dux Armeniae, for example, whose forces, according to the Notitia dignitatum, exceeded thirty thousand men ${ }^{26}$ a.

Theodosiopolis, in Inner Armenia, became the residence of the magister of Armenia. Before that, Melitenē, the capital of Lesser Armenia, had been the military center, since the Duke of Armenia had resided there ${ }^{26 \mathrm{~b}}$. During the Roman-Persian war of the early sixth century, Eugenius, one of the Roman generals operating against the Persians in Mesopotamia, is even referred to as Duke of Melitene é ${ }^{27}$, though he was in fact Duke of Armenia. With the reunion of the Armenian provinces to the Empire, the center of the military forces shifted to the frontier city of Theodosiopolis. Of the newly created dukes subordinate to the magister, one was stationed at Artalesōn, two in the Satrapal lands, at Kitharizōn and Martyropolis, and two in Pontus and Tzanika, at Horonōn, and Schamalinichōn or Tzanzakōn, of which we have already discussed the position ${ }^{27 a}$.

These sites had been chosen primarily for strategic purposes, consequently Justinian reinforced them with new defenses. It is well known that the building activity of Justinian is one of the amazing and admirable aspects of this activity, and struck the imagination of his contemporaries. It seemed to them that future generations would not believe that such enormous and innumerable buildings could be the work of one man ${ }^{28}$. The undertaking was indeed gigantic and knows no equal in history for scope. The vast Empire, and particularly its borders, was covered by an uninterrupted network of fortifications. The positions, with their fortifications and garrisons were chosen with the defense of the country in view, and, in general, the fortifications of the Emperor were closely connected with the system of defense. As we have seen from the topography of Lesser Armenia, the strategy of the Romans had formerly consisted of the occupation of the most important points on the main roads. This system no longer provided sufficient protection for the country in the period of Justinian. The Empire had spread so far, and was in such a disturbed condition, that enormous forces were needed to secure the defense of the vast expanse of the state. Justinian was forced to compensate for the lack of armed forces by an increase in the number of defensive positions and of secure fortifications, which
would solve the problem of national defense as well as that of attack. This was the policy followed on the eastern frontier of the Empire, namely in Armenia. The primary requirement was the strengthening of the border line. For this purpose, a series of fortresses was erected, stretching in a long chain along the frontier itself from Dara to Trapezos. This was the first line of defense, made up of the posts already mentioned, Martyropolis, Kitharizōn, Artalesōn, Theodosiopolis, Horonōn and Tzanzakōn, in which stood permanent garrisons under the command of the five dukes and the magister.

The main strategic points were Martyropolis and Theodosiopolis, and other smaller forts were built in the rear for their protection. Behind Martyropolis stood the fort of Pheison and the famous Kleisurai, the naturally inaccessible passes which Justinian surrounded with new fortifications and a garrison intended for the protection of both Martyropolis and Kitharizōn. The same function in relation to Theodosiopolis was fulfilled by the forts of Baïberdōn, Chartōn, Areōn, and Barchōn, disposed against attacks from the East and from the North. For the same reason, Sisilisōn, Bourgousnoes, and the so-called Longini Fossatum were built to protect the dukes of Tzanika, ${ }^{28 \mathrm{a}}$.

Behind the front line of defense ran a second one, with two main centers, Melitenē and Satala, which were positions as strong as Martyropolis and Theodosiopolis. The importance of these ancient cities even in the military sense was not decreased by the erection of the new defense line. Justinian prized their position highly and restored their ancient fortifications. He endowed Melitene with such brilliance that the contemporaries called it the pride of Armenia. Satala was transformed into a fortress of the first rank, and the ancient localities scattered around them, the forts of Osroenē: Lythararizōn, Lysiormon, Germani Fossatum, as well as Bizana and Tzumina were also renovated. The building activity of Justinian also touched the ancient cities of Sebasteia, Nikopolis and Koloneia ${ }^{\text {asb }}$.

Procopius dedicated a special work, the de Aedificiis in four books, one entirely devoted to Armenia, to Justinian's building activities; through it we are informed about the Emperor's constructions in Armenia. According to Procópius, the city of Martyropolis had been poorly defended from ancient times. Hence the Satrap Theodore had not even considered the possibility of resisting Kavadh I, in 502 , and had surrendered unconditionally to the Persians. The

Emperor Anastasius, who was familiar with the situation, did not blame Theodore for his behaviour, but considered the step reasonable and praiseworthy. Taught by this experience, Anastasius surrounded the city with a wall four feet thick and twenty feet high, but the wall was still not strong enough to withstand assault and wall-piercing engines, and it was even possible to make one's way over it into the city.

Therefore the Emperor Justinian devised the following plan: Outside the circuit of the wall he dug a trench, and laying foundations there he built a second wall with a thickness of four feet, leaving a space of four feet between the two walls; and he raised the new wall also to a height of twenty feet and made it in all respects equal to the first. Then, by throwing stones and mortar into the space between the two walls, he brought this work to perfection by forming one solid structure with a thickness of twelve feet. Above this he added, in about the same thickness, the same height which the earlier wall had had. He also constructed admirable outworks for the city and all the other things without exception on which the city's defense are based ${ }^{288}$.

In this way the thin and low walls of Martyropolis were altered by Justinian into major fortifications reaching twelve feet in thickness and forty feet in height.

We are already familiar with the positions of Pheisōn and the Kleisurai. Justinian "... by establishing admirable forts at Pheisōn and in the passes and posting in them invincible garrisons, has made this region altogether inaccessible to the barbarians." ${ }^{28 \mathrm{~d}}$. In the village of Kitharizon because of the absence of earlier fortifications,
$\ldots$ he established a fortress which had not existed before,
a huge and extraordinarily impregnable stronghold situated
in a hilly region. He also brought into it an abundant supply
of water and made all other proper arrangements for the
inhabitants, and he stationed there the second of the Dunkes,
as I have said, with a very numerous garrison of soldiers.
And he thereby guaranteed the safety of the Armenian provinces.

## Similarly,

There was a town in the middle of this region named Artalesōn which he surrounded with a very strong wall and converted into an impregnable fortress; and he stationed there
detachments of regular troops which by his order were always to be commanded by an officer whom the Romans, in the Latin tongue, call a Dux ${ }^{28 e}$.

Theodosiopolis, according to Procopius' account owed its foundation to Theodosius II, who "took over the dominion of Arsaces [the last Armenian king], ... he built on one of the hills a fort which was easy for assailants to capture, and he named it Theodosiopolis" ${ }^{288}$. Karin, the Armenian name of the city, which is identical with the ancient name of the province, indicates that a village, if not a town, had existed on the site of the fortress of Theodosius from ancient times. Had the locality first become known to the Armenians as Theodosiopolis, a second, Armenian, name would hardly have been necessary. The emperor Theodosius is only entitled to the credit of having built a fortress where an Armenian village had formerly stood. Indeed, in another work, the same historian writes that the emperor Anastasius built a city on the frontier of Persarmenia, and adds, "now in this place there had been a village from old, but it had taken on the dignity of a city by the favour of the Emperor Theodosius even to the name, for it had come to be named after him " ${ }^{288}$.

The construction of Theodosius proved inadequate for military purposes, at least in the period of the wars with Kavadh I. Theodosiopolis, like Martyropolis, was unable to withstand a siege and was captured by the Persians. Procopius informs us that,

The Roman Emperor Anastasius not much later built a city there, enclosing within the circuit-wall the hill on which stood the fortress of Theodosius. And he gave his own name to the city, yet he was quite unable to obliterate that of Theodosius, the earlier founder; for although familiar names are wont constantly to be changed by men for new, nevertheless the older names cannot easily be relinquished. This wall of Theodosiopolis was of adequate extent, but it did not rise to a height proportionate to its thickness. In fact it attained a height of only about thirty feet, and for this reason it had proved to be very easy for an enemy to capture by assault, particularly for the Persians. In other ways too it was vulnerable; for it was protected neither by outerworks nor by a moat. Indeed, there was actually a certain elevation which came very close to the city and overtopped the circuit-wall. Consequently the Emperor Justinian took the following measures to meet the situation. First of all he dug a very deep ditch all around, making it very like the ravines between lofty
mountains. Next he sliced off the elevated ground, so transforming it as to make a series of impassable cliffs and of gulehes affording no outlet. And in order that the wall might be exceptionally high and altogether impregnable, in case anyone should attack it, he added all the details which he had incorporated in the fortifications of Daras. For he made the embrasures quite narrow, just wide enough for the defenders to be able to shoot from them, and by adding courses of stone he built thereon a storey like a gallery all around, he then cleverly added other embrasures above them; and surrounding the wall with outworks on all sides he made it much like the circuit-wall of Daras, fashioning each tower as a strong fortress. Here he stationed all the troops and the Generals of the two Armenias, and thus he made the Armenians thenceforth too strong to be afraid of the attacks of the Persians ${ }^{28 h}$.

The historian goes on to say that no fortifications were erected at Bizana. The reason for this was that,

This town lies on level ground, and about it for a great distance stretch plains suitable for cavalry manoeuvres, and there are many pools of standing water there. Consequently it is not only very open to the enemy's attack, but most unhealthy for the inhabitants. For these reasons he passed over this town and in another situation built a city bearing the Emperor's name, a very noteworthy and altogether impregnable place, in the district called Tzumina, which is three miles removed from Bizana, situated on very precipitous ground and enjoying excellent air ${ }^{28 i}$.

Tà Bı̧avá is the city called Bá̧avıs or $А$ єovoómo入ıs in Justinian's decree ${ }^{28 \mathrm{j}}$. Scholars have located it incorrectly as they identify it with either Theodosiopolis or Erzincan. In reality Bizana lay half way between these cities, and is the Armenian Vižan, a village which still stands on the banks of the Euphrates at the point were Akilisenē borders on Mananałi. It was renamed Leontopolis, probably in honour of the emperor Leo I (457-474), but we do not know on what occasion ${ }^{288}$. We cannot tell how far the topographical conditions described by Procopius are accurate, but his description seems to be corroborated by the name of the place, Vižan, which means " flood" in Armenian ${ }^{29}$.

Not far from Bizana, nearer to Erzincan in the foot hills of the Keşiş dağlari, stands the settlement of Cimin, incidentally renowned for its excellent wine ; this is the historical Tzumina ${ }^{30}$. The Emperor
enlarged it, re-named it Justinianopolis, and made it the center of the civilian administration. This city was also the residence of the bishop of the province, who was known as the bishop of Justinianopolis or of Akilisenē, from the name of the province ${ }^{31}$. From antiquity these three localities, Theodosiopolis, Leontopolis, and Justinianopolis, have been confused with one another as a result of their closeness. An error has even crept into such official document as Novella $X X X I$, where Justinianopolis is given as the new name for Leontopolis. It should now be entirely clear, however, that Justinianopolis is to be identified with Cimin, Leontopolis with Vižan, and Theodosiopolis with Karin [Erzurum].

Justinian likewise restored the city of Satala,
The city of Satala had been in a precarious state in ancient times. For it is situated not far from the land of the enemy and it also lies in a low-lying plain and is dominated by many hills which tower around it, and for this reason it stood in need of circuit-walls which would defy attack. Nevertheless, even though its surroundings were of such a nature as this, its defences were in a perilous condition, having been carelessly constructed with bad workmanship in the beginning, and with the long passage of time the masonry had everywhere collapsed. But the Emperor tore all this down and built there a new circuit-wall, so high that it seemed to overtop the hills around it, and of a thickness sufficient to ensure the safety of its towering mass. And he set up admirable outworks on all sides and so struck terror into the hearts of the enemy. He also built a very strong fortress not far from Satala in the territory called Osroenēe ${ }^{31 a}$.

According to the description of Procopius, the city of Koloneia lay in the same district. First it had been a castle, which had existed from antiquity, at the top of a steep hill ${ }^{32}$, then the Roman general Pompey who conquered this district captured the castle, fortified it, and called it Koloneia.

This also the Emperor Justinian finding that it had suffered much through the ravages of so long a time, restored with all his resources. Furthermore, by granting great sums to the inhabitants of this region he brought it about that everywhere on their own land either new defenses were built or those which had fallen into decay were restored. Thus practically all the fortifications which can be found there are, as it happens, the work of the Emperor Justinian. In that region also he
constructed the forts called Baiberdōn and Areōn. He likewise restored Lysiormum, which had already fallen into ruin, as well as Lytararizōn. And at the place which they call Germani Fossatum he built a new fort. Furthermore, he rebuilt the walls of Sebasteia and Nicopolis, cities of Armenia, for they were all on the point of collapsing, having suffered from the long passage of time, and he made them new ${ }^{32 \mathrm{a}}$.

Melitenē, a very important center in Armenia and in Asia Minor in general, was at first a small fort serving as a post for the Roman army; it was built on level ground in the form of a square. From the time of the Emperor Trajan, Melitenē was a city and the capital of the district. When the population had grown to such a point that it could no longer be contained inside the fortifications, the inhabitants began to settle on the plain outside the walls. Here they built temples, houses for the magistrates, a square and a market. Streets were laid out, porticoes, baths, theatres, and all that pertains to a large and well planned city was erected. Thus suburban Melitenē arose in very ancient times. Anastasius intended to surround the city with a wall, but died before he had had time to carry out his plan. " But the Emperor Justinian built about it on all sides a very strong wall and made Melitenē a mighty stronghold for the Armenians and a thing of beauty " ${ }^{32 \mathrm{~b}}$.

Among the constructions of Justinian several churches are also mentioned.

> In Theodosiopolis he dedicated a church to the Mother of God, and he restored monasteries in the place called Petrios and in Coucarizōn. In Nicopolis he built the monastery named after the Forty-five Saints, and in Bizani a church to the martyr George. And close to Theodosiopolis he restored a monastery named after the Forty Martyrs ${ }^{32 \mathrm{c}}$.

> All the localities mentioned are well known with the exception of a few points. These are Areōn, Lysiormon and Petrios, which must be sought in the neighbourhood of Bayburt. Here too, stood Koukarizon, in the vicinity of Derjan and Karin, on the site of the present Kokaris ${ }^{33}$. Lytararizōn is unquestionably the Olotoedariza of the Itinerarium Antonini ${ }^{34}$. Germani Fossatum should be identified with one of the episcopal cities of the Metropolis of Trapezos in the ninth century, namely Keramon recognizable under the present name of Krom, a small village north of Gümüß̧ane ${ }^{35}$.

The description of the fortifications of Justinian given above has more than a topographical interest, it also acquaints us with the principles of the art of fortification at that time. In this connexion, the fortifications of Theodosiopolis and even those of Martyropolis are of particular interest. First, it is interesting to compare the data of Procopius with the Armenian material. According to the national tradition, the city of Theodosiopolis was founded by a certain Anatolius at the order of the emperor Theodosius,

> ...at the foot of a well situated mountain whence flowed a multitude of small clear springs. He surrounded it by a deep moat and in a ditch laid the foundations of the walls. On these he raised enormous and heavy towers of which he called the first Theodosia in honour of Theodosius. Further he bilt sharp ended towers like the prow of a ship and stretched passages with incurved recesses which faced the mountains. Similar towers were built facing the plain toward the North. On the Eastern and Western sides, however, he built round towers. In the center of the city on a raised spot were established a number of magazines and this place was called the Augusteon in honour of Augustus. He also led in other streams through many places by hidden channels. He filled the city with arms and troops and named it Theodosiopolis ${ }^{36}$.

Extremely interesting information on the foundation of Theodosiopolis has been preserved in a tale which though legendary in character derives unquestionably from a well informed source. In opposition to the above account, this tale attributes the foundation of the city to two Armenian monks, Moses and David, who were among those sent to the Byzantine capital to translate the Holy Scriptures, and not to Anatolius. The Emperor Theodosius the Younger had entrusted to these two personnages, who were well known in Byzantium, the task of building a new city in Armenia. Having returned to their native land they undertook this task.

They built a Xosrovian tower, fearless against siege engines, and raised three walls on one foundation. It was ordered to dig out and carry away the earth for the space of three walls and to dig through to the center (lit. the navel) of the city. The a deep ditch was filled with enormous undressed blocks and lime [mortar?], and on a single foundation three walls were erected. Inside, on the side of the city, two hundred steps going further and further down were set against the wall
so that it might not be shaken by tunneling underneath. In the same way two hundred steps, one below the other, were set on the outside of the wall for safety from tunnels by the enemy. Other means were also invented in case the enemy should attack, besiege the city or close all the roads to the city. They made underground paths to the city, they succeeded in digging deep into the ground and in leading a tunnel to the plain, half a day's journey from the city to a place where there are stagnant waters which form a samb, a swamp filled with reeds. In this way in case of a siege the city could obtain fodder for the cattle and reeds for fuel, and the enemy would know nothing about it. On the other side of the city they also laid a tunnel to the mountain called Aycu-ptkunki, that is to say, Goatteats, and filled it with large rocks. If cavalry were needed, it could be sent for and could ride into the city without the knowledge of the enemy.

As for water, everything was excellently organized exactly as it should be. There is no one in the city, rich or poor, who may not make use of the water from underground conduits. The palaces and towers are magnificent and built of cut stone. The streets and squares, slaughter houses and markets are of impecable cleanliness. The churches amaze the beholder. The gates of the city are tall and broad, the walls are well kept, and the towers all Xosrovian ${ }^{37}$.

According to the description of Procopius, the Euphrates had its source forty-two stadia from Theodosiopolis on a not very high mountain.
... the Euphrates at its beginning flows for a short distance, and is then immediately lost to sight as it goes on; it does not, however, become subterranean, but a very strange thing happens. For the water is covered by a bog of great depth, extending about fifty stades in length and twenty in breadth; and reeds grow in this mud in great abbundance. But the earth there is of such hard sort that it seems to those who chance upon it to be nothing else than solid ground, so that both pedestrians and horsemen travel over it without fear. Nay more, even waggons pass over the place in great numbers every day, but they are wholly insufficient to shake the bog or to find a weak spot in it at any point. The natives burn the reeds every year, to prevent the roads being stopped up by them, and once, when an exceedingly violent wind struck the place, it came about that the fire reached the extremities of the roots, and the water appeared at a small opening; butin a short time the ground closed again, and gave the spot the same appearance which it had had before. From there the river proceeds into the land called Celesene ${ }^{38}$.

We have here the description of the reed swamps which the Armenians call sumb. Movsess Xorenac̣i says of them that one of the branches of the Euphrates, not far from its source
$\ldots$ spreads into the likeness of a swampy lake and on its
banks forms a šamb, and reeds grow in great number; the
plains are famous for thick grass and the wealth of cereals ${ }^{39}$.

This place is called in Turkish saslyk " the reeds", and lies north of the city at approximately the distance indicated by Procopius, namely not more than ten kilometers ${ }^{40}$.

On the opposite side, that is to the south, the city is protected by the Palandöken mountains, which are the ancient Goats' Teats. In the east, just above the city rise the heights of Top daği also known as Surb Nšan, (Holy Cross), from the name of the church. The citadel is on a hill on which is also found the arsenal. The Top daği rises in sight of the citadel and it is possible to direct artillery fire from it against the city and the arsenal ${ }^{41}$. Indeed, during the last RussoTurkish war, Russian troops occupied "... first two forts of Top-dag, Azizie and Medzhidzhe, which dominate the entire citadel" ${ }^{42}$.

It is perfectly clear from all this that the high point which rose before the city and which was dug out by Justinian was in fact the present Top-daǧi. The well situated mountain at whose feet the city was spread according to Movsēs Xorenac̣i, was not Top-daǧi but the Goats' Teats. This can be deduced from that fact that the Armenian historian says that the round towers of the city walls faced east and west, while the towers like ships' prows faced north and toward the mountains, which clearly means to the south. According to a late author who was a native of Theodosiopolis, the city was situated on a height, and like a royal throne lay at the foot of the high mountain Šołalar and Gohanam, looking out toward a beautiful circular plain in the direction of the village of Kân ${ }^{43}$. Kân or Kian lies north of the city, while both Šołalar and Gohanam are actually one and the same mountain south of the city between the Deveboynu and the Palandöken range ${ }^{44}$. It is considered to be the highest peak of the region, and from its summit both the Ararat and the Black Sea are visible.

These descriptions of the fortifications are not in complete agreement. According to Procopius, the fortifications of Theodosiopolis consisted of a three fold defense: a very deep ditch ( $\dot{\eta} \tau a ́ \phi p o s \quad \beta a \theta \dot{v} \tau \alpha \tau o s)$, the
outworks or fore-walls ( $\pi \rho \circ \tau \epsilon i x i \sigma \mu a$ ), and the main crenellated wall ( $\pi \epsilon \rho^{\prime} i_{0} \lambda_{\text {dos }}$ or $\tau \epsilon i \hat{\chi} o s$ ), composed of two storeys separated from each other by a passage similar to a covered gallery with towers. Movsēs Xorenac̣i knows only a ditch and a wall with towers, and his ditch does not seem to have had a separate function, but merely served to deepen the foundation of the walls. This is also the version found in the Legend ${ }^{45}$. The author of the Legend unquestionably had a good source at his disposal, but he is also probably to blame for certain absurdities in the description resulting from an incorrect understanding of his source. The digging out of the earth in the space between the walls mentioned by the author of the Legend is reminiscent of the work done by Justinian on the walls of Martyropolis ${ }^{45}$. . The three walls built on a single foundation correspond to the outworks and the two-storey wall. According to the evidence of the anonymous Legend, the city walls had the appearance, within and without, of a grandiose staircase with two hundred steps. Such a structure, regardless of the function assigned to it, is unsuitable from the very fact that besiegers could have climbed up the wall by means of the stairs. This information must be considered as altogether doubtful. Obviously, either the original source described separate stairs added to the wall, or we have here an exaggerated description of the twostorey wall of the city. The account of the underground approaches, unless confirmed by excavations on the site, may also be taken as an exaggeration of the fact that the city had four gates, from one of which it was possible to ride north to the samb, and from the others south to the Goats' Teats.

The description of both Movsēs Xorenac̣i and the Legend refer to the reconstruction of Theodosiopolis by Justinian; and the city walls were destroyed and rebuilt several times thereafter ${ }^{46}$, Nevertheless, certain ancient traits are still visible when compared with the modern city. Modern Erzurum consists of three parts: the citadel, the city, and the suburbs, in other words the citadel, the fortress, and the city. The city with the citadel is situated on a height and is separated from the suburban sections by a double wall and a ditch with an embankment. The height of the walls is 24 to 30 feet and the thickness up to 5 feet; there are 62 towers in them; the circumference of the city is one half hour's walk. The citadel, Ic-kala in Turkish, Mijaberd in Armenian, occupies the highest point in the western corner of the city and is surrounded by a high wall to the east. It is
shaped like a rectangle 180 steps long and 80 steps wide. Inside it is an empty space with one tall tower and a few buildings ${ }^{47}$. As for the suburban part, it lies outside the fortress walls and consists of four parts or maala. In the east, the remains of ancient walls some 6 feet thick adjoin it, and in front of them there are traces of an embankment ${ }^{48}$.

Where do the boundaries of Justinianic Theodosiopolis end? We have seen that Justinian built a temple dedicated to the Mother of
 $\left.{ }^{2} \nu \nu^{\prime} \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)^{48}$ a . To this day the main church of the city bears the name of the Mother of God, and the Armenian Legend attributes its foundation to David and Moses, that is to say to the men who were entrusted with the building of the city. This circumstance clearly points to an intrinsic relationship between the present church and the temple of Justinian. We believe that the monastery of the Forty Martyrs built near the city by Justinian may have been connected with the present spring, Kərh-cesma " the 40 springs" in Erzurum and to the Korh-deirman, " the 40 mills", outside the city because of its name. In Nikopolis the same Emperor built a monastery dedicated to the Forty-five Martyrs. Should we believe Procopius that the monastery in Theodosiopolis was under the vocable of the Forty Martyrs, or is another origin to be sought for the name? In 1653 the Church of the Mother of God had up to fifteen priests and ten deacons; among the former was the Yakovb of Karin, referred to earlier, who has left us a description of his native province. Since the church of the Mother of God is now found in one of the suburban sections outside the fortress, we must suppose that the ancient walls of Justinian were those which enclosed the suburban districts and whose remains have survived to the present day. One of the travellers who visited Erzurum in the 1840's believed that the suburban walls were older than those of the fortress ${ }^{48 \mathrm{~b}}$. The position of the church of the Mother of God solves the problem of the outer circumference of Justinianic Theodosiopolis, since there are no grounds for thinking that Justinian built this church outside the city he had fortified.

Justinian merely raised and reinforced walls which had existed previously; they actually dated from the period of his predecessor Anastasius. This Emperor had " built a city there, enclosing within the circuit-wall the hill on which stood the fortress of Theodosius" ${ }^{840}$. The walls of the present fortress in all likelihood indicate the boundaries
of the castle of Theodosius. That is not to say, of course, that the walls themselves are of such ancient origin. According to Movsess Xorenac̣i one of the towers was called Theodosia or rather Theodosian ${ }^{49}$ the one intended is clearly the tall tower standing isolated on the citadel. It is also the one called "Xosrovian" in the Legend ${ }^{50}$. The account of Movsēs Xorenaẹi may perhaps reflect a historical fact, namely that Theodosius was responsible for the establishment of no more than the citadel and the tower. If this is the case, the walls of Anastasius, and, therefore, of Justinian coincided with the line now followed by the double walls of the fortress. This hypothesis is acceptable if we also admit that the Church of the Mother of God had originally stood within the fortress and was subsequently transported to the suburbs under the Muslim domination ${ }^{51}$. The problem can be solved only through an archaeological investigation of the site.
In connexion with the actual technique of fortification, it is important to note the means of defense, which consist of three devices; the fundamental wall ( $\tau \in \hat{i} \chi$ os or $\pi \epsilon \rho i \beta o \lambda o s$, ), the outworks ( $\pi \rho \circ \tau \epsilon i \chi \iota \sigma \mu a$ ) and the moat ( $\tau \alpha \dot{d} \phi \rho o s)^{52}$. The fundamental as well as the outer walls were protected by a whole series of towers which served as bases for repelling enemy attacks; the walls ended in crenellations. When it was found desirable to raise the wall, the crenellations were filled in with stones to form a gallery, and above this the wall was raised higher to end once more in crenellations. The gallery went all around the wall, and produced a kind of two-storied wall ${ }^{53}$. The defense was carried on from the galleries at the top of the walls and towers. The walls of Dara and Theodosiopolis, the two most important strategic points on the frontier of the Empire, were constructed in this way. It would be a mistake to think that this system of fortifications was imported into the East by Justinian, it was undoubtedly the product of local tradition. It is possible that the common Armenian terms, parisp, patovar, $\chi$ andak or p'os, are intended to render three forms of fortifications corresponding to the Greek $\tau \in i ̂ \chi o s, \pi \rho o \tau \epsilon i \chi \downarrow \sigma \mu a$ and $\tau$ áф $\rho o s$.

Not every fortification was provided with all of these devices. The outer, additional walls were usually put up in large fortresses in order to give to the neighbouring defenceless population a refuge in time of attack. Procopius says of Dara that it was surrounded by two walls, of which the inner was incomparably higher than the outer; the height of the former reached 60 feet, and the towers were as high
as 100 feet. The space between the two walls was reckoned as no less than 50 feet: " in that place the citizens of Daras are accustomed to put their cattle and other animals when an enemy assails them " ${ }^{54}$. Several types of fortified centers were distinguished according to their strength: great fortified cities ( $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota s-$ civitates), important fortresses ( $\phi \rho o v \rho i \alpha-c a s t e l l a)$, unimportant redoubts (byrgi), camps surrounded by a moat (castra), and walls closing a pass (kleisurai) ${ }^{55}$. As we have seen, all of these types were to be found in Armenia.

## VII

## THE CIVILIAN REORGANIZATION OF ARMENIA

The administrative reasons for the reorganization of Armenia and their connexion with the general reform of the provincial administration - The decay of the administrative machinery and its causes according to Justinian - Suffragium and its suppression, administrative reform along the lines of provincial consolidation - The legal reform - The Novella creating four governors in Armenia - Analysis of the Novella - The new divisions: Armenia I, II, III, and IV, from the point of view of territory - Attempted changes before the promulgation of the Novella - The personalities of Akakios and Thomas and their role in the reforms - Problems met by Justinian in Armenia - Sacra commonitoria and Novellae concerning the system of inheritance found in Armenia - Apalysis of these Novellae - Meaning of the absence of women's rights treated in these Novellae - The problem of marriage and dowry in Imperial legislation: $\phi \in \rho \nu \eta$ and $\delta \omega \rho \in \alpha$, or $d o s$ and donatio, varjank and awjit among the Armenians, Armenian proyg and towayr as literary borrowings from the Greek $\pi \rho o t \xi$ and $\delta \omega \rho \varepsilon a ́$ - Contemporary transformation of ancient marriage customs - The non-inheritance of women in family estates - Inheritance ab intestato in Armenia Presence of both customs in European feudalism - Real sense of the Novella - The destruction of the naxarar system, one of Justinian's chief intentions - Fiscal interests, the immediate motive for the reform both in general and in Armenia.

Justinian's transformation of the civilian administration in Armenia had a much more fundamental effect on the country that the military reorganization, because it altered its ancient pattern of life. This reform took place in 536 as the result of a special Novella. The ultimate goal of this change was undoubtedly the destruction of the peculiar socio-political structure of the country and its Romanization. A Romanized Armenia seemed a more reliable base against the continuous attacks from the East. Justinian never disguised his desire that "the Armenians should follow Roman laws in all ways" and that "Armenia should in no way be differentiated from the Empire" a. Despite the clearly assimilating intentions of the Imperial reformer, his plan for the reorganization of the Armenian territories does not seem to have been conceived at first as an exceptional measure directed against the Armenians; it began naturally as part of his general reform of the administration.

The internal policies of the Emperor were as admirable as the external ones. When Justinian came to the throne, the Empire was passing through a very difficult period. Thanks to the negligence of his immediate predecessors, the internal organization of the state had sunk to a level altogether unsuitable to the pride of a mighty realm, and it showed signs of disintegration: venal administration, absence of justice, decline in the ability of the people to pay taxes, impoverishment of the country in the face of overwhelming danger, unsound finance; all these contributed to the dismal picture presented by the political life of the country. All governmental institutions were in need of renovation; decisive measures were required to save the state from disaster. The population oppressed and exploited in every way, was driven to despair, discontent grew, and disorder spread throughout the Empire. Popular movements, sedition, and the increase of open rebellion threatened the Empire with inevitable dissolution. An imperative need for transformation and renewal of the administration was manifest. This was undertaken by Justinian some eight years after his accession to the throne.

In the year 535, on April 15, Justinian promulgated an admirable, and for its type an unusual Novella, in which he exposed with unwonted candour the decadence of officialdom, and the depravity of its morals, and uncovered the festering sores of the bureaucracy in all their horror ${ }^{1}$. Among all officials extortion and all the sins derived from cupidity were highly developed, "The love of gain is
 $\kappa а \kappa \bar{\omega} \nu)$ " proclaims the Emperor in his Novella. All officials were infected with this love of gain however, not because of a general moral decay, but as a result of the system for filling offices known as suffragium. Vacant posts were openly offered practically for public sale. The grant of an office was customarily accompanied by the payment of a given sum known as suffragium or סórıs. Naturally, the offices went to those who offered the largest sum. The Emperors who preceded Justinian had not condemned this practice, and their example was followed by men of other ranks, each of whom fleeced his subordinates ${ }^{2}$. The whole weight eventually fell on the people who were forcetto pay various illégal but compulsory exactions above and beyond the legal taxes.

An official having obtained his position for money, expected not only to recover the suffragium he had paid, but to make a profit as
well once he received his post. His salary being insufficient for such a purpose, he had recourse to forcible and illegal means of obtaining revenue. Often, not having the means of paying the suffragium, he had to borrow at a high rate of interest and on many occasions he would set out for his post accompanied by his creditors. These abnormal conditions pushed men into illegality and manifested themselves in bribery, extortion, favouritism, coercion and injustice; hence, they had a corrupting influence on morals, since they undermined authority and cut the country's sense of honesty and legality at its very root.

Who, then shall not steal with impunity, "exclaims the author of the Novella", who will not rob irresponsibly, when he looks to those in power, sees everything traded by them for money, and is assured that whatever crime he commits can be remitted with a payment! From this come murder and adultery, assault and plunder, the rape of women, seditious gatherings, and contempt of law and authority, since all are of the opinion that power is up for sale like a wretched slave ${ }^{3}$.

All levels of society suffered equally from this arbitrariness and lack of leadership. Persecuted by the authorities, "clergy, magistrates, landowners, town and country people ", all fled to the capital to complain of their fate and of the plundering and abuses they had suffered at the hand of officials. The general discontent occasionally exploded in riots erupting now here, now there, in the towns and in the countryside.

The Imperial treasury suffered no less from the disorder. The population hit in its material well-being, fell into such poverty that it paid with the greatest difficulty " ordinary taxes provided by law ". The irregularity of these payments disturbed Justinian above all. As the Emperor states himself, the imperialist policies involving him in wars both in the East and the West, required and consumed vast sums of money, and the regular return of state revenues was a ${ }_{\text {ana }}^{\text {atter }}$ of the first importance. Justinian returns repeatedly to this problem in his Novella, stressing its enormous importance. Concern over finances provided one of the main stimuli for the reform.

First, it was indispensable to root out the demoralizing system of selling offices, the fount of all evil. The Emperor realized that order could be re-established only
if those persons who stand at the heads of provinces keep their hands clean, and forswear bribes of any kind, remaining satisfied with their bare salaries paid by the state. But this cannot be achieved otherwise than by having them obtain their offices freely, without suffragium or other expenses ${ }^{4}$.

Justinian consequently abolished the suffragium and re-established the ancient custom whereby a newly appointed governor was required only to pay a sum to the bureaus concerned with his appointment, in return, so to speak, for the work of preparing and forwarding the necessary papers. This sum was rigorously set for each governor. With the exception of a few provinces which were considered spectabiles, all were divided in to consular provinces, consulares, and praesidal ones, correctoriales; of these the former paid more than the latter. We learn from the list appended to Novella VIII, that the governors of Armenia II, Greater Armenia and Helenopontus paid according to the first category, while the one from Armenia I paid according to the second ${ }^{5}$. A Novella de mandatis principium was promulgated at the same time as Novella VIII ${ }^{5 a}$. In this edict the entire range of duties of a provincial governor is described in detail, together with severe injunctions to abide by the orders given.

Among the measures taken by Justinian likewise with the aim of regularizing provincial life, we should take special note of the changes in administrative divisions. Novella VIII abolished the vicariates of Pontica and Asiana. In this period the vicar of Asiana was simultaneously praeses of Phrygia Pakatiana; Justinian left him only the government of Phrygia with the title of Count, having abolished his authority over the other provinces of the diocese. He acted in the same way with regard to the vicar of Pontica; to him the Emperor entrusted only Galatia with re-united military and civilian authority. The comes Orientis, who was the equal of a vicar, had his authority limited in the same manner though with the retention of his title. It was furthermore forbidden to either military or civilian officials to maintain substitutes ( $\tau о \pi о \tau \eta \rho \eta \tau a ́ s$ ) in the provinces under their authority ${ }^{6}$. These measures were directed against the strictly hierarchical system which had proved such a favourable ground for abuses: the prefeets bought their office from the Emperor, the vicars from the prefects, the provincial governors from the vicars; finally the governors appointed substitutes for themselves, and in turn required payment for the position granted. With the abolition of the
vicariate, one of the steps in the hierarchical ladder was removed, and the provincial governors came into direct contact with the prefects. Justinian went on to extend the powers of provincial governors, raised them to the rank of spectabiles, and thus allowed them a certain independence from the prefects, this too being to the detriment of the hierarchical system.

Filled with Roman spirit, Justinian attempted in many ways to imitate antiquity. He believed that ancient Rome was in part indebted to its provincial organization for its greatness. In his opinion, Rome would never have grown from a small state to a world power had she not inculcated respect for herself by appointing highranking governors in the provinces and by surrounding them with magnificence through a grant of full military and civilian power ${ }^{7}$. The natural consequence of such a view was an opposition to the principle, in effect since the period of Diocletian, whereby the Empire was gradually subdivided into increasingly smaller units, while military and civilian authority was separated. Justinian began to reverse this process by means of a côncentration of lands and powers.

In 535 and 536 , Novella VIII was followed by a series of Novellae intended for the re-organization of the provinces. Paphlagonia, which had been divided without reason, according to Justinian, in to Paphlagonia and Honoriada, was again restored to its former size under the authority of a praetor with the rank of spectabilis ${ }^{8}$. The two Cappadocias were re-united and entrusted to a single proconsul also with the rank of spectabilis ${ }^{9}$. Pontus Polemoniacus and Helenopontus were joined together into a single province under the name of Helenopontus; its governor was called moderator, and received once again the same rank ${ }^{10}$. The provinces of other dioceses underwent similar transformations ${ }^{11}$. At this same time, and amidst the general reform, a Novella for the re-organization of the Armenian territories was likewise promulgated.

In his provincial re-organization, Justinian was guided not only by administrative considerations, but also by the interests of justice. In order to understand his reforms both in general and in Armenia, it is indispensable to begin with some acquaintance with his general scheme for the administration of justice.

In the Roman Empire, justice was not assigned to a separate branch ; the administrators supervised legal procedure along with their other duties. Every governor, regardless of his title or rank, was also a
judex. Three legal levels corresponding to the three ranks of governors, were distinguished: ordinarius or clarissumus, spectabilis, and illustris (judices ordinarii, spectabiles, illustres) ${ }^{12}$. At the very top was the court of the Emperor, as the supreme guardian of justice. Below the judex ordinarius stood the municipal magistrates, but their jurisdiction was extremely limited, and it can be said that legal cases were generally tried in the first instance before the judex ordinarius. To him also went appeals against the verdiets of the same magistrates, and from him these appeals went on to the judex spectabilis, that is to say the vicar. The praetorian prefects judged without the possibility of further appeal. The verdicts of vicars, on the other hand, were subject to review, and appeals from them were made not to the court of the prefect, as we should expect, but directly to the Emperor as sacro judici.

Such was the system before Justinian. In his time legal relations underwent certain changes in the order of precedence. From the second half of the fourth century, a special official known as the €кठठкоs or defensor civitatis had existed às opposed to the magistrates. His function was to defend the interests of the poor against the magistrates who were the instruments of the wealthy classes. Gradually, however, the defensores had lost their importance and had fallen so low in the eyes of the people that, in the words of Justinian, the name defensor in his time was rather a term of opprobrium than a title ${ }^{13}$. The Emperor rehabilitated the title and position of the defensores; whereas before they could judge suits involving no more than 50 solidi ${ }^{14}$, now that limit was raised to 300 solidi ${ }^{15}$, though suits and claims of more than 300 solidi were still under the jurisdiction of the provincial governors.

As a result of the provincial reform of Justinian, the governors with rare exceptions came from the rank of spectabiles, and thus became judices spectabiles. Six new spectabiles provinces were created out of the eleven former provinces which had formed the diocese in conjunction with the Armenian territories. The judices ordinarii and their substitutes the defensores were in effect abolished thereby. According to the legislation of Justinian, the judices spectabiles had final jurisdiction over all cases up to a sum of 500 solidi. If however, the matter exceeded this figure, the case was subject to appeal in the court of the praetor or of the quastor. The Novella dealing with this matter is lost, but we know of it from frequent references in
subsequent legislation, among others from the Novella on the reorganization of the Armenian territories ${ }^{16}$.
From a knowledge of the general intentions underlying the reforms of Justinian we come to an understanding of the re-organization effected by him in Armenia. We give the entire text of Novella $X X X I$ : On the Creation of Four Governors in Armenia, both in the original and. in translation ${ }^{16 a}$.

Concerning the Establishment of Four Governors for Armenia:

The Emperor in person to Johannes the most honoured Eparch of sacred matters for the East, second among the hypatoi and patrician:

## Prologue

Everything neglected and disordered, if it be brought into fitting order and well arranged, takes on a completely different appearance from what it was before: from bad it becomes excellent, from ugly - beautiful, from disorganized and confused - orderly and clear. Having found such a defect also in the land of the Armenians, we have thought it necessary to reorganize it according to a single pattern, to give it disciplined strength through good regulations, and to establish a fitting and suitable order.

## Chapter I

By the present decree we have decided to create four Armenias: The Inner one, whose metropolis is already adorned with our blessed name and formerly was called Bazanis or Leontopolis. .To it we grant the rank of a proconsular province and appoint the most magnificent Akakios as its governor. We proclaim this office spectabilis, alloting to it all that is customary for a proconsulate. We adorn him with the garments of a proconsul and permit him all the privileges designated for this rank. We assign to this province the cities of Theodosiopolis, which belonged to it formerly, Satala, Nikopolis, Koloneia, which have been taken from the former Armenia I; also Trapezos, and Kerasos, from the former composition of Pontus Polemoniacus. Having taken some of these from the province of a clarissimus governor, and others from a spectabilis moderator, we establish a full province of seven cities with their surrounding territories.

1. Second Armenia is created from the former Armenia I with Sebasteia as capital. We assign to it Sebastopolis, which belonged to it formerly, also Komana, from the former Pontus Polemoniacus, Zela, from Helenopontus, and also Brisa. Thus, this province consists of five cities. As for the authority existing there, namely that of a praeses, we retain it and its governor is not granted a higher rank, but that which he formerly had is retained to him.
2. We furthermore establish a Third Armenia, which was formerly called Armenia II. Its capital is the ancient city of Melitenē, a distinguished city, with an excellent situation and air, standing not far from the course of the Euphrates. It seemed to us necessary to strengthen this Armenia at the present time and to re-organize it after the fashion of spectabiles provinces. We bestow upon its governor the title of Justinianic Count, and grant him a revenue of 700 solidi, to his assistant 72 solidi, and to his office 60 solidi; we assign to him all that is appropriate for such a position. The so called taxeotai will continue their former duties an particularly to supervise the collection of taxes. Only their name is altered to comitiani, everything else is maintained as it was for the taxeotai. To [this province] are assigned the cities of Arka, Arabissos, the other Komana (otherwise known as Golden Komana) and Koukousos, all of which it formerly included since it was composed of six cities.
3. We also establish a Fourth Armenia which up to now did not have a provincial organization. Because it was inhabited by various peoples it bore diverse names foreign to us: Tzophanenē and Anzetenē, Tzophenē and Asthianenē and Belabitenē, and it was under the authority of Satraps. This title is not derived from the Romans or from our predecessors, but was introduced by another power. Into this same country we bring our civilian organization, appointing a civilian governor there and giving to it the city of Martyropolis and the fortress of Kitharizōn. To it is assigned the rank of an ordinary province since we have made it consular. Thus there are four Armenias of which two are spectabiles and governed one by a proconsul and the other by a count, the proconsul being the governor of Armenia I and the count of Armenia III. As for the governors of Armenia II and IV, they are considered to be ordinarii. We have already taken careful measures so that appeals up to a sum of 500 nomismata shall not be sent to our blessed city, but rather to the nearest spectabilis authority. Therefore, we decree that appeals from Armenia II shall go to the governor of Armenia I, that is to Sebasteia and that the ones from Armenia IV go to the count of Armenia III who is in Melitenē, and this up to the sum indicated.

## Chapter II

After we had arranged all things in this way, it seemed right to us that we should appoint for Armenia III a distinguished personage who had already proved himself in office and was worthy of such a weighty and important position. Taking into consideration the fact that the most magnificent Thomas has already occupied various posts in the country of Armenia and that he has been a capable and knowing man in other circumstances, that he has served and still serves us loyally, we raise him to this position, so that he should now govern this province according to the system established by us and concern himself carefully with all that we transmit to him either in person or through our sacred commonitoria concerning the province entrusted to his care or any other. We have already prepared for him sacred commonitoria on many and varied problems and it behoves him to put them into effect in other spheres as well.

1. Concerning the clergy, as we have often stated, our will is as follows, that it remain in its previous order. Nothing new is to be introduced either in connexion with the rights of metropolitans or concerning the laying on of hands. But whoever formerly had the power to lay on hands, he shall also have it now, and the former metropolitans shall remain in their position, thus in relation to the clergy no innovations are permitted.

## Chapter III

Since the count of Armenia III was appointed by us not only with civilian but also with military powers, there can be no question but that all troops stationed in his province are necessarily also subordinated to him. He is empowered by the right inherent in a military commander to call up soldiers in his own name, to seek out and concern himself with their supplies, to pursue their criminal activities, if there be such, and not to allow the soldiers to oppress his subjects. In the case of more serious offenses, moreover, he may also judge capital offenses if the defendent be a soldier. Whatever is granted to a military commander, he is empowered to do. Just as we have granted military authority to the Count of Isauria, the Count of Phrygia Pankratia, as well as to the praetors of Lykaonia, Pisidia, and Thrace, so he shall also have not only an officium for civilian affairs, but likewise authority and jurisdiction over soldiers. When he gives an order, both soldiers and civilians shall be subject to him as the sole wielder of authority. The count shall watch vigilantly
that no crime be committed in his province and that such as occur shall be subject to suitable punishments. Under no circumstances do we deprive him of this right with regard to any inhabitant whatsoever of his province, whether it be a private individual, or a soldier, or a financial official. We desire to observe a single and eternal peace among our subjects and not to differentiate among men thus developing in them a contempt for the law.

## Epilogue

Thus let thy excellency take care to supervise these our decisions concerning the organization of the four Armenias now and in the future; especially those concerning Armenia III which has served as the motive for the promulgation of the present law. And let [thy excellency] do everything, even promulgating thine own regulations, so that each year the taxes be paid in proportion with what has been established by us.
Dat. XV K. April.CP. post consul. Belisarii V.C.
As a result of this Novella, the Armenian territories, that is to say those extensive districts inhabited by Armenians subject to the Empire taken in a broader sense than the ones considered at the time of creation of the military commands, were subjected to an administrative reform and reorganization on the same bases as the whole of the Empire. Four provinces, all bearing the name of Armenia, were created. Certain portions of Pontus Polemoniacus and Helenopontus were transferred by the new division to the Armenian provinces, whose boundaries were thereby extended northward tôward the sea as well as toward the West. Our Novella was promulgated on the 17th [sic] day before the Kalends of April, that is to say on 18 March, 536. The Novella concerning the re-union of Pontus Polemoniacus and Helenopontus, and appointing for them a common governor called the moderator Helenoponti, was promulgated a short time before, specifically on 23 July, $535{ }^{16 \mathrm{~b}}$. In addition to all other considerations, the name of Pontus Polemoniacus displeased the Emperor because of its derivation from the name of the usurper, and he was of the opinion that, " it would be far more suitable to name localities with Christian and imperial names than with those which recall wars and disturbances " ${ }^{17}$.

There were at that time eight cities in Helenopontus: Amasia, Ivora, Euchaita, Zela, Antrapa, Sinope, Amisos, and Leontopolis.

In Pontus Polemoniacus there were five: Neo-Caesarea, Komana, Trapezos, Kerasos, and Polemonion ${ }^{18}$. At the time of the creation of the Armenian provinces, it was convenient for Justinian to take the four cities of Zela, Komana, Trapezos and Kerasos from under the authority of the moderator and add them to the Armenian territories. Armenia I together with Interior Armenia and these cities formed two new provinces. All of Interior Armenia, part of Armenia I, within the limits - Satala, Nikopolis, Koloneia - and the newly acquired Pontic cities of Trapezos and Kerasos taken together formed the first province which received the name of Armenia I. The other province consisted of the remaining portion of Armenia I, with the cities of Sebasteia, Sebastopolis and Brisa, and of the Pontic cities of Zela and Komana; it was called Armenia II. Former Armenia II was re-named Armenia III without territorial alterations; it included the cities of Melitenē, Arka, Arabissos, Ariaratheia, Golden Komana and Koukousos. Finally the lands of the autonomous principalities of Sophanenē, Anzitenē, Sophenē, Asthianenē, and Belabitenē formed one province, with the name of Armenia IV and Martyropolis as its capital ${ }^{18 \mathrm{a}}$.

There can be no doubt that the formerly independent satrapal possessions were first transformed into an Imperial province in 536 by means of this Novella, since this is clearly indicated in this official document. The situation is different in the case of Interior Armenia. According to certain and rather clear indications, attempts had been made to introduce a provincial organization there even before the promulgation of our Novella. There is an interesting remark concerning a proconsul of Armenia in one of the Novellae promulgated simultaneously with the Armenian one, namely on 18 March, 536, " Formerly we had instituted there ordinary authority, now, however, having added nothing to it, we have transferred it to the rank of a proconsular province ${ }^{19}$. We have already seen that the governor of the section of Greater Armenia known as Interior Armenia (ä $\rho \chi \omega \nu{ }^{\text {' }}$ Ap $\mu \in \nu i a s$ $M \epsilon \gamma a \dot{\lambda} \eta s)$ is included together with those of Armenias I and II in the list of provinces dating from 15 April $535{ }^{20}$. It is clear that even before the promulgation of the Novella of 18 March, 536, an Imperial civilian authority vested in an archon or praeses ordinarius existed in this district. All that took place in the year 536 was merely the elevation of the official from the rank of clarissimus to that of spectabilis; the replacement of the archon by a proconsul.

A new capital "adorned with the blessed name", of the Emperor obviously had to be selected at the time of the civilian re-organization of the country. The existing capital, Theodosiopolis, was assigned to the military commander, moreover, since it was situated on the frontier of the province near enemy territory, it could not become the center of a civilian administration ${ }^{202}$. Another site, with a central position was needed for this purpose, and a village not far from Bizana proved suitable. The construction and re-naming of this city as Justinianopolis preceded the promulgation of the Novella ${ }^{21}$. Likewise Akakios was already governor of Armenia when the Novella appeared; both these facts are evident from the text of the decree. We also know that Akakios was not the first representative of the imperial power in Interior Armenia. This district had been ruled before him by Hamazasp, one of the native princes appointed archon of the Armenians by Justinian himself. Akakios, by means of malignant denunciations, finally obtained the Emperors consent to Hamazasp's death and his own assumption of the power in Armenia, but soon afterward he too was killed by the Armenians ${ }^{22}$.

Hamazasp and, at first, Akakios were simple governors [ảp $\chi o ́ v \tau \epsilon s$ ], and the Armenian territory subject to them belonged to the category of ordinary provinces. When it was raised to proconsular rank in 536, " nothing was added to it", according to the words of the Emperor ${ }^{22 a}$. This assertion is puzzling if taken in a territorial sense, and yet it can be understood in no other one. This would imply that Proconsular Armenia, within the limits seemingly first established in Novella $X X X I$, had in reality been created earlier, i.e. that the former governor had the same amount of territory as the subsequent proconsul. We know from Novella XXVIII of 23 July, 535, that the cities of Trapezos and Kerasos, which became part of Proconsular Armenia, were still under the authority of the moderator of Pontus at that time ${ }^{22 \mathrm{~b}}$. Consequently, if any ordinances, now lost, existed on this subject, they would have to date from the period between 23 July, 535 and 18 March, $536{ }^{23}$.

Hamazasp, the first governor and representative of Imperial power in Inner Armenia after the abolition of the office of count, was apparently appointed at the time of the peace of 532 ending the Persian war, and as a result of the dissentions which had then arisen among the Armenian princes. It is significant that the Armenian embassy which came to king Xusrō I, dated the beginning of Justinian's oppression
from that year ${ }^{23 a}$. The statement of the Armenians naturally tried to underscore the uselessness of the peace, in as much as it soon proved favourable to Justinian. But in addition to its propaganda intention, we must see a foundation of truth in the reference to the year of the peace as the beginning of Armenia's misfortunes, in the sense that this was the date when the Emperor evidently began to interfere in the affairs of the country by introducing into it a representative of the Imperial authority. The attempt to broaden the limits of Internal Armenia may also have followed at that time, but the complete re-organization of Armenia as a whole, together with the territorial alterations, must belong to the year 536, when the famous Novella was promulgated.

The division of Armenia into four parts seems to run counter to the unifying tendency noted in Justinian's provincial policy. In fact, even here the general principle was adhered to insofar as it was needed from the judicial point of view. Legally, the four provinces formed two large districts respectively under the jurisdiction of the proconsul and of the count. Both of them had the rank of spectabiles and all the powers appropriate to it up to an to un-appealable verdict within the set limit of 500 nomismata. Appeals from Armenia II went to the proconsul, and from Armenia IV to the count ${ }^{23 \mathrm{~b}}$.

Of the two northern provinces, the one to the east became spectabilis. We might think this the result of an increase in power in areas adjoining enemy territory. In such a case, however, we should expect the same imperial action in the south, yet the count appointed by Justinian was placed in Armenia III rather than in Armenia IV. Nor did Justinian act from a consideration of the natural advantages of the capital of Melitene, its scenic position, or the air which so pleased the Emperor. In both cases Justinian was guided not by serious policy but by a simple calculation, the intention to reward the imperial favourites, Akakios and Thomas. At the time of promulgation of the Novella, Thomas as well as Akakios held office in Armenia. The Emperor showed particular care for these provinces, not from a realization of their superiority, but merely for the sake of their governors of the moment.

The personality of Akakios is fairly well known from Procopius. An Armenian by birth, he was nevertheless far removed from the interests of his native land. In his rôle as governor of Armenia, he did not succeed in reconciling his loyalty to the throne with the
simple qualities of an honourable man. He reached the governorship itself by cunning and through the shedding of his kinsman's blood; a man cruel by nature, he breathed an incomprehensible hatred toward his compatriotes ${ }^{24}$. In the brief period of his rule he succeeded in accomplishing so much evil that the Armenians could bear his oppressions no further, and he met his death at their hands.

As for Thomas, the laudatory references of Justinian to him, as a valuable and honest official, prove rather that he was not far from Akakios in qualities and outlook, and that his activity must be thought negative from the point of view of the country and its inhabitants. As a reward for their merits the Emperor invested both faithful servants with the rank of spectabilis. To Count Thomas he assigned a salary of 700 solidi, a considerable increase over the customary 300 solidi received by the praetors of provinces equal to him in rank and position - as for example in Pisidia, Lykaonia and Thrace, or by the Count of Isauria ${ }^{25}$. His assistant, however, received a salary corresponding to the norm for that office, namely 72 solidi. His officium or chancery received a smaller salary than was usual, 60 solidi as against 2 litres of gold ${ }^{26}$. The numerical composition of the officium varied with the type of functions and with the period; Justinian was in general inclined to limit it. Thus he reduced the officia of governors such as praetors, and counts entrusted with civilian and military authority, to one hundred men ${ }^{27}$.

The proconsul Akakios was probably similarly honoured. Among his signs of distinction are mentioned the stola and other privileges; by this we must understand the right to the sella currulis, the fasces and securis, the primordial attributes of proconsular authority. They were, for example, at the disposal of the proconsul of Cappadocia and of the praetor of Pisidia ${ }^{28}$.

We have seen that one of the dukes had had his seat at Melitené ${ }^{28}$ a. The position of this duke automatically disappeared with the appointment of a count to whom the duties of a military commander had also been delegated. The importance and the responsible character of the office of count were due in part to the complexity of his functions. Thomas proved to be the experienced administrator capable of fulfilling the rigorous demands of this office. He too was an Armenian, and undoubtedly the Thomas who had served in Lazika where "... this Thomas had built many strongholds ... at the direction of the emperor, and he commanded the soldiers there, seeming to the emperor
an intelligent person " ${ }^{28 \mathrm{~b}}$. He had a son John, surnamed Gouzes, who was still young at the siege of Petra in 550, but was outstandingly gifted for war, and distinguished himself in the capture of the city ${ }^{29}$. As a native, Thomas was well acquainted with the district in which he was being appointed and with all its pecularities, all the more since he had already served in it. Such a man seemed particularly suited to put the Imperial intentions into practice and to carry out the transformation of the country. He was strictly admonished to conform in all his actions to the supreme commands, the sacra commonitoria, and to supervise their application not only in the province entrusted to him as count, but also outside it, primarily in the neighbouring Armenia IV.

We do not know the content of these commonitoria. We can guess that they consisted in advice on open or secret means for the successful application of the Imperial system in provinces distinguished by characteristic native institutions. Armenia Interior and the Satrapies, i.e. Armenias I and IV were in the stage of socio-political development known in the native terminology as the naxarar system. We will subsequently discuss this system in detail; let it suffice here to say that the basis of the naxarar system was merely the local variation of the world-wide phenomenon known in the West under the name of feudalism.

Only a relatively small fragment of the vast territory in which naxarar customs prevailed lay in the Empire. At the time of the division of the inheritance of the Arsacids, one fourth of it went to the Emperors and three-fourths to Persia ${ }^{299}$. Interior Armenia and the Satrapies formed the western border of naxarar Armenia. Naxararism as a social pattern determined the cultural and social climate shared by Armenia and Iran. In it were hidden the basic ties linking Armenian and Persian life. In spite of their political division, the Imperial and Persian parts of Armenia showed a certain unity from the point of view of their naxarar structure. The nazarar ruling princes of Imperial Armenia were bound by indissoluble ties to their kinsmen in Persarmenia, and together with them they showed a certain inclination toward Persia. The Empire had to take this unwelcome phenomenon into consideration. The Emperor Justinian naturally did not overlook this fact in his zeal for reform, and he took measures to destroy or at least to dislocate the bases of feudal usages in Armenia; several of the famous commonitoria were probably devoted
to this problem. Two documents unquestionably connected with the means to be used against this feudal system have come down to us. Both of them affect the laws of inheritance then in force in Armenia ${ }^{29 \mathrm{~b}}$. At first glance they seem to have nothing in common with the problem of feudalism; in reality they are a key to the substructure of Justinian's reforms. One of these is the decree "Concerning the Order of Inheritance among the Armenians", the other, the Novella ordering " That the Armenians Should Follow Roman Laws in All Ways ". Let us study the text of these documents.

Concerning the Order of Inheritance among the Armenians ${ }^{29 \mathrm{c}}$

## Introduction

We desire to free the Armenians also from former injustice, to transfer them altogether to our laws, and to give them fitting equality.

## Chapter I

Not long ago we learned of a barbarous and harsh law existing among them, which befits neither Romans nor the spirit of justice of our realm, namely that men are allowed to succeed their fathers but under no circumstances women. As a result of this we ordain by the promulgation of this sacred law in the name of thy magnificence, that succession must be equal, and that all that is laid down in the Roman laws concerning men and women shall have force in Armenia, since it is for this reason that our laws have been forwarded there, that the manner of life should conform to them.

1. Since to raise once again a matter already past is fraught with difficulties, we command that the force of this law be recognized from the time of our blessed reign, and that action in the cases of persons who have died from that moment shall be according to the present law except in cases where matters have already been settled or decided in some way. If something of this kind has already been done, we command that it be left in force and not altered in any way.
2. We desire that women should also receive a share in the family estates beginning with the date indicated. If by chance there should be found persons who list their daughters as heiresses, even though they are not eligible under their custom of intestate ( $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota a \theta \in \dot{\varepsilon} \tau o s$ ) inheritance, then they and the children born from them shall participate in the inheritance of the family estates.

## Epilogue

Thus let thy exellency preserve and put into effect our will expressed in this blessed law. All of our laws must have force and sovereignty. The present law as we have indicated enters into effect from the beginning of our reign, for all that is past and for future times it is necessary to be guided rigorously by it and to observe it in all ways.
Dat. XVII K. Aug. Belisario v.c. Cons.
That the Armenians Should Follow Roman Laws in All Ways ${ }^{\text {add }}$
From the Emperor in person to the most magnificent Akakios Proconsul of Armenia.

## Prologue

Desiring that the land of Armenia should prosper altogether and should differ in no way from our realm, we have established Roman institutions. Having abolished its former names, we have taught it to make use of Roman systems and have laid down that there should be no laws among them except those honoured among the Romans. We have also found it necessary to correct the glaring defects of their lives by this law, so that inheritance from parents, brothers, and other relatives should no longer belong to men alone and never to women, according to a barbaric custom, and likewise so that women should no longer be married without dowries and bought by their bridegrooms. These signs of extreme barbarousness are common among them to this day. Indeed, such outlandish customs exist not only among them. There are other peoples who act equally irreverently toward nature and destroy the female sex as though it were not created by God and did not serve the survival of the race, but rather as though it were unimportant and contemptible, in a position without honour.

## Chapter I

In view of this we command that through this sacred law the same usages should be in effect among the Armenians as are customary among us without any difference whatsoever between the male and female sexes. As inheritances take place here, exactly as it has been laid down in our legislation and in the precise form in which one inherits from relatives, namely from father, mother, or uncle or grandmother, and so on in the ascending and equally in the descending line, that is to say to the son or to the daughter; so shall it take place among the Armenians, and in no way shall the legal norms of

Armenia diverge from those of the Romans. Since the Armenians are part of our Empire, are subject to us equally with other peoples and taste our privileges, their women must not be excluded from the equality existing among us. The compulsion of our laws must bind all equally, both those which were gathered by us from ancient decrees and included in our Institutes and Digest, and also other laws promulgated by former Emperors and by us.

## Chapter II

Hence we command that all of this shall go into effect for the future from the present XIV indiction in which this law was composed. To search in more ancient affairs, however, and to go back into the past means to introduce confusion rather than order. From the beginning of the present XIV indiction, as we have just said, for all future times, what legally pertains to inheritance must henceforth be carried out; inheritance must be equal in all ways, alike with regard to the women as also to the men. As for what took place before, we permit to leave everything in its former state whether the matter pertain to family possessions or to other things. Persons of the female sex must in no way be considered as sharers in family estates already devided or in inheritances which took place up to the XIIİ indiction inclusively. From the term given, however, that is to say from the XIV indiction, that which we have decreed shall be in effect.

## Epilogue

Let thy excellency and those who occuppy this position after thee endeavor to care for our will as expressed in this sacred law for all times.
Dat. XV K. Apr. Constantinop. post Belisarii v.c. consul.
Both documents have a single theme. One of them, the one addressed to Akakios, is dated 18 March, 536, and was, consequently promulgated at the same time as Novella [XXXI], concerning the reorganization of Armenia. The date of promulgation of the other document is not exactly known, but in one manuscript the date 23 July, 535 is given, and it can be taken as correct ${ }^{29 \mathrm{e}}$. In any case, its appearence must be put before 18 March, 536, when Novella [XXI], on inheritance, was promulgated. According to the Edict, the new regulations concerning inheritance were to go into effect as of the accession of Justinian, but the retroactive application of the new law
apparently caused complications. New dispositions were needed to eliminate these difficulties, and were introduced with the promulgation of Novella [XXI], on the order of inheritance. In this document the terminus a quo for the application of the law was set at the XIV indiction that is to say, at September 535. Hence, the first document unquestionably antedated the second ${ }^{30}$.

The personage to whom the first $E d i c t$ was addressed is not known since the title of the document is lost. From the formula, " $\dot{\eta} \sigma \grave{\eta}$ $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \circ \chi \eta^{\prime}$ ", found in the concluding word of this Edict, we must presume that it was addressed to John, the Praetorian Prefect of the East, who was also the official to whom Novella XXXI was addressed.
 or "excellency", is the usual title of this Prefect, as is evident from the numerous Novellae promulgated in his name. The new law in the Edict is promulgated " $\pi \rho o{ }_{s} \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu \sigma \eta ̀ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda o \pi \rho \in \pi \epsilon i a \nu$ ", a title given to Akakios in Novella [XXI] ${ }^{30 \mathrm{a}}$. Might Thomas, who was an official of equal rank with Akakios be intended here? This question is of minor importance, since there can be no doubt that in whosoever's name the laws on Armenia were promulgated, copies of them would be sent to Akakios, Thomas, and their superior the Prefect John.

In both documents the Emperor carries through the principle of the equality of women in matters of inheritance. He notes the existence among the Armenians of the custom whereby women received nothing through inheritance, no right of inheritance being recognized to them. This may also explain in part the statement that women marry without dowry and that on the contrary the bridegroom pays for or buys his bride. There is no reason for doubting the truth of this statement in the official document. It seems only that the nature of the gifts made by the bridegroom to his intended bride has been somewhat exaggerated.

In the Graeco-Roman world the dowry played an important part in the institution of marriage; its amount was exactly specified in the contract which was drawn up at the time of the betrothal. It was called $\phi \epsilon \in \nu \eta$ or $\pi \rho o t{ }^{\prime} \xi$ among the Greeks and dos among the Romans. It was also customary for the bridegroom to bring in compensation certain gifts to the bride; these were called $\pi \rho \circ \gamma a \mu ı a i a ~ \delta \omega \rho \in \alpha$, -ante nuptias donatio. This pre-marital gift of the bridegroom seems to have had a less mandatory character than the dowry of the bride.

In the period 531-533 of Justinian's reign, the donatio ante nuptias was renamed donatio propter nuptias, thus setting the gifts of the bridegroom on the same level as the dowry, or dos of the bride, of which the Emperor says propter nuptias fit. The donatio, according to the clarification of Justinian, was not merely a gift but the equivalent or answer to the dower offer of the bride; it was an antipherna, a reciprocation. Consequently the donatio became mandatory, on a par with the dos. The dowry was not, however, considered an indispensable preliminary of marriage. According to Justinian, " sine dote autem nuptias possunt celebrari", in other words, weddings without a dowry were permissible ${ }^{31}$.

In 538, two years after the promulgation of the Armenian Novella, Justinian decreed the indispensability of a marriage contract for persons of a certain rank. The Novella states,

In the cases of bearers of higher titles up to senators and illustres, marriage must be accompanied by a dowry and a prenuptial gift and by all that befits such illustrious names ${ }^{32}$.

They are granted the right to conclude marriages without dowries, "according to mere inclination", but in such a case the couple is
 a certificate indicating that such and such persons had entered into wedlock at such and such a time ${ }^{"}{ }^{33}$. This requirement is incidentally interesting in that it also indicates the origin of church weddings.

A few years later, in 542, a new Novella of Justinian rescinded the decree just mentioned that newlyweds should present themselves to a church elder, or defensor. The author of this Novella says,

Not long ago we published a law that marriages should be concluded either by means of a contract or by means of an oath in the presence of the defensor of a church for the sake of the solidity of the marriage. At the present time, however, we prefer to abide by the statutes which existed formerly. Consequently we ordain that persons adorned with higher titles up to that of illustris should enter into wedlock in no manner other than by means of marriage contracts.

The evasion of the legislator on the following point is noteworthy,
The exact fulfilment of this law is not required from barbarians subject to the Empire, even if they bear the titles noted, but they are granted the possibility, should they so desire, of entering into wedlock on the basis of inclination alone ${ }^{34}$.

As for persons not of high rank, they were free to enter into whatsoever marriage they desired, either by contract with a dowry, or, without it, through the mutual agreement of the spouses ${ }^{35}$. In view of the non-obligatory character of the property requirements for the bridal couple, there was no basis for singling out the barbarousness of Armenian customs, because they did not agree with Imperial laws. How did these matters stand in Armenia, and what were the peculiarities in the institution of marriage displeasing to Justinian?

The classical donatio was nothing more than a survival from a distant past, a memory of the custom according to which the bridegroom obtained his bride through gifts ( $\epsilon \delta \nu a$ ) or in other words, bought her. This form of marriage, characteristic of peoples at a certain period of their development, was not foreign to the Greeks either, according to the authoritative testimony of Aristotle ${ }^{36}$; it also existed in antiquity among the Armenians. According to the national Epic, the Armenian king Artašēs, having vanquished the Alans in war wished to take the daughter of their king princess Sat'enik as his bride. The king of the Alans answered as follows to the proposal of Artašess,

> ... and where will the brave Artašes find thousand upon thousand and myriad upon myriad to pay for the noble maiden princess of the Alans? ... [then]. The valiant king Artašes climbed on his fair black steed, pulled out a long red leather strap with golden rings; he flew like an eagle across the river, he threw the red leather golden ringed strap on the princess of the Alans, and painfully binding the tender waist of the princess, - he brought her swiftly to his camp ${ }^{37}$.

The Armenian historian, Movsess Xorenac̣i, who quotes the words of this popular tale, believes that they must be taken allegorically, and proposes his own interpretation. According to him, the "red leather strap with golden rings ", indicates that,
because red leather was highly prized among the Alans, he [the Armenian king] presented them with a great deal of leather and with much gold as a bridal gift and took as wife the princess Sat'enik ${ }^{37 \mathrm{a}}$.

The interpretation of Xorenac̣i is not necessarily correct, but it is very interesting. Imbued with a rationalistic outlook, the Armenian historian sought a profound meaning everywhere, and often found allegory where none existed. In this case, the native bards, the

Vipasan, merely sang of the way in which the Armenian king riding on his black horse had kidnapped the daughter of the king of the Alans with the help of his red strap. Their lively description shows the custom of abduction, one of the earliest means of obtaining a bride. The royal lariat is described as being woven of red strips, that is to say of leather of high quality, and adorned with a ring, as befits a king. The explanation of Xorenac̣i is important, however, because it reflects a form of marriage through purchase gifts which was contemporary and familiar to him. Abduction was evidently no longer known to him, and the presence of the lariat was puzzling. He solved the problem by changing the lariat into red leather, a valuable object of value required for a bridal gift. Xorenac̣i uses the single word varjank $=$ " payment" to describe everything that Artašes had given for the princess, i.e. the red leather and the gold. Obviously this was the payment which was taken by the Romans as the purchase of the bride, and condemned in the Novella of Justinian. In this sense the words of the Novella are partially justified.

The same cannot be said for its evidence on the problem of dowries. In view of the existence of the word, awžit, meaning "the dowry of a bride ", in Ancient Armenian, we cannot accept with impunity Justinian's assertion that among the Armenians women married without dowries. This word belongs to the non-IndoEuropean stratum of the Armenian language, and its antiquity is, therefore, unquestionable ${ }^{37 \mathrm{~b}}$. In the Syrian Lawcode, where property relations of spouses are treated in detail, we incidentally find a note to the effect that
... that which the husband brings to the wife is called in Greek, dastīr in Persian, zabhd $\vec{a}$ or $m a h r a \bar{a}$ in Syrian ${ }^{38}$.

The Syrian word zabhdā given here corresponds etymologically to the Armenian awžit. The three letter root, $z-b-d$ corresponds to the Armenian $w-z-t$. with the customary transfer and alteration ${ }^{39}$. This word in Armenian and in Syrian designates a gift in general, and more particularly a dowry. Although the Syrian Lawcode equates it with $\delta \omega \rho \in$ á, the gift which the bridegroom gives to his bride, in common Syrian as well as Armenian usage it designated primarily the dowry of a bride ${ }^{40}$.

The Persian synonym dastīr, more exactly dastiri (the contracted form of dastiari) has the actual sense of "help" or "support" ${ }^{41}$;
it meant the gift of the bridegroom to the bride. We know from the same Code that the bridal dowry was also customary among the Persians. In contrast to the laws of the Roman Empire where the bridegroom had to pay back to his bride the same amount as she brought him in dowry ( $\phi \in \rho v \gamma^{\prime}$ ) in the East, that is to say in the Sasanian realm, the custom was that,
... if the wife brings 100 denarii, then the husband brings the half. Sometimes the husband brings more than the wife, sometimes nothing, and occasionality the wife brings nothing ${ }^{42}$.

We must presume that these same customs existed also in Armenia, as part of the Iranian cultural sphere.

It is altogether uncertain whether the Roman notions of $\pi \rho o t \xi$ and $\delta \omega \rho \kappa \alpha$ in their contractual sense ever entered into Armenian life, and if so to what extent. The terms themselves are found in a few Armenian
 best of our knowledge, they occur for the first time in the Armenian translation of the Syrian-Roman Lawcode ${ }^{43}$. The Armenian translation is far from being as old as the Syrian original. The transcriptions and the linguistic evidence in general indicate a date close to the Cilician period. Petermann believed that the translator was $\mathrm{M}_{\chi} \mathrm{it}^{\text {tar }}$ Goš 44 , but the identity of the translator is now established with certainty on the basis of his own colophon published by the Mxit'arists. The Syrian document was translated into Armenian by the famous Cilician bishop Nersess Lambronac̣i in the days of the kat'olikos Gregory VI in the year 645 of the Armenian Era = A.D. 1197, according to the testimony of a learned Syrian priest named Theodosius ${ }^{45}$. On the other hand, Mxit'ar Goš, by his own testimony, composed his work in 1184. The two codices, therefore, saw the light at almost the same time ; but since the work of $\mathrm{M}_{\chi}{ }^{i t}{ }^{\text {far }}$ was still some thirteen years older than the translation of the Syrian Code, there can be no question of MXit'ar's dependence upon it ${ }^{46}$. The passages common to both, unless they are derived from imperial sources, must be attributed to additions to the original work of $\mathrm{M}_{\chi} \mathrm{it}^{\prime}$ ar Goš made by persons acquainted with the translation of the Syrian Code.

The present edition of the work of $M \chi^{i t}{ }^{\text {'a }}$ ar Goš, for which we are indebted to Father Bastamean, a learned member of the Community of Eymiacin, is not altogether satisfactory, in spite of its value ${ }^{46 \text { a }}$. The editor accepts on faith all that is attributed to Gos in the manuscripts
without considering the variants noted by himself. A critical study, however, easily reveals later accretions, i.e. elements which have crept into $\mathrm{M}_{\chi}$ it'ar's Code after his time. We believe that the articles on proyg and towayr show the influence of the Cilician translation of the Syrian Code and should consequently be classified among the additions to the Code of M $\mathrm{M}_{\text {it'ar Goš. According to the Syrian Code, }}$ the Emperor Leo decreed,
... that which the wife brings, let them write it down as proyg ( $\pi \rho \circ \stackrel{\star}{\xi})$ ); likewise, let them also record towayr ( $\delta \omega \rho \in \epsilon^{\prime}$ ), that is to say, varjank or mahrāab.

In the Code of Mxit'ar Goš, however, one of the articles begins as follows:

Among the Muslim the conclusion of a marriage takes place differently; first they set the price of the bride, this is called mahr $\bar{a}$ - the same is called towayr among the Romans, then they determine the share of the bride in the property of her father, this is called proyg ${ }^{47}$.

It is impossible to miss here the influence of the Armenian translation of the Syrian Code, on the terminology; the actual concepts were probably foreign to the Armenian society reflected in pre-Cilician literature. It is interesting that although the author of this interpolated article, underscores the Roman origin of $\pi \rho o \not ̈ \xi$ and $\delta \omega \rho \epsilon \alpha$, he then immediately becomes evasive,
... the matter does not lie thus among us: the husband does not pay the price to be paid for a bride, but gives a few things
 whereas the bride enters into the house of her husband with a dowry ${ }^{48}$.

Even in our times, in the patriarchal strata of Armenia society, as yet untouched by new ideas, a young girl begins to hide from her bridegroom and his close relatives after her betrothal. It is not customary for her to appear before them, to be present among them with an uncovered face, or to speak with them. In all case, this is considered in poor taste and unadvisable for a bride, and this also holds true in her relations with the relatives of the bridegroom during the first years of marriage. The right to each of these steps is obtained through
the presentation of gifts, which bear appropriate names, to the bride ${ }^{49}$. These ceremonies are performed in different ways from place to place. In the Code of Gos the whole collection of gifts is apparently called eresactes. The purpose of the presents is to accustom a stranger to a new milieu; it is no more than a survival in symbolic form of the old bridal gift, the varjank', which has taken on the character of presents.

The Armenian awzit and varjank' are then basically equivalent to the Graeco-Roman $\pi \rho o \neq \hat{\xi}$ and $\delta \omega \rho \epsilon \alpha$, or dos and donatio. Like them, they were not mandatory but had been re-inforced and consecrated through by the sole force of custom. Under these circumstances, how are we to understand the denunciations in Justinian's Novella?

We believe that the main reason for the promulgation of this Novella was the existence of family estates, the problem of the division of the lands called " $\gamma \epsilon \nu \in a \rho \chi \iota \kappa \grave{\alpha} \chi \omega \rho^{\prime}$ ' " $^{\prime \prime}$ in the Novellae. This was the category of lands in which women could not inherit a share under the existing system. According to the statement of the Emperor, under the system prevailing in Armenia, daughters could not inherit
 systems of inheritance both with and without wills. In the latter case, that is to say when a man dies without having made a will, the inheritance takes place according to the law of successio ab intestato. This system is unquestionably older than the system of inheritance through wills. In early periods of history, law or custom kept to an agnatic basis, that is to say it recognized the right of inheritance only in the male line of descendants. This basis was also known in the classical world, and Roman law to the time of Justinian had not quite abandoned it ${ }^{50}$. The existing laws on the rights of inheritance presented such a confusion of different systems, that Justinian was forced to review this entire question and to regulate severly the rules of inheritance. Several Novellae were promulgated with this aim, among them one Concerning the Abolition of Agnatic Rights and the Establishment of Inheritances ab Intestato ${ }^{51}$. This law appeared in 543 , that is to say after the Armenian Novella. If then agnatic rights still held a pre-eminent position in the imperial legislation, there seems to be no basis for his amazement or for the accusations of barbaric survivals, since the same system, albeit in its pure form, still existed among the Armenians.

The emperor was interested in the " $\gamma \in \nu \in a \rho \chi \iota \kappa \grave{\alpha} \chi \omega{ }^{\prime} i^{\prime}$ ", and these lands are to be understood as the Armenian naxarar estates.

Naxarar law was composed of tribal and feudal elements. In the feudal world, as is well known, land passed along the agnatic line from father to son or to brother, with the exclusion of women from the line of succession; the same was true of the Salic law ${ }^{52}$. This system was derived from the very nature of feudalism: since feudal land tenure was conditional upon military service, women, because of their incapacity to fulfill this obligation, naturally had to be excluded from the right to hold land. Similarly in a tribal society, the non-participation of women in land inheritance was explained by their inability to fulfill the tribal obligation of the blood feud, which corresponded to the military service of the feudal period. The Armenian naxarar system, feudal in content and tribal in form, took toward women or the cognate line the position dictated by its character : the right to land was not extended to them. According to the evidence of the Novella the custom of making wills did not exist in Armenian private law ${ }^{53}$, and this fact is most characteristic of the naxarar system. Since conditional land holding in Armenia followed a tribal pattern, the need for making wills obviously did not exist. A will is an act of free disposition permitted in cases of personal ownership; hence, it is of necessity foreign to a milieu with a tradition of clan property. An individual heading a clan as its leading representative, was merely the administrator of the common clan property and was not empowered to transmit his power to some other person in accordance with his own decision. According to tribal custom, there can be only successors but no heirs, moreover, the order of succession is determined, not by the individual will of any particular successor, but according to rights of birth: blood kinship and seniority. Thus, for instance, among the Germans " ... each man's children are his heirs and there is no will " ${ }^{54}$. Consequently, the absence of wills must be considered a characteristic feature of naxarar private law in Armenia.

The historians report that the Armenian patriarch, Sahak I, for lack of a son, left all his possessions to his only daughter, the Mamikonean princess, and to her descendants forevermore ${ }^{55}$. As we shall see, feudal regulations also functioned in the Church, consequently, evidence taken from ecclesiastical life is entirely appropriate as illustration for naxarar customs. Łazar P'arpeẹi explains this will in favour of a daughter by the fact that " Sahak had no son ", This would seem to indicate that the rights of a daughter manifested themselves only where there was no male heir. Here too, we can observe a simil-
arity to western feudalism. Where women gradually acquired the right of inheritance to a fief, and where their rights were first recognized precisely in cases where the male line had come to an end ${ }^{56}$.

Thus the Armenian custom of inheritance $a b$ intestato is an unquestionable fact. When, however, we ask why the Imperial authority manifested antagonism toward it, the only explanation possible is the desire of the Emperor to weaken the naxarar system. Like any native system, historically developped, and forming a bulwark against foreign aggressors, the naxarar system stood in the way of the centralizing aims of the great imperialist. The demands of Justinian, like any other measure directed against the unity of the naxarar lands, would necessarily undercut the power of the princes which was based on their lands. In spite of his repeated affirmations, it is evident that a concern for the welfare of the country was the last motive which urged the Emperor toward reform. The grandiloquent prologues of the Novella on Armenia hardly fulfill their purported aims. What matters is not the fact that the reformer looks down on local culture; a contemptuous attitude toward the Orient and its culture was as characteristic of the ancient West as of the present one. We might think that the Armenian nation had, indeed, stagnated in some sort of disorderly and chaotic conditions and that Justinian had decided to lead it out of this confusion for the sake of the development and welfare of the Armenians. The true purpose of the bombastic style of the Novellae is to obscure the truth.

The Novellae of Justinian, as literary works, have a certain scholastic flavour both in form and content. They are all composed according to a single stereotype and invariable consist of three parts, a prologue, a development, and an epilogue. Furthermore, some maxim or aphorism is presented in the prologue as the thesis of which the provisions listed in the development are intended to be the realization. Such theses are far from expressing the true motives of the reform; they reflect traditional literary tastes rather than legislative truth. For instance, the prologue of Novella XXVI claims that " the Romans would never have created a world Empire if their provincial governors had not been surrounded with honours". Novella $X X V$ begins with the statement that "the population of Lycaonia, because of its illustrious descent from King Lycaeonius, is related to the Roman people and is, therefore, entitled to a more worthy ruler ". The
promulgation of Novella $X X V I$ was presumably caused by the fact that " the name Thracian is related to the concept of something powerful and warlike". Pontus Polemoniacus and Helenopontus had to be unified by means of Novella XXVIII because, " power does not lie in a multitude of names but in the true state of affairs ". And Paphlagonia deserved to be reformed as "an ancient people not without honour ". Finally the transformation of Cappadocia was also presumably based on the "famous reputation ard name of a people who once ruled all of Pontus ${ }^{56 a}$, etc.

All of these considerations were in reality very far from the actual reason for the reforms. We have already pointed out the general bases of Justinian's reforming activity; if he also took the situation of a particular province into consideration, then it was primarily in the interest of the treasury. The provincial Novellae owed their appearance not to romantic reminiscences of a pleasing past, but to alarming disaffection as a result of which, as the Novellae themselves admit, vast regions with settled populations frequently refused to pay taxes, and restless gangs roved through the area, murdering and plundering ${ }^{57}$.

The prologues of the Armenian Novellae are worth no more than the introductory maxims of Novellae in general. Armenian practices might of course seem chaotic in the eyes of Justinian, but his concern with re-organization was not to further the interests of the country, it was above all to regularize and secure the state revenzes. From this point of view, the candid epilogue of Novella $X X X I$. which the Emperor charged the prefect to watch closely over thë acrura payment of the taxes, contains far more truth, and it may be saic to tear from the text of the Novella its specious veiling of good will.

Justinian achieved his goal, at least at the beginning. According to the statement of a contemporary, Akakios, the governor of Armenia $I$. who had won the Emperor's praise, " plundered [the people] ... wi'", at excuse and ordained that they should pay an unheard-of tax oi sour centenaria" ${ }^{58}$.

## VIII

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUSTINIAN'S REFORM IN ARMENIA


#### Abstract

The reaction of the Armenians to the reform of Justinian - The immediate results of the reforms - The disintegration of the naxarar system - The migration of Armenians in to the Empire and the revival of the lands of Lesser Armenia: the preparation of the ethnic substratum for the theme of Armeniakon and the kingdom of Cilicia The significance of the Armenian migration from the Imperial point of view - The effect of the migration on the fate of Armenia - The influence of Imperial culture on Armenia and the philhellenic school - The policy of Justinian from the point of view of the interests of the Eastern Empire.
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When we try to determine and to evaluate the significance of the reforming activity of Justinian, we should first take the place of the contemporaries and clarify the reaction of the country at that time, although thifs point of view is often subjective, conditioned in a large measure by the occurences of the moment, and not always justified by subsequent events. Frequently a phenomenon or an action, positive by nature, proves to be negative after an objective weighing of the further course of history, when, thanks to the influence of chance factors from without, completely unexpected consequences develop and no longer fit into the general pattern of earlier events.
The revolt against the Imperial power in Armenia which followed immediately after the reform of Justinian, shows that the Armenians reacted negatively to the system imposed on them by the Empire. The increase in taxation associated with the changes created great discontent in the population and led to bloody clashes. All these were soon settled, however, and the ring leaders of the rebellion, having made their peace with the Emperor, moved to the capital.

What were the changes subsequently made in the re-organization of Justinian; did the Armenians obtain a lightening of their lot, or did the measures once passed continue to operate unaltered? This
we do not know. The problem did not lie, of course, in oppressive regulations which might be set aside or lightened; the crux of the matter lay in the naxarar system, to which the Imperial provisions proved destructive. We know that the monuments of Ancient Armenian literature which have reached us say absolutely nothing about naxarars in Western or Imperial Armenia. Even the particular historian of the naxarar clans, Movsēs Xorenac̣i, has little to say about the princely houses of this part of Armenia. In view of the unusual interest of this historian in all that has to do with the naxarar families, and their origins, which form the main focus of his work, such a silence seems incomprehensible. It can be explained only by the fact that at the time when he wrote his History of Armenia the naxarar houses of Imperial Armenia had lost their actual significance, and at best, had been transformed into an aristocracy of office whose leading representatives were probably absorbed for the most part into the Imperial bureaucracy.

Strictly speaking, the question of the duration of a particular provision is not particularly important for the evaluation of Justinian's re-organization of Armenia. Single measures, which might be maintained or superseded, are not important. What mattered here was the general principle of transformation which could not subsequently be altered. There are ideas which are like seeds fallen on fertile soil in their capacity for development; once brought to life, they need no further outside help but live and grow from their own inner strength. The avowed aims of the Imperial power were based on the breaking up and destruction of those conditions which furthered. the isolation of Armenian society, its national exclusiveness, and on the inclusion of the country into the sphere of common Imperial interests. If this were achieved, it was believed that the defense of the eastern provinces against the threats of the Persian monarchy would be ensured.

The movement of Armenians toward the center of the Empire was furthered by this policy. Not only single individuals but entire groups were often driven beyond the borders of their native land by general political misfortunes as well as frequent quarrels over ecclesiastical, political, or other differences within the country. All such groups found a solution to their problems in migration to the West, and sought their fortune in the general life of the Empire. Nor did the Empire, draw to itself only outcasts and renegades. The Byzantine
capital, as the focus of international life and culture, attracted other forces as well, and a new sphere of activity enticed those who under other circumstances might have stayed at home in their native land

The increasing attraction of Armenia toward Byzantium starting from the period of Justinian, had both positive and negative results. One of the favourable results was the national renaissance in the lands of Lesser Armenia. Lesser Armenia, which had separated from Greater Armenia at an early stage, was progressing along a path of development that threatened the total destruction of its national life. To be sure, the Armenian element was still strong there in the fifth century ${ }^{2}$. It is sufficient to remember in this connexion the significant answer of the bishops of Armenia II to the encyclical of the Emperor Leo I in 452 . These ecclesiastical dignitaries assure the Emperor of their attachment to Orthodoxy but complain that they are unable to express their thoughts in suitable form because they
> ... live on the edge of the world far from the imperial city and have tongues unsuited to debates.

The prelates then go on to complain,

> ... We live among Armenian foreigners. Although they are orthodox they do not use the Roman tongue correctly. We are separated from them (the Armenians) by some little distance and most of all by the course of the Euphrates, and on account of continuous intermingling with foreigners we do not know the language well enough for long discourses ${ }^{1}$.

These same words might be repeated, and with greater cause by the bishops of Armenia I.' The Trans-Euphratine Armenians were hardly to blame for the fact that the clergy of even Armenia I and II spoke little Latin. The reference is primarily to the influence of those Armenians among whom the bishops themselves were living, i.e. the population of Armenias I and II. They are the ones of whom the bishops complain. In both these provinces the core of the population consisted of Armenians who still spoke their native language in the mid-fifth century.

Confessional problems, which reached such a pitch with the passage of time that they could stifle national interests, presented a serious danger for the concept and feeling of nationality. Confessional differences dictated the choice and use of a language, not only for
the liturgy, but also for the literature, which was permeated with religious spirit. Consequently, the Armenians who adhered to the Imperial Church proved incapable of creating a national written language within the confines of Lesser Armenia. In the absence of a national literature and national education, the fate of a language and eo ipso of a nationality becomes unsure and insecure. Armenian culture would undoubtedly have died out in Lesser Armenia which was caught in the whirlpool of the general life and interests of the Empire, had not a flood of new strength from the neighbouring parts of Armenia refreshed it with a new spirit, and re-awakened its national consciousness.

The preservation of the name Armenia for the lands of Lesser Armenia and its extention to the neighbouring territories at the time of Justinian's provincial reforms, proves that the process of rebirth had begun even earlier. It might have seemed more natural to extend the name of Cappadocia, especially since some of the regions incorporated into the Armenian territory at this time had formerly belonged to Cappadocia, but, in fact, we see Justinian extending the territory of Lesser Armenia at the expense of the neighbouring lands, and considering them to be as Armenian as the Imperial portion of Greater Armenia - a fact which can be explained only by a growing pressure of Armenian population westward, toward the center of the Empire. The clain found in Movsēs Xorenac̣i, that the Armenian possessions had been extended through conquests to the land of Pontus and to Mazaka-Caesarea, and that Armenian was spoken throughout this territory, seems to reflect the situation in the period of Justinian rather than that of the distant days of Aram, which the history is purportedly describing. This is clear from the fact that Xorenac̣i recalls the division of the Armenian territory into Armenia I, II, III, and IV, in connexion with this conquest, though he stubbornly continues to associate it with the legendary period of Aram, refusing to believe the rumours current in Imperial Armenia as to the real origin of these divisions ${ }^{1 \mathrm{a}}$.

In their continuous advance, the Armenians now poured still further in two directions beyond their frontiers into the adjoining lands: the movement first turned westward from Greater Armenia, with a northward deflection to the sea. The Armenian element grew so strong here in a brief period of time, that in the next period, i.e. at the beginning of the eight century, one of the large districts of the
new provincial organization was called Armenian. We are referring here to the Theme of Armeniakon, the district stretching from Caesarea of Cappadocia to the Black Sea, including all the territories from Sinope to the Phasis and the Euphrates, but excluding Armenia III, which had by that time been conquered by the Arabs. All of this vast region, equal in size to the territories of the former provinces of Cappa-
 $\kappa \omega \nu$. "from the name of the Armenians living there and in the neighbourhood", according to the authoritative testimony of the Emperor himself ${ }^{2}$. The movement of Armenians also took place in the direction of Armenia III, i.e. from Melitenē toward Cilicia, once again toward an outlet to the sea, thus creating the ethnic substratum out of which eventually sprang the independent political entity under the rule of one of the branches of the Armenian Bagratids, which was to be known as the Rubenian dynasty after its founder Prince Ruben ${ }^{2 a}$.

The westward migration of the Armenians was very desirable from the Imperial point of view. The proof of this is that the Emperors encouraged the movement, and sometimes personally brought emigrants from the Armenian lands to settle in other parts of the Empire. The project of the Emperor Maurice is particularly well known in this connexion ${ }^{3}$. The Armenian infiltration of Byzantine territory proved exceedingly beneficial for it and brought innumerable advantages to the Empire. The Armenians who threw in their lot with that of the Empire dedicated themselves to its interests with exceptional devotion, and their gifts, emerging from the narrow confines of political life in their native land, displayed themselves in all their strength and diversity. Armenians distinguished themselves in many spheres of Imperial life; they produced outstanding men who rendered important services to Byzantium in military as well as civilian careers. Many of them sat on the throne itself, and on several occasions laid the foundations for entire dynasties. The Armenian cavalry fought in distant parts of the Empire for the glory and success of its military undertakings.

The Armenians also played a fairly important part in the cultural and spiritual life of the Empire. The Iconoclastic movement, so significant for the history of Byzantium, was born on the eastern border of the Empire, and owed an important part of its development to Armenian support and protection. Iconoclasm, which up to now
has primarily been a subject for theological studies, has not been valued sufficiently from a cultural point of view. As a new formulation, an attempt to bring a certain rationalism into the world of religious mysticism, Iconoclasm was destined to play the same part in the Byzantine culture as the Reformation was to play in the modern history of the West. It contained the seeds of the teachings which, after further development, were to destroy the outgrown dogmatic traditions overlaid on the Christian faith and on the life of the faithful. Realizing the danger threatening primarily the interests of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the spiritual and secular powers which derived from theocracy, brought to bear all possible means in order to root out this evil in the initial stage of its development. The role of the Armenians in all of these intellectual currents was by no means the least important; they unquestionably brought to them a specific and very sharp relief ${ }^{3 a}$.

How did the migration of the Armenians affect the fate of Armenia? The scattering of Armenians throughout the Empire cannot, obviously, be considered a positive manifestation from the point of view of the interests of the homeland. Emigration is normal and harmless for a country when it is brought about by a density of population or its natural growth. But what the Empire drained from Armenia was not an excess of population, on the contrary, they were the elements which were most needed by the country, the ones which were most enterprising and active, the men endowed with qualities which enabled them to keep afloat in the turbulent sea of Imperial life. The flower of Armenian aristocracy, all the naxarar families from the portion of Armenia involved, were gradually drawn to the capital to add lustre to the ranks of Imperial officials ${ }^{3 \mathrm{~b}}$.

Even the Armenians who left their native land realized the pointlessness of wasting their energies in the service of foreign interests, while their native land languished under the oppression of the very power for whose sake they were pouring out their blood on the battle field. In this connexion, the case of an Armenian official from the capital becomes very significant. In 548, the Armenians of Constantinople entered into a conspiracy against the Emperor Justinian, under the leadership of Arsaces and Artabanes, both of whom were from the royal Arsacid house. At that time, Artabanes was enjoying a brilliant reputation, thanks to his military exploits in Libya where he had killed the tyrant Gontharis. The conspiracy was instigated by

Arsaces, who persuaded his kinsman Artabanes to take a hand in the matter. Procopius, a contemporary, relates that Arsaces rebuked Artabanes, saying that,
... he [Artabanes] had on the one hand given proof of his nobility of spirit in his attitude toward the misfortune of others in that he had put an end to the tyranny; indeed though Gontharis was his friend and his host, he had slain him under no compulsion whatever. But at the present juncture, he said, he was utterly cowed, and he continued to sit there without a spark of manhood, though his fatherland was kept under strictest guard and exhausted by unwonted taxes, his father had been slain on the pretext of a treaty and covenant, and his whole family had been enslaved and was kept scattered to every corner of the Roman empire ${ }^{4}$.

The bitter words on the state of Armenia which the historian puts into the mouth of an Armenian from the capital and a descendant of the Arsacids, sound painfully true and give a picture of the position of Armenia after the re-organization of Justinian. Even at a later date, the Imperial authorities persisted in a policy which proved fatal for Armenia. We possess a valuable testimony that one of Justinian's immediate successors [Maurice] sent to the Persian king [Xusrō II] a letter of accusation directed against the Armenian naxarars and their armies. The Emperor wrote as follows,

The Armenians are a disloyal and disobedient nation, they stand between us and create dissentions. Let us make an agreement, I will gather up mine and send them to Thrace, let you gather up yours and order them sent to the East. If they should perish there, then enemies will have perished and if they should kill others, it is our enemies that they will kill, and we shall live in peace, for, as long as they shall remain in their country we shall have no rest ${ }^{48}$.

This cynical proposition from a Christian ruler illustrates admirably the fundamentally malignant and monstrous policy of the Byzantine court, from which Armenia suffered, and for which the Empire itself was eventually to pay a heavy price. By driving the Armenians from their native land and draining away the upper strata of the Armenian population, the Empire deprived the country of a sound framework. The consequences manifested themselves all too clearly during the period of Arab domination. Native kingdoms were
successfully established, after a brief struggle, in the former Persian districts of Armenia which had become Arab: in Ayrarat, in Vaspurakan, in Tarōn and in Siwnik', but the Roman districts proved unfit for political responsibilities. The military strength of the country had been broken with the weakening of the naxarars while in the realm of political liberty, the naxarar traditions had likewise been destroyed.

In view of the close contact between Armenia and the Empire, it is natural that Imperial life and culture should in their turn have exercised a powerful influence on Armenian spiritual life. After the period of Justinian, careful observation reveals the gradual appearance of a new current sharply divergent from the literary traditions of the preceding epoch. With the spread of Christianity to Armenia, the religious life of the country, and the literature created by it, had developed primarily in accordance with the general tastes and traditions of Syrian Christianity, but after a time, a clear break becomes visible in literary works, primarily in the field of language. To be sure, linguistic evidence is not entirely reliable, theories and interpretations derived from it are not always safe, but in this case we are dealing with objective linguistic material, specifically with the lexical aspect of the language, which is independent of its other stylistic characteristics. There are certain words and word formations which are, so to speak, entirely foreign to the works of first period of Armenian Christian literature, such as the translation of the Holy Scriptures, exceptis excipiendis, the works of Faustus of Byzantium, of Łazar P'arpec̣i, and of others. The presence of such words serves as proof that a given document belongs to a slightly later period, when the so-called Imperial or Hellenizing school was flourishing ${ }^{5}$. These elements came into the language through philosophical and generally speculative literature. One of the immediate results of the closer contact with imperial life was friction over religious questions. Dogmatic debates and dissentions became widespread. It became indispensable both for the followers of the official Imperial theology and for the adherents to the traditions of the national Church to exercise themselves in the realm of speculation and abstract thought in order to understand and be able to expound extremely complicated and subtle problems of christology. For this and other reasons, a new trend manifested itself, and a literature filled with scholarly or theoretical spirit arose, and with the widening of intellectual horizons, the language was enriched by a new layer of scientific terms.

This tendency began in the period of Justinian and was closely connected with his reform, so that we are justified in seeing the second half of the sixth century as a new epoch in the intellectual life of Armenia. The importance of the Hellenizing school in the history of Armenian literature may be judged from the fact that it produced among others the philosophical treatises of David the Invincible, the works of the famous mathematician Anania Sirakac̣i, and finally the first complete and critical History of Armenia, that of Movsēs Xorenac̣i, a truly outstanding monument, one in many ways unequalled in Armenian literature, and one remarkable above all for the profound national ideology which it created and by which generations were to be educated for centuries to come.

The influence of Imperial culture on Armenian life, on one hand, and the migration of Armenians into the Empire, on the other, led to the same result from opposite sides, namely to a certain cultural homogeneity. If we consider the matter exclusively from the point of view of the growing Imperial structure, we cannot deny that the of ethnic variations and their transmutation into a single cultural unit had a favourable effect on the political future and the entire fate of the Byzantine Empire. From the time of the division of the Roman Empire into two halves, life in each of them had necessarily developed in different directions. The division of the Empire in itself indicated the existence of a certain disagreement in the cultural climate of its two halves. The Western Empire was Romanized, while the Eastern one followed, so to speak, along a path of Orientalization. In the West, the main factors proved to be the new ethnic groups, while in the East, small historical nations competed vigourously with each other for the first place in politics.
Justinian's policy toward the Armenians, insofar as it pursued the aims dictated by a natural tendency to incorporate them and all other nations into one Empire, was justified by the internal trends of imperial history, but unfortunately, traditional concept of an interrelation between the Eastern and Western parts of the Empire made it impossible for this unification to benefit the Eastern Empire alone. Disregarding the fact that the breach between the two parts of the Empire widened constantly as a result of existing political and social conditions, and dedicating himself to an ideal of conquest, the Emperor Justinian sought to reunite the lost territories once again and to reestablish the former unity of the state. As a result, he sacrified to
this ideal, enormous material and spiritual resources which were not used for the needs and benefits of the Eastern Empire, but were shifted to the Western half for its protection against the onslaught of barbarian tribes. Together with others, Armenians, Syrian, and Georgian regiments under their own generals fought in Africa, in Italy, and in other parts of the Empire to defend a cause totally divorced from their interests, not only as the representatives of foreign nations but even as citizens of the Eastern Empire.

A great deal of vital strength was poured into the Empire from the East. History displays before us a whole gallery of gifted statesmen who dedicated their lives with remarkable loyalty and energy to the welfare of the Empire, and not a few of them belong to the period of Justinian ${ }^{6}$. It should be enough to single out the outstanding figure of Narses, one of the pillars of Justinian's reign, a man who had made a name for himself in a civilian career, who then in critical moment displayed an exceptional military talent, and whose victories even overshadowed the glory of Belisarius, the military genius of the times. The majestic figure of Narses in the forefront of Byzantium is an exact foreshadowing of the future, since it appears as the embodiement of the spiritual and material wealth, as well as of the strength which flowed continuously from the Eastern provinces toward the center of the Empire during the whole of its existence.

## NOTES

## INTRODUCTION

All the notes have been numbered consecutively by chapter, since the pagination of the original text could not be maintained. The figures in parentheses indicate the page and number of the note in the Russian text. Notes marked with a letter were added in the present edition and square brackets indicate all additions or alterations inserted by the editor. Wherever such additions are drawn from another note, or a note has been divided for the sake of greater clarity, the original note has been identified at the end of the new reference. In numerous cases sources have been quoted in editions different from the ones used in the original, either because better editions were now available, or because those used by Adontz proved unobtainable; both editions are given under the relevant entries in the Bibliographical section. Russian and Armenian titles have been given in the notes in English abbreviation, for the sake of convenience, for the complete reference, see the Bibliography.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ [The publication of this study preceded the appearance of extensive work on the pre-Christian period of Armenian history, for which see the Bibliographical Note. Adontz, himself, also concerned himself with this epoch in his Histoire d'Arménie. Les origines du Xe au VIe siècle Av. J.C., posthumously published, Paris, 1946.]
${ }^{1}$ We regret that through circumstances beyond our control, the map prepared by us could not be published in this volume. [Unfortunately, this map never appeared subsequently, to my knowledge].
(xi, 1)
1a [Adontz's proposed periodization has been subject to considerable criticism. Vasiliev, in his review of this book, ZMNP, p. 415, objected to Adontz's view that the Justinianic age formed the watershed between antiquity and the Byzantine era. Manandian, Trade, pp. 42-43, and Feudalism, pp. 10, 250-260, 304-306, rejected the thesis that the disintegration of Armenian tribal society had taken place in the Artaxiad period of Armenian history and was complete by the reign of Tigran the Great. Moreover, he argued that the nazarar system characteristic of Mediaeval Armenia had not 'disappeared altogether with the Mongol invasions, which Adontz sets here as the terminus ad quem. For a review of the literature on the periodization of Armenian history including the Marxist interpretation, see Sukiasian, Armenia, pp. 15-27, and for a recent critique of Adontz, as well as an appreciation of his contribution, Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 70 n. 76, 108, 111 n. 176, 144 n. 262].
${ }^{1 b}$ [Adontz gives no reference for this quotation which I have regretfully been unable to trace.]

## CHAPTER I

a The entire geographical information of Adontz's work, both in this and subsequent chapters should be checked against the more recent studies indicated in the Bibliographical Note. See also Appendix V, in which an attempt has been made to list the various names of a given ancient site together with its modern (definitive or hypothetical) equivalents. Some additional material will be found in the relevant notes, but the disagreement of scholars on a number of points precludes the possibility of a systematic or exhaustive discussion which would expand this work to unmanageable size. (2,1)
${ }^{1}$ This city should not be confused with its namesake, Ganjak-Elizavetpol' [Kirovabad] in the province of Otenē. Ganjak of Atropatenē [Ganjak Šahastan] lay considerably south of Tabriz. Modern scholars identify it with Takht-i-Sulaimān near Zanjān. [Cf. Christensen, pp. 142 n. 1, 165, and 166 n. 3. Frye, Persia, p. 139 and n. 23, and pls. 4-5; also Aurel Stein, Old Routes of Western Irān, London, 1940, p. 341; and Le Strange, Lands, pp. 223-224. The recent study of the site is by H. van der Osten and R. Nauman, Takht-i-Suleiman. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen, Berlin, 1961]. Cf. Ch. IX, n.28. The problem of the frontiers of Armenia will be discussed subsequently.

1a [On the frontier of 363 , see Honigmann, Ostgrenze, ch. i. On the partition of 387, see Grousset, Arménie, pp. 163-166; Jones, LRE, I, p. 158; Stein, Bas Empire, II, p. 528 n. *89; Toumanoff, Studies, pp. $350-352$ and p. 352 n. 6. On the partition of 591, see Grousset, Arménie, pp. 251-253; Jones, LRE, I, p. 311; M. Higgins, The Persian War of the Emperor Maurice, Washington, 1939, p. 73, and particularly, P. Goubert, Orient, pp. 189-190 and Appendix 10; Garitte, Narratio, pp. 236 sqq.]
${ }^{1 b}$ [This is a particularly good example of Adontz's gift for identifying the crucial aspect of a problem. The religious divisions of Armenia had already been observed by such scholars as E. Ter Minassiantz, Die Armenische Kirche, but the subdivisions suggested by Adontz are much more complicated and essential, as I hope to demonstrate in my own forthcoming study on Armenia in the Fourth Century.]
${ }^{2}$ Procopius, Pers., I, x, 13-19 [L. 80/1-82/3]. Kiepert, Karte.
${ }^{3}$ Procopius, Aed., II, i, 4 sqq. [L. $98 / 9$ sqq.]. Procopius gives the position of Dara


 to 6 stadia, consequently 6 miles would be equal to 42 stadia, but Procopius Pers. I, x, 14. [L. 80/1] gives the distance from Dara to the frontier as 28 stadia. It is unlikely that the passage in Georg. Cypr. refers to a different period, and more probable that Procopius' stadion was longer than the customary 210 meters. The distance from Dara to Nisibis is 30 kilometers as the crow flies, yet Procopius [Idem] gives it as 98 stadia. [On Dara, see Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 10 and n. 5, et sqq. The Oxford Classical Dictionary (1957), "Measures", p. 547, gives the following definitions of the stadion: the Greek stadion, " contained 600 feet, no matter what the length of the foot might be, and its exact length is therefore often doubtful ". The Roman stadium $=125$ paces, where 1 pace $=5$ pedes of 296 mm each. Webster's New World Dictionary, College edition (1966), p. 1620, defines the verst as "c. 3000 feet or about $2 / 3$ mile"]. (4,2)
${ }^{4}$ Procopius, Aed., III, ii, 2-3 [L. VII, 186/7].





Joh. Eph., $H E$, VI, 15, p. 236, is also familiar with Arzanenē as a wealthy Persian province; also Joh. Eph., de beatis, p. 191, "Arzanenē Persarum ". [Cf. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 22-24, 32-34].
${ }^{5}$ Procopius, Pers. I, xxi, 6 [L. I, 195/6-197/8], and I, viii, 22 [L. I, 66/7-68/9],




${ }^{6}$ Procopius, Aed., III, ii, 4 [L. VII, 186/7-188/9]; Vand. I, i, 17; [L. II, 8/9]. (5, 3)
${ }^{7}$ Procopius, Pers., I, xxi, 9 [L. X, 196/7], "... хшpiov ... 'Atтaरâs ... ". Georg. Cypr.,

 ties damaged by earthquake. [Vide infra note 11].

8 Arab writers derive the epithet $\mid \vec{ق}="$ black" to the black stones from which the city was built. See Le Strange, Lands, p. 108. The city owes its present name to a certain Bekr, who was governor of the province. The name province of Bekr" and the name of the province has been transferred to the city which was its capital. [Cf. Le Strange, "notes" to Ibn-Serapion, p. 34, for a different explanation of this name].

8a [The location of $A t^{\prime} t^{\prime} a_{X}$ is not absolutely certain. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. 37 and map I identifies it with Hattäh, though no such village can be found in $G 46$ or the relevant sheet of the USAFM. On the basis of the co-ordinates c. $38^{0} 19^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 40^{\circ} 55^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$, At't'ax might be identified with the modern Hindis, G46, p. 289, but there is some variation in the location of the village on the maps of Honigmann, Idem, Kiepert, Karte, Lynch, Armenia, and particularly Chapot, Frontière. Wilson, Handbook, p. 248 notes, "On the Lija plain, the ruins of Attalch, anct. Altacha". Of. also Markwart, Sildarmenien, p. 249.]




 28 May; Tēr Israēl, 25 February; says that he had collected up to 280,000 relics: 120,000 from the Roman Empire, 20.000 from Assyria, 80,000 from Persia, and 60,000 from Armenia. These figures are unquestionably exaggerated. The Coptic synaxary derives the name of the city from that of Marut' $a$, Wüstenfeld ed., Synaxarium das ist HeiligenKalender der Coptischen Christen, Gotha, 1879, p. 312, " die Stadt einen von dem namen des heiligen Marutha abgeleitenen namen erhielt". [Adontz does not indicate the edition of the synaxaries used by him, although the Synaxary of Cerenc̣ was published in 1706 and 1730, both times in Constantinople. The edition of the Synaxary of Tēr Israēl used by Adontz must have been that of Constantinople, 1834, but a more recent edition with a translation has been brought out in the Patrologia Orientalis, G. Bayan ed. "Le Synaxaire arménien de Ter Israel ", Patrologia Orientalis, V:XII (1910-1930). In
this edition, the Life of Marut' $a$ is given at the date 25 Mareri $=1$ June, Ibid., XXI (1928 this edition, the Life of Marut'a is given at the date 25 Mareri $=1$ June, Ibid., XXI (1928), pp. 515-518. See also, Ibid., V (1910), "Avertissement", pp. 350-352 for the earlier history of the text. An English translation of the Life has been given by R. Marcus, "The Armenian Life of Marutha of Maipherkat ", Harvard Theological Review, XXV, 1 (January, 1932), pp. 47-71. The passage referring to the collection of relics occurs in this translation on p. 68. Cf. Manandian, Trade, 61-62].
 can be found on the page indicated. This edition of Asolik invariably gives the form " Qhpllipun". The form given by Adontz does however, occur in Kir. Ganj., lxi,

 be compared with the Syr. mêfarakt < *mëfaratt. The Arabs evidently altered maifar$k a t$ into miyya-farkin because they saw the word ohe (the plur. of alo "water") in the name, on the same basis as Meiacarire, a small locality on the right bank of the Tigris near Mardin, which took its name from the cold springs : Amm. Marc., XVIII, vi, 16 [L. I, 442/3], " Meiacarire nomine venissemus, cui fontes dedere vocabulum gelidi", Tab. Peut., [IX, p. 741 and 740 map 240] the name is translated as "Aquae Frigidae". Near the city are found the springs of the عون حون the Jehan-numa, Charmoy, I, supp. 1, p. 143; these form a spring which flows through the city toward the Batmansuyu. The presence of these "waters" may have influenced the etymology just given. If the hypothesis of C.F. Lehmann-Ha, 1 pt and W. Belck, "Majafarkin und Tigranokerta ", $Z \mathbb{Z}$, XXXI (1899), pp. 263-275, that ancient Tigranokerta was located on the site of Maipherkat-Martyropolis is correct, the Batmansuyu must correspond to the ancient Nymphios on which the city of Tigranokerta was located. $C f$. Tacitus, Ann. XV, iv [L. IV, 220/221]. [These identifications are no longer challenged, see Lehman-Haupt, Armenien, I, pp. 381-429, 501-523; Markwart, Südarmenien, 86-202; and Manandian, Trade, 60-62]. There is perhaps a link between Nicephor-ius, Arm. " \& LTLER" and Syr. maifar < *nakfar. Markwart, Erãn. 161-162 derives Nikephorios from Iran. *Nēwak-farr = 'A AaOÓroxos, but his equation of the last syllable with the Arm. thn " eleft", is less fortuate.


12 A. Saint-Martin, ed. in, Lebeau, Histoire du Bas-Empire, nouvelle édition entièrement revue, corrigé et augmentée par M. de Saint-Martin et continuée par M. Brosset, 21 vols., Paris, 1824-1836, X, p. 132.
${ }^{12 a}$ [ $O f$. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. $21 \mathrm{nn} .3-4$, who cites Adontz without, however, expressing an opinion.]
${ }^{13}$ Arm. Geogr., pp. 30/41, 37-38/50, "[qшцшпи mши反] q




${ }^{14}$ Joh. Eph., $H E, V I$, xxxvi, p. 258. "de castello alio cui nomen Āqbâ, quod in terra Persarum ad Kallath est. - In ripa vero ulteriore Kallath fluvii in tractu limitis contra Maipherqat mons praeruptus est, super quo quasi a temporibus longinquis populo delendo magorum castellum aedificare in animo erat, et, quandoquidem inter Romanos
et Persas pactio est ne intra tot milia passum a limite vel his vel illis aedificare liceat, Romani contra eos stabant nec eos aedificare sinebant; etenim saepe aedificatum erat et disiectum. Aliquando autem, ut supra indicavimus, Persae, opportunitatem nacti, castellum aedificaverunt et in eo consederunt". [Cf. Jos. Styl., lxvii, p. lviii]. (8, 2)



 aip ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \in \varepsilon \nu "$.

16a [On Akbas-Okbas, see Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 24-25, 27, 32, and Markwart, Streifzüge, p. 480 n .2 . Cuinet, II, p. 520 map, indicates "Chirvan-kala, north-east of Siirt", but no trace of the ruins can be found on modern, or for that matter on most maps. Of. Kiepert, Karte, and Lynch, Armenia, map].]
${ }^{17}$ Theoph. Sim., II, ix, p. 86; III, xv, p. 143, "... тò 'Aфоú $о \nu$, ... калоú $\mu \in \nu о \nu$ фрov́pıov", Menand. Prot., pp. 410, 415, "'Aфovpêv фроv́pıop", Georg. Cypr., p. 47,

 castella ibi ... unum cui nomen Pum ... aliud quoque Persarum ... cui nomen Klimar ". Klimar is the Armenian $\mathcal{R}_{\eta} \mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{L} w}$, which is also known as Kutemian in the Arm. Georg.,


 marōn with the Ub-bu-me and Kul-li-im-me-ri of Assyrian inscriptions. K'iš, which Markwart considers unidentifiable, Ibid., p. 160, is the episcopal city of Qis which sent a representative to the Council of 544, Chabot, Syn. Or., pp. 322-323. Chabot sought this city in Chorzanē, Ibid., p. 680, whereas it actually stood in Arzanenē and is probably to be identified with present-day Kuš, near the town of Zok. [ K 'is is identified by Eremyan, Armenia, p. 89 and map, with modern Bamau-kuš, but no locality of this name can be found on modern maps. For the problem of the loca,tion of Chlomarōn, see n . 18a].
17a [Fūm is no longer given in $G 46$ or on the relevant sheet of the USAFM. Of., however, Honigmann, Osigrenze, pp. 23-34, 37, and map I, also Kiepert, Karte, C VI, "Diarbekir", c. 38027 'N $\times 40^{0} 42$ 'E, and Georg. Cypr., p. 167, and map IV.]

18 Theoph. Sim., II, ix, pp. 86-88.
${ }^{18 a}$ [The position of Chlomarōn near Nerjiki suggested by Adontz does not agree with the one given by Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 23, 26, 31-33, 37 and map I, or by Eremayan, Armenia, p. 89 and map. Nerjiki is no longer indicated in $G 46$ or in the USAFM, but it is recorded by Cuinet, II, p. 520 map, as being in the kaza of Kulp of the vilayet of Bitlis; see also, Lehmann-Haupt, Armenian, II, 1, p. 432 and map, and Kiepert, Karte, C VI, c. $38^{0} 32^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{0} 03^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$, on the Kulp-su. If Chlomarōn were situated in this vicinity, it would lie considerably north of the position given by Honigmann and Ere-
 Ibid., p. 89. Maligir-Malagir is located at $38005^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{0} 13^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ in $G 46, \mathrm{p} .455$. See also, Georg. Cypr., p. 167, and Markwart, Erän., pp. 158-159, and Südarmenien, p. *14.]

19 See Hoffman's notes to Georg. Cypr., pp. 165-167 [Also Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 7, 16-18, 24-26, 34]. It is possible that Nıкךфópıos - Nú $\mu \phi \iota o s$, and Kala $\theta$-Ši $\theta \mathrm{i} \theta \mathrm{ma}$ originally designated different courses of the same river. As the first form of the name
has been linked with Maipher－kat，so Kala $\theta$ may perhaps be linked with Kapка日－七－кєрта by means of learra $\theta$ ．The Šit＇it＇ma is also mentioned by Ibn Serapion，pp．18，264－265， in the form［Sãtidamãd］$د$ ．$\quad$ ． Erän．，p．161，this form points to an Aramaic rather than an Arabic origin，and likewise has the sense of＂bloodthirsty＂（＜šadi u dema）．In Markwart＇s opinion，the name might be explained by the fact that the river＇s banks had been the scene of many bloody battles．［Cf．also Markwart，Südarmenien，pp．274－284］．

19a［Cf．Goubert，Orient，p．76．］
20 Procopius，Aed．，III，iii，1－4［L．VII，190／1－192／3］，






 ＇I



21 Taylor，Kurdisian，p．39，＂．．．a mass of ruins that covered the slopes of the hill for the space of one mile，fragments of thick walls and neatly cut blocks of stone were strewed over the road and impeded our progress，the remains of the old city of Fees． A small village near them is also called Fees，Affis and Afisios＂．［Cf．Honigmann， Ostgrenze，pp．18－19；Wilson，Handbook，p．248］．Asolik，III，xv，p． 193 mentions a


 ＇A ${ }^{\prime} \lambda_{\epsilon \iota \sigma o ́ s, ~ . . . ~ " . ~ S e e ~ a l s o, ~ H o n i g m a n n, ~ O s t g r e n z e, ~ p p . ~}^{22}$ n．3，25－26．］

22 Vardan，Geography，as cited in Inčičean，Description，p． 44 ［Cf．Berbérian edition，

 167 in Dashian，Catalogue．See，Arm．Geogr．，pp．30／40，＂q之wحukiu，jnpils Fqputí wqphьp S／ifphu qtinnj＂．Cf．Nöldeke，＂Alexanderroman＂，Denk－ schrift der Wiener Akademie，XXXVIII（1890），p．28，＂Haloras，wo der Tigris ent－ springt＂．According to Al－Kisrawì，W．Tomaschek，Sasun，p． 23 Holûris هلر هس was on the upper－Tigris．According to Yākūt，Le Strange，Lands，p．110－111，＂The source of the Tigris，．．．was distant two and a half days＇journey from Amid，at a place known as Halûras，＇where＇Alî，the Armenian，obtained martyrdom＇＂，Might this name be derived from the Arm．olor，vulg．h－olor，nLn $\quad$ pu from nLn $h_{p}$, ＂zig－zags＂？ ［Cf．Markwart，Siudarmenien，pp．＊12，58－59，74， 232 sqq．，264，269，437．Honigmann， Ostgrenze，pp． 58.

22a［Although the Cevtla－Cotela mountains are still indicated in $G 46$ and the relevant sheet of the USAFM，the Darkosh shown by both Lyyoh Map and Kiepert Karte C－VI， have vanished from modern nomenclature］．
${ }^{22 b}$［Timur agha is given by Wilson，Handbook，p．247，but it is not found on modern maps．］
${ }^{23}$ See Taylor, Kurdistan, p. 42 and Wilson, Handbook, pp. 247-248. [Also LehmannHaupt, Armenien, " Der Tigris-Tunnel", I, pp. 430-462, and Markwart, Südarmenien, pp. 58 sqq. and 74]. The Kleisurai were familiar to $M X$, II, viii, " $\cdots$ qlitunK





 भ $4 L^{\underline{m} \not \partial ш ј ~ . . . " ~ t h e ~ w o r d ~ p u p ~ s e e m s ~ t o ~ r e f e r ~ t o ~ a ~ p a r t i c u l a r ~ l o c a l i t y ~ w h i c h ~ m i g h t ~}$ perhaps be identified with the Kleisurai.
$(12,1)$

















Also Procopius, Pers., II, xxiv, 13, 14 [L. I, 476/7], "... Kı $\begin{aligned} & \text { apíh } \omega \nu \text { tò фpoúpıov ... } \delta \iota \in ́ \chi \in l ~\end{aligned}$


 Unpriminu, which is found in the 1901 Venice edition of Aristakees Lastivertẹi, p. 109]. Inčičean, Description, p. 43, gives the variant Vnpippmiu. This town is to be identified with the modern town of Melomeran, which is given on maps such as Lynch, Armenia as Molla Omer or Mulla Omer, [Mollaömer], obviously as the result of a false etymology. [The river equivalent to the Perisuyu is not the Gayl-Lykos-Kelkit, but the "Other" Gayl-Mews Gayl. Cf. Eremyan, Armenia, p, 70 and next note].




 [Kiği-Kasaba] = ancient Kołoberd. The entire district is now called Keli [Kiği kazasi] and is identical with ancient Chorzanē. [For Koloberd and particularly the Other Gayl (S|hıu Y形) see, Hübsehmann, Ortsnamen, pp. 441, 415-416; Markwart, Süd-
armenien, pp. 264, 435-437, and Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 204-205. For the discussion of the districts found in Armenia IV according to the Arm. Geogr., see Hübschmann, Ortsnamen, pp. 290 sqq., Markwart, Siddarmenien, pp. 39 sqq., and particularly Eremyan, Armenia, pp. 116 sqq. For Procopius' text describing Chorzanē, see above, n. 24].
$26 a$ [See above, nn. 24, 26].
${ }_{27}$ Hübschmann, Ortsnamen, pp. 291-293, defines Asthianenē [Hašteank'] by means of the Göniksuyu, and believes that Kitharizōn is to be identified with the modern Köderiç. In such a case, Asthianenē would have occupied the entire border zone, and Chorzanee would consequently become a district in the interior. But Procopius, Aed., III, iii, put the vulnerable border district for whose protection the fortress of Artalesōn was erected into Chorzanē. Moreover, Asthianenē adjoined Chorzanē from the south, according to the description of the Arm. Geogr., pp. 30/40-1. [See alsa Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. 9, 16].






 brhqü ". The passages in square brackets are part of Asolik's text, but were left out of Adontz's quotation thereof.]




[On Iwanē, son of Liparit, see J. Laurent, Byzance et les Turcs Seljoucides, Paris, 1913, also, Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. 183, et. al.].


 the fortress of the Mamikonean. It is evident from Zenob's account that $\Pi_{\eta} \eta^{m} w i$ was located near Kowaris (now Guvars near Boğlan) behind a spring, which must be the one now known as the "spring of the ten brothers", north of Kowaris. [The position of Kowars is not altogether clear: the maps in both Lynoch, Armenia and Kiepert, Karte B VI give Guvars or Girvaz SE of Boğlan, c. $38^{0} 55^{\circ} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{\circ} 05 \mathrm{E}$, whereas Eremyan,
 where G 46, p. 391 gives Kiravi considerably further east, $38054^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{0} 32^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$, as does Lynch. However, Lynch also indicates a village which he names Alzhgan just SE of Kiravi]. According to $F B, \mathrm{~V}$, iii, the Mamikonean fortress stood on the Euphrates,
 not be confused with П $\eta_{\text {innın, }}$, especially since Yovhannees Mamikonean distinguishes
 in the above case. Tomaschek, Sasun, p. 11 translates $\Pi_{\eta} \boldsymbol{m} \boldsymbol{q}^{m} \boldsymbol{K}$ as "rundlich" as a result of his confusion between $n \eta$ and the Arm. $\omega_{L \eta}=$ "ring ", as Hübschmann correctly observed, Ortsnamen, p. 460. However, Hübschman makes a similar mistake
when he translates B $\quad$ \{inun, bquKig phiq as "Hirschkuhreich", "Burg der
 derived from the Arm. $n \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathbb{L}=$ " spine, backbone ", which can also be used of mountains

 simply "hilly", bqwing $\beta^{\hbar} \Gamma \eta\left(\right.$ for $\left.\Pi_{\eta} w i g R^{L} \Gamma \eta\right)=$ " the castle on the hills, or the crests ". In Łazar P'arpec̣i, $\Pi_{\eta} \beta^{5}$ is the genitive of $\Pi_{\eta}\left\{\right.$, giving $q /\left\llcorner\eta \eta_{\eta} \beta_{i}\right.$ similar to




 $326 / 7]$ or " Volandum ", Tacitus, Ann., XIIT, xxxix [L. IV, 66/7].




${ }^{32}$ I.e. اريزن 1 . however, give Aziza. Cf. Appendix V. Cf. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. 196]. (17, 2)

 327, 370 and Eremyan, Armenia, pp. 40, 80. The Bingöl-su no longer exists under this name. Judging from Adontz's argument and Hübschmann's map on which two streams are given this name, the one intended here may be the one now called Hasanova suyu. However, Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. 197 suggests that the " ... Bingöl-su [ist] vielleicht den oberen Aracani ".]
${ }^{32 \mathrm{~b}}$ [See above, nn. 30 and 31. The name Menaskut found in Hübschmann, Ortsnamen, Lynch, Kiepert, Karte B VI is no longer recorded.]




 Among the estates of the Mamikonean, Zenob also mentions, Ibid., p. 37,





[Eremyan, Armenia, pp. 63, identifies Porpēs with Xaraba-Barbas" Qpisulipun
 <nlunnuS: ", and agrees with Adontz that it lay in the center of the district of Palunik' Ibid., p. 76. Xaraba can be identified with the modern Harabe Köy, 38057'N $\times$ $41^{\circ} 02^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ according to $G 46$, p. $275(1)$, but Kiepert, Karte, B VI gives Borbas as a separate locality slightly to the south-west of "Charaba". No Borbas can be found on modern maps or in G46].
$(18,1)$
${ }^{33 a}$ [For the Navsan pass cf. Lynch, Map and Kiepert, Karte B VI.]
${ }^{33 \mathrm{~b}}$ [Astlberd is probably to be identified with Azakpert, $3^{3} 9^{\circ} 14^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 40^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ according to G46, p. 64, and Aznaberd with Aznafer, $39^{\circ} 12^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 40^{\circ} 35^{\prime}$ E, Idem. Kiepert, Karte, gives all three localities in the same district, Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. 19 n. 2 rejects Adontz's identification as " zu weit westlich ". His own localization of Kitharizōn, Ibid., pp. 16-19 and map I place it further south though no further east. Eremyan, Armenia, p. 59 suggests the possibility of an identification with Çapakçur. Hübschmann, Ortsnamen, pp. 291-293, identifies Kitharizōn with Köderiẹ, a suggestion rejected by Adontz, see above, n. 27. See also Markwart, Südarmenien, p. *50.]





 "Goat-teats "; the mountains evidently received their name from their bare and jagged peaks (cf. Teke-dere = "goat - plain" near Erzurum, if in this case means "goat" and not " monastery", or "cemetery"). The modern name of the range, Palandöken $=$ " throwing off the saddle ", likewise emphazises the craggy abruptness of the mountains. [Cf. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 195-197].
${ }^{34 a}$ [On Mardałi, see, Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 157, 192-193, and Eremyan, Armenia, p. 65.]
${ }^{35}$ Menand. Prot., pp. 394-395,






Saint-Martin in his edition of Lebeau, Histoire du Bas-Empire, X, p. 135, corrected the error of the Latin translator who had turned äрктov into a proper name, "ad Arctum", but he made a similar error himself in mistaking бvvaróneyov for a place name, "à Synagomenon". The truth of the matter is that the name of the province has dropped out of the text. The advance of king Xusrō from the neighbourhood of Dara to Armenia, and thence to Caesarea by way of Theodosiopolis, is also related by Joh. Eph., $H E$, VI, viii, p. 225. The passage concerning the battle near Theodosiopolis is incorrect, with the result that the word bgr in the original has been incorrectly interpret in the German translation [I.M. Schönfelder, Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus, Munich, 1862], p. 232. This same word is read "Bagrava", in Bar-Hebraeus, Chron. Syr., viii [Budge, in his translation, p. 79 gives the passage as follows, "Then the Rhomâyê overtook (or, pursusued) [the Persians] in Mount Bagrûh, ... '"]. There can be no doubt that the name of the locality where the battle took place is given here. The author obviously had in mind the Armenian province of Bagrewand, the $M a \kappa \rho a \beta a \nu \delta-\hat{\omega} \nu$ of Menander (replacing $M-\beta-\alpha \kappa \rho a \beta a v \delta \omega \nu$ where $-\mu \beta$ - have replaced the former $\beta$-), the district close to Roman territory where the clash between the Persian and Roman forces occured. [The de Boor edition of Menander, Excerpta de legationibus, Berlin, 1903, p. 201, 27 gives " Bакраßavঠิิข каi Tapavp̂ิv". See also, Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 21 sqq.].
${ }^{36}$ Ende-r-is or Henderis [Endires] is a distortion of Arda-l-is. Another example of the Turkish shift of $l$ into $r$ is to be found in Pe-r-i < anc. Pe-l-i = Пádıos кáaтpov, Arm. $\eta_{u \eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{-\{ } \boldsymbol{\{}$. [On Artalesōn, see Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 16-19].
${ }_{37}$ Procopius, Pers., II, xxiv [L. I, 478/9].
${ }^{38}$ Joh. Eph., HE, VI, xiv, p. 235; Maurice, setting out against the Persians, "... inter Armeniam et Syriam apud Qithariz videlicet, constitit ".
${ }^{38 a}$ [Darizoa cannot be identified with certainty. All the localities called Darōzü in $G 46$, p. 169, lie much too far west for Adontz's argument. The most likely identification seems to be Derreigazan $38^{\circ} 58^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 40^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, G 46$, p. 180 and USAFM.]
${ }^{38 b}$ [The Deveboyun mountains are found in Wilson, Handbook, p. 222 and Lynoh's Map, but have vanished from modern nomenclature].












 Geography, p. 90, followed by many others, has identified Du and Ordru as Greater and Lesser Du [Büyük and Küc̣ük Tuy]. In my opinion, however, Ordru should not be identified with one of the Dus, but rather with present day Ortu, on the Ortu-su east of Alvar, which is already mentioned in Lazar P'arpeci's account of Vahan, £P',
 [Honigmann, Ostgrenze, pp. 180-181 and 214 n. 7, accepts Adontz's identifications. However, the present Ortuzu $39^{\circ} 55^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{0} 33^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ according to $G 46$, p. $500(1)$ lies just SW rather than E of Alvar $39056^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{0} 37^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$, Ibid., p. $\left.35(2)\right]$. According to Inčičean, Geography, p. 104, the village of $\bar{\sigma} w \eta h \nmid y$ stood within the borders of Asthianenē, but it is evident from Łazar's account, that it was not far from Ok'al (since Łazar calls it " qhLpiush sLpà". ELP", lxxxi, p. 481, to the Persian general Hazarawu ${ }^{t}$, who was stationed near Ok'al, Ibid., lxxix, p. 472); it was also on the way to Karin and to the nearby village of Arcat'i, Ibid., lxxxi, pp. 481-483.


${ }^{40}$ Procopius, Pers. I, xv, $32-33$ [L. I, 138/9-140/1], "...Bஸ̂入ov av̉roîs to фpov́poov,
 208/9] and Goth. IV, xiii, 19 [L. V, 188/9].
${ }^{41}$ Joh. Mam., pp. 57-58, " \& $\frac{1}{2}$.

 [in 1908]. In the tenth century, the bishop of the Iberians had his seat at Vałaršakert, $A L, \mathrm{ii}, \mathrm{p} .28$.
 and in the Gahnamak, " Fnıpuw Rpiwpukwf", [see Appendix IIIA]. In both cases the form $\mathrm{Bu}_{\chi}$ a can be taken as a genitive form of $\mathrm{Fn}_{n} / \mathrm{p}$. The form $\beta_{n L}$. $u m$ is also found in MSS, Iněičean, Geography, p. 371. Fnף or Bol bears the same relation to

 tumg. The modern form, Oltu $O_{L} \partial p$ shows that the phoneme $-\mu u$ in $\hat{\eta}_{L} \mu \nu \partial p_{P} p$ was originally derived from $a-\eta-$. Incidentally, we should note that a village named [Uגta-Otha ?] still exists on the banks of the Tortum gölu, west of Oltu, and that its name is closer to that of $\Pi_{L} / u \not \partial \rho$ Lynch, Armenia, map, gives the name of this locality
 and agrees with Adontz's identification. Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. 157, n. 5].
${ }^{43}$ Procopius, Pers. I, xv, 31-33 [L. I, 138/9]



Ibid., xx, 3 [L. I, 202/3-204/5]; Goth. IV, xiii, 19 [L. V, 188/9]; Pers. II, xxix, 14 [L. I, 530/1-532/3],


Bóas $=\downarrow n \zeta$ Arm. Geogr., pp. 30/40, or $8 n \zeta$ Ibid., pp. 35/46, where the initial - Jis the prefixed preposition. $\cap\langle$ is a popular spelling for $\downarrow \boldsymbol{L} \zeta$ resulting from the pronunciation of an initial n-as 丩n. [Cf. Eremyan, Armenia, 32, 84, 104].
 Káßadda". The origin of Pharangion is not clear. G. Destunis, commenting on the Russian translation of Procopius [S. Destunis, History of the Vandalic War, St. Petersburg, 1891], " notes", vol. I, p. 189, believed that the name should be derived from the Gr. фapáy ' "cleft, gorge, valley". Inǒičean, Antiquities, I, 189, associated it with Arkni-Arłni and reads it as фáprapop. It is clear from Procopius' comment, "... Фapáyriov кадоú $\underset{\text { vov ", that Farangius was a local term. We believe it to be none other }}{ }$ than the Pers. farhang, Arm. <pwцuifq, having the sense, "works, exploitation, mines"

${ }^{43 a}$ [The Parhal or Parhar range is given on the maps of both Lynch, Armenia and Kiepert, Karte, A VI [Balchar], but this name has disappeared from the modern nomenclature albeit the village of Barhal $40^{0} 59^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{0} 25^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, G 46$, p. 77 still records its existence. The range refered to by this name is the NE end of the Pontic chain. Of. Marqwart, Sudarmenien, pp. *21 sqq.; Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 450 sqq.]


 South of Haris is found $\operatorname{Ir} \chi^{2 n}$ [ $=$ Erkinis $40^{0} 33^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{0} 43^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, G 46, p$. 213], the historical

 $\left.41^{045}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E}, G 46, \mathrm{p} .58\right]$ which can perhaps be identified with $U_{p} p^{w}\langle t q$, the birthplace of the kat'olikos Giwt', $£ P^{\prime}$, lxii, p. 354. Oşnak [40040'N $\left.\times 41^{024} 4^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, G 46, \mathrm{p} .501\right]=$ $\Pi_{\Gamma} \sum_{反}\{w \eta$ Ibid., xli, p. 234, is closer to Ispir.
${ }^{44 \mathrm{a}}$ [For the Imerhevi = Šawšēn, see, Eremyan, Armenïa, p. 73.]
 Tuphump $L^{\text {L }} \Gamma^{\omega} \mathcal{S}_{P}$, ", but locates the Par $\chi$ ar range on the left bank of the Voh-Çoruh. According to $L P$ ', xli, p. 233, the Parұar mountains were found "...stid wn
 the fortresses in the Par $\chi^{\text {ar mountains in which Hmayeak Mamikonean had found }}$ refuge apparently belonged to the Mamikonean and were part of the district of Tayk', Ibid., p. 234. [On Tayk' and Klarjet'i, see, Markwart, Erān, p. 116, and Eremyan, Armenia, pp. 59, 84, 116, etc.].
${ }^{46}$ Procopius, Pers. I, xv, 19 [L. I, 134/5],

${ }^{46 a}$ [On Petra and its defense, see Procopius, Pers. II, xv, 10 (L. I, 388/9); xvii, 3 to end of chapter (Ibid., 405/6-410/1); xix, 47-49 (Ibid., 428/9-430/1); xxix - to end of book (Ibid., 528/9 sqq.). Goth. IV, ii, 32 (L. V, 72/3); xi-xiii (Ibid., 148/9-190/1); Aed. III, iii, 7 (L. VII, 214/5; ete..]

## CHAPTER V

${ }^{1}$ Gibbon, Decline and Fall, I, p. 351, "... Tike Augustus, Diocletian may be considered as the founder of a new empire ". [Adontz's discussion of the administrative system of Diocletian and his successors should be checked throughout against the extensive recent scholarship, for which see the Bibliographical Note].
$(91,1)$

- 2 Notitia Dignitatum et administrationum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus Orientis et Occidentis,, E. Böcking ed. (1839-1853). Because of its extensive and valuable historical notes, Bōcking's edition cannot be considered as completely superceded by Seeck's new and undoubtedly more critical edition of 1876. [Used throughout this edition and for Appendix II A]. In his special study, Über die Notitia, Dignitatum (1834), Böcking, after reviewing all previous opinions, came to the conclusion that the Notitia had been composed under Theodosius II, after 399 and ca. 404 [sic.] Tillemont, Histoire des Rmpereurs, VI, pp. 476, 733-736, had been of the same opinion, but at present, Seeck's opinion that the document dates from 413-415 is preferred. Cf. Questions de Notitia dignitatum (1872). [At present, the general view is that the two parts of the Notitia are not quite contemporary in content " the Western section having been revised to a later date than the Eastern ". Jones, LRR, II, pp. 1417 et sqq. See also J.B. Bury's study, "The Notitia Dignitatum ", JRS, X (1922)].] (92, 2)
${ }^{3}$ Zosim., II, 33.
${ }^{3 a}$ [See Appendix II A, xxv.]
${ }^{4}$ Bethmann-Hollweg, Civilprocess, III, No. 135, p. 83. [Jones, LiRE, I, pp. 609, "... the fifth-century laws show clearly that the regional magistri retained authority over the comites and duces in their respective zones ". Also pp. 597, 599, 608 et sqq.]. (93, 1)
${ }_{5}$ The Not. dig. lists the legions by name; we give here only the pseudo-comitatenses:
Prima Armeniaca Quarta Italica
Secunda Armeniaca Sexta Parthica
Fortenses auxiliarii Prima Isaurica sagittaria
Funditores Balistarii Theodosiaci
Prima Italica Transtigritani.
[Not. dig., vii, 23-24, 35, 38, 48-58, pp. 21-22].
${ }^{6}$ Vegetius, Epitoma, II, 6. Joh. Lyd., De mag. I, xlvi, p. 46, who is familiar with

 $\dot{\rho} \eta \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ intté $\omega \nu$ ". The name vexilliationes is derived from vexillum "ensign, these detaohments were composed of vexilla veteranorum, i.e. vexilla recruited from veterans having completed twenty years' service.

7 Vegetius, Epitoma, II, 1, "... auxilia a sociis vel foederati gentibus mittebantur". Ibid., II, 2, "... auxiliares ... ex diversis locis ex diversis numeris venientes, nee disciplina inter se nee notitia nee affectione consentiunt".
${ }^{7 a}$ [For the army described in the Not. dig. and calculations as to its probable size, see Jones, LREE, Appendix II, Tables I-XV, II, pp. 1429-1450].

8 Willems, Droit Public, p. 590.
${ }^{82}$ [Not. dig. Oc., V, 125-126, 133, p. 121. Cf. Not. dig. Or., V, 26 and VI, 26, pp. 13, 17, also Appendix II A.]
${ }^{8 b}$ [This passage is rather puzzling in view of its internal contradiction, and of the fact that a number of other dukes with their contingents are duly listed in both parts of the Notitia dignitatum. Cf. Jones, LRE, I, pp. 44, 223-224, etc.]
${ }^{9}$ Bethmann-Hollweg, Civilprocess, III, No. 135, p. 85.
${ }^{92}$ [See Appendix II A, for the context of this passage.]
${ }^{10}$ Mommsen is probably mistaken when he takes " nuper", in the phrase "Ala prima praetoria nuper constituta", for the deformation of a place name. Some of the MSS give a prefix ca- "ca-nuper", which Böcking, Not. dig., I, p. 96, suffixes on the preceding word, "pretori-ca". Müller, Ptolemy, p. 886 notes, suggests the reading "Zopar" by association with the Zoparissos of Ptolemy, [V, vi, 21], but this is an unfounded hypothesis. The word "nuper" occurs several times in a similar context in the Not. dig. : "Ala Theodosiana nuper constituta. Ala Arcadiana nuper constituta ... ". [Not. dig. Or., XXVIII, 20-21, p. 59] to show that these regiments bearing the names of Theodosius and Areadius had been constituted shortly before the composition of the Notitia dignitatum, during the reigns of these emperors. The appointment of the regiment ad praetorium presumably belongs to the same period. Many stations in the Itinerarium Antonini, bear the name "Praetorio". One of these is listed on the road from Caesarea to Anazarbus [Itin. Ant., 212], and nine more stations with the same name occur in other parts of the Empire. [If the "Ala ... nuper constituta" stood "ad Praetorium ", the location must have been that of the station on the road Sebasteia to Kukusos by way of Melitené, according to Itin. Ant., 177, This would place it at Hasançelebi on the road from Malatya to Sivas. See above, Chapter IV, pp. 63-67. The "Praetorio" on the road to Anazarbus seems too far south.]
${ }^{10 a}$ [Tacitus, $A n n . \mathrm{XV}$, xxv, [L. IV, 254/5, "Suriaeque ... copiae militares Corbuloni permissae, et quinta decuma legio ducente Mario Celso e Pannonia adiecta est". The Twelfth legion was sent by Corbulo down to Syria, Ibid., xxv [L. IV, 254/5-256/7], "At Corbulo quarta et duodecuma legionibus, quae fortissimo quoque amisso et ceteris exterritis parum habiles proelio videbantur, in Suriam translatis, ...", but it was sent back by Titus after the capture of Jerusalem, Josephus, Bell. Jud., VII, 18 [L. III,




The Fifteenth legion likewise participated in the Jewish war, but instead of returning it immediately to Armenia, Titus first kept it with him, Ibid., VII, 19 [L. III, 510.1], and then quartered it in Pannonia, Ibid., VII, 117 [L. III, 538/9]. The precise date of its return to the East is not known, Arrian, Periplus, v , knows that it was in Cappadocia by A.D. 136, and a vexillatio from it was stationed at Kainepolis [Vałaršapat] in 185, CIL, III, 6052. Cf. Müller, Ptolemy, pp. 884-885, notes and Chapot, Frontière, pp. 73$74,79,351$, etc.]

 11a [Itin. Ant., 183.]

 ${ }^{13}$ Tacitus, Hist., III, v [L. I, 336/7].

14 Vegetius, Expitoma, II, 6, "... in una legione decem cohortes esse debere, sed prima cohors reliquas et numero militum et dignitate praecedit. Nam genere atque institutione litterarium viros electissimos quaerit ... babet pedites mille centum quinque, equites loricatos CXXXII, et appellatur cohors miliaria".
$(99,1)$
15 [Not. dig., xxxviii, 2-19. Cf. Appendix II A]. Without deciding a priori whether or not a place named Aladaleariza really existed (cf. Olotoedariza in the Itin. Ant., 183, 207), we can assume that in this case, Aladaleariza is merely a dittography for Ala Rizena. The text should then be read;

Ala Rizena (Aladaleariza), apud Auaxam
Ala Theodosiana
Ala (Felix) Theodosiana) $\}$ Siluanis.
In other words, the Ala Rizena was stationed at Auaxa and the other ala stood at Siluanis. This second detachment bore the name of Theodosius. Here the duplication was brought about by the repetition of lines, and the epithet "Felix" was added to distinguish one Theodosiana from the other. The authenticity of this Ala felix Theodosiana is all the more doubtful that an "ala prima felix Theodosiana " is listed further down as being stationed at Pithiae ". [Not. dig., xxxviii, 32. Adontz's suggestion is ingenious, and the repetition of a detachment seems to have occurred elsewhere, eg. Ibid., xxxi, 41, p. 64, "Ala prima Abasgorum, Hibeos - Oaseos maioris", and xxxi, 55, p. 65, "Ala prima Abasgorum, Oasi maiore ". However, cf. Seeck, Not. dig., p. 84 n .2 and Miller, Itineraria Romana, pp. 675, 679 identifying Aladaleariza with Olotoedariza of the Itin. Ant., and placing the Ala Rizena there. Jones, LRE, II, 1430, also preserves the three alae of the Notitia and stations the first at Aladaleariza].
${ }^{15 a}$ [Lynch, Armenia, Map. Kiepert, Karte, A V. This locality cannot beidentified on modern maps.]
${ }^{16}$ Lynch, Armenia, II, p. 236, fig. 174, gives a photograph of the " eastle of Kalajik ". The ruins are also described by Wilson, Handbook, p. 203.
${ }^{16 a}$ [Mochora is given by Kiepert, Karte, B VI, but no locality of this name can be found east of Zigana on modern maps. The nearest approximation to the location seems to be Muzena, given on USAFM 324 C IV though not in G46. Both Muçura $40^{\circ} 54^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 39^{\circ} 27^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ and Mohala $40^{0} 57^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 39^{\circ} 27^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, G 46$, pp. 475 and 477 seem too far north of the Zigana pass.]

17 The location of Hadzana does not seem to coincide exactly with that of Chaszanenica. The road from Trapezos followed two routes : [Itin. Ant., 216]: "Trapezus 20 ad Vicensimum 32 Zigana 24 Thia 17 Sedissa 24 Domana 18 Satala.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 20 \text { Magnana } 10 \text { Gizenica } 18 \text { Bylae (pylae) } 6 \text { Frigidarium } 8 \text { Patara } 14 \\
& \text { Medocia } 12 \text { Solonenica } 18 \text { Domana } 18 \text { Satala ". [Tab. Peut., X, 2-5, cf. }
\end{aligned}
$$ pp. 645-646, fig. 212]. Judging from the distances given, Magnana was identieal with the station called ad Vicensimum in the Itin. Ant., and should have been located in the vicinity of Cevizlik. Gizenica, the next station on the road, must in anye ase have laid further south, but this fact hinders the identification of Chaszanenica with Hadzana, since the latter is located to the north of Cevizlik. The name of the Tzans is included in the toponym Chas-zan-enica or Gi-zen-iea. [Cf. Kiepert, Karte, A VI and Miller, Itineraria Romana, p. 681. The toponym Hadzana, or Hatsavara as it is given by Kiepert, has disappeared, from modern maps, but Larhan, with which Kiepert identifies Chaszanenica, can still be found lying duly south of Civizlik. G46, p. 449, USAFM 324 CIV].

18 Arrian, Periplus, viii. [Anonymous Periplus], p. 411. [Cf. Müller, Ptolemy, p. 922 note, and Chabot, Frontière, p. 365 et al.]. (100,3) 19 Böcking, Not. dig., I, p. 434 n. 47. [Kainē Parembolē is identified with Colehidian Neapolis by Müller, Ptolemy, p. 923 note, and with Kena or Okena in Tzanika by Chabot, Frontiere, p. 363 and n. 3. On the independence of Tzanika before Justinian, see above Chapters I, p. 23 and III, pp. 49 sqq. Might it be possible on the other hand to identify Kainee Parembole with Kainēpolis = Vałaršapat, where the presence of a vexillatio of the XV Legion Apollinaris is attested as early as A.D. 185, cf. above n. 10a? On Pithia and Sebastopolis and the city referred to by Ancient sources under the latter toponym, see Not. dig., p. 84 n. 7, who identifies Pithia with Pitiunt, Müller, Ptolemy, pp. 922-923 notes, who discusses the problem of Sebastopolis: Chabot, Frontiere, 213-214, and $364-368$, who raises the question of the extent of the jurisdiction of the dux Armeniae. For more recent discussions of the extent of Roman penetration in this area, see Markwart, Itinerar, passim, Manandian, Trade, pp. 106-110 and 114-115, and Toumanoff, Studies, p. 257 n. 359].
(100, 4)
19a [Itin. Ant. 217. See preceding note.]
${ }^{20}$ According to the Not. dig., Or. XII, p. 35; Oc. X, p. 147, the duties of the Quaestor sacri palati were to draft imperial constitutions and receive petitions, "Leges dictandae, Preces ". He also confirmed laws: "quaestor legi" or "subscripsi". [For the Laterculus maius et minus and the duties of the quaestor and the primicerius notarium, $c f$. Jones, $L R E$, I, pp. 101-104, 337, 574-575, ete.]

20a [Not. dig., xxxviii, see Appendix II a.]
${ }^{21}$ Bethmann-Hollweg, Civilprocess, III, No. 142, pp. 133-161.
21a [Not. dig., xxv, xxxviii, pp. 54, 83, see also Appendix II a.]
${ }^{21 \mathrm{~b}}$ [Panciroli, Not. dig.]
21c [Böcking, Not. dig., I, p. 284.]



${ }^{22 a}$ [The following correction was included by Adontz in the list of errata, p. 526 of the Russian edition, "The following information transmitted to us through the kind offices of I.I. Smirnov should be added to the discussion of the abbreviation CONOB given on pp . 103-104 [Russian ed.]. These letters are now read CON(stantinopolis) and OB (ryzum), " pure gold", see Pinder and Friedländer, De la signification des lettres OB sur les monnaies byzantines, (Berlin, 1851, 2 ed., 1873), also Babelon, E., Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines, Paris (1901-1907), I, pp. 889 sqq. ".]
${ }^{22 b}$ [For another discussion of the Satrapies and their status, see Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 131 sqq., 172-173 nn. 96-100, etc., who shares a number of Adontz's views but has corrected and developed them to a considerable extent.]
${ }^{23}$ Kuhn, Verfassung, II, p. 14, "Verbündete freie und ünterthänige Gemeinde". Willems, Droit Public, pp. 335-336, 349-351, 362.
${ }^{23 a}$ [On the foederati and the transformation of this term, see Jones, $L R E, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{pp} .159$, 199-203, 663-668.]





$(106,1)$
25 Procopius, Goth., IV [VIII], v, 13 [L. V, 90/1-92/3],





$(106,2)$



26a [Cf. Procopius, Pers., I, xv, 3 [L. I, 130/l] in which Dorotheus is called "general of Armenia", "Appєvias $\mu$ èv oт $\rho a \tau \eta \gamma \dot{\prime}$..." whereas Sittas is referred to as having
 є́ 'фєєनтท́кєє ". Of. below, Chapter VI, pp. 108-111 and nn. 13-14.]

27 Procopius, Aed., III, i, 17-27 [L. VII, 182/3-186/7],






















28 Malalas, p.413. [See also, Toumanoff, Studies, p. 134 nn. 233, 234].
28a [Cf. Toumanoff, Studies, passim.]

 BnLIumg".
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31 Procopius, Pers., II, iii, 35-36, [L. I, 280/1], " 'Apoáкฑs $\gamma$ àp ó $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о \gamma o ́ v \omega \nu \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$



(111, 2)
${ }^{32}$ Güterbock, Römisch-Armenien, p. 19.
(112, 1)

 ${ }^{33 a}$ [Stein, Bas Empire, II, p. 528 n. $89 *$ agrees with Adontz that the provinces which passed to the Empire at the time of the partition of Armenia enjoyed the same status as the Satrapies. Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 133-134, however, distinguishes the status of the "Pentarchs" [Satraps] and that of the princes of Inner Armenia, "... the ... princes of Inner Armenia were placed under the supervision of their suzerain's viceroy$<$ s>- ... the comes Armeniae ... . The Pentarchs, on the other hand, were left entirely to themselves ". Cf. however, pp. 152, 193-195 n. 208. Jones, $L R E$ I, 229 and n. 26 argues that the office of comes Armeniae was created during the reign of the emperor Zeno (474-5, 476-491). Consequently the provinces acquired by the Empire at the partition of the IVth century could not be subordinated to him from the start. Cf. below, p. 93]
${ }^{33 \mathrm{~b}}$ [Vasiliev, " Review", ZMNP, p. 416, objected that the discussion of the financial obligations of Armenia to the Empire was unclear and self-contradictory. Although most scholars support Adontz's view that the Satrapies benefitted from fiscal immunity as civitates foederatae, at least at first, of. Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 133, 171, Adontz's discussion is in need of clarification as Vasiliev pointed out. Toumanoff, Studies, p. 173 n .103 rightly notes that the payment of taxes by the ruler of Sophenē in 502 mentioned by Adontz did in fact imply the loss of financial immunity, and that the fiscal status of the Satrapies had consequently been altered before the period of Justinian.]
${ }^{330}$ [See Appendix I A for the text of this decree.]
${ }^{34}$ Cod. Th., XII, xiii, 5, "Ad collationem auri coronarii placuit neminem absque consuetudine esse cogendum. Dat. XV. Kal. Febr. Constantinopoli, Richomere et Clearcho Coss. (384).
${ }^{35}$ Ibid., XX, xiii, 1, " Imp. Iulianus A. ad Sallustium Pf. P. Aurum coronarium munus est voluntatis, quod non solum senatoribus, sed ne aliis quidem debet indici, licet quaedam indictionum necessitas postulaverit; sed nostro arbitrio reservari oportebit. Dat. III. Kal. Maii Mamertino et Nevitta Coss. (362).
${ }^{36}$ Dio. Cass., LXXVII [LXVIII], ix, 2-3 [L. IX, 294/5], " $\chi \omega \rho i s \gamma$ d̀ $\rho \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon \phi a ́ v \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$




 $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ ク̈ $\sigma \tau \in ́ \phi a \nu o \nu$ фì̀ous $\delta i \delta o ́ v \tau \epsilon s$ ". $(114,3)$
${ }^{38}$ Amm. Marc., XXIII, iii, 8 [L. II, 324/5], " Sarracenarum reguli gentium genibus supplices nixi, oblata ex auro corona, tamquam mundi nationumque suarum dominum adorant ".

 Seston, REA, XLIV (1942) and Lacombrade, Ibid., LI (1949)].
${ }^{40}$ Procopius, Aed., III, ii, 6 [L. VII, 188/9], "... oi $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta є є \dot{\psi} \kappa \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \varepsilon о \iota ~ . . . ~ a ̈ \mu \alpha ~ Ө є о \delta \omega ́ \rho \psi ~$




40a [See above, nn. 27 and 33b.]
${ }^{40 \mathrm{~b}}$ [CJ, X, xvi, 13. For the text of this decree, see Appendix I C. $C f$. Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 193-195 and n. 212.]
${ }^{41}$ Procopius, Aed., III, i, 14-15 [L. VII, 182/3], "... каi. tò doımòp [after the partition






42a [This point of view is shared by Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 194-195. See aboven. 33a for Jones' thesis that the office of comes Armeniae was probably not created before the end of the Vth century, i.e. almost a century after the partition of Armenia and half a century after the end of the Arsacid rule in any part of the country.]


 is of the opinion that, " the post of comes Armeniae was created to take over the command of the local levies which protected the area ". Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 152, 193196, refers to him as a " viceroy ". This was also the opinion of Güterbock, RömischArmenien, p. 26 who also noted, however, that the count had no troops at his disposal, "An der Spitze des Landes stand der Comes Armeniae - dies sein offizieller Titel - com Kaiser als sein Vertreter ernannt und nach der damaligen hierarchischen Rangordnung mit dem Rang eines spectabilis bekleidet. In welche Kategorie der Comites or aber einzureihen, wird bei der Dürftigkeit der Nachrichten sich mit Sicherkeit kaum entscheiden lassen ... [der] Comes Armeniae überhaupt keine Truppen - weder reguläre noch Auxiliartruppen zur Verfügung standen, und er der Militärgewalt entbehrte," also lbid., pp. 37 sqq. etc.].
(117, 1)
432 [Not. dig., xxii, xxviii, xxix, pp. 48, 58, 61.]
44 Bethmann-Hollweg, Civilprocess, No. 132, pp. 53-54. [On the comes Orientis and his office, see also, Jones, LRE, I, pp. 105, 373, 481, 592].
$(118,1)$
${ }^{45}$ Güterbock, Römisch-Armenien, p. 27, [" ${ }^{4}$ Dies vorausgeschickt, dürfte die Vermutung wohl nicht zu gewagt ersoheinen, dass auch der Comes Armeniae eine ähnliche Stellung wie der Comes Orientis eingenommen habe, und dass auch ihm, der an des Kaisers statt ein Königreich zu verwalten und zu regieren berufen war, eben deshalb die besondern Rechte eines Vicarius beigelegt worden seien ".]
$(118,2)$
45a [Adontz's view that the native Armenian princes were the equivalent of provincial praesides in their relation to the comes Armeniae is questioned by Toumanoff, Studies, p. 195 n .213.$]$
${ }^{46}$ Cod. Th., XI, i, 15 [" Unusquisque ammonarias species pro modo capitationis et sortium praebiturus per quaternos menses anni curriculo distributo, tribus vicibus summam collationis implebit. Si vero quisquam uno tempore omnia sua debita optat expendere, proprio in accelerandis necessitatibus suis utatur arbitrio. Dat. XIV. Kal. Iun. Remis, Gratiano et Dagalaipho Coss. (366)].
$(119,1)$
46a [CJ, X, xvi, 13. For the text of this decree, see Appendix I C. Cf. also above, n. 40b.]
${ }^{47}$ Procopius, Pers., II, iii, 6-7 [L. I, 270/1-272/3],





$(120,1)$
${ }^{48}$ Ibid., II, iii, 8-9 [L. I, 272/3],




$(120,2)$
${ }^{48 \mathrm{a}}$ [See above n. 31, also Chapter VII below.]
48b [Idem.]
 $\pi \rho o ́ t \in \rho \circ \nu$ ои̂cav ... ". $(121,1)$
49a [See Manandian, Trade, pp. 116-120, for an attempt to evaluate the weights and currency of the period.]
${ }^{50}$ CJ, VII, lxiii, 5, " 1 mp . Iustinianus A. Triboniano quaestori sacri palati. Cum anterioribus legibus ex omni provincia ad hune nostrum sacratissimus comitatum similis cursus ad appellationes exercendas impertitus est, necessarium nobis visum est huiusmodi spatiis iustum imponere libramentum. Sancimus itaque, si quidem ab Aegyptiaco vel Libyeo limite vel Orientali tractu usque ad utrasque Cilicias numerando vel Armeniis et gentibus et omni Illyrico causa fuerit more appellationum transmissa, primum semestre spatium in antiqua definitione permanere et nihil penitus neque deminui neque aderescere ".
$(122,1)$
51 FB, V, liv. Sebēos, p. 139. [See, Toumanoff, Studies, p. 201 sqq., 316, etc.]. (122, 2) $52 \mathrm{FB}, \mathrm{V}$, liv.
${ }^{53}$ Ibid., V, xxxvii. [Cf. Toumanoff, Studies, p. 193 n. 209]. (123, 2)

 also xli, p. 231, et al. [Cf. Toumanoff, Studies, p. 193 n. 207].






 57a [On Artabanes' career, see, Procopius, Vand., II [IV], passim, especially xxvii, 12 -xxviii, 42 [L. II, 438/9-456/7]; also below, Chapter VIII, n. 3b]

58 Joh. Eph., de beatis, xiii, p. 69, "Vir fuerat magnifieus et fastidiosus, a puero regie educatus, natus genere Arsacidarum, Bar-Bar'i, olim patricii omnium in Oriente potentissimi, maximi, et illustrissimi ". Bar-Bar'i $=$ Bar- $\langle\omega<\mu \zeta$ ?

59 Ibid., xxi, p. 101.

 Nersēs, pp. 36, 38, Чwp£wgh.p, Һппа

${ }^{61}$ FB, IV, xiv. [Cf. Toumanoff, Studies, p. 233 n. 291].
$62 F \cdot B$, III, ii, et al.
63 L, $P^{\prime}$, xviii, p. 111.
$(125,3)$


 $(125,4)$
 ảp $\delta$ pós ".

66 According to $\mathbb{Z t i s ̌ e}$, IV, p. 93, Vasak Mamikonean, the collaborator of the marzpan was at that time (i.e. A.D. 451) the sparapet of Lower Armenia, and had been given the

 Lower Armenia must obviously mean the Satrapies, and consequently Vasak was one of the Satraps. Elisēe's information about the fifth century does not enhance his reputation as a historian. Imperial armies were stationed neither in the Satrapies nor in Armenia Interior in this period, the defense of the frontier being entrusted to native troops until 529 when Justinian first appointed a magister militum per Armeniam and three dukes under his command [see next chapter]. Since Eliše speaks of a sparapet of Roman troops in Armenia, whether we take this to be the magister himself or one of the dukes, the History of the Vardanank' cannot have been composed earlier than 529 when these offices were created. Łazar P'arpeci does not know this Vasak Mamikonean, consequently the reference to him must be attributed to those additions in the text of Elišē which are not found in the parallel sections of Łazar's History. Might the Vasak of Elise be a memory of the historic Vasak, the leader of the Armenian rebels mentioned by Procopius? Procopius places the arrival of Vasak in Constantinople before the Persian campaign of 544 . At that time the office of one of the dukes of Armenia was held by a member of the Kamsarakan house, who resided at Kitharizon. Perhaps, Vasak was also appointed duke because of his knowledge of local affairs, and sent to Martyropolis, which was likewise the station of one of the dukes. Such a detail is interesting for a study of the text of Elisée.
(126, 1 (

## CHAPTER VI

1 De Iustiniano codice confirmando, incipit. [On the reforms of Justinian and his legislative and administrative activity in general, see Jones, LRE, and Stein, Bas Empire, II as well as Rubin, Iustinian. For his policy in the East and in Armenia in particular, see also, Ibid., iv, pp. 245 sqq. and Toumanoff, Studies, 174-175, 194-196, etc.; Manandian, Feudalism, pp. 299-303; Sukiasian, Armenia, pp. 325-332].
${ }^{2}$ Procopius, Pers., II, ii, 6 [L. I, 266/7],



$(128,2)$
${ }^{3}$ Ibid., II, iii, 42-43 [L. I, 282/3],



${ }^{4}$ Nov., XXX = Const., XLIV, xi, 2,







(129, 2)
 est maiestate?".
(130, 1)
${ }^{6}$ Ibid., I, xiv, 12 (5), "... tam conditor quam interpres legum solus imperator solus iuste existimabitur ".
(130, 2)
${ }^{7}$ Ibid., I, xvii, 2, introduction.
8 Ibid., I, xiv, 12 (1), "... quis tantae superbiae fastidio tumidus est, ut regalem sensum contemnat, cum et veteris iuris conditores constitutiones, quae ex imperiali decreto processerunt, legis vicem obtinere aperte dilucideque definiunt? ... (4) vel quis legum aenigmata solvere et omnibus aperire idoneus esse videbitur nisi is, cui soli legis latore esse concessum est? '.

9 Ibid., I, xxvii, 2 (1).
(130, 5(
9a [Vasiliev, " Review ", ZMNP, pp. 416-417, objected that Adontz tends to underestimate the activity of Justinian's predecessors and of Anastasius in particular, in various parts of his work. In the present section, Adontz does follow perhaps too closely the evaluations of Procopius, as expressed in the Buildings, a work repeatedly tending to shift from history to panegyric.]
10 Procopius, Aed., III, i, 16 [L. VII, 182/3],







11 Ibid., III, i, $28-29$ [L. VII, 186/7],





11a [ $C J$, I, xxix, 5. For the text of this decree, see Appendix I B.]
12 Malalas, pp. 429-430,











${ }^{122}$ [Cf. Jones, $L R E, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{p} .271$ who speaks of five dukes in 528, at the time when the post of magister militum per Armeniam was created, also Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 195196.]
${ }^{13}$ Justinian himself dated the beginning of his reign from 1 April, 527, Nov., XLVII = Const., LXVI, i, 1, when he was designated as co-emperor by Justin I. According to Procopius, Anec., IX, liii [L. VI, 118/9], this was three days before Easter, which fell on April 4 in 527. He became sole emperor on 1 August of the same year. Güterbock, Römisch.-Armenien, p. 40 dates the accession incorrectly in 528. [For the date of the creation of the office of magister militum per Armeniam, see Jones, $L_{i} R E, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{p} .271$, and above, Chapter V, n. 26a].

14 Procopius, Pers., I, xv, 3 [L. I, 130/1],

 $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \widehat{\varphi}$ छ̀ $\phi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \tau \eta \eta_{\kappa \iota} "$ "]
${ }^{15}$ Ibid., I, xxi, 2 [L. I, 194/5],


[Procopius says that Belisarius had been removed from his eastern command, "in order that he might march against the Vandals ... '].
$(125,3)$
16 Ibid., I, xxi, 9 [L. I, 196/7],






 $B v \zeta_{\alpha \nu \tau i \psi} \in i \chi \epsilon \ldots$...
 [Cf. Rubin, Iustinian, p. 289].

19 Malalas, p. 470.
20 Ibid., p. 469.
21 Ibid., p. 472.
21a [Procopius, Pers., I, xv, 9-17 [L. I, 130/1-134/5].]
21b [See above, n. 12.]
${ }^{21 \mathrm{e}}$ [Not. dig., IX, 49, p. 30. Cf. Jones, LRE, I, pp. 597-599.]


 thought that Ursicinus was Sittas' Roman name, Ibid., Introduction. It is more likely
 a bishop's name given by Agat', exxi, p. 624, and Uuph4 [UupnLl], the successor of bishop Xad, in $F B$, IV, xii [Rubin, Iustinian, p. $508 \mathrm{n}, 1010$, rejects this hypothesis].
${ }^{22 \mathrm{a}}$ [CJ, I, xxix, 5, see Appendix I B.]
${ }^{22 \mathrm{~b}}$ [Not. dig., vi, 31; vii, 49-50, 58, see Appendix II A.]
${ }^{23}$ [See above n. 12]. Cedrenus, I, p. 643 says that the four numeri had 1,000 men apiece, a statement which needs verification,
$(138,2)$
24 Theoph. Conf., I, p. 175, follows Malalas, but describes the scriniarii in his own fashion,





(139:1)


 26a [See above, Chapter V n. 7a.]
${ }^{26 b}$ [Cf. Stein, Bas-Empire, II, pp. 289-291 and Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 152, 174, etc.] $(139,4)$
27 Jos. Styl., lii, p. xlv.
${ }^{27 a}$ [Procopius, Aed., III, ii, 2-3; iii, 8, 14; iv, 15-20; v, 12; vi, 16-17, 26 [L. VII, 186/7, 192/3, 194/5, 198/9-200/1, 204/5, 208/9, 212/3. See above Chapter I, pp. 9-10,14-16, 18-20 and Chapter III, pp. 49-51.]


$(140,1)$
28a [Ibid., III, ii-vi, L. VII, 187/8-212/3.]
${ }^{28 b}$ [Ibid., III, iv, L. VII, 194/5-200/1.]
28c [Ibid., III, ii, 11-14, [L. VII, 190/1,









28d [Ibid., III, iii, 6, [L. VII, 192/3],

 таขта́табьข єi้ขal".]

28e [Ibid., III, iii, 7-8, [L. VII, 192/3],]






Ibid., III, iii, 14, [L. VII, 194/5],




28i [Ibid., III, v, 2, [L. VII, 200/1],


 pp. 64-70.]

 є $\gamma \in \gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \iota$ ". Cf. Manandian, Trade, p. 88 and Toumanoff, Studies, p. 193 n. 209.]

28h [Procopius, Aed., III, iv, 4-12, [L. VII, 200/1-204/5],



















${ }^{281}$ [Ibid., III, v, 13-15, [L. VII, 204/5],







${ }^{285}$［Nov．，XXXI，1．］
28k［On Bizana－Leontopolis－Justinianopolis，see Jones，$C R E P$ ，pp．225－226，Stein， Bas－Empire，p． 290 n .1 ，Honigmann，Ostgrenze，pp．17－19，93－94，and Eremyan，Ar－ menia，pp．65，83．The village of Vižan on the Kara－su can no longer be found in $G 46$ ， though it is given in both Kiepert，Karte B，VI and Wilson，Handbook，p．249，but the locality named Vican is still indicated in the corresponding position on the USAFM 300 A i．］
 Procopius，Aed．，III，iv， 13 ［L．VII，198／9］，＂èv Bu弓avoîs＂corresponds to the Armenian
 not $\left\langle\boldsymbol{L} w \mathcal{L}_{1}\right.$ as it is given by Inčičean，Geography，p． 91 ［and Eremyan，Armenia，pp．65， 83］．Bizana is also mentioned in the Nova Tactica，Georg．Cypr．，p． 78 as one of the eparchies of the metropolis of Trapezos，＂o（ $\theta \rho \dot{\rho} \nu o s$ ）Bĭ̧ápov．The consiruction here seems to indieate a nominative or the genitive from Bu̧̧áva．In the same List［Ibid．，
 politanate of Kamacha，which is easily confused with Bizana．We prefer the reading Tap弓avícod（now Gercanis）above Erzincan．This city cannot be identified with Bizana since the latter was listed in the metropolitanate of Trapezos．［Cf．Appendix II G； for the text of the Nova Tactica．The reading Garzanissa pro Barzanissa is not suggested by Gelzer in his edition of the Nova Tactica，loc．cit．，and Honigmann，Ostgrenze，pp．71， 75，identifies Barzanisses with Vardenik＇．］
$(145,1)$
${ }^{30}$ The Greek $-\tau \zeta$－is a rendering of the palatal dzh．Inčičean，Geography，p．101，
 of the eastern pronunciation．Cf．Thavoi and $\sigma w 反 p-$ ．f．［On Tzumina，see，Honig－ mann，Ostgrenze，pp．19，199．］
（145，2）
31 Mansi，TX，p．391，Gregory of Justinianopolis at the Council of 553．Ibid．，XI，
 Council．
$(145,3)$
${ }^{312}$［Procopius，Aed．，III，iv， $2-5$［L．VII，194／5－196／7］，










 шјdк шир 4ппnípuj＂．
${ }^{32 a}$ [Procopius, Aed., III, iv, 7-11 [L. VII, 196/7-198/9],












${ }^{32 \mathrm{~b}}$ [Ibid., III, iv, 15-20 [L. VII, 198/9-200/1],















${ }^{32 \mathrm{e}}$ [Ibid., III, iv, 12-14 [L. VII, 198/9],



 е̇тикалоч́ $\mu \in \nu о \nu "$ "]
${ }^{33}$ Cuinet, I, p. 134 gives Kokiris among the 14 "nahiés" of the kaza of Bayburt. This is clearly the historic Kukarizōn which is also known to Xorenaẹi, MX, II, lxv,
 Cuinet does not indicate the location of Kokaris on his map. [Cf. Hübschmann, Ortsnamen, pp. 380, 442. Cuinet lists Kokiris between "Khart" and "Aginsor". Although both Hart and Ağinsos can be found both on Kiepert, Karte, B VI and USAFM 324 C IV, Kokaris cannot be found unless it is to be identified with Gögẹ̌eli, G46, p. 242 (8)].
(147, 1)
34 There is probably no foundation for the identification of $A v \tau a \rho a \rho i \zeta \omega \nu$ with Lnumw/ $\sigma w n / 6$ which stood in Armenia IV at the junction of the Arsanias and the Euphrates, according to the Arm. Geogr., [p. 30/41. Of. Eremyan, Armenia, p. 54].
(147, 2)

35 " ${ }^{\circ}$ Kєра ${ }^{\prime} \omega \omega$ " according to the Nova Tactica of the X-XI C. in Georg. Cypr., p. 78. Near Krom is found Rumluk, which is equated by Cuinet, I, p. 127 with "Lérion ", " $\delta \Lambda_{\epsilon p i o v " ~ l i k e w i s e ~ a n ~ e p i s c o p a l ~ s e e ~ i n ~ t h e ~ m e t r o p o l i t a n a t e ~ o f ~ T r a p e z o s ~[G e o r g . ~}^{\text {. }}$ Cypr., p. 78. Krom ean be found in Kiepert Karte, B V, but not on modern maps or gazetteers, although the Korum deresi evidently preserves the name of the locality, G46, p. 420 and USAFM 324 CIV. Rumluk does not appear in the modern topography, but Leri is still found on the USAFM 324 CIV even though it is not listed in G46. On both these bishoprics see, Honigmann, Ostgrenze, p. 54 and nn. 1, 6-8.]
























[For the whole discussion of Karin-Theodosiopolis, see in particular, Manandian, Trade, pp. 87-90, also above nn. 28 g -h].
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$(149,1)$
${ }^{38}$ Procopins, Pers., I, xvii, 6-11 [L. I, 146/7],










 $K \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \eta \nu \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \kappa \lambda \lambda о \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu \quad \chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu$ " ${ }^{\prime}$.
Procopius also locates the sources of the Tigris near Theodosiopolis, having evidently confused it with the Araxes [Ibid., I, xvii, 4, L. I, 144/5].
${ }^{39}$ MX, III, lix. [See above, n. 36 for the text].
40 The etymology of the word $\tau^{w} \delta_{P}$ is unknown. The Turkish name is derived from سا سازلت "reed or " According to Yakovb Karneci, p. 578, the samb lay half-a-day's journey from the city. [Cf. Eremyan, Armenia, pp. 73 (2), 94].
$(150,3)$
${ }^{41}$ According to the information of Inčičean, Geography, p. 66.
${ }^{42}$ Maj. Gen. S. Dukhovskiü, "The Russians in Erzerum in 1878 ", Voennyž Sbornik (1878), p. 13.
$(151,2)$
${ }^{43}$ Yakovb Karneci, p. 569.
$(151,3)$
44 Inčičean, Geography, p. 59. This is the third case of a mountain called Gohanam:

 high or steep mountain.
${ }^{45}$ [See above, nn. 28g-h, and 36-7, for the relevant texts.]
$(151,4)$

45a [See above pp. 113-114 and n. 28e.]
${ }^{46}$ According to Asolik, II, v, p. 132 the city was taken in the VIIIth century by







(152, 2)
47 Many travellers have visited and described Erzurum. The best deseription of the city is given by Father Inčičean, Geography, pp. 65 sqq., the next is by K. Koch, Reise im pontischen Gebirge (Weimar, 1846), II, pp. 281 sqq. We have relied her primarily on Koch. Inčičean gives 72 towers as against 62 in Koch, and Lynch, [Armenia, II, p. 210. Lynch also gives an extensive description of the city, Ibid., pp. 198-224.] (153, 1)
${ }^{48}$ Koch, Reise, II, 287, " Die grossartigen Uberreste einer Ringmauer ... soheinen mir selbst " alter zu sein, als die der Festung (und halten 6 Fuss im Durchmessen, lagen aber in Trummer. Hinter ist ein ausgefüllter Wall)".
$(153,2)$
${ }^{48 a}$ [See above n. 32c.]
${ }^{48 \mathrm{~b}}$ [See above nn .32 c and 48.]
${ }^{48 c}$ [See above n. 28h.]
 for the context].
( 154,1 )
${ }^{50}$ Yakovb Karneci, pp. $548-9$ makes use of the Legend in his description of Theodosiopolis. Unfortunately he described the " $\chi$ osrovian towers" by means of a word
 Ibid., p. 563, $=$ a type of gun, is apparently used in the sense of an arsenal. The citadel contains an arsenal حبرd خانd or powder cellar next to a tall tower, and Yakovb tries to identify the " $\chi$ osrovian tower" with the arsenal. The present storehouses in the citadel are related to those called "Augusteon" by Xorenac̣i [See above n. 36]. Procopius, Aed., I, ii, 1 [L. VII, 32/3] gives the name Augustéon to a market-
 Pasch., p. 529, but the meaning of the term was not exhausted by this explanation, it could also have the sense given to it by Xorenaci. On the meaning of the word Augusteon, see, Du Cange, Familles byzantines, II, p. 70.
(154, 2)
51 According to Inčičean, Geography, p. 69 there are two churches dedicated to the Theotokos in the suburbs of the city not far from each other. One is called the upper chureh, and the other one the lower. The first is also called " 1 Пшршии ИИдіид $/ \Sigma$,

 The explanation given seems improbable, it is probable that the foundation of a second church bearing the same name, if it is not of recent date, was due to confessional quarrels between Armenians of the National and Imperialist parties.
52 Diehl, L'Afrique byzantine, p. 145. [Manuel, I, p. 197 sqq.].
${ }^{53}$ Texier and Pullan, L'architecture byzantine (London, 1864). [Diehl, Manuel, I, pp. 197-200].
$(155,3)$
${ }^{54}$ Procopius, Pers., II, xiii, 17-18 [L. I, 376/7].
${ }^{55}$ Diehl, L'Afrique byzantine, p. 185.

## CHAPTER VII

${ }^{\text {a }}$ [Nov. XXI, title and incipit. The text of the entire Novella is given in Appendix I F. See Chapter VI, n. 1, for additional bibliography on the reforms of Justinian.]
${ }^{1}$ Nov. VIII $=$ Const. XVI. The entire text of this Novella is given in Appendix I D.
1a [Ibid., Preface, 1.]
${ }_{2}$ Procopius, Anec., xxvi, 1-6 [L. V, i, 242/3-244/5]. According to this tale, even Justinian did not refuse such a gift and accepted 30 centenaria from the Prefect, John of Cappadocia.
${ }^{3}$ Nov. VIII, Preface, 1.
${ }^{4}$ Idem.
${ }^{5}$ Nov. VIII, "Notitia" xxii, xxiii, xxvi, xliii. [See Appendix I for the relevant texts]. The payments were made to the imperial household (in sacro cubiculo), to the first secretary (primicerio ... tribunorum notariorum), to his assistant (eius adiutori), as well as to the chancery of the praetorian prefect (officio praef. praet.). The first class paid respectively $9,24,3$, and 40 solidi; the second, $9,15,3$, and 36 . [On suffragium and Justinian's attempt to abolish this practice, see Jones, LRRE, I, pp. 279, 306-307, and particularly 391-401.]

5a [Nov. XVII.]
${ }^{6}$ Nov. VIII, ui-v. [See Appendix ID].

${ }^{8}$ Nov. XXIX, " $\Pi_{\varepsilon \rho i}$ тồ $\pi \rho a i \tau \omega \rho o s$ Mapגayovias".


11 Nov. XXIV, " Praetor Pisidiae "; Nov. XXV, " Praetor Lyeaoniae "; Nov. XXVII, "Comes Isauriae"; Nov. CII, " Moderator Arabiae "; Nov. CIII, " Proconsul Palestinae "; Nov, CIV, " Praetor Siciliae".
(163, 4)
12 Bethmann-Hollweg, Civilprocess, III, No. 131, p. 44. [Cf. Jones, LRE, I, xiv, pp. 470-522], also p. 404.
${ }^{13}$ Nov. XV, " $\Pi_{\epsilon \rho i} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ éк $\delta i \kappa \omega \nu "$ ", Preface. [Cf. Jones, LRE, I, pp. 144-145, 279-280, 479-480, 499, 726-727, 758-759].
$(164,1)$
${ }^{14}$ CJ, I, lv, 1, [" Impp. Valentinianus et Valens AA. Senecae defensori. Si quis de tenuioribus ac minusculariis rebus interpellandum te esse crediderit, in minoribus eausis, id est usque ad quinquaginta solidorum summam, acta iudicalia conficias, scilicet ut , si quando quis vel debitum iustum vel servum ... vel quod ultra delegationem dederit postulaverit, vel quodlibet huiusmodi, tua disceptatione restituas. Ceteras vero, quae dignae forensi magnitudine videbuntur, ordinario insinuato rectori. D. v k. Iul. Tyrici Valentiniano et Valente AA. conss. (a. 365)].
(164, 2)
${ }^{15}$ Nov. XV, iii, 2, from 17 July, 535,



${ }^{16}$ The earliest references are found in Novellae XXIV and XXV from 18 May, 535. The lost Novella was not yet known on 15 April of the same year, since there is no reference to the legal competence of the counts created in Phrygia and Galatia in the Novella
dealing with their appointment, [Nov. VIII, ii, iii]. The lost Novella was probably promulgated, therefore, between 15 April and 18 May , 535. After some time, more precisely in January of 536, appeared Novella XXIII, " De appellationibus ... " in which the author complains, Ibid., iii, " evenit, ut super minimis causis maximi nostri iudices inquietentur et homines propter minimas causas magnis fatigentur dispensiis, ut forsitan totius litis aestimatio ad sumptus iudicales non sufficeret". Thereafter, appeals on sums less than ten pounds of gold, were to be taken not to the capital but to the nearest spectabilis court. Since the provincial reform was still incomplete in 535, appeals from the Armenian provinces went to the Moderator of Helenopontus, as the nearest official with the rank of spectabilis [Cf. Nov. XXVIII, viii, "Dat. xvii. kal. Aug. CP Belisario v.c. cons."]. The limit was ten pounds of gold or 720 solidi instead of the normal 500 solidi, a fact to be explained either through a temporary devaluation of the solidus, or because legal expenses were higher in certain provinces and the sum had consequently been intentionally increased. [Cf. Jones, LRE, I, pp. 280-282, 483, 506].

16a [The entire text of this Novella will be found in Appendix I G.]
${ }^{16 \mathrm{~b}}$ [Nov. XXVIII = Const., XXXI, " Dat. xvii k. Aug. CP Belisario v.c. cons. ".]


$(172,1)$
18 Ibid., Preface. Leontopolis should not be confused with the city of the same name found in Armenia [Cf. above, Chapter VI, n. 50]. Leontopolis of Helenopontus was

$(172,2)$
${ }^{182}$ [On the creation of the four Armenias, see Jones, LRER, I, 280-282, Toumanoff, Studies, p. 174, etc.]
${ }^{19}$ Nov. XX $=$ Const. XLVI, iii. [For the text, see Appendix I E].
20 Nov. VIII = Const. XVI, "Notitia", xxiii. [For the text, see Appendix I D]. (173, 2)
20 a [See above, Chapter VI, n. 26.b]
21 We should note here that Procopius, Aed., III, v, 15 [L. VII, 204/5] mentions Iustinianopolis at a time when he presumably had no knowledge of Justinian's reform of 536 .
(174, 1)
${ }_{24}$ Procopius, Pers., II, iii, 4-5 [L. I, 270/1],



${ }^{22 \mathrm{~b}}$ [Nov. XXVIII, Preface.]
${ }^{23}$ Editor's note to Const., XLIV, Teubner ed., I, 277.
${ }^{23 a}$ [Procopius, Pers., II, ïi [L. I, 270/1-286/7]. Cf. Toumanoff, Studies, p. 175 n. 109.]
${ }^{23 b}$ [Nov. XXXI, i, 3.]
24 Procopius, Pers., II, iii, 5-7 [L. I, 270/1-272/3],


$(176,1)$
${ }^{25}$ [Pisidia, Nov. XXIV, vi; Lykaonia, Nov. XXV, Epilogue; Thrace, Nov. XXVI, v, 1; Isauria, Nov. XXVII, Epilogue;. of. Thomas, Nov. XXXI, i, 2]. Only the Moderator of Helenopontus received a trifle more, i.e., 725 solidi [Nov. XXVIII, iii]. In contrast to the other officials, the proconsul of Cappadocia received 20 pounds of gold [Nov. XXX, vi, 2]. This province contained vast Imperial estates, тapєıaкخे ктйous and, the proconsul also administered them and their revenne in addition to his regular duties,
and deposited 50 pounds of gold for the private expenses of the emperor and the empress. Nov. $\mathrm{XXX}=$ Const. XLIV, vi, 1. This circumstance explains the unusually high salary of this proconsul.
(177, 1)
${ }^{26}$ Is this to be explained by the reduced size of the officium, or by a mistake in the text? The figures given are not always accurate in other Novellae, as evidenced by the corrections found in the new Teubner edition.
${ }_{27}$ Nov. XXV = Const. XXVI, i. Cf. Bethmann-Hollweg, Civil-process, III, No. 142, p. 137.



28a [See above Chapter VI, n. 26b.]
${ }^{28 b}$ Procopius, Pers., II, xxx, 5, [L. I, 540/1],






29a [Cf. Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 151 sqq., et al.]
${ }^{29 b}$ [On the naxarar system in Armenia and the effect of Justinian's reform upon it, see Manandian, Feudalism, and particularly Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 119-123 with their notes and 174, where the author discusses the Armenian system of agnatic inheritance and its destruction by Justinian, et passim, also below, Chapter XV.]
${ }^{29 \mathrm{c}}$ [Const., LXXIII $=E d$., III. The entire text of this document will be found in Appendix I.]

29d [Nov. XXI = Const. XLVII. The entire text of this document will be found in Appendix I F. Of. Nov. CXVIII.]
${ }^{29 e}$ [Cf. Novellae, p. 760 note 22.]
${ }^{30}$ The wording of the decree should also be considered here, "... סı̀̀ rov̂ro $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \mathrm{j} ~ \delta \dot{\eta}$
 подıгєv́ouтo" [Ed., III, i], i.e. our laws were introduced into Armenia so that they should regulate their lives according to them. From this remark, we might conclude that that the transformation of Armenia had already been completed by the time this decree appeared. In other words, that Novella XXI had been promulgated before 18 March 536, but this is impossible in the light of the above discussion. The passage in the decree probably refers to the establishment of the praeses in Armenia Interior, which took place before 536 , as we have already seen. [This passage both in the text and in the note is partially obseured by Adontz's reference to Nov. XXI and XXXI as Ed., III as " the Novella" without specifying the particular document under discussion].
${ }^{30 \mathrm{a}}$ [Ed., III, i = Nov., XXI, title.]
${ }^{31} C J, V$, iii, 20 (2).
${ }^{32}$ Const., XCIV = Nov. LXXIV, iv, 1,



${ }^{33}$ Idem.
${ }^{34}$ Const., CXLI $=$ Nov. CXVII, iv,








(187, 2)
${ }^{35}$ Idem.







$(188,2)$



${ }^{37 \mathrm{~b}}$ [Cf. Benveniste, $R E A$, n.s., I, p. 5, who on the contrary cites $a w z ̌ i t<{ }^{*}$ abi-jiti-, among " plusieurs ... mots arméniens à préfixe aw- que l'on peut présumer iraniens, même si les formes originales nous manquent encore ... ". See below, n. 39.]
${ }^{38}$ Sachau, Syrischer Rechtsbücher, R I, "Leges Constantini Theodosii Leonis", No. 31, p. 17, "Was der Mann der Frau gibt, heisst $\delta \omega \rho \in$ á. Auf Persisch sagt man dastîr, auf Syrisch zabhd $\hat{a}$ oder mahrâ".
 likewise be linked here; $c f$. the proper name Zebed-ee, $Z_{\epsilon} \beta \in \delta$-aios, Zautha $=$ Arm.

$(189,2)$
${ }^{40}$ It is possible that od $/ n n$ - mud $/ \mu n$ is used in Armenian as it is in Syriae to indicate the gift of the bridegroom to the bride. [Cf. Hübschmann, Grammatik, No. 150, p. 448. For additional bibliography on Armenian Codes and their relation to the socalled Syrian Code, see below n. 44].
(190, 1)
${ }^{41}$ Dastar is also found in Sachau, Syrischer Rechtsbücher, R I, No. 43, p. 23. Sachau says that he is not familiar with such a word in Persian, and makes the incorrect suggestion that, "Vielleicht darf man es mit dastâr in dem Ausdruck دستار $\quad$ = Geschenk geben kombinieren. Die Anfürhung dieses persischen Wortes deutet vielleicht darauf hin, dass RI innerhalb des Sassaniden reichs oder nieht fern von der persischen Sprachgrenze wie in Babylonien verfasst worden ist ". Ibid., p. 187 note. The actual word required here is the Pers., supporter ", < *dasta-data, or more commonly *dasta-dära, "giving a hand" or
 word suggested by Sachau is a diminutive of دستار "kerchief" = Arm. qumunmn - wh [Cf. Hübschmann, Grammatil, No. 171, p. 135].
${ }^{42}$ Sachau, Syrischer Rechtsbücher, R I, No. 31, p. 17 [" Im Lande der Römer (Romäer) ist dies die Ordnung der Gesetze: Wenn ein Mann sich verheiratet und seine Frau aus ihrem Vaterhaus als $\phi \epsilon \rho \nu \eta$ ' Herden von Schafen ... oder Denare mitbringt, dann ist ihr

Ehemann verpflichtet, ihr seinerseits von allem, was sie mitgebracht hat, den gleichen Betrag zu geben. ....

Im Lande der Herrsehaft des Ostens besteht eine andere Gewohnheit. Wenn die Frau 100 Denare bringt, bringt der Mann die Hälfte. Zuweilen bringt der Mann mehr. als die Frau bringt, zuweilen bringt er niehts und zuweilen bringt auch die Frau nichts "]. Ibid., No. 51, p. 81, where it is said that in Roman law, if a wife brings 100 denarii, the husband likewise brings 100 , if 200 , then 200 , whereas in the East, if the wife brings 100 denarii, the husband brings only half, i.e. 50. Cf. Syr.-Röm. Recht., xlv, p. 111-112,







The word мшحпшшишцш反и meaning "dowry" exists in Armenian; it is perhaps $<$ Pers. *peš-data, " pre-given ".
$(190,3)$
${ }^{43}$ Syr.-Röm. Recht., which gives both the Syriac text and the Armenian and Arabic translations. [On proyg, see Hübschmann, Grammatik, No. 352, p. 374, and Kostanean, Proyg.]
(191, 1)
${ }^{44}$ Ibid., p. 163. [On M $\chi$ it'ar Gǒs's Code and its relationship both to the Syrian Code, and the Code of Smbat Sparapet, see Karst, Sempadscher Kodex; M ${ }_{\chi}{ }^{i t}$ 'ar Gōs'; Smbat Sparapet, Code; Pivazyan, MXit'ar Gōš and Smbat Sparapet; T'orosyan, Two Redactions; and for further bibliography on Armenian medieval law, Sukiasian, Armenia]. (191, 2)
${ }^{45}$ Zarbanalean, pp. 754-755.
$(191,3)$
46 The editors of the Armenian translation of the Syrian Code accepted the thesis that Gos was aequainted with it, Syr.-Röm. Rechts., p. 163 , but the colophon to which we have referred was not yet published at the time. In his small article, K. Kostanean, " Proyg and Towayr ", Azgayin Handēs, XIII (1906), p. 131, forgets the existence of this colophon, insists that we still do not know when and by whom the Armenian translation of the Syrian Code was made, and supposes incorrectly that Goš had made use of it. [Cf. above n. 44, particularly Harut'unyan's Preface to the Lawcode, pp. xviiixxiii].
${ }^{46 a}$ [V. Bastameanc̣, ed., The Armenian Lawcode of $M_{\chi}{ }^{i t}$ 'ar Göš (Vałaršapat, 1880).]



 шп <ппи пр $4 \pi \Sigma \beta$ щппјq. ". This artiele is missing in four of MSS used by the editor of the Code, in one of the MSS it has been put into the second part of the Code. The beginning of the artiele shows that it is not in its proper place but has been shifted from another part of the Code. Snıwn, the deformation of $\delta \omega \rho \in \alpha$ assumes the form mnıwJp in MXit'ar's Code, probably as a result of a false etymology deriving it from Arm. unц $w_{J P}$, meaning mnLhwill junlils which is given in the Arm. Dict., II, p. 890 [Cf. Harutyunyan, " notes" to the Lawcode, p. 237 n. 57]. Concerning mahrā, see van den Berg, Droit musulman, pp. 147-149.
$(192,1)$
$48{ }^{2} \chi^{i t}{ }^{\prime} a r$ Göš, I, cxxi,
(192, 2)
 to the Lawcode, p. 237 n. 58].

49 a [ $\mathrm{Ed} ., \mathrm{III}$, i.]
${ }^{50}$ According to the Law of the XII Tables, V, 4 [L. III, 448/9]. "Si intestato moritur, cui suus heres nee escit, adgnatus proximus familiam habeto ". The same was true of the Greek, not only before Solon, but also after his reform. Men were given the precedence over women in cases of intestacy. [On the question of agnatic inberitance, see, Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 119-123.
(194, 1)
${ }^{51}$ Const., CXLIII = Nov. CXVIII, " $\Delta \iota a ́ \tau a \xi ̆ ı s ~ a ̉ v a ı \rho o v ̂ \sigma a ~ \tau a ̀ ~ a d g n a t i k a ~ \delta i к а ı a ~ к а і ~$

(194, 2)
52 Lex Salica, lix, 5, "De terra vero nulla in muliere hereditas est sed ad virilem sexum qui fratres fuerint tota terra perteneat". See Waitz, Verfassungsgeschichte, I, p. 64.
(184, 3)


 Julian's Latin translation, "... ab intestato parentibus suis secundum pristinam Arme-

 54 Tacitus, Germ., xx [L. Discourses, 292/3], "heredes suecessoresque sui ouique liberi, et nullum testamentum ".
(195, 2)









#### Abstract

$(195,3)$


56 Lex Salica, lxxxii, "Hereditatem defuncti filius non filia suscipiat. Si filium non habuit qui defunctus est, ad filiam pecunia et mancipia terra vero ad proximam paternae generationis consanguineum pertineat ".
$(196,1)$
${ }^{56 a}$ [Nov. XXIV, Pisidia; XXV, Lykaonia; XXVI, Thrace; XXVIII, Helenopontus; XXIX, Paphlagonia; XXX, Cappadocia.]
${ }^{57}$ Nov. XXIV, i.

 number of exactions imposed on the Empire as a whole, cf. Diehl, Justinien, p. 296. We do not know which of these were levied in Armenia. It is possible that the revenue from the gold mines located in Akakios' portion of Armenia also entered into the 400 pounds of gold. According to Malalas, p. 456, the mountains lying on the border of Persarmenia were very rich in gold; in periods of heavy rainfall, the earth washed down from the mountains and uncovered the gold deposits. These lands had formerly been rented out by the Romans and the Persians for 200 pounds of gold, but with the transfer of these lands to the Empire under Anastasius, the Romans alone received this revenue,



 rial treasury received a yearly income of 200 pounds of gold from these mines, if these were included into the 4 lentenaria or 400 pounds, the amount of the yearly taxes

 Theophanes is unquestionably making use of Malalas in this passage, and is using the word " talent" in the sense of "kentenarion".

## CHAPTER VIII

${ }^{a}$ [Cf. above Chapter IV n. a, for Vasiliev's objection to Adontz's thesis on the position of Armenia Minor in the successive periods of Armenian history, and his argument that Justinian's policy was aimed at the erradioation of local traditions and the incorporation of Armenia into the norms of Imperial life, all of which Vasiliev considers insufficiently demonstrated, "Review" ZMNP, pp. 414-415. Nevertheless, Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 119-123 and p. 196 n .219 , does not seem to take issue with this aspect of Adontz's argument, and accepts his thesis of the migration of the Armenian nobles westward and their assimilation into the bureaucracy of the Empire after Justinian's transformations in their homeland.]
${ }^{1}$ ACO, II, vi, p. 71, cf. Appendix II H, "... cohabitamus enim circa Armenios barbaros, fideles quidem, sed recte Romano eloquio non utentes, breui quodam ab eis spatio magis autem intercessione Eufratis fluminis separati, et propter frequentem barbarorum permixtionem longos nequiuimus proferre sermones ... ". [Adontz usually dates Leo's Encyclical in 452 or 453 , which is patently impossible since Leo I did not come to the throne until 457. The Answers to this Encyclical are usually dated 457 and 458. See e.g., R. V. Sellers, The Council of Chalcedon (London, 1961), p. 274 and n. 5; Honigmann, Original Lists, pp. 75-76 and n. 167].
(202, 1)
${ }^{1 a}$ [ $M X, \mathrm{I}$, xiv.]


 ... '". Also Pertusi, Notes to Ibid., pp. 108-109, 117-118].
${ }^{2 a}$ [The thesis of Bagratid origin for the Rupenid dynasty is no longer considered tenable. See e.g. Adontz himself in his article " L'aỉeul des Roubéniens. Notes arménobyzantines, VI ", Byzantion, X (1935), reprinted in his Études Arméno-byzantines (Lisbon, 1965), pp. 177-195, et al.]
${ }^{3}$ Sebëos, vi, viii, x, pp. 47, 51, 53, ete. Joh. Eph., $H E$, xi, xv, pp. 231, 236. (204, 1)
${ }^{3 a}$ [The interpretation of iconoclasmo as a rationalist movement, albeit favoured at the time of composition of this book, is no longer taken seriously. For the most recent rejection of this thesis, see M. Anastos, "Iconoclasm and Imperial Rule, 717-842", $C M H$, IV, 1, pp. 61 sqq .]
${ }^{3 b}$ [See Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 196 n. 219, 200-201 n. 228, and Charanis, The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire (Lisbon, s.d.), also above, Chapter V, nn. 57-58.]
${ }^{4}$ Procopius, Goth., III [VII], xxxii, 6-7 [L. IV, 420/1.-422/3],




 $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ 'P $\omega \mu a i \omega \nu \lambda \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ ". [The translation of this passage given in the text is taken from the Loeb Classical library, and is closer to the text than the one given by Adontz].
$(260,1)$




 L作p＂．Cf．Goubert，L＇Orient，pp． 191 sqq．，particularly pp．209－211 and 217－218．］



 ［On the Syrian elements in early Armenian Christianity and their linguistic importance， see，e．g．Ter Minassiantz，Armenische Kirche，and Hübschmann，Grammatile，pp．281－321， ete．On the Hellenistic school in Armenia and the period of its development，Manandian， Hellenistic School］．
$(208,1)$
${ }^{6}$ According to one authority，the Armeniens，＂haben dem Reiche unermessliche Dienst gethan．Die fähigsten Offiziere，die genialsten Heeres leiter der folgenden Jahr－ hunderte（i．e．after Justinian）sind armenischen und iberischen Geblüts＂，H．Gelzer， Die Genesis der byzantinischen Themenverfassung，（Leipzig，1899），p．24．＂Der hohe und niedere Adel der Armenier（Naharark＇，oatpámal und Azatk＇＂A ${ }^{\text {atarot }}$ ）bildeten neben den Iberern den kernhafsten und tüchtigsten Stamm der romäischen Reiter－ regimenter（Kaßa入入арıка̀ $\theta \epsilon ́ \mu a \tau a)$＇＂，Ibid．，p．96．［Cf．above n．3b］．

## APPENDICES

The Appendices are an addition in the present edition and were not part of the original publication, although some of the material included in them was printed as part of Adontz's text, and much of it was referred to in his notes. In some cases, such as the new Greek version of the Life of St Gregory, the Appendices contain material which has become known since the publication of the Russian edition.

Each of the documents included is given either in extenso, or, as in the case of geographical documents or such administrative documents as the various Notitiae, in their relevant portions. The text from which a given document has been cited will be indicated in every case, but for variant readings or editorial notes, the reader is referred to the original edition.

## APPENDICES

The Appendices are an addition in the present edition and were not part of the original publication, although some of the material included in them was printed as part of Adontz's text, and much of it was referred to in his notes. In some cases, such as the new Greek version of the Life of St Gregory, the Appendices contain material which has become known since the publication of the Russian edition.

Each of the documents included is given either in extenso, or, as in the case of geographical documents or such administrative documents as the various Notitiae, in their relevant portions. The text from which a given document has been cited will be indicated in every case, but for variant readings or editorial notes, the reader is referred to the original edition.

## I. GREEK AND LATIN LEGAL DOCUMENTS

## A. Codex Theodosianus ${ }^{1}$

## Liber XII Titulus XIII De auro coronario

6. Iidem AAA [Gratianus, Valentinianus et Theodosius] Gaddanae Satrapae Sophanenae. Aurum coronarium his reddi restituique decernimus, quibus illicite videtur ablatum, ut, secundum consuetudinem moris antiqui, omes satrapae pro devotione, quae Romano debetur imperio, coronam ex propriis facultatibus faciant serenitati nostrae solenniter offerendam. Dat. XVIII. Kal. Iul. Constantinopoli, Valentiniano A. III. et Eutropio Coss. (387).

## B. Codex Justinianus ${ }^{2}$

## Liber I Titulus XXVIIII De officio magistri militum

5. Imp. Iustinianus $A$. Zetae viro illustri magistro militum per Armeniam et Pontem Polemoniacum et gentes. Cum propitia divinitate Romanum nobis sit delatum imperium, sollicita cura cauta diligentia pertractantes perspeximus oportere etiam partibus Armeniae et Ponto Polemoniaco et gentibus proprium magistrum militum per hanc legem constituere, tuamque magnitudinem, quae nobis ex ante gestis optime commendata est, idoneam ad talem fore dignitatem confidentes elegimus certasque provincias, id est magnam Armeniam, quae interior dicebatur, et gentes (Anzetenam videlicet, Ingilenam, Asthianenam, Sophenam, Sophanenam, in qua est Martyropolis, Balabitenam) et primam et secundam Armeniam et Pontum Polemoniacum tuae curae cum suis ducibus commisimus, comite Armeniae penitus sublato, certosque subdidimus numeros, non modo quos in praesenti novos constituimus, sed etiam de praesentalibus et Orientalibus et aliis agminibus segregatos, non tamen quantitatem eorum agminum minuentes: sed quia plures eis addidimus sine rei publicae gravamine et sine augmento sumptuum, aliquantos subtraximus,

[^4]ita tamen, ut et post hanc subtractionem ampliores remanserint, quam usgue ad nostra felicia fuerant tempora.

## C. Codex Justintanus ${ }^{3}$

## Liber X Titulus XVI De annona et tributis

 $\rho^{i} \omega \nu$.

























 тоѝs є̇тáp



[^5]












 тробпropía av̀тov.
D. k. April. Paulo vc. cons.

## D. Novella viit ${ }^{4}$

## Ut iudices sine quoquo suffragio fiant

##  OIASOYN $\triangle O \Sigma E \Omega \Sigma$ IINE $\triangle \Theta A I$.

$\beta^{\prime}$, à $\pi$ ò $\dot{\imath} \pi \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$ каì $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \iota к i ́ \varphi$.











[^6]
























 $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau o s ~ a ̀ \phi \theta o \nu i ́ a . ~ そ ̀ ~ o v ̉ ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma i v ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota ~ \phi a \nu \epsilon \rho o ́ v, ~ o ̀ \tau \iota \pi \epsilon \rho ~ o ́ ~ \chi \rho v \sigma i o v ~$












































 ov̉סєขòs av̉ $\frac{\imath ̂}{}$


## CAPUT I.


















 $a v ̉ \tau \omega \uparrow \hat{\mu} \mu \gamma a ́ \lambda \eta \nu$ aı̈ $\sigma \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$.
caput II.



















CAPUT III.














## CAPUT IV.







## CAPUT V.










caput va.




















 $\theta \epsilon \sigma \pi i \zeta \rho \mu \in \nu$.

## CAPUT VII.



























 $\kappa a i$ oĭ $\gamma \epsilon$ ả $\mu \phi^{\prime}$ aù $\frac{0}{}$





## CAPUT VIII.


















































CAPUT IX,

















 $\lambda a ́ a z o v$.

## CAPUT X.

















 $\kappa \lambda о \pi \hat{\omega} \nu$, кaì ov̉ठ̀ $\tau$ ò $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ v i \pi \eta \kappa o ́ o v s ~ \epsilon ’ \rho v \theta \rho \iota \omega ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \pi a \rho a ́ \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu a . ~$







































 ¿́puovia.

CAPUT XI.
























 Biov.

## CAPUT XII.






 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a u ̉ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \pi a \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \omega ิ s ~ \phi o ́ \rho o v ~[\eta ้ \tau o t ~ к \rho \iota \tau \eta \rho i o v] ~ \pi a \rho a \gamma \rho a ф \eta ̀ \nu ~ \mu \eta ́ \tau \epsilon ~$

























 aủrov̀s $\chi \rho \eta \eta_{\sigma a \sigma \theta a \imath ; ~}$

## CAPUT XIII.

























## CAPUT XIV.






















 Dat. xvii. k. Mai. CP. Belisario v. c. cons.
[a. 535].
 о́ $\iota \omega \tau \alpha ́ \tau o \iota s ~ \pi а \tau \rho เ \alpha ́ p \chi \alpha ı s . ~$



























## CAPUT I.






















Dat. xv. k. Mai. CP. Belisario v. c. cons.
[a. 535].







 $\sigma v \mu \phi \in ́ \rho o v ~ a i p o v ́ \mu є \theta a$ $\pi o ́ v o \nu . ~$


 $\tau \iota \pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma$.


$\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i ́ \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho \circ \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta \circ$ v́v $\omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$

кoúlov
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̀ $\tau o \hat{v} \beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu \quad \mu . \nu$,
$\tau \hat{\tau}$ aṽ $\tau \hat{v} \beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \quad \nu \circ \mu \cdot \gamma$,

датоs $\quad \nu о \mu . \pi$,

$\kappa о \nu \beta о v к \lambda є i ́ \varphi \quad \nu о \mu . \xi \gamma^{\prime}$


кои́лоv
vo $\mu . \mu$,
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉ $\tau o \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu \circ \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$

датоs $\quad \nu о \mu . \pi{ }^{\text {' }}$

oṽт

$\theta \epsilon i \circ v \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ коขßочклєiov
$\nu \circ \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 pí $\omega \nu$

рон．к $\delta$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av่тô $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 та́уратоs ขоц．v’
4 ＇A $A$ ò то仑 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta \lambda є ́ \pi \tau о v$ кó $\mu \eta \tau o s ~ \Gamma a \lambda a \tau i ́ a s ~ \pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta s ~$ ov゙т $\omega$ ．
 коиßоиклєíov vоц．$\theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \widehat{\omega} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i ́ \omega ~ \tau \omega ̀ \nu ~ \lambda а \mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \tau \rho \iota \beta о u ́ \nu \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$ picuv $\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu o \mu . v$,
 $\pi \epsilon \rho \imath \beta \lambda$ є́ттоьs $\chi$ артоvдарíoıs трıбi то仑 $\theta$ єíov коv－ $\beta$ оик $\lambda є i ́ o v$
$\nu o \mu \cdot \theta^{\prime}$
 $\rho i \omega \nu$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \alpha v ่ \tau o \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu о \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha \xi \in \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \stackrel{\jmath}{\epsilon} \nu \delta o \xi o \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ Є่ $\pi a ́ \rho \chi \omega \nu \dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho \pi \rho o s \tau a ́ \gamma-$ matos
$\nu о \mu \cdot \mu^{\prime}$

6 ＇A $A$ ò $\tau о \hat{v}$ ä $\rho \chi o v \tau o s ~ M a \lambda a \iota \sigma \tau i v \eta s ~ \pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta s ~ o v ̃ \tau \omega s . ~$
 коиßоиклєíov vou．$\theta^{\text {’ }}$
 рí $\omega \nu \quad \nu о \mu . к \delta{ }^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av่тô $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi} \quad \nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 натоs $\quad \nu о \mu . \mu$＇
 тоîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi т о \iota s ~ \chi a \rho \tau о v \lambda a \rho i o ı s ~ \tau \rho ı \sigma i ́ ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ \theta є i ́ o v ~$ кои $\beta$ оик $\lambda є i ́ v=$ vo $\mu . \theta^{3}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \omega\left(\omega \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v^{\prime} \nu \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-\right.$ píw
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉ $\tau o \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu о \mu \cdot \mu^{\prime}$
8 'A $A$ ò $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ä $\rho \chi o v \tau o s ~ \Phi o \iota v i к \eta s ~ \pi a \rho a ́ \lambda o v ~ o v i \tau \omega s . ~$
 коข $\beta$ оик $\lambda є i o v$ $\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 $\rho i \omega \nu$ $\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\omega}$ av̉ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$

$$
\nu o \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}
$$

 мatos

```
\nuо\mu. \mu'
```

9 'A $A$ ò тov̂ ä $\rho \chi o \nu \tau o s ~ \Sigma v p i a s ~ \delta є v \tau \epsilon ́ p a s ~ o v ̋ \tau \omega s . ~$
 кovßоиклєiov $\nu \circ \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \underset{\iota}{\tau} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ да $\pi \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о \tilde{v} \nu \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$ $\rho^{i} \omega \nu$ $\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\omega}$ av่ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$ $\nu 0 \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs $\nu о \mu \cdot \mu^{\prime}$
10 ' $A \pi o ̀ ~ \tau o v ~ a ̉ p \chi o v \tau o s ~ \Theta є o \delta \omega \rho l a ́ \delta o s ~ o v ̃ \tau \omega s . ~$
 коиßоขклєiov $\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \underline{\omega} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v ́ v \omega \nu$ vотаpíw $\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\omega}$ av่тô $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$ $\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 натоs
$\nu о \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

тоîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau o u s ~ \chi a \rho \tau o v \lambda a \rho i o ı s ~ \tau \rho ı \sigma i ~ \tau o \hat{v}$ $\theta \in i o v ~$ коиßоиклєiov $\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 píw
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{2}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉rô $\beta$ oŋ $\theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 мatos
$v o \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 коvßоикдєíov
$\nu 0 \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\imath} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \not \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda a \mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v \not \nu \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$ $\rho i \omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\Sigma} \alpha$ ข่тov $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \quad \nu о \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 матаs
$\nu \quad \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 кочßоиклєі́ov
$\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \nprec \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v ́ \nu \omega \nu$ voтapi $\omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 мatos
$\nu о \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 кочßотклєíov
$\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota к \eta \rho i ́ \omega$ т $\frac{\omega}{\nu} \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \omega \nu \quad \tau \rho \iota \beta о \cup ́ \nu \omega \nu$ vотаpicuv
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av่rô $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma \quad \gamma^{\prime}$
 матos
$\nu о \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 коvßоиклєiov
$\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \varphi \psi \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v ́ v \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$ $\rho i \omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\epsilon}$ av̉ $\tau \circ \hat{v} \beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu о \mu, \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu о \mu, \mu^{\prime}$

 коиßоขк $\lambda є i ́ o v$
$\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 pi $\omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ аv่тov $\beta о \eta \theta \hat{\varphi} \quad \nu о \mu . \gamma^{?}$
 $\mu \alpha \tau o s$
$\nu \quad \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 коиßоиклєív $\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \omega \psi \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho \circ \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta o v ́ v \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$ $\rho i ́ \omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av̇ $\tau \hat{v} \beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \quad \nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$

матоs
$\nu о \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 коиßоик $\lambda \epsilon i ́ o v$
$\nu 0 \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i ̣$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ да $\mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о \cup ́ \nu \omega \nu$ vотаpícu
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av̉тô $\beta$ ov $\theta \hat{\omega} \quad \nu о \mu . \gamma$ ’
 натоs $\quad \nu о \mu . \mu$ '
 тоîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \imath \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau o l s ~ \chi a \rho \tau o v \lambda a \rho i ́ o ı s ~ \tau \rho \iota \sigma i ~ \tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon i o v$ коиßоук $\lambda \epsilon i ́ v$
$\nu o \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \not \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v ́ \nu \omega \nu$ voтаpicuv
vо $\mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
рон. $\gamma^{\prime}$
 matos vou. $\mu$ '

 коvßоขк $\lambda \in$ íov
$\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \underline{\omega} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda a \mu \pi \rho о \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v ́ \nu \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$ рíwv vo $\mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega}$ av่тồ $\beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\psi} \quad$ ขо $\mu . \gamma^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha ́ \xi \epsilon \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ '̉v мaтos vou. $\mu$ '

 коvßоขк $\lambda \epsilon i ́ o v$
$\nu o \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \not \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v ́ \nu \omega \nu \nu v \tau \alpha-$ $\rho i ́ \omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av่ $\tau o \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha ́ \xi \in \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Є่ $\nu \delta o \xi o \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ є́ $\pi a ́ \rho \chi \omega \nu$ vinc̀ $\rho \pi \rho o s \tau a ́ \gamma-$
натоs $\quad \nu о \mu . \mu$ '

 коиßоик $\lambda \epsilon i ́ v$

 $\rho^{i} \omega \nu$

$$
\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}
$$

$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉rô $\beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
 натоs $\nu \circ \mu \cdot \mu^{\prime}$

 коиßоуклєі́ov $\nu \quad \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 $\rho^{i} \omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\sim}$ av̉ тô $\beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu \circ \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 натоs
$\nu \circ \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 коиßоук $\lambda \in i o v$
 ${ }^{\mathrm{p}}{ }^{i} \omega \nu$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av̉rô̂. $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu \quad \mu . \gamma$ '
 matos
$\nu \quad \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 кочßочклєiov $\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 $\rho^{i} \omega \nu$
${ }^{\nu} \boldsymbol{\mu} . \kappa \delta{ }^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av่тô $\beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu \circ \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 натоs
$\nu \circ \mu . \mu$ '
31 'A $A$ ò $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ àp $\chi o y \tau o s ~ K a p i ́ a s ~ o v ̃ \tau \omega s . ~$
 кочßоук $\lambda \in i ́ o v$
$\nu \circ \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 $\rho^{\prime} \omega \nu$
${ }^{\nu} \boldsymbol{\mu} . \kappa \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} a v ่ \tau o \hat{v} \beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu \quad \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 matos
$\nu \circ \mu . \mu^{\prime}$

 коvßоиклєiov
 pi $\omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . к \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\Psi}$ av̉тô $\beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu о \mu, \mu^{\prime}$
 тоîs $\pi \epsilon р \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau т o \iota s ~ \chi a \rho \tau o v \lambda a \rho i ́ o t s ~ \tau \rho \iota \sigma i ~ \tau o \hat{v}$ $\theta \epsilon i o v ~$ коvßошклєiov $\nu \circ \mu . \theta^{*}$
 píw
$\nu о \mu . к \delta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av̉ $\alpha \circ \hat{v} \beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 matos
$\nu о \mu . \mu^{\prime}$


 коуßоуклєíov
$\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 picuv
$\nu \circ \mu . ~ \iota \in ́$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av่тô $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma$ '
 мatos
vоц. $\lambda s^{\prime}$

 кочßоиклєiov vo $\mu . \theta^{\prime}$



 мatos
$\nu о \mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$

 коуßошклєíov
$\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \underset{\varphi}{\tau} \tau \hat{\nu} \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о \cup ́ v \omega \nu$ ротаpícuv $\nu о \mu . \imath \epsilon$, $\tau \hat{\omega}$ av̉тô̂ $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \quad \nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
цатоs $\quad \nu о \mu . \lambda s$ '

 коиßоиклєíov $\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i ́ \omega \tau \omega \bar{\nu} \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta о v ́ \nu \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$ pí $\omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \iota \epsilon^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av่ $\tau o \hat{v} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu о \mu . \lambda s{ }^{\prime}$

 коиßотклєiov
$\nu 0 \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \notin \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta o v ́ v \omega \nu$ voта-
pícuv
$\nu о \mu \cdot l \epsilon$
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ av̉тô $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs $v o \mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$

 коиßоуклєiov vou. $\theta^{\prime}$
 $\rho^{\prime} \omega \nu$
$\nu \circ \mu . \iota \epsilon^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ аv่тôै $\beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\psi} \quad \nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu \circ \mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$

 коиßотклєiov

рícv עоц. $\iota \epsilon^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av่тô $\beta$ ò $\theta \hat{\varphi} \quad \nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu o \mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$
41 'Amò тov̂ äpұovtos Mєбототанías оข̈тшs.
 коиßоиклєiov $\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 $\tau i \omega \nu$
$\nu о$. $\iota \epsilon$ '
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\imath} \beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu \quad \mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$
 тоîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau o \iota s ~ \chi a \pi т о u \lambda a p i o \iota s ~ \tau \rho \iota \sigma i ~ \tau o \hat{v} \theta є i ́ o v ~$ коиßочклєíov
$\nu o \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 pícu $\nu о \mu, \iota \epsilon^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\omega}$ av่тov $\beta$ оך $\theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 матоs
$\nu о \mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$

 коvßоиклєiov vou. $\theta^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \varphi \varphi ~ \tau \hat{\varphi} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho о \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta o v ́ \nu \omega \nu$ voтаpí $\omega \nu$ $\nu=\mu . \imath \epsilon^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\imath}$ av่тov $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma$ '
 матоs
$\nu о \mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$
 тoîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau o \iota s ~ \chi a \rho \tau o v \lambda a p i o u s ~ \tau \rho \iota \sigma i ~ \tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon i o v$ коиßоขк $\lambda$ кiov vo $\mu, \theta^{\prime}$
 pí $\omega \nu$
$\nu о \mu . \iota \epsilon^{\prime}$
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \alpha u \boldsymbol{v} \tau o \hat{v} \beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$
$\nu \circ \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 mãos $\quad \nu о \mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$

 коvßоуклєiov $\nu о \mu . \theta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \not \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda а \mu \pi \rho о \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \rho \iota \beta о v ́ \nu \omega \nu \nu о \tau \alpha-$ píw $\nu о \mu . \iota \epsilon^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\omega}$ av่тô $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \quad \nu \circ \mu . \gamma{ }^{\prime}$
 матоs $\quad$ ро $\mu . \lambda s^{\prime}$

тоîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta \lambda \in ́ \pi \tau o \iota s ~ \chi a \rho \tau o v \lambda a p i o ı s ~ \tau \rho \iota \sigma i ~ \tau o \hat{v}$ $\theta \in i ́ o v$ коvßоvк $\lambda \in i o v$ $\nu \circ \mu . \theta^{\prime}$
 pícv
$\nu о \mu . \iota \epsilon^{\prime}$ $\tau \underset{\sim}{\hat{u}}$ aủrô̂ $\beta$ oŋ $\theta \hat{\omega}$
$\nu о \mu . \gamma^{\prime}$
 رатоs $\quad \nu о \mu . \lambda s{ }^{\prime}$

 коиßоиклєiov $\quad$, $о$. $\theta^{\text {' }}$
 рї̀ $\quad \nu о \mu . \iota \epsilon '$ $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av̉rô $\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\varphi}$ $\nu \quad \mu \cdot \gamma^{\prime}$
 натоs $\quad$ vо.$\lambda s^{\prime}$

 $\kappa \circ v \beta о v \kappa \lambda \epsilon i o v$ vou. $\theta^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \iota \mu \iota \kappa \eta \rho i \underline{\varphi} \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho \circ \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \rho \iota \beta \circ \hat{v} \nu \omega \nu \nu 0 \tau \alpha-$ рícv $\quad \nu \quad \mu$. $\iota \epsilon^{\prime}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ av่то̂ $\beta \circ \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \quad \nu \circ \mu . \gamma{ }^{\prime}$
 $\mu$ atos $\nu о \mu . \lambda s$ '











Dat. xvii. k. Mai. CP. Belisario <v. c.> cons.

## E. Novella XX ${ }^{5}$

De administrantibus officiis in sacris appelationibus

## ПEPI TQN $\Upsilon \Pi H P E T O Y M E N \Omega N$ OФФIKISN EN TOİ ᄃAKPOIS TQN EKKAHTSN.
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## CAPUT I





 $\kappa a i ̀ \mu \epsilon \tau \in ́ \chi o \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \tau \tau о \mu$ ќv $\omega \nu$.

## CAPUT II

















## CAPUT III











## CAPUT IV












## CAPUT V













 $\dot{v} \pi \eta \rho \in \sigma i a \nu \delta \in \chi \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta \omega \tau \hat{\eta} s \tau a ́ \xi \epsilon \omega s$ тồ $\theta \rho o ́ v o v ~ \tau o \hat{v} \sigma o \hat{v}$.

## CAPUT VII



















 $\kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ vi $\pi о \cup \rho \gamma о u ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ vi $\pi \epsilon ́ \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \epsilon \sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a$.

 $\sigma \pi \epsilon v \sigma a ́ \tau \omega$.
Dat. xv. k. April. Constantinopoli post cons. Belisarii v.c. [a. 536]

## F. Novella XXI ${ }^{6}$

De Armeniis ut ipsi per omnia sequantur romanorum leges

## $\overline{K A}$ <br> ПEPI APMENISN $\Omega \Sigma T E$ KAI AYTOYГ EN IIA II TOIL PSMAISN AKOAOY $\Theta E I N$ NOMOIL.








 $\epsilon i v a \iota ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \delta \iota a \delta o \chi a ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \gamma o \nu \epsilon ́ \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon$ à $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o \hat{v} \tau \epsilon a ̉ \lambda \lambda o v \gamma \epsilon \in v o v s$,
 $\mu \eta \delta غ ̀ ~ a ̉ \gamma o \rho a ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \sigma v \nu o ו \kappa є i ̂ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega \nu, ~ \tau о v ̂ \tau o ~ o ̊ \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \beta a \rho-~$
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## CAPUT I.
















captut II.














 $\theta \epsilon \sigma \pi i \zeta \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$.


 Dat. xv. k. April. CP. post cons. Belisarii v. c.

## G. Novella XXXI ${ }^{7}$

De dispositione quattuor administrationum Armeniae

## $\overline{A A}$

ПEPI $\triangle I A T Y \Pi \Omega \Sigma E \Omega \Sigma T \Omega N$ TE $\Sigma \Sigma A P \Omega N ~ A P X O N T \Omega N$ APMENIAL.
 " $E \omega \pi \rho a \iota \tau \omega \rho i ́ \omega \nu$ тò $\beta$ ", à àò víát $\omega \nu$ каì $\pi a \tau \rho \iota \kappa i ́ \omega$.









CAPUT I.
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 $\tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu ~ \delta є v \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a \nu$, ท̂s $\eta \gamma \epsilon i ̂ \tau a l ~ M \epsilon \lambda \iota \tau \eta \nu \eta ̀ ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s ~ a ̉ p \chi a i a, ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$




 solidos septuaginta duo кaì $\tau \hat{\eta} \gamma \epsilon$ av̉rô $\tau$ áǵєı solidos sexaginta































CAPUT II.




















CAPUT III.







 $\mu a \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota \quad \delta \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu, \kappa \alpha ̆ \nu \quad \epsilon i \quad \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega \tau \alpha \iota \quad \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \prime \kappa о \iota \epsilon \nu, \kappa \alpha i$



















 Dat. xv. k. April. CP. post consul. Belisarii v.c. [a. 536] (8)

## H. Eidotum III ${ }^{9}$

De Armeniorum successione

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Gamma \\
\text { IIEPI TH } \Sigma \text { TQN APMENIQN } \triangle I A \triangle O X H \Sigma . \\
<^{\circ} O \text { av̀ròs } \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in v s ~ \ldots>.
\end{gathered}
$$





## CAPUT I.





[^10] $\nu o ́ \mu \omega$ тро̀s $\tau \eta ̀ \nu$ бท̀v $\mu \epsilon \gamma а \lambda о \pi \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota a \nu$, ópoías єîvaı $\tau$ às $\delta \iota a \delta o \chi a ̀ s$






















Dat. X. kal. Aug. Belisario v. c. cons.
[a. 535].

## II. GREEK AND LATIN ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS

## A. Notitia dignitatum ${ }^{1}$

i. Notitia dignitatum omnium tam civilium quam militarium, in partibus Orientis
2. Praefectus praetorio Orientis ...
5. Magistri equitum et peditum in praesenti duo.
6. Equitum ac peditum per Orientem ...
28. Comes Orientis ...
30. Uicarii quatuor : ...
32. Ponticae ...
38. Duces tredecim: ...
42. Per Orientem sex : ...
44. Eufratensis et Syriae ...
46. Osrhoenae.
47. Mesopotamiae ...
49. Per Ponticam unus :
$50 . \quad$ Armeniae ...
79. Praesides XL : ...
86. Per Orientem VIII : ...
90. Eufratensis ...
92. Osrhoenae.
93. Mesopotamiae ...
103. Per Ponticam VIII :
104. Honoriados.
105. Cappadociae primae.
106. Cappadociae secundae.
107. Helenoponti.
108. Ponti Polemoniaci.
109. Armeniae primae.
110. Armeniae secundae.
111. Galatiae salutaris ...
${ }^{1}$ Not. dig., pp. 1 sqq.

## ii. [Praefectus praetorio per Orientem]

1. Sub dispositione uiri illustris praefecti praetorio per Orientem sunt dioceses infrascriptae :
2. Oriens ...
3. Pontica
4. Prouinciae :
5. Orientis quindecim :
6. Palaestina.
7. Foenice.
8. Syria.
9. Cilicia.
10. Cyprus.
11. Arabia [et dux et comes rei militaris]
12. Isauria.
13. Palaestina salutaris.
14. Palaestina secunda.
15. Foenice Libani.
16. Eufratensis.
17. Syria salutaris.
18. Osrhoena,
19. Mesopotamia.
20. Cilicia secunda ...
21. Ponticae decem :
22. Galatia.
23. Bithynia.
24. Honorias.
25. Cappadocia prima.
26. Cappadocia secunda.
27. Pontus Polemoniacus.
28. Helenopontus.
29. Armenia prima.
30. Armenia secunda.
31. Galatia salutaris ...
vi. Magister militum praesentalis II
32. Sub dispositione uiri illustris magistri militum praesentalis :
33. Uexillationes palatinae sex : ...
34. Comites sagittarii Armeni ..

## vii. Magister militum per Orientem

23. Sub dispositione uiri illustris magistri militum per Orientem : ...
24. Item [Legiones] pseudocomitatenses XI :
25. Prima Armeniaca.
26. Secunda Armeniaca ...
27. Transtigritani ...
xxii. Comes Orientis
28. Sub dispositione uiri spectabilis comitis Orientis prouinciae infrascriptae :
29. 
30. Foenice.
31. Syria.
32. Cyprus.
33. Cilicia.
34. Palaestina secunda.
35. Palaestina salutaris.
36. Foenice Libani.
37. Eufratensis.
38. Syria salutaris.
39. Osrhoena.
40. Mesopotamia.
41. Cilicia secunda.
42. Isauria.
43. Arabia ...
$x x v$. Uicarius dioceseos Ponticae.
44. Sub dispositione uiri spectabilis uicarii dioceseos Ponticae prouinciae infrascriptae :
$\begin{array}{ll}15 . & \text { Bithynia. } \\ 16 . & \text { Galatia. }\end{array}$
45. Paflagonia.
46. Honorias.
47. Galatia salutaris.
48. Cappadocia prima.
49. Cappadocia secunda.
50. Helenopontus.
51. Pontus Polemoniacus.
52. Armenia prima.
53. Armenia secunda ...
xxviiii. Comes limitis Aegypti
54. Sub dispositione uiri spectabilis comitis rei militaris per Aegyptum : ...
55. Ala secunda Armeniorum, Oasi minore.
xxxviii. Dux Armeniae

56. Sub dispositione uiri spectabilis ducis Armeniae:
57. Equites sagittarii, Sabbu.
58. Equites sagittarii, Domana.
59. Praefectus legionis quintadecimae Apollinaris, Satala.
60. Praefectus legionis duodecimae fulminatae, Melitena.
61. In Ponto:
62. Praefectus legionis primae Ponticae, Trapezunta.
63. Ala Rizena, Aladaleariza.
64. Ala Theodosiana, apud Auaxam.
65. Ala felix Theodosiana, Siluanis.
66. Et quae de minore laterculo emituntur :
67. Ala prima Augusta Colonorum, Chiaca.
68. Ala Auriana, Dascusa.
69. Ala prima Ulpia Dacorum, Suissa.
70. Ala secunda Gallorum, Aeliana.
71. Ala castello Tablariensi constituta.
72. Ala prima praetoria nuper constituta.
73. 
74. 
75. 
76. 
77. 
78. 
79. 
80. 
81. 
82. 

Cohors tertia Ulpia miliaria Petraeorum, Metita.
Cohors quarta Raetorum, Analiba.
Cohors miliaria Bosporiana, Arauraca.
Cohors miliaria Germanorum, Sisila.
Ala prima Iouia felix, Chaszanenica.
Ala prima felix Theodosiana, Pithiae.
Cohors prima Theodosiana, Ualentia.
Cohors Apuleia ciuium Romanorum, Ysiporto.
Cohors prima Lepidiana, Caene-Parembole.
Cohors prima Claudia equitata, Sebastopolis.
37.
38.

Cohors secunda Ualentiniana, Ziganne
Cohors, Mochora.
39. Officium autem habet ita :
40.
41.
42.
43.
44.
45.

Principem de scola agentum in rebus.
Numerarios et adiutores eorum.
Commentariensem.
Adiutorem.
.
A libellis siue subscribendarium.
Exceptores et ceteros officiales.
46. Dux Armeniae VII ${ }^{2}$.
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## B. Laterculus ueronensis ${ }^{3}$ <br> Nomina prouinciarum omnium

2. Diocensis Orientis habet prouincias numero XVIII :
3. Libia superior.
4. Libia inferior.
5. Thebais.
6. Aegyptus Iouia.
7. Aegyptus Herculea.
8. Arabia.
9. item Arabia Augusta Libanensis.
10. Palestina.
11. Fenice.
12. Syria Coele.
13. Augusta Euphratensis.
14. Cilicia.
15. Isauria.
16. Cyprus.
17. Mesopotamia.
18. Osroena.
II. Diocensis Pontica habet prouincias numero VII :
19. Bitinia.
20. Cappadocia.
21. Galatia.
22. Paphlagonia, nunc in duas diuisa.
23. Diospontus.
24. Pontus Polemoniacus.
25. Armenia minor, nune et maior addita ... .
XIII. Gentes barbarae, quae pullulauerunt sub imperatoribus : ...
26. Armeni ... ${ }^{4}$.
${ }^{3}$ Not. dig., pp. 249 sqq.
${ }^{4}$ Cf. Mommsen, Verzeichniss, and above Chapter IV, n. 31, Bury, Verona List, Jones, Verona List.

## C. Laterculus Polemit Silvii ${ }^{5}$ <br> Nomina Prouinciarum

 ... VIII. In Oriente X:2. Prima: Siria Coele, in qua est Antiochia.
3. Secunda: (Siria) Palestina.
4. Tertia : Siria Phoenice.
5. Quarta: Isauria.
6. Quinta : Cilicia, iuxta montem Taurum.
7. Sexta: Cyprus.
8. Septima: Mesopotamia, inter Tigrem et Euphratem.
9. Decima : Eufratesia.
10. Octaua: Hosdroene.
11. Nona: Sophanene.

## IX. In Ponto VIII :

2. Prima : Pontus Polemoniacus.
3. Secunda: Pontus Amasia.
4. Tertia: Honoriada.
5. Quarta: Bithinia.
6. Quinta: Paflagonia:
7. Septima : Armenia minor.
8. Sexta : Armenia maior.
9. Octaua: Cappadocia ... ${ }^{\text {© }}$.

> D. Hierokles' Synemdmmos?
> IEPOKAEOYइ $\Sigma$ YNEKAHMOL





[^12]
6985 KАПІААОКІА $\bar{A} \overline{\lambda_{s}}$ ．＇Eтархia Kamтабокias $\bar{a}$ ，viтò коубоv入а́pıov，по́ $\lambda_{\epsilon \iota s} \bar{\delta}$ ．

Kaıóápєıa
Núooa
$\Theta \in \rho \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha}$

7001 KАППААОКІА $\bar{B} \quad \bar{\lambda}$ ．＇Eтархía Kamтабокias $\bar{\beta}$ ，ímó $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu$ óva，$\pi$ ó $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \iota \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\eta} \bar{\eta}$ ．
Túava
Tưava
Фаvatıо́тодıs
Фavatıvoútodıs
Kúßıoтра
Kvßíaтра
Naלıav̧ós
Nav乌̆av̧ós

「áoıpa
Mapraarós
$\dot{\rho} \in \gamma \in \dot{\omega} \nu \triangle$ óapa
$\dot{\rho} \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \omega \dot{ }$ Movкıббós
Mapvacós
${ }^{\text {＇}} \mathbf{P}_{\varepsilon \gamma} \boldsymbol{P} \in \delta$ oá $\rho a$
 коубоv入ápıov，$\pi о ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota s \bar{\zeta}$ ．
＇$A \mu a ́ \sigma є \iota a$
${ }^{\prime} A \mu a \sigma i a$
＂Iß $\quad$＇Ißópa
$Z \hat{\eta} \lambda a$
$Z \hat{\eta} \lambda a$
Zád
Sád $\quad$ ov Za入íxov
＂Avסрата
＂Avסрa $\pi \alpha$
＇$A \mu$ ноós
＇$A \mu$ urós
$\Sigma \iota \nu \omega ̈ \pi \eta$
$\Sigma \iota \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \eta$
ПONTOГ ПOАEMSNIAKOг $\overline{\lambda \theta}$ ，＇ETapxía Пóvtov


Nєокаıба́рєьa
Kópava
Nєокаьба́pєıa
Kouáva
Подє $\mu$ с́vıо⿱
тò $\Lambda є \mu$ óvlov
$K є \rho a \sigma \circ$ v̂s
Kєparô̂s
$T_{\rho a \pi \epsilon \zeta \text { 论S }} \quad T_{\rho a \pi \epsilon \zeta o \hat{v}_{S}}$
APMENIA $\bar{A} \quad \bar{\mu}$ ．$\quad$＇Emapxía＇Apuєvias $\bar{a}, ~ v i \pi o ̀ ~ \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu o ́ v a, ~$ $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma \bar{\epsilon}$ ．
$\Sigma \epsilon \beta$ á $\tau \tau \epsilon a$
$N_{\iota к о ́ т о д \iota я}$
Кодс́vєєа
$\Sigma$ а́тада
$\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta a \sigma \tau о$ úro $\lambda_{\iota}$
$\Sigma_{\in} \beta$ áotıa
Nıко́тодеs
Koдóvıa
Гaтáлa
$\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta a \sigma \tau о$ úmò̀ıs

|  | 6 | APMENIA $\bar{B} \quad \overline{\mu a}$ ．＇Eтapxía＇Ap $\mu \in \nu i a s ~ \tilde{\beta}, \dot{v} \pi o$ $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu o ́ v a$, $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \bar{s}$ ． |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7 |  |  |
|  | 8 | ＂$А р к а$ | ＂$А р к \alpha$ |
|  | 9 | ＇Apaßıббós | ＇Apáßıoos |
|  | 10 | Kovkovaós | Koкоvбós |
|  | 11 | Kópava | Kouáva |
|  | 12 | ＇ApıapáӨєıa | ＇Apapatia |
| 704 | $1 a$ |  |  |
| 712 | 10 |  |  |
|  | 11 |  | ＇Iєра́то入ıs |
| 713 | 1 | Kúppos | Kúpos |
|  | 2 | इapóvara | $\Sigma$ ацо́бата |
|  | 3 | $\Delta$ о $i^{\prime} \chi \eta$ | $\triangle$ о $\chi^{\prime} \chi \eta$ |
|  | 4 | $Z \in \hat{v} \gamma \mu \boldsymbol{a}$ | $Z \in \hat{v} \gamma \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ |
|  | 5 | Tєр $\mu$ аviкєıа | Гєр ªvıкіа $^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | 6 | $\Pi \epsilon ์ \rho \rho \eta$ | $\Pi$ ¢́рр $\eta$ |
|  | 7 | Nıко́то入ıs | Nıко́то入ıs |
|  | 8 | $\Sigma к \eta \nu a \rho \chi i a$ |  |
|  | 9 | $\Sigma a ́ \lambda \tau о \nu ~ ' E \rho a \gamma ı \zeta ̆ \eta \nu o ́ v ~$ | $\Sigma a \lambda \gamma \in \nu о \rho a \tau i \zeta \in \nu о \nu$ |
|  | 10 | Ov้рıиа | $\Sigma$ v́pıua |
|  | 11 | Evp ${ }^{\text {Ofos }}$ | Evpwros |
|  | 12 | OIPOHNH $\overline{\mu \bar{\theta}} . \quad{ }^{\prime} E \pi$ $\pi$ о́八єıs $\bar{\theta}$ ． |  |
| 714 | 1 | ＂Eঠєбба | ＂Eסє $E \sigma a$ |
|  | 2 | Kんvoravziva | Kwvoravriva |
|  | 3 | $\Theta \in о \delta о \sigma \iota o v ́ \pi 力 \lambda_{l s}$ | $\Theta \in o \delta o \sigma l o v ́ \pi o \lambda l s$ |
|  | 4 | Káppaı | Káppaı |
|  | 5 | Bátvaı | Bátvaı |
|  | 6 | Nє́a Ov̉a入өөvтía | Néa Ov̉a入єขtıás |
| 715 | 1 | Аєорто́тодıs $\dot{\eta}$ каі Kал入ірıкоя | Аєорто́тодıs $\dot{\eta}$ каі Kад入ıvíкп |
|  | 2 | $B i p \theta a$ | $B i \rho \theta a$ |
|  | 3 | МЕГОПОТАМІА $\bar{\nu}$ ． $\hat{\eta} \gamma \in \mu o ́ v a, \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s \bar{a}$. | ＇Emapхía Mєбототанєias，vimò |
|  | 4 | ${ }^{\prime} A_{\mu ı} \delta a$ |  |

[^13]
## E. Basilit notitia ${ }^{9}$

## TA』İ IPPOKA@EAPIAइ TRN OEIתTATSN ПATPIAPX $\Omega N$

$\delta^{\circ} P \omega{ }^{\circ} \mu \eta s$<br>о̀ K $K \nu \sigma \tau \alpha \nu \tau \iota \nu \circ v \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$<br><br>ó 'Avriox eias<br>ס Ai入ias ‘Iєросодv́ $\mu \omega v$


 $\beta$ ашт $\lambda i \not \subset o s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s . ~$

| $\bar{a}$. | 'Emapxía | Kantaбокias $\bar{\alpha}$ | ó Kaıaıpєias. ... |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\overline{i a}$. |  | 'Apucvias $\bar{\beta}$ | o $\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta$ acteias. |
| $\bar{\beta}$. | émapxia | ${ }^{\text {' }}$ E $\lambda \in \nu$ оото́vтоv | ó 'A ${ }^{\text {a }}$ aceias. |
| $\bar{\nu}$. | е̇тархia | ${ }^{\text {'Aphevias a }}$ | ó $M \in \lambda \iota \tau \tau \nu \hat{s}$. |
| 18. | ėmapxia | Kantaбокіая $\bar{\beta}$ |  тоvто́лєшs. ... |
| $\overline{i s}$. | èmap̧ía | - Op̀wpládos |  |
| $\bar{\zeta}$. | ėmapxia | По́үтоv Подє шрикоиิ |  |
| $\overline{k s}$. | ėmapxia | Kamtaסokias $\bar{\beta}$ |  |
| $\bar{\eta}$. | ė $\pi$ apxia | Ааऍ̆кฑิs | ơ $\tau 0$ v̂ Фáaıరos. ... |

 кє́фадоı. ...

| є̇тархіа |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| є̇ $\pi$ apxia | 'Appevías $\beta$ | ó "Нраклоито́лє ${ }^{\circ}$ s ท้тоь $\Phi_{1} \lambda a \chi$ Өó $\eta s$. |
| ė ${ }^{\text {a }}$ apX ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 'Aßaryias |  |
| ėmapXia | По́vтоv Полє - $^{\text {- }}$ |  |

$\omega \boldsymbol{\text { ракои }}$
 ко́тоия).

> A. ${ }^{\prime}$ 'EтарХia Kamтабокias
> ó Kaırapeias
> $\vec{a} . \quad \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu B a \sigma \iota \lambda \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu \Theta \epsilon \rho \mu \omega ิ \nu$

[^14]$\bar{\beta}$ ．ó Núvŋs
$\bar{\gamma} . \quad$ ó $\Theta \epsilon о \delta o \sigma \iota o v \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s ~ ' A p \mu \epsilon \nu i ́ a s ~$
$\bar{\delta}$ ．ó Kauov入ıavติv
$\vec{\epsilon}$ ．ó Kıбкıбой．．．．
$\bar{I}$ ．＇Etapxia＇Appєvías $\bar{B}$
ó $\Sigma \epsilon$ ßaortías


$\bar{\gamma} . \quad \delta^{\circ} \Sigma a \tau a ́ \lambda \omega \nu$
$\bar{\delta}$ ．ó Kod $\omega \nu \in i ́ a s$
$\bar{\epsilon}$ ．ó B $\quad$ pı $\iota \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ ．
$\overline{I A}$ ．＇ETap才ia＇E入єvoדóvтov
$\delta^{\prime}$＇A $A$ artias
$\overline{\bar{a}} . \quad \delta^{\prime} A \mu \iota \sigma \sigma o v$
$\bar{\beta}$ ．$\quad \dot{\delta} \Sigma^{\iota} \nu \omega \dot{\prime} \pi \eta s$
$\bar{\gamma}$ ．o＇$I \beta o ́ p \omega \nu$
$\bar{\delta}$ ．o＇$A v \delta \rho a ́ \pi \omega \nu$
$\bar{\epsilon}$ ．ó Zàíxov ク̈тои $\Lambda є о \nu \tau о v \pi o ́ \lambda є \omega s$
$\bar{s}$ ．$\dot{\delta} Z \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ ．
$\overline{I B}$ ．＇Emapxia＇＇Ap $\mu \in v i a s$
${ }_{\delta} M_{\epsilon} \lambda_{\iota \tau} \tau \nu \hat{\eta}_{S}$
ㄹ．$\quad \delta " A \rho \kappa \eta s$
$\beta$ ．$\delta$ Kovкоvбov
$\bar{\gamma} . \quad \delta^{3} A_{\rho \alpha \beta ı \sigma \sigma o v}$
$\bar{\delta}$ ．ó＇Aplapáaŋs
$\bar{\epsilon}$ ．ó $K є о \mu a \nu \omega ิ \nu$
$\bar{I} \bar{\Gamma}$ ．＇Eтархі́a Каттабокіаs

ㅁ．$\quad \delta \dot{\beta} K \nu \beta \iota \sigma \tau \rho \omega ิ \nu$
$\bar{\beta}$ ．ó Фavatuvovaód $\epsilon \omega S$
$\bar{\gamma}$ ．$\dot{\delta} \sum_{\alpha \sigma i \mu \omega \nu . ~ . . . ~}^{\text {．}}$
$\overline{I E}$ ．＇Emapxia＇Ovwpıádos


$\begin{array}{ll}\bar{a} . & \text { ó ‘Hpaк入єías Пóvтov } \\ \bar{\beta} . & \text { ó Проvaıáסos }\end{array}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\gamma} \text {. ó Tiov } \\
& \bar{\delta} \text {. ó Kpareias } \\
& \bar{\epsilon} \text {. o ' } A \delta p ı a \nu o v \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s \\
& \text { I5. 'Eтapגía По } \lambda_{\epsilon \mu} \omega \nu \iota a \nu \eta \\
& \text { ó Nєокаибарєías }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\beta} \text {. ó Kєра⿱宀ои́vт } \omega \nu \\
& \bar{\gamma} . \quad \dot{\delta} \tau \circ \hat{v} \Pi_{\circ} \lambda_{\epsilon} \mu \omega v i o v \\
& \bar{\delta} \text {. ó Kо } \text { ááv } \omega \nu . ~ . . . ~_{\text {. }} \\
& \overline{K E} \text {. 'Emap才ía Kammaסoкias } \\
& \text { ó } М \omega \kappa \eta \sigma \sigma о \hat{v}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\beta} \text {. o Kod K } \omega \text { єias } \\
& \bar{\gamma} \text {. } \quad \text { о Парvaббо仑 } \\
& \bar{\delta} \text {. ó } \Delta \text { oáp } \omega \nu \text {. } \\
& \overline{K_{5}} \text {. 'Emapxía } \Lambda a \zeta_{\iota \kappa \eta} \\
& \text { ó Фá⿱宀兀ঠos }
\end{aligned}
$$

$\bar{\beta}$. $\quad \delta \tau \hat{\eta} S^{'} A \beta l \sigma \sigma \eta \nu \omega ิ \nu$
$\bar{\gamma} . \quad \delta \Pi_{\epsilon \tau \rho} \omega \nu$

## F．Georgit Cyprit descriptio orbis roman ${ }^{11}$

．．．$\triangle I A$ THE ANATOAIKH $\triangle$ IIOIKH $\Sigma E \Omega \Sigma$ ．．．

＂E $E \in \sigma \sigma a ~ \mu \eta \tau \rho o ́ \pi \sigma o \lambda \iota s$
Kápaı
K $\omega \nu \sigma \tau a ́ v \tau \epsilon \iota a$
$\Theta \in \circ \delta \circ \sigma \iota \sigma$ и́то $\lambda_{l s}$

Néa Ov̉àєvтía
${ }^{10}$ On Basil see Honigmann，Basileios，Laurent，Busile，and Hierokles，pp． 49 sqq．
11 Georg．Cypr．，pp．41， 45 sqq．

$B i \rho \theta \omega \nu$<br>Movı日ìдa<br>$\Theta \eta \rho \iota \mu \alpha ́ \chi \omega \nu$<br>Movıáza<br>Ма́карта<br>Маркои́тодья<br>＇Apaotacia<br>＇$H \mu$ ќpıos<br>Kıркךбía

 Пєрбioos．

＂$А \mu \iota \delta а ~ \mu \eta \tau \rho о ́ \pi о \lambda \iota \varsigma$
Maртvро́тодıs

$\Delta a \rho \hat{s} s$
 кai $\Sigma v p i a s$.

ка́бтрог ‘Pıбкךфаิs<br>ка́aтрог Toupávdıos<br>ка́бтрог Ма́ $\delta \eta$ б<br>ка́бтроу Aópvəs<br>ка́ $\sigma \tau \rho о \nu$＂$P_{l} \phi \theta$ оv<br>ка́бтроv＂Iбфрıos<br>ка́бтроу Tלaúpas<br>кáбтроv Av̉סáoбos<br>ка́бтроv’ Aßápuךs<br>ка́бтрор Ţıроßías<br>$\kappa$ ка́ $\tau \rho о \nu \quad{ }^{\prime} I \nu \zeta_{l \in \tau} \omega \hat{\nu}$<br>$\kappa а ́ \sigma \tau \rho о \nu ~ B a \nu a \beta \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$<br>ка́ттроข Xov́бठ $\omega \nu$<br>ка́бт $о$ р＇Ä̈бovסovos<br>ка́бтроข Maбфро́vas<br>ка́бтроу Baбı入ıко́v<br>$\kappa \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \rho о \nu ~ \Sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \lambda о \nu \kappa \alpha i{ }^{\prime} O \delta \eta$ д $\lambda \omega \nu$<br>ка́бтроу Bךїоиßаïtas<br>кáoт $\rho о \nu$ Mava⿱㇒áp $\omega \nu$

$\kappa \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \rho o v \Phi_{\iota \rho \theta a \chi a ß \rho a ́ \eta s}$<br><br>ка́бтрог Ká $\lambda \omega \nu$ оs<br>ка́aтрог Bıßađáp $\omega \nu$<br>кáorpò Tらaúpas<br>ка́atpov Bípəas<br>кá $\sigma \tau \rho o v{ }^{\prime} A \tau \tau a \chi \hat{a} s$


$\kappa \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \rho \circ \nu$＇$A \phi о v \mu \omega ิ \nu$

$\kappa \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \rho о \nu ~ Ф \lambda \omega \rho ı а \nu \hat{\nu}$
ка́aтpov $\Delta a \not \propto \nu \circ \hat{\imath} \delta \iota \nu$
кáoтpov Ba入ov̂os
$\kappa \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \rho о \nu ~ \Sigma a \mu о \chi a ́ \rho \tau \omega \nu$






 $\mu \epsilon p \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota \tau \hat{\eta} S$ б $\eta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon p o \nu$ ．

[^15]
$\kappa \lambda i \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} A \nu \zeta \eta \tau \iota \nu \hat{\eta} s$
$\kappa \lambda i \mu a \Delta i \gamma \eta \sigma \iota \nu \hat{\eta} s$
$\kappa \lambda i \mu a$ Гарıр $\hat{s}$
$\kappa \lambda i ́ \mu a ~ B ı \lambda a \beta \eta \tau \iota \nu \eta$ §
$\kappa \lambda i \mu a ~ \Pi а \lambda \iota \nu \hat{\eta} s$
$\kappa \lambda i \mu a$ ' $O_{\rho} \zeta_{l a \nu \imath \nu \eta ̂ s}$

клíца MovЦ̆оррิิ ...
'Eтapxia 'Appevias Mєүád $\eta s$
 $\lambda_{\iota \kappa o ̀ v} \theta \rho o ́ v o \nu . ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \tau \iota \mu \eta \theta \epsilon i \sigma a ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ a ̆ \gamma ı o \nu ~ Г \rho \eta \gamma o ́ p ı o v ~ ' A \rho \mu к \nu i a s, ~$


## G. Nova tactica ${ }^{13}$

## TAYTA MEN TA ПAAAIA TAKTIKA LKOIIEI $\triangle E$ KAI TA NEA


$\bar{a} . \quad$ 'H Kaıбápєıa ...
$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\imath a} . \dot{\eta} \sum_{\epsilon} \beta \dot{a} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota a$
$\overline{\iota \beta}$. $\dot{\eta}^{\prime} A \mu \alpha ́ \sigma є \iota a$
$\overline{\nu \gamma} . \quad \dot{\eta} M_{\epsilon} \lambda_{\iota \tau \iota \nu \eta}^{\prime} . .$.
ıך. $\dot{\eta}$ Nєокаıбápєıа ...
$\overline{\kappa \theta}$. $\dot{\eta} M \omega \kappa \eta \sigma o s . .$.

$<\bar{A}>T \hat{\eta}$ Kaıбарєía Kamтаסoкias.
а. o $\quad N \dot{\beta} \sigma \eta s$
$\bar{\beta}$. ó $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Baбı $\lambda_{\iota \kappa} \omega \hat{\nu} \Theta_{\epsilon \rho \mu} \omega \hat{\nu}$
$\bar{\gamma}$. ó Kapovдıav $\omega \nu$
$\bar{\delta}$. ó Kıбкıбоv

[^16]APPENDIX II

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{\epsilon} \text {. ó Evaïrov } \\
& \text { s. ó } \sum \in u \eta p u a ́ \text { ós } \\
& \bar{\zeta} \text {. o 'Apa日єias } \\
& \bar{\eta} \text {. } \quad \dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\nu} \text { Aimo入í } \omega \nu \text {... }
\end{aligned}
$$

> ㅁ. ó $\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta a \sigma \tau о v \pi$ ó $\lambda \epsilon \omega s$
> $\beta$. ó Nıкото́лєшs
> $\bar{\gamma} . \quad \delta \Sigma a \tau a ́ \lambda \omega \nu$
> $\bar{\delta}$. ó Bєpíooŋs.
> $\overline{I B} . \quad T_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} A \mu a \sigma \epsilon i ́ a ~ ' E \lambda \epsilon \nu о \pi o ́ v \tau о v$
> ㅁ. $\quad \delta^{\prime}$ ' $A \mu \tau \sigma \circ \hat{v}$
> B. o $\Sigma^{\iota} \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \pi \eta s$
> $\bar{\gamma}$. ó 'Ißóp $\omega \nu$
> $\bar{\delta}$. of ' $A \nu \delta \rho a ́ \pi \omega \nu$
$\overline{I \Gamma} . \quad T \hat{\eta} M \epsilon \lambda \iota \tau \eta \nu \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\eta} S^{\prime} A_{\rho} \mu \epsilon \nu i a s$
$\begin{array}{ll}\bar{a} . & \delta " А \rho \kappa \eta s \\ \bar{\beta} . & \delta \dot{\delta} \text { Kovкоvбо仑 }\end{array}$
$\bar{\gamma} . \quad \delta^{\prime} A \rho a \beta ı \sigma o v$
[ $\bar{\delta}$.$] каі \Lambda v \pi \omega \hat{\nu} . .$.
$\overline{I H} . \quad T \hat{\eta}<N \epsilon о>к а \iota \sigma a \rho \epsilon i ́ a ~ \Pi o ́ v т о v ~$
Полє $\mu \nu$ аїкои
а. $\quad \delta$ Kєрабоúvт $\omega \nu$
$\bar{\beta} . \quad$ o $\tau \circ \hat{v} \Pi_{\circ} \lambda_{\epsilon} \mu \omega \nu i o v$
$\bar{\gamma} . \quad$ o Kода́ $\nu \tau \omega \nu$
$\overline{\Lambda \bar{T}} . T \hat{\eta} T_{\rho a \pi \epsilon \zeta \circ \hat{v} \nu \tau \iota \tau \hat{\eta} S} \Lambda<a \zeta \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} S>$.
$<\bar{a} .>$ ó $X \epsilon \rho \iota a ́ \nu \omega \nu$
$<\bar{\beta}$. $>$ ó Xauaróלovp
$<\bar{\gamma} .>$ o Xá入
$<\bar{\delta} .>$ оீ Паітєр
$<\bar{\epsilon} .>$ ó Kєранє́ $\omega \nu$
< $\bar{s}$.> ó Acpiov
$<\bar{\zeta} .>$ o Bu弓áv $\omega \nu$...

| $\overline{M S}$. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{\bar{\alpha}}$. | ${ }_{\text {o }} K_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{l \tau}{ }_{l} \iota_{\iota \nu} \hat{\eta}^{\prime}$ |
| $\beta$. | ó 'Apaqpákco |
| $\gamma$ | - Bap弓avíoбךs |
| $\bar{\delta}$ | o $M \in \lambda 0 \hat{v}$ |
| $\epsilon$. |  |
| $\overline{N A}$. |  |
|  |  |
| $\overline{N B}$. | $T \hat{\eta}$ ' $A \mu a ́ \sigma \tau \rho \iota \delta \iota ~ т о \hat{v}$ Móvтоv |
| $\overline{T N}$. | $T \hat{\nu} \nu$ ' $A \sigma \mu \omega \sigma a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ |
| $N \Delta$. | Ai Xêvaı. |

## H. Epistulae ad Leonem imperatorem

xxxvi-Armenia Prima ${ }^{14}$

Piissimo et Christianissimo imperatori uictori semper augusto Leoni Iohannis Gregorius Auxentius Eustathius Epiphanius episcopi primae Armeniae in domino salutem. Deus uerus dominus noster Iesus Christus semper optima naturae humanae dona concedens nullum tempus sine sua prouidentia dereliquit. qua gratia etiam nunc fidei uerae prospiciens, quae nostrae salutis spes est, in te pio et Christiano principe quodam secundo Dauid cornu imperii reclinauit. quem sibi nouit religiose a cunabulis seruiturum, hunc sua sententia in omni orbe terrarum imperare sanciuit, quatenus ex uestro imperio profluerent bona subiectis et ubique pietatis praedicatio praeualeret uestra utique mansuetudine nihil aliud praeter fidem sceptra regalia iudicante. quarum rerum testis est praesens zelus et studium illa firmandi, unde firmitas uestri accedat imperii. a deo namque unctus et regem mox ei qui unxit, ipsa principia commendasti optime satis cogitationibus simul et uocibus ei deseruiens et ut haec bene consisterent, prae ceteris omnibus apud cunctos pro fide orthodoxa decertatus es, omni scilicet mala secta prorsus expulsa atque sublata, ad
idem conuenientibus et ad inuicem concordantibus qui nuper quod fieri non oportuerat, uidebantur esse diuisi. quia prospicit uestra pietatis intentio, ad unam reduxistis ecclesiam non solum eos qui per dissensionem noua passione languebant, sed etiam eos quorum erat a priscis temporibus mens corrupta et a recta et regia uia recedentes ad loca praua et spinosa blasphemi erroris abierant, ut secundum euangelicam uocem omnis ecclesiae unum ouile consisteret et unus pastor dominus Christus esset. sed haec quidem omnia proueniant in uestro semper imperio; quia uero et meae simul humilitati piis litteris estis iubere dignati ut quid sententiam de his quae Alexandria facta sunt, manifestem, licet [et] exaggeratio rerum ibi gestarum neque sententiae tribuit facultatem caligine rerum tristium mentibus obumbrante, hoc tamen uobis insinuo quia si uera sunt quae in precibus religiosissimorum episcoporum et clericorum Aegyptiacae diocesis continentur et auctor Timotheus inuenitur tantorum et talium scelerum, quae propter nimietatem, ut arbitror, non creduntur, alienus sacerdotio cum his qui similia perpetrarunt, apud sanctos canones iudicabitur. et haec quidem de his quae Alexandria gesta sunt, cum sancto concilio quod mecum est, deliberans religiositati uestrae significaui; fidem uero solam trecentorum XVIII sanctorum patrum qui dei gratia conuenerunt in Nicaena urbe sub piae memoriae principe Constantino, seruamus, qua ab infantia sumus inbuti et in sacerdotio alios inbuere nouimus quamque et post haec CL episcopi congregati in ciuitate regia firmauerunt et propriam iudicarunt et ipsa sibi cooperatrice utentes et doctrina diuinitus inspirata, sancti scilicet spiritus, blasphemias et zizania radicitus amputantes quamque nihilo minus et definitio a sancto Calchedonensi consilio explanata firmauit, praecipue repugnans uesaniae nefandi Nestorii et sanctam synodum quae Ephesi est celebrata, confirmans, cuius praesules fuerunt deo amabile et sanctissimae memoriae Romanorum et Alexandrinorum episcopi Caelestinus et Cyrillus, qui maxime aduersus sceleratam blasphemiam Nestorii suis responsionibus doctrinisque claruerunt, quorum epustulae aduersus eundem impium Nestorium et $<\mathrm{ad}>$ Orientales uniuersos datae et ab eodem sanctae memoriae Cyrillo contra eundem Nestorium anathemata proposita sunt firmata atque roborata. Igitur indicamus prolatam definitionem a sancto Calchedonensi concilio non sicut fidei symbolum, sed sicut definitionem esse positam ad peremptionem Nestorianae uesaniae et exclusionem eorum qui salutem incarnationis domini nostri Iesu Christi
denegare noscuntur, ut agnoscant omnes qui ob hoc scandalum patiuntur, quia neque nos post orthodoxum symbolum CCCXVIII sanctorum patrum aut augmentum aut deminutionem in his quae sic perfecte et a sancto spiritu sunt definita, suscipimus <et> fidem aliam nescimus, quia neque est nee patimur hoc audire, licet quidam esse dicant. si uero quibusdam uolunt calumniari uerbis, etiam hoc uestrae serenitati indicare confidimus quoniam ea quae illis uidentur esse dubia, ad intellegentium sic respicere noscantur affectum. sunt enim quaedam in definitione quae <si> recte intelligantur, orthodoxa sunt; si uero aliquis ea aliter uelit inspicere, inueniet hanc sensus dubios parientem. multi siquidem et scripturas diuinas non intellegentes sicut scriptae sunt, propriae blasphemiae dogmata genuerunt, quos dominus Christus sua clementia et sacra pietatis uestrae prudentia diligentiaque conuertat et rectae praedicare uerbum ueritatis edoceat et hoc sapere quod sancta catholica dictat ecclesia, cuius caput quidem est Christus, uos autem robur ae fundamentum imitantes immobilem Christi petram, super quam omnium creator ecclesiam suam aedificans omnibus Christianis pietatis requiem condonauit. qui etiam uestram serenitatem semper conseruare dignetur in talibus uigilantem et insidiantem bestiam Christi ouilibus a saeptis fidei orthodoxae repellentem. credimus enim quia postquam nostris litteris haec indicauimus, cuncta ueritatis uia omnis modus uestrae panditur pietati quatenus sopiantur scandala et ad fidem rectam membra discordantia reducantur domino Christo super quadam inspiratione uestram tranquilitatem ad bona omnia deducente.

Iohahhis episcopus misericordia dei Sebastiae metropolis sanctae dei ecclesiae manu mea suscribens secundum sanctionem uestrae pietatis praedictam epistula mea sententiam nuntiaui, quam habeo pro fide trecentorum XVIII sanctorum patrum in Nicaea conuenientium, quam et sanctum Calchedonense concilium confirmauit, simul et pro Timotheo, quem preces his aduersarium ostenderunt, et conseruari uestram potestatem temporibus longis exopto
Iohannis episcopus Nicopolitanus similiter
Gregorius episcopus Sebastopolis similiter
Maxentis episcopus Varissae similiter
Eustathius episcopus Coloniae similiter
Epiphanius episcopus Satalenus similiter.

xxxvii - Armenia Secunda ${ }^{15}$

Religiossimo et piissimo et Christianissimo imperatori semper augusto Leoni Otrius Acacius Iohannis Adelfius Hormisda Longinus secundae Armeniae episcopi in domino salutem. Deus qui glorificantes se glorificat, secundum cor suum apicem uestrae tranquilitatis inueniens inexpugnabilem palmam et honorem fidei consistentem placidus praebuit uobis, Christianissimi principum, super omnes homines sine prohibitione aliqua potestatem. Insurgentes enim inopinabiliter subdidit uictoriis atque inconparabilibus triumphis et uestram pietatem excellentissimis honoribus exornauit, immutilata et sine litigio et ab aliis indiuisa praebens sceptra uestri imperii, ut firmas atque claras in uobis diuinas seruantes formas optima uoluntate seruitis. bonum enim circa dominum deum favorem uobis habentibus, mansuetis nutibus ad legalem et mirabilem uitam conuersationemque deducitur quidquid sub sceptra uestri imperii gubernatur; aequam uero sortem salutis uestrae utilitati reliquiorum hominum ponentes inconcussam catholicis totius orbis ecclesiis pacem sine tumultuatione confertis et dei clementiam imitantes neque paruulos humilesque despicitis, quando per commodum condescensionis summitatis culmen ad nos etiam pro fidei causa deponitis sociosque nos, qui pro abiectione nostra nihil in terra sumus, inter uestras accipitis curas, non egentes conlationem nostram et in hoc utique magnitudinem incomparabilis dei clementiae demonstrantes. quapropter quoniam iussi sumus, ultra nos quoque praesumimus et quid sentiamus, uestrae pietati suggerimus. nos igitur, uenerabilis imperator, in ultimo mundi loco degimus multo spatio a regia ciuitate distantes, sed uestrae potentiae in nullo diuisi fauore circa fidem equidem rectam sententiam possidemus, ad sermones uero contentionum linguas habemus segnes. cohabitamus enim circa Armenios barbaros, fideles quidem, sed recte Romano eloquio non utentes, breui quodam ab eis spatio, magis autem intercessione Eufratis fluminis separati, et propter frequentem barbarorum permixionem. longos nequiuimus proferre sermones, uitamus autem etiam doctrinas extraneas proferentes, quia eloquentia quidem sancti spiritus rennuunt et propriam doctrinam in euangelicis eruditionibus adferre noscun-
tur. nos etenim secundam inhabitantes Armeniam una et immobili utimur uoluntate et in una fide consistimus, communiter omnes et seorsum singuli pro uestra maiestate ad deum facientes orationem ab omni haerese et lingua blasphema separati unamque doctrinam super omnia claram a sanctis trecentis XVIII patribus percipientis patrum fidem inuiolabilem conseruamus, quaestiones uero de deo tamquam inutiles et nostra cogitatione superiores effugimus et aliud quidquam aut <sentientes aut> dicentes ualde declinamus a superfluis quaestionibus abstinentes et lectiones impias refutantes ab eorum parauitate inimica ecclesiae sumus extranei et triticum fidei a zizaniis separatum uobis fidelibus imperantibus conseruamus, in traditione patrum doctrinae sufficientiam possidentes et nihil superuacaneum quemquam loqui sinentes. ... eum itaque adoremus Christum, qui et dispensative pro nostra salute suscepit carnem passionis et diuinae nobis inpassibilitatis iura donauit. sic enim concilium sanctorum patrum Calchedone celebratum sapiens et trecentorum XVIII patrum inuiolabilem et intemptabilem custodiuit fidem et fortiter ineruditi uiri fatuitatibus resistens catholicis ecelesiis in toto orbe fundatis contulit bona pacis, cum quibus nos quoque in uno corpore congregati per fidem uestrum imperium inmutilatum et ad filiorum filios peruenire ab omnium domino deprecamur. si uero quidam decerpentes congruentias syllabarum conpositionesque uerborum bella et lites mouere temptans aduersus ecclesias, deus restitit eis; nos autem intentionem exponentium fidem et mentem probantes nequaquam a uerborum conpositione recedimus, sed et propugnatores dogmatum et perfectos custodes fidei trecentorum XVIII patrum habemus sanctos patres Calchedone collectos et sicut et ipsos trecentos XVIII patres honoramus. nihil enim adicientes illorum symbolo os obnoxium multis suppliciis damnauerunt. igitur sanctionem pietatis uestrae suscipiens una cum sanctissimis episcopis nostrae prouinciae relegensque preces ab Alexandrinis clericis uestrae maiestati porrectas priores atque posteriores in prioribus quidem inuasionem ouium factam contra pastorem fleui et contra ipsum sacerdotium seditionem noui Dathan et Abiron nimis ingemui. pudor enim cuctus per arrogantiam est expulsus, omnis lex et timor imperialis et iudicium est contemptus et sacerdotales sanctiones uexauerunt nefandissimae uoluntates manus contra sacerdotes armantes, quas debuerunt optime temperare et donum perceperunt dignum suae salutis pignus. habens etenim mentem ratione priuatam, sicut precibus sumus edocti, si tamen
uerae sunt, sceleratus Timotheus principatus amorem utilitati praepo nens ad res nefandas accessit sedibus non sibi conpetentibus inruens adhuc uiuo ecclesiae sacerdote dispensationemque ecclesiae petulanti uoluntate diripiens et principium. sacerdotii faciens sanguinis effusionem, sed etiam sanctarum gregium caedis factus occasio inpudenter custodem constituit semet ipsum, qui neque uocari dignus est Christianus, quando cruentis manibus uenerabilia mysteria non dubitat impia praesumptione contingere et post damnationem illam operari quae <neque> eum neque alios agentes sanctorum patrum regulae uidere permittunt. qui [neque] non sustinens ut secundum regulas ordinaretur ecclesiasticas et ab his qui simili castigationi uidebantur esse subiecti, factus episcopus ab omnibus ecclesiis semet ipsum excommunicasse dinoscitur quasi faciens diuinae gratiae donis iniuriam. deinde cum non ualeat curare quae ab eo male praesumpta sunt, si tamen quae de ipso dicta sunt, cum ueritate concordant, patrum conciliis obloquitur et cum ei mala patriae non sufficiant, omnes conturbare temptat ecclesias, quasi potestatem habens gerendi quaecumque uoluerit, et neque uiuis neque mortuis praesulibus parcit ecclesiae, sed quasi contra omnes potestatem impietatis adeptus primum CL patrum synodo derogat, quam spiritu diuino statuit sedes Alexandrina. quod mihi fecisse uidetur, ut effugiat homicidii adulteriique supplicia, illic namque in ipsis principiis contra homicidas excommunicationis decreuerunt poenam. non suscipit autem sanctam. et uniuersale Calchedonense concilium nesciens quia etiam ante hoe a trecentorum XVIII sanctorum patrum fide semet ipsum fecit extraneum, quam sanctum utique Calchedonense concilium confirmauit ac roborauit. oportebat enim eum ascendentem tyrannice ad thronum beatae memoriae Cyrilli, illius libris incumbere et doctrinam illius possidere. sed uos, pii, tamquam uniuersos principes optima uirtute superantes fidem defendite tyrannidem sustinentem, patrum sanctionibus conferte uirtutem, sacerdotibus donate a periculis libertatem, prohibete eos qui inregulariter contra ecclesias nituntur insurgere, quatenus sine seditione et lite atque bello uestris temporibus sanctae dei ecclesiae constitutae incessabiliter pro uestra longaeuitate atque salute emittant domino Christo suas orationes, ut longis pacificisque temporibus uniuerso orbo terrarum et omnibus sanctis et catholicis dei ecclesiis condoneris, per omnia inuictissime et Christianissime triumphator semper auguste.

Otreius misericordia dei episcopus Melitene metropolis sanctae et
catholicae ecclesiae propria manu suscribens secundum sanctionem uestrae pietatis meam sententiam per praefatam epistulam protuli quid sentio et in confessione sanctorum patrum Nicaea conuenientium, quam secuta est et Calchedonense sanctam et uniuersale concilium, simul et quod sapio super Timotheum, quem preces accusauerunt, et custodiri uestram potestatem sancti ecclesiis et omni orbi terrarum temporibus longis exoro

Iohannis episcopus Arcae similiter Adelphius episcopus Arabissi similiter ${ }^{16}$.

## I．Tables

i．Helenopontos，Pontos Polemoniakos，Armenia Prima ${ }^{17}$

| Hierokles | Notitiae I，VIII，IX | Notitiae III，X，XIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ＇Apaaia | I． $1{ }^{\prime} A \mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{\sigma cias}$ | 1 ＇Apaveias |
| ＂Iß ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ， | 4 ＇Ißvopv ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 4 ＇Ißо́p $\omega \nu$ グтоь Пıродías |
| $Z \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ | $7 Z_{\eta \lambda} \hat{\omega} \nu$ om． viii，ix | $7 Z_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \hat{\omega} \nu$ |
| $\Sigma a ́ \lambda \tau o v ~ Z a \lambda i \chi \chi \eta \nu$ | 6 Za入íxov グтoı Дєоขтоито́入єшs | 6 Za入íxov グтои <br>  |
| ${ }^{\prime} A \nu \delta \rho a \pi a$ | $5{ }^{\text {＇}}$＇$A \nu \delta \rho a \pi o ́ \delta \omega \nu$ | $5{ }^{\text {＇}}$＇ $1 \nu \delta \rho a ́ \pi \omega \nu$ |
| ＂A彻оs |  | $2{ }^{\text {＇}}$＇$\mu \iota \nu \sigma о$ v̂ |
| $\Sigma \iota \omega \bar{\omega}$ | $3 \Sigma \iota \nu \omega \pi \eta s$ | $3 \sum^{2} \nu \nu \omega \dot{\pi} \eta{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| － | II．Ev̉ðait | II．Ev̀хaítwy |
| Nєокаıаа́рєıа | 1 Nєoкаıбарќıаs | I． 1 Nєокаıбарєias |
| Kó ${ }^{\text {Nava }}$ | 5 Kouáv $\omega$ | $4 K o \mu a ́ \nu \omega \nu$ |
| Полє $\mu$ ¢́vıо | 4 Полє $\mu \omega \nu$ ¢iov | 3 Полєц $\omega \nu i o v$ |
| Kєparovs | 3 Kєpaqov̂ขtos | 2 Kєpaらov̂vtos |
| Tратє弓ovs | 2 Tратє弓оข้ขтos | II．Tрamє号о́s |
| － | － | 5 ＇Adúas |
| － | － | $6{ }^{\text {² }} \mathrm{P}_{2}$ ¢aiov |
| － | － | 7 Ко́ккоข |
| － | － | 8 Eủviкov |
| － | － | 9 ＇Apaסáan |
| － | － | 10 Мартvротó－ $\lambda_{\epsilon} \omega s$ |
| － | － |  |
| $\Sigma \epsilon \beta$ áбтєıa |  |  |
| Nıко́то入ıs | 3 Nıкото́dєшs | 3 Nıкото́dєшs |
| Kodovía | 5 Kod 5 vias | 5 Kod $\omega \nu$ cias |
| $\Sigma$ а́та入а | $4 \Sigma a \tau a ́ \lambda \omega \nu$ | $4 \Sigma \alpha \tau a ́ \lambda \omega \nu$ |
| $\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta$ абтои́то入ıs | $2 \Sigma \epsilon \beta a \sigma \tau o v \pi$ о́八є ${ }^{2}$ ， | $2 \Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta a \sigma \tau o v-$ $\pi$ то́лє $\omega s$ |
| － | 6 Bnpioons | $6 \mathrm{~K}_{7}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \eta{ }^{18}$ |

[^17]ii. Pontos and Armenia ${ }^{19}$

| Justinian's Re-organizatıon |  | Older Byzantine |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Armenia Prima | Bazanis or Leontopolis <br> Theodosiopolis <br> Trapezous <br> Kerasous <br> Satala <br> Nikopolis <br> Koloneia | Unknown |
|  |  | Cappadocia Prima |
|  |  | Pontos Polemoniakos |
|  |  | " |
|  |  | Armenia Prima |
|  |  | " |
|  |  | " |
| Armenia Secunda | Sebasteia <br> Sebastopolis <br> Komana <br> Verissa <br> Zela | Armenia Prima |
|  |  |  |
| " |  | Pontos Polemoniakos |
| " |  | Armenia Prima |
| " |  | Helenopontos |
| Helenopontos | Amaseia urbs Amisus urbs [sic] | Helenopontos |
|  |  |  |
| " | Ibora urbs | " |
| " | Eukhaita urbs | " |
| " | Andrapa urbs | " |
| " | Sinope urbs | $"$ |
| " | Leontopolis urbs | " |
| " | Neokaisareia urbs | Pontos Polemoniakos |
| " | Polemonion urbs | " |
| " | Pityous phrourion | " |
| " | Sebastopolis phrourion | " |

[^18]
## J. Xenophon ${ }^{20}$

## KYPOY ПAIDEIA

## I,ii



























 ขоутєs סıкацобúvŋр• ...


[^19]




 є́avtov̀s $\tau \circ i ̂ s$ ảp







 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu о \nu . . .$.


















 калои.




 каi $\theta a v a ́ \tau o v ~ \delta e ̀ ~ o ̂ ̂ \tau о \iota ~ к р i ́ v o v \sigma ı, ~ к а i ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ a ̉ p \chi a ̀ s ~ o ̂ ̂ \tau o ı ~ \pi a ́ \sigma a S ~ a i p o v ̂ \nu \tau a l . ~$.


 тò̀ $\lambda$ oımòv ßíov.




 ả $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oi $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \delta v v a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \imath ~ \tau \rho є ́ \phi є \iota \nu ~ \tau o v ̀ S ~ \pi a i ̂ \delta a s ~ a ̉ p \gamma o v ̂ \nu \tau a s ~ \pi є ́ \mu \pi о v \sigma \iota \nu, ~$








 $\beta \epsilon \in \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau o \iota a ̉ ้ \nu \in i ̂ v a \iota$.

# III. ARMENIAN ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS 

A. Throne list - Gahnamak ${ }^{1}$

## 












| w. |  | $d t$. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F. |  | $d_{\text {d }}$. |  |
| 4. |  | dts. | 9 qunilimy mbp |
| [ 7. |  | ${ }_{t}{ }_{L}$. |  |
| 7. | $U_{w u \}$ | $d \beta$. | Smjng |
| $t$. |  | $p$. |  |
| q. |  | pu. | 9.4/0nLitwn untr |
| 5. |  | $h$. |  |
| $\underline{L}$ |  |  |  |
| $\beta$. | 4 wиu! 5 ¢ mb 5 \% | $p^{5}$. |  |
| d. |  | $p q$. | 9.wntrotipy untr |
| ${ }^{\text {dm. }}$ | $U_{\text {M }}$ | pl |  |
| ${ }_{\text {d }}$. |  | kr | Upu⿺𠃊mg tplpпгпи |
| dq. |  | $p \%$. |  |
| $\phi \eta$. |  | 1 |  |

[^20]| $L^{w .}$ |  | $\partial m$. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LP． |  | $\partial{ }_{\text {d }}$ ． | Unumbituminu |
| L4． |  | $\partial \underline{\text { a }}$ | Spmispin |
| LT． | 7pinweputukiu | $\partial \eta$. |  |
| $L^{t,}$ |  | $\partial L$ ． | Zmaknuspir |
| 19． |  | $\partial \underline{T}$ | Fodinniupin |
| 15. |  | $\partial J$ ． |  |
| $L E$. |  | $\partial_{L}$ ． |  |
| $L P$ 。 | Unmuthtumbil | $\partial \rho$ ． | QulutLptix |
| ［u． |  | 4. |  |
| juw． | 2mspnudtusiu | 4m． | Приши立мик шрракир |
| lup． |  | 4F． |  |
| ［uq． | 2p＜um¢m\＆и | 47． |  |
|  | U．45ughir | 47. | $8 n L L^{4}$ |
| jut． |  | 44. |  |
| juq． |  | 47. | U，pwdmı |
| Lus． |  | 45. |  |
| lus． |  | $4 D$. |  |
| $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ | SmjqT | $4 \beta$. |  |
| d． |  | $\zeta$. | цшширмимпц［црц］ |

B．Military list ${ }^{3}$

| U．plivintum q̧aniu |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 411 |
| Fпhatur uqditimg | 4 |
|  | 4 |
|  | $n$ |
| คшqшршипп上р | $n$ |
| hnpphunncup | $n$ |
| Опиш引р | $n$ |
|  | $n$ |
|  | $\pi$ |
| 9 Smusp | $\tau$ |
| Funtinug | $n$ |
| $\Pi_{m} L^{n \leq} \leq$ | J |



| Upusp | $m^{\prime} p^{\prime \prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | S |
| Uицшдтдрий | 15 |
|  | 5 |
| Suиририщg | 6 |
|  | 6 |
|  | 6 |
|  | $\partial$ |
|  | $\partial$ |
| คmpuk | d |
| 46pmispib | д |
|  | $\partial$ |

$1 / 4$
n
4
$\pi$
2

I
$n$
$n$
$n$

$J$

[^21]|  | 4 |  | д |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | J | $9 \times \underline{\text { 9\％plum }}$ | $\partial$ |
|  | J |  | d |
|  | J |  | d |
| $U_{1 /}$ дtinuquin | 6 | Uппшıр | д |
| Unmititutulu | $J$ | U．pmbhgh | d |
|  | 6 |  | d |
|  | $J$ | ир¢ши | d |
|  | 6 | Swqptumis | $\partial$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\pi$ |  | w＇elu |
| 4шкишршиши | $n$ |  | $n$ |
| 4mumbyh | 4 |  | $n$ |
| nuntugh | $n$ | クRE2masp | $n$ |
| Ow－nt mgh | $n$ | Unlump | $n$ |
| Swjhgh | $n$ |  | 2 |
| Uunipl | $n$ | USさLumgh | 2 |
|  | $n$ | 2 mpnadtum | 6 |
|  | $n$ | $S_{\text {¢甲шиппи }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | 6 |
| Прףпьир | $\varepsilon$ | UFSSMnLup | 6 |
|  | 2 | U．45mg | $J$ |
|  | 2 | 9mpt \｛nıw反itu | J |
| ทримрикики | J |  | J |
|  | J |  | 6 |
| Pnpumbgh | J |  | $J$ |
|  | J |  | 6 |
|  | J |  | 6 |
| Luniminip | J | Spmink | J |
|  | J | Pnıdnıinh | ${ }^{5}$ |
|  | J | Pu9ptrniub | 6 |
|  | 6 | $\beta_{\text {пqп }}$ | 6 |
|  | 6 | $V$ пиршgmи | J |







[^22]
## C．Pseudo－Gahnamak ${ }^{5}$










2шлцшqци．曰．


$\beta$ мпршшпицри．
$S_{\text {Г }}$ мшипицци．р．


引пприпппицр．р．
Uрдрпиии．f．

Upustighp．


цршдрр．
бпцр．
цшршすそn⿺廴й．



чшдр．р．
Uhum\＆kwip．


bqhutwip．
9mintimip．

FqumLiph．

9．punip．



ULршшйแшโ．p．



Иишшұипецрр．




чшqрпгip．．．
чшкишришшци．
Unlump．p．

P乡⿸尸巾Lupp．
Uипицшипицйp．


2nq4tnn．p．

$U_{\text {PRLILIpp．}}$
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## D. Armenian Princes accompanying St. Gregory to Catesarea

## i. Armenian version ?









[^23]












## ii. Arabic version ${ }^{8}$

86. Cum igituŕ pervenerunt epistulae, ad eum venerunt tres reges, rex Abchazorum ('bh'z) et rex Georgiorum (ğrğ'n) et rex Albanorum ('ll'nyn) et cum ipsis caterva principum : primus princeps 'lhbns. Secundus princeps 'rṭnwğ nomine vitaxa (bytqs) magnus. Tertius princeps 'rmot'n. Quartus princeps 'sbytywn nomine 'sbyts, qui praepositus erat custodiae montium qwsywn et mṭznywn. Quintus princeps mqwny'nwn nomine 'ssb'r'b'ts : hic autem praefectus erat exercitui totius Armeniae, equitum et peditum, nee discedebat a rege magnae Armeniae, atque in bellis omnes quos memoravimus principes, et memorabimus, sub eius potestate erant, praeterquam quod princeps qmodl non erat sub eius potestate, quae (regio) est fortes qrdyṭn. Septimus regens magnae regionis șfnys, quae est iuxta regionem fluminum. Octavus princeps regionis giurgr. Nonus princeps rstnwn. Decimus princeps mfnṣn. Undecimus princeps swnywn et custos. Duodecimus princeps dsbwd'wn. Decimus tertius princeps 'tywn. Decimus quartus princeps zwrydwn, et ipse iuxta qrdyṭn. Decimus quintus princeps hrhwrwnyws, dux, qui rector erat mlh'zwn'h. Decimus sextus princeps (a'px $\rho \nu$ ) 'rtzrwnyws. Et omnes gentes convenerunt secundum gradus suos.
87. Et hi sunt sedecim principes quos enumeravit rex et ad quos

[^24]misit propter honores eorum. Atque deliberaverunt de iis quae inter ipsos erant, constitueruntque ut ad illum irent, et hoc perfecerunt.

## iii. Greek version ${ }^{9}$

135. ... ó $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon u ́ s ~ . . . ~ к є \lambda \epsilon v ́ є \iota ~ o u ̂ v ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ a ̉ p \chi \eta \gamma o v ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \sigma a \tau \rho a \pi \hat{\omega} \nu$


















## iv. Greek Life of Saint Gregory ${ }^{10}$
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 $\tau a ́ \xi \iota \nu \quad \sigma v \nu \eta ́ \chi \theta \eta \sigma a \nu{ }^{11}$.

## E. Armentan Princes accompanying Trdat III to Rome

## i. Armenian version ${ }^{12}$
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[^26]
## ii. Greek version ${ }^{13}$


















## F. Armentan Princes summoned to Ctesiphon

## i. Lazar P'arpeci $i^{15}$










[^27]













## ii. Etišē ${ }^{16}$
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## G. Partisans of Vasak of Siwnik' ${ }^{18}$

## i. Łazar P'arpeci
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## ii. Etišē ${ }^{19}$
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## H. Partisans of Vardan Mamikonean

## i. Eazar P'arpeci ${ }^{21}$
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## ii. $E t i s{ }^{-1}{ }^{22}$
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## I. Armentan Princes Prisoners in Persia

## i. Lazar P'arpeci ${ }^{24}$





[^31]
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## ii. Elǐ̌ēē ${ }^{25}$
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25 Elišé, p. 193, cf. also pp. 178-179.







## J. List of Armenian Churches in Jerusalem 27

##  (U〔шипши цุшрпшщћп)













Єпрш!


 4ппर्iu:






[^32]Uри£

























ц









$U_{2}$ гuй





















 unprs:











 य


 $\pi 卩 \sum^{\kappa} \eta$ वे












 ипирр иппそtwи





 ипш






























## K. The Gregorid Bishops

## i. Armenian version ${ }^{28}$






































## ii. Greek version ${ }^{29}$




























 ... [Грךүópıos] єis $\mu \epsilon ́ \sigma о \nu ~ \pi a \rho є \lambda \theta \omega ́ \omega, ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \zeta \omega о \pi о \iota o ̀ ̀ ~ к \eta ́ \rho v \gamma \mu a ~ \tau о \hat{v}$







 v$\pi \epsilon \rho \beta a i \nu є \iota . . .$.

## iii. Greek Life of Saint Gregory ${ }^{30}$












 $\theta \epsilon o \pi \nu \in v ́ \sigma \pi o v s$ रpaфás.












 є่ $\pi \grave{\imath}$ Ḱ́ $\tau \omega \nu$. M $\quad$.













 $\chi \omega ́ \rho a \nu " A \rho \sigma a \mu o v \nu i o s . K a i$ є́ $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho o v s ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \tau o v s ~ \chi \omega \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa a i{ }^{\epsilon} \theta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$
 rò̀ $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s$ ả $\eta \eta \theta$ єias.







## iv. Arabic version ${ }^{31}$

158. Tum praeparavit episcopos sanctus Gregorius, hic qui catholicus totius Armeniae factus est, eosque dimittebat in totam terram Armeniae et in Georgiam (ǧig'n) et in regionem drzqy't et in Albanos (ll'nyn). Et assumpsit hominem georgianum (ğrǧny) ex illis qui cum ipso Sebastea venerant, nomine 'byrbzhw' (lege Irenarchum) eumque metropolitam fecit et misit eum ut episcopos constitueret super totam Georgiam (ǧrğ'n); erat autem pulcher vitae modo, perfectus, doctus Scripturarum Ecclesiae, diaconusque erat et praesens cum ossa Quadraginta Martyrum invenerunt, atque ornatus canitie erat; propterea eum in hunc gradum constituit. Et misit in regionem Abchazorum ('bh'z) Sophronium (sfrwn) qui presbyter erat a Cappadocia advenitque cum sancto Gregorio, eumque episcopum fecit et misit. Et misit in regionem Albanorum ('ll'nyn) Thomam, hominem electum, eratque e civitate Satala (s s't l' 1 'wn) parva. Hi autem erant ex illis qui cum eo venerant et docti erant Scripturarum sanctarum.
159. Et sicut prius fecerat, misit ad regionem 'lğylnyn et ad 'bh'z et ad magnam zwf'nyn et ad zwf'nyn parvam et ad 'sty'nyn et ad swynws (sic, lege swnyws) et ad mqswn et ad mrznṭ'q'n et ita ad omnem locum quem praefecti ei accomodabant, episcoposque cum praefectis regionum mittebat. Illi autem principes et potentes et praefecti gentium multa cum laetitia in regiones suas ibant cum episcopo suo qui eis praefectus erat catervaque sacerdotum ut ecclesias in nomina martyrum constituerent.
160. Et festinavit etiam in reliquas regiones Armeniae episcopos mittere. Misit Albianum ('llby'nwn) in regionem Bagravand (b'g̀rw'nḍwn) et ad omnes incolas finium Euphratis qui antea idolis ministrabant, sed doctrina sua eos omnes ad cognitionem Dei convertit, nam dignus erat qui in throno discipulorum sederet. Et misit Euthalium

[^33]('wt'lywn) in regionem bsy'nyn, episcopum super eam. Et misit Bassum (bşwn) episcopum super byqwgiwn. Et misit Moysem (mwsy) episcopum super regionem 'yb'klyrtyn et drdnyn. Et misit Erusebium ('ws'byws) super regionem d'r'n'l'ws. Et misit Iohannem episcopum super regionem qw'nytyn. Et misit Amatum episcopum super regionem swsb'rtyn; qui abiit cum praefecto regionis dicto 'sb'ta. Et misit Albium ('lbywn) episcopum super regionem 'sbr'b't-icam et mqway'nwn, qui ex familiaribus regis erant et 'ssbr'b'tw' cum praefecto eorum qui patricius dicitur; beatus autem Gregorius praecepit Albio ('lbywn) episcopo et dixit ei : «Ne discesseris a patricio regionemque imple praedicatione»; atque hoc (fecit) quia episcopus eruditus erat in variis scientiis, romana et pagana, validusque erat ad interpretationem sanctarum Scripturarum; et sub eius potestate erant t'rwn et bswn. Atque Artithem ('rtyty'n) episcopum fecit eumque ad regionem mlh'zwn misit cum principe eorum g'n'ršy. Et fecit Arsukan ('rṣwq'n) episcopum eumque ad sr'ğ regionem misit. Antiochum ('ntywhn) etiam episcopum fecit eumque ad regionem qrdlt misit. Tiricium (tryqywn) quoque episcopum fecit eumque ad regionem Atrpatakan ('tr'b't'qn) misit. Cyriacum (qry'qs) quoque episcopum fecit eumque ad regionem 'rṣ'mwnyws misit. Et misit etiam episcopos nonnullos ad reliquas regiones et gentes, et ita etiam monitores misit validos ad docendum verbum veritatis.
161. Sanctus vero Gregorius ... . Cum vero omnia absolvit, universosque in religione christiana confirmavit, sanctum Albium ('llyywn) omnibus rebus ad inquisitionem regiones (pertinentibus) praefecit. Et ita et omnes regiones et episcopos omni tempore fundabat docendo fidem in qua constituti erant. Post haec autem omnia, abiit et habitavit in spelunca m'ny'rt nominata, in regione d'r'n'l'ws, ut quietem inveniret a curis mundi, atque seipsum ieiunio et orationi et fletui dedidit ${ }^{32}$.

[^34]
## v. Step'annos Orbelean ${ }^{33}$








## vi. UXtanēs Urihaeci $i^{34}$
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# L. ARMENIAN CONCILIAR LISTS 

i. Council of A.D. 450
a. Łazar P'arpec̣i ${ }^{36}$
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## b. Ełišē ${ }^{37}$

## 


ВПчИらф Łцрицпцпи UЈршршипл.
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ii. Council of A.D. $505^{39}$




[^36]${ }^{38}$ On the Council of 450 and the list of those present, see Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 246 sqq. and tables viii-ix.
${ }^{39} B L, \mathrm{pp} .41-47$.






























40 The text seems clearly defective at this point. Not only does the printed version,

 kupuqnunumg:" with the suspicious repetition of names, but the punctuation is curious.
${ }^{41}$ A translation of the greater part of this letter can be found in Ter Minassianz, Die Armenische Kirche, pp. 152-157, to accompany his discussion of this Council, Ibid., pp. 33 sqq. See also Garitte, Narratio, p. 109, and Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 249-250 and table $x$.

## iii. Council of A.D. $555{ }^{42}$































[^37]
## iv．Councils of A．D． $607{ }^{45}$

##    
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## v. Council of A.D. $644^{47}$
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中шпии ми
vi. Council of A.D. ${ }^{1726}$
a. $(\text { Armenian })^{49}$

##  





47 Dwin Canons, pp. 200-202.
${ }^{48}$ On the problematic date of the Council of 644( ?), see above Chapter XII, nn. 20a, 26, and Garitte, Narratio, pp. 339 sqq.
${ }^{49}$ BL, pp. 220-224.




















b. $(\text { Syriac })^{50}$

Exemplaire de la lettre synodale que firent les Arméniens et les Syriens lorsqu'ils s'unirent

En l'an 1037 des Grecs, 135 selon le comput des Arméniens, vous êtes arrivés chez nous de la région de Syrie, sur l'ordre de Mar Athanasius, patriarche d'Antioche, près de moi Iwannês, catholicos de la Grande Arménie, vous, évêques, dont les noms sont consignés ici :

Constantin d'Edesse, - Siméon de Ḥarran, - Theodorus de Germanicia, - Athanasius de Maipherqaṭ, - Siméon de Dara; en vue de l'union entre nous et vous, c'est-à-dire entre les régions de Syrie et d'Arménie.

Selon la règle, nous avons dû vous demander de nous donner la définition de votre foi; vous l'avez écrite et nous l'avez remise par

[^38]écrit. Alors nous avons ordonné qu'un synode des vénérables évêques s'assemblât dans le canton d'Apahounis au village de Manavasqerd.

Nous y arrivâmes par la permission de Dieu et de l'Esprit-Saint:
Moi, Iwanês, catholicos de la Grande Arménie, et les évêques qui étaient avec moi :

1) Halphai, évêque de 'ARKIWS; - 2) Theodoros de 'ARMN; Sahak, évêque Mamikonean; - 4) [RSQW, évêque de] Basean; 5) Sargis, évêque de DIṬPIS( ? ) ; - 6) Theorios, de Beznounis; - 7) Theodoros, d'Ašamounis; - 8) Grigorios, d’Ašarounis; - 9) NWZWN, de 'ASIBW; - 10) Habel, d'Amatounis; - 11) David, d'Ěrěštounis; 12) Iowsêp', d'Artsrounis; - 13) Grigor, de Wanand ; - 14) Narkisos, de Khorkhorounis ; - 15) Esayi, de Golt'n; - 16) Iwanês, de Gnounis; 17) Gorgi, de Rotakay; - 18) Iowsêp', de Bakratounis; - 19) Mik'ayêl, de Bagrevand; - 20) Eremia, d'Apahounis;-21) Salomon, de MRINA; - 22) Gabriel, d’Arzôn(? ); - 23) Khosrow, prêtre et docteur des Arméniens; - 24) David, de Souphrin( ?); - 25) Salomon, archimandrite de Mak'enis; - 26) Raphaël, archimandrite ; - 27) Siméon(?), docteur; - 28) Iwanês, chorévêque ; - 29) Grigor, de Taraun; - 30) Sahak, chorévêque de MATNIS; - Sargis, évêque des Sanasnayê;
avec les autres prêtres et moines assemblés dans le synode, dont il n'est pas nécessaire d'écrire les noms, et aussi (avec) notre frère le noble, glorieux, sage Haiyan( ?), fils de 'Abou Hakîm. ...

Pour la confirmation, le maintien, la conservation de l'union faite entre nous et vous, nous avons écrit (cette définition) et nous vous ( ${ }^{\prime}$ ')avons donnée, ô nos frères nommés plus haut, représentant toute la Syrie, nous évêques, chorévêques, prêtres, plus haut désignés, représentant toute l'Arménie, devant le Dieu vivant et vivificateur de l'univers, et (devant) ses saints anges. Qu'il soit lui-même le sceau et le cachet confirmatif de la foi, c'est-à-dire de l'union entre nous et vous jusqu'à la fin du monde.

Et nous aussi, pour la certitude des choses qui ont été faites, nous avons signé et scellé de notre sceau, en confirmation ${ }^{51}$.

[^39]
# IV．GEOGRAPHICAL DOCUMENTS 

A．Ptolemy－Geography

## КЕФ．S’．КАППАФOKIAइ＠ELIL¹






$70^{\circ} \quad 37^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$



 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta} s, \ddot{\eta}$ €̇ $\pi \epsilon ́ \chi \in \iota \mu o i ́ p a s \quad 71^{\circ} \quad 42^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$
 $\dot{\eta}$ Ó́ $\sigma \iota s$
$73^{\circ} \quad 44^{\circ} 45^{\circ}$

 Taдaтias $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \imath \pi \epsilon ́ \rho a \tau o s, ~ o ̂ ̂ ~ \theta ́ ́ \sigma \iota s ~ 72^{\circ} 20^{\circ} \quad 44^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$
 тоьаи́т $\eta \nu$ ．Иєvкобv́р $\omega \nu$ ．．．

4．Пóvтоv По $\notin \mu \omega \nu$ иако $\hat{v}$

$67^{\circ} \quad 43^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$
ai $\pi \eta \gamma a i$ то仑̂ тотано仑
$68^{\circ} 30^{\circ} \quad 42^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$
Полє $\mu \omega \dot{\nu} \iota \nu$
$67^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 43^{\circ} 05^{\prime}$
＇Iacóvıov ăкроข $\quad 67^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 43^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$
Koтv́㇒日рои $67^{\circ} 35^{\prime} \quad 43^{\circ} 05^{\prime}$
＇Epućva⿱宀八а
$67^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \quad 43^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$

[^40]|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I＇才о́толеs | $68^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
| Kєpacoûs | $68^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Фаруакía | $69^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 05^{\circ}$ |
|  | $70^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
|  | $70^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 05^{\prime}$ |
| 6．$\pi$ apà $\delta$ ¢̇ тov̀s Kıroiovs |  |  |
| ＇Oфıovs | $71^{0}$ | $43^{\circ} 25^{\prime}$ |
|  | $71^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 35^{\prime}$ |
| ${ }^{\prime} A \theta \eta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \stackrel{3}{ } \kappa \rho \circ \nu$ | $71^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 45^{\circ}$ |
| Kорঠú入 $\eta$ | $71^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 45$ |
| Móp Oov $^{\text {a }}$ | $71^{\circ} 40^{3}$ | $43^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| ＇Apхáßıos тотаной є̇кßо入аі＇ | $72^{0}$ | $44^{\circ}$ |
| Eviiv | $72^{\circ} 05^{\prime}$ | $44^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ |
|  | $72^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ | $44^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
| ＂A ${ }^{\text {\％oppos }}$ | $72^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $44^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$ |
| ＇Aభóppov потаной є̇кßо入аi＇ | $72^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $44^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | $72^{\circ} \cdot 45^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ}$ |
|  | $71^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ}$ |
| $\Sigma_{2 \in \beta \text { абто́то入ıs }}$ | $72^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $44^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | $65^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$ |
|  | $66^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
|  <br>  | $\sigma_{710}^{\sigma v \mu \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon}$ | $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  $\tau \mu \hat{\eta} \mu a$ є่ $\pi \epsilon ́ \chi \in \iota$ ноípas <br> каí | $\mu$ ¢̀ $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\text { a }}$ òs | Taúpu |
|  | $65^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
|  | $67^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | $67^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| кai | $71^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | $68^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ}$ |
| каi＇ | $69^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Гo弓a入ض̀va | $66^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |


| Eüdıфоs | $67^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kapovapıs | $67^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| Bapßávıooa | 680 | $42^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
| ${ }^{\prime} A \beta \lambda \alpha \tau \alpha$ | $68^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ}$ |
| Nєокаıоа́pєıа | $67^{\circ} 20^{3}$ | $41^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |
| Savpavia | $68^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ}$ |
| Mкүádovia | $67^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ |
| $Z \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ | $67^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 42^{\prime}$ |
| $\triangle$ aván | $68^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ}$ |
| $\Sigma \in \beta$ áotєıa | $68^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Meбoр $\omega$ и $\eta$ | $68^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| $\Sigma a \beta a \lambda i ́ a$ | $68^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Mєүa入oooós | $68^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
| $Z є \phi$ v́pıov | $68^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ}$ |
| ${ }^{\prime} A \zeta$ a | $69^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Kокáлıа | $69^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Kop $\delta$ v̀خ $\eta$ | $70^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ}$ |
|  | $70^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 05^{\prime}$ |
| "Acı $\beta$ a | $71^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
| Mapóápa | $71^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Kapovрท́барßоv | $72^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| 11. $\Sigma_{\tau}$ ¢ $\alpha \tau \eta \gamma i a s ~ X a \mu \alpha \nu \eta \nu \eta$ S |  |  |
| Zápa | $65^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| "Арбрака | $65^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Гaסaनท́va | $65^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 55^{\circ}$ |
| Ovádaтa | $65^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ}$ |
| Sapoúnpa | $65^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| 'Osója | $66^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| 12. $\Sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma i a s ~ \Sigma a p \gamma a v p a \sigma \eta \nu \eta$ ¢ |  |  |
| Ф ¢ápa $^{\text {a }}$ | $67^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ}$ |
| $\Sigma a \delta a ́ \gamma \eta \nu a$ | $66^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Taúpaıva | $67^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| इaßadaocoós | $66^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 25^{\prime}$ |
| 'Apıapá大ı ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $67^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Mápwya | $67^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
| $\Phi \Phi^{\text {¢ }}$ ¢́ãa | $65^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ}$ |
|  | $64^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |

Navaroós
Дıккаıб́ápєıа
इаланßрiaı
Tєт $\rho a \pi v \rho \gamma i a$
14． Itpatทrias Kıдıкias $^{2}$
Movoтi入ía
Líova
Ká $\mu \pi a \iota$
Má乌ака $\dot{\eta}$ каі Kaıoápєıa
Kú̧ıaтра
Eủáyıva
＂Ap才a入入a
「óßapa
$65^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$
$65^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$65^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$
$66^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$
$66^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$
$66^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ} 05^{\prime}$
$66^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$
$66^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$67^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$
$67^{\circ} 10^{\circ} \quad 40^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$
$67^{\circ} 30^{\circ} \quad 40^{\circ}$
$67^{\circ} 10^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$

15．Аvкаovías ．．．
16．$\overline{\text { Itparqरias＇A } A \tau \iota o \chi ı a \nu \eta ̂ s ~ . . . ~}$
17． Itpatทrias Tvavíıios $^{2}$


 $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ aútòv $\tau o ̀ \nu ~ E u ̉ \phi \rho a ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ a i ̊ \varepsilon . ~$

19．$\Sigma \iota \nu \eta$ ńpa $71^{\circ} \quad 42^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$
＇A ${ }^{\prime} \stackrel{\text { Lpi＇s }}{ }$
पáлava
$71^{\circ} \quad 42^{\circ}$

Líruapa
$71^{\circ} \quad 41^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$

Zíдара
$71^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 41^{\circ} 25^{\prime}$

Дашкоиба
$71^{\circ} 30^{\circ} \quad 40^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$


| इáràa | $69^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\triangle$ о́pava | $70^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ} 05^{\prime}$ |
| Tátovpa | $70^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| Nıко́толıs | $69^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ |
| Xoparßia | $69^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| $\chi$ ג́pa̧ | $70^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| $\Delta \alpha{ }^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu$ a | $68^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
|  | $69^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ}$ |
| Kалтı́́pıбоа | $69^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 15^{\circ}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {＇} A v}{ }^{\text {áa }} \lambda_{\iota} \beta \lambda^{\prime}$ | $70^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| חıбьү ${ }^{\text {áápa }}$ | $68^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 55^{\prime}$ |
| Todáoa | $69^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |

Eủdoígara
$68^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ} 25^{\prime}$
Кара́лŋ
$71^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$
$41{ }^{0}$
Kacápa
$70^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$
'Opó $\mu$ avסos
$69^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
"I ${ }^{\prime} \pi a$
Фо́́фŋга
$70^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$
'A A áv $\eta$
$69^{\circ} \quad 40^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$
Фovфáz ${ }^{2}$
$69^{\circ} 45^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$
Máp $a^{2} \rho a$
$68^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$
Ov̉apoáta
$69^{\circ} 05^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$
"Opoa
$67^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$
21. $M_{\epsilon} \lambda_{\iota \tau \eta \nu}{ }^{\eta} s$
$\pi а \rho a ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ E u ̉ \phi \rho a ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \pi о т а \mu o ́ v ~$
Sáyovaa
इıvíбкодо⿱
$M \varepsilon \lambda_{l \tau} \tau \eta \nu \eta^{\prime}$


Kıávıка
$69^{\circ} 20^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$
Фovaımápa
$70^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$
Ev̉̄ı $\mu$ ápa
$70^{\circ} 10^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
'Iaroós
$69^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
Kıaкís
$69^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$
^єúyaı $\sigma a$
$70^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$
Ма́ркала
$70^{\circ} 40^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$
$\Sigma$ дицıбоós
$70^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$
\aסoıvepis
$69^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 38^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$
22. İpaтךүias Kataovías

Kaßaocós
$67^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 38^{\circ} 35^{\prime}$
Túvva
$66^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \quad 38^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
Tıpad入is
$67^{\circ} \quad 38^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$
Kı́ßıaтра
K $\lambda a v \delta \iota o ́ \pi$ о $\iota_{\iota}$
$66^{\circ} \quad 38^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$
$\triangle$ àı $\sigma a v \delta o ́ s$
Modvavoós
$65^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \quad 37^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$

Kópava Kamтабокías
$66^{\circ} 20^{\prime} \quad 37^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$

Móభov Kр ${ }^{\prime} \nu \eta$
$67^{\circ} \quad 38^{\circ}$

Mo K
$68^{\circ} \quad 38^{\circ}$
Tavadapis
$67^{\circ} 20^{\circ} \quad 37^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$68^{\circ} 20^{\circ} \quad 37^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$

| ＾єavois | $68^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $37^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $\Sigma_{i v \delta i \tau \alpha}$ | $67^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ |
| Kótaıva | $68^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ |
| Zopotaroós | $69^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $39^{\circ}$ |
| Núoбa | $68^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| ＇Apáoaja | $67^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Kapva入is | $68^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Гарүáкп | $68^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Kópuך | $71^{\circ}$ | $39^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
| Méтєıта | $71^{\circ}$ | $39^{\circ}$ |
| Kıavoıás | $71^{0}$ | $38^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Kатаркє入is | $70^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ | $39^{\circ}$ |
| Zı̧óarpa | $70^{\circ}$ | $38^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Пабápvך | $70^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Ki¢apa | $69^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
|  | $68^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| Noбa入خ́vp | $69^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
| Aaư̧a，a | $69^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $37^{\circ} 50^{\circ}$ |
| 25．$\Sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma i a s ~ ' A \rho a v \eta \nu \eta ิ s$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ＇Iov入ıóто入ıs | $71^{0}$ | $38^{\circ} 25^{\prime}$ |
| Bap弓à ${ }^{\text {á }}$ | $71^{0}$ | $38^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
| $\Sigma \epsilon p a \sigma \tau \epsilon ์ \rho \eta$ | $70^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
| Дакрıабоо́s | $70^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $38^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
|  | $70^{\circ}$ | $37^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| ＂$A \delta a \tau \theta a$ | $69^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $37^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$ |

．．．KEФ．$\Theta^{\prime} . K O \wedge X I \Delta O \Sigma \Theta E \Sigma I \Sigma{ }^{2}$




 ... KEФ. I. 'IBHPIAZ $\Theta E \Sigma I \Sigma^{3}$



 $76^{\circ} \quad 44^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$




| Мойßıоу кढ́цך | $75^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $46^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "Ayıpva | $75^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Oưáбaıסa | $76^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Oủápıка | $75^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $46^{0}$ |
| $\Sigma \mathrm{o}$ ¢ $p a$ | $75^{\circ}$ | $45^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
| 'Aprávıora | $75^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ}$ |
| $M_{\epsilon \sigma \tau \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau a}$ | $74^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ | $45^{\circ}$ |
| $Z a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \sigma a$ | $76^{\circ}$ | $44^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {' }}$ Ариа́ктıка | $75^{\circ}$ | $44^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$ |

$K E \Phi . I A^{\prime} .{ }^{\prime} A A B A N I A \Sigma \Theta E \Sigma I \Sigma{ }^{4}$




 $\alpha i ̂$ є̇ $\pi$ '́́ $\chi о v \sigma \iota ~ \mu o i ́ p a s ~$

$$
79^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \quad 44^{\circ} 30^{\prime}
$$




2. Té $\lambda a \iota \beta$ тóólıs $85^{\circ} \quad 46^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$

[^41]Г＇́рроv тотанои є́кßодаі
$\Gamma \epsilon ́ \lambda \delta a \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$
Kaбiov тотаноv є́кßодаí
＇A $A \beta$ áva $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$
＇A入ßápov тотацоиิ є́кßодаí
Гáyүара тódıs
$\mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \nu$ а $\mathfrak{i}$ то̂ $K \hat{v} \rho о v \pi о \tau а \mu о \hat{v} \epsilon \in \kappa \beta о \lambda a i ́$
$84^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 46^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$83^{\circ} \quad 46^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$82^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 46^{\circ}$
$81^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \quad 45^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$
$80^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 45^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$79^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 45^{\circ}$
$79^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \quad 44^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$





| Tá $ү \omega \delta \alpha$ | $77^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $46^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Baк久ía | $77^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Savov́a | $77^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $46^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| $\Delta \eta \gamma \lambda$ áv | $77^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $45^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Níqa | $77^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $45^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |




| Móoŋү | $79^{\circ}$ | $47^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sapovvis | $79^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {＇Ióßov }}$＇ | $78^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| ＇Iov́va | $79^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {＇EA }}$ ，${ }^{\text {ódaıov }}$ | $78^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $45^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {＇} A \delta i{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \beta \lambda a}$ | $79^{\circ}$ | $45^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| ＇$A \beta \lambda$ 人́va | 780 | $45^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
| Kapєұía | $79^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $45^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| ＂Ооька | $77^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $44^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| $\Sigma \iota o ́ \delta a$ | $78^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $44^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Bарои́ка | $79^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $44^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |


$80^{\circ} \quad 47^{0}$

5．Meта乡ेv $\delta \in \tau о \hat{v}{ }^{\prime} A \lambda \beta$ ávov каı то̂̂ Kaбiov $\pi о \tau а \mu о \hat{v}$

| Хаßá入a | $80^{\circ}$ | $47^{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Хо $\beta \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha$ | $80^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $46^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Boц̆ı́́ta | $80^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Mıoía | 810 | $46^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Xaסáxa | 810 | $46^{\circ}$ |
| ＂Adapos | $82^{\circ}$ | $46^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |



| ఆíavva | $82^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $46^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ఆа $\beta \iota \lambda \alpha ́ к \alpha$ | $82^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $46^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |

 $\Theta_{l} \lambda \beta{ }_{i}^{\prime}$
$84^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 46^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$
 $\dot{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \chi \in \iota$ moípas
$80^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$45^{\circ}$

## $K E \Phi . I B^{\prime} .{ }^{\prime} A P M E N I A \Sigma$ MEГAAH $\Theta E \Sigma I \Sigma{ }^{5}$







 $79^{\circ} 45^{\prime} \quad 43^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$



$$
\begin{array}{ll}
79^{\circ} & 42^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \\
\text { кai } & 80^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \\
40^{\circ}
\end{array}
$$


䒑oipas $71^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 38^{\circ}$
 $75^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 38^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$







|  | $75^{\circ}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $77^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$


$80^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ}$
${ }^{5}$ Ptolemy, pp. 932-949.
 moípas $72^{\circ} \quad 41^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$
 $77^{\circ} \quad 41^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$

$75^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$

 uoípas $79^{\circ} 45^{\circ} \quad 43^{\circ} 50^{\circ}$





$$
78^{\circ} 30^{\circ} \quad 44^{\circ} 30^{\circ}
$$




$$
75^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \quad 42^{\circ} 40^{\prime}
$$




| $71^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $77^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ}$ |

$\tau \grave{o ̀ ~} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{a} s \pi \eta \gamma \grave{a} s$ $77^{\circ}$ $41^{\circ}$




 $78^{\circ} \quad 43^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$

$78^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 40^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$








| 5. Jáda | $73^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $44^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "Aqкоира | $74^{0}$ | $44^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ |


| Bápaらa | $75^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $44^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Máda | $76^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ | $44^{\circ}$ |
| इavtov̂тa | $77^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $44^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| इaiaфápa | $78^{\circ}$ | $44^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
| T $\omega$ \％ | $78^{\circ} 50^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Ov̉apoúta | $73^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ}$ |
| ＇Aら̧́тa | $73^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Xodoúa | $74^{0}$ | $43^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| $\Sigma \eta \delta a \dot{\lambda} a$ | $74^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
|  | $74{ }^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 40^{\text {a }}$ |
| Tagriva | $74^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ}$ |
| Ko弓áda | $75^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Kотонáva | $75^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ |
| Bativpa | $76^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ |
| $\Delta \iota$ ¢áка | $76^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| Пто仑ิба | $77^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Г入íqua | $78^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Xo入ováta | $78^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $43^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ |
| $\Sigma а к а ́ \lambda \beta ı \nu a$ | $79^{\circ} 10^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {＇}}$ A $\rho$ гарára | $79^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$ | $43^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Bpєббós | $72^{0}$ | $42^{\circ} 45^{\circ}$ |
|  | $73^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Xaoipa | $74^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Xópora | $74^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |
| ©a入iva | $75^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |
| ＇Appaovípa | $76^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 45^{\circ}$ |
|  | $78^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Nagovava | $78^{\circ} 50^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |





 $\tau \mu \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \iota a i \delta \epsilon$
7．＇A $\theta$ oúa
$71^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 42^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$

Típláa
$73^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 42^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
Zópıza
$71^{\circ} 30^{\circ} \quad 42^{\circ}$

| $\Sigma$ áva | $73^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $42^{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bрі弓ака | $74^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| \apávıara | $76^{\circ}$ | $42^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Zоүока́ра | $77^{0} 15^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Kov́ßıva | $78^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $42^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Kodáva | $71^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Kaqov́pa | $72^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| Xodov́a | $73^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $41^{0}$ |
| Гоүока́pa | $74^{0}$ | $41^{0}$ |
| Фav́ova | $74^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Фavסa入ía | $74^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Zapováva | $75^{\circ} 40^{3}$ | $41^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Kiтapov | $76^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| ＇Avápiov | $76^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
| Sujov́a | $77^{\circ}$ | 410 |
| Tepoúa | $78^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |
| Zouplova | $78^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $41^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Matovoráva | $78^{\circ}$ | $41^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| ＇Aбтака́va | $78^{\circ}$ | $41^{0}$ |
| Tápeıva | $72^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $41^{0}$ |
| Ba入ıб弓ija | $73^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Baßi入a | $74^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| Sayaváva | $75^{\circ} 15^{3}$ | $40^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |
| ＂$A \zeta$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $76^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |





|  | $H \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \rho \delta \alpha$ | $72^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | $40^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$

Maらápa
$71^{\circ} 20^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 50^{\circ}$
＂Avらlтa
$72^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$
Kóкıта $72^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \quad 39^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$
$B \epsilon \lambda \kappa a v i a \quad 73^{\circ} 30^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$
$\Sigma_{\epsilon} \lambda \gamma_{i}$ a $74^{\circ} \quad 40^{\circ}$
$\Theta \omega \sigma \pi i a \quad 74^{\circ} 20^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ} 50^{\circ}$
Kodxis
$75^{\circ} 30^{\circ} \quad 39^{\circ}$
Llaváva
$71^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 38^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$
＇Apбанóгата
$73^{\circ}$
$38^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$
Kóppa
$74^{\circ} 30^{\circ} \quad 38^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$




| 10. Та́бка | $75^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\Phi \omega \rho{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $76^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| Maina | $76^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| Bováva | $76^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ}$ |
| Xodíupa | $77^{\circ} 45$ | $40^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| T ${ }_{\text {¢ }} \in \beta$ ía | $77^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 55^{\prime}$ |
| Savduáva | $77^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $40^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
| Kaтоиิта | $79^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ |
|  | $78^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$ |
| $\Theta \in \lambda \beta$ 入入áv ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | $76^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |
| $\Sigma i ́ a \iota$ | $75^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 40^{\circ}$ |
| $\Phi_{\epsilon \rho \in \nu \delta i}{ }^{\prime}$ | $74^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ |
| Tıүрало́кєрта | $76^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$ |
| इapȯךоv́a | $75^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ | $39^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ |
| Kódла | $78^{\circ}$ | $39^{\circ} 50^{\prime}$ |
| Tiүpavoáua | $79^{\circ} 45^{\circ}$ | $40^{\circ}$ |
|  | $75^{\circ} 20^{\text {a }}$ | $38^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |

... KEФ. IZ'. ME $\mathcal{O}$ OПTAMIA $\Theta E \Sigma I \Sigma^{6}$




 нoípas
$80^{\circ}$
$34^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$




 $\kappa a i ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi i ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda v ̀ ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ E u ̉ \phi \rho a ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \dot{\eta}^{\prime} A \gamma \kappa \omega \beta a \rho i ̂ \tau \iota s$.
... . 6. Пара̀ $\delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ T i \gamma \rho ı \nu ~ \pi о \tau а \mu о \nu ~ \pi o ́ \lambda ~ \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ a i ̈ \delta \epsilon ' ~ . . . ~$
... $\Sigma \dot{\alpha} \pi \phi \eta$
$76^{\circ} \quad 37^{\circ} 40^{\prime}$

[^42]... $\Sigma l$ lү ${ }^{\prime}$ á $\rho a \quad 76^{\circ} \quad 37^{\circ}$
... 'A $A$ á $\mu \in \iota \alpha \quad 79^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \quad 34^{\circ} 20^{\prime}$

... ${ }^{\text {E }}$ E $\delta \sigma \sigma a$
... Nioußus
... Káṕṕá
.. ${ }^{`}$ Pearaipa
$72^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \quad 37^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$75^{\circ} 10^{\prime} \quad 37^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$
$73^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \quad 36^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$
$74^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \quad 35^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 7$

## B. Armentan Geography - Long version ${ }^{8}$
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## C. Armenian Geography - Short version ${ }^{10}$
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D. Itinerarium Antonini ${ }^{12}$

1. Itinerarium Provinciarum Antonini Augusti ...

| A Sebastia Cocuso per |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Melitenam | 294 sic | Blandos 24

177. Euspoena 28

Arahis 24
Ad Praetorium 28
Pisonos
32
Melitena
(32) 22

## 178. Arcas <br> 26

Dandaxina 24
Osdara 24
Ptandari 24
Cocuso 38
Item a Sebastia Cocuso
per Caesaream 257 sic
179. Scanatu 28

Malandara 30
Armaxa 28
Eulepa 24
Caesarea $\quad 16$
180. Artaxata 24

Coduzalaba 19
Comana 24
Ptandari 24
Cocuso 38

Item a Sebastia Cocuso
per compendium 206 sic
181. Tonosa 50

Ariarathia $\quad 50$
Coduzalaba 20
Comana 24
Ptandari 24
Cocuso 38

Item ab Arabisso per compendium Satalam 268 sic 182. Tonosa 28

Zoana 25
Gundusa 23
Eumeis 30
Zara 18
Dagalasso $\quad 20$
183. Nicopoli 24

Olotoedariza 24
Ad Dracones $\quad 26$
Haza 24
$\underset{\text { Satala leg. XV Apolli- }}{\substack{\text { Saris }}}{ }_{26}$

11 See above, n. 9.
12 Miller, Itineraria Romana, pp. lix-lx.
184. A Germanicia per Dolicham et Zeugma Edissam usque 87 sic Sicos Bassilisses $\quad 20$
Dolicha 10
185. Zeugma 12
Bemmaris $\quad 20$
Edissa 25
186. Item a Gemanicia per

Samosatam Edissa 70 sic
In Catabana 15
Nisus 16
Tharse 14
Samosata leg. VII 13
187. Edissa 12

Item ab Antiochia Eme-
sa $\quad 133$ sic
Niccaba 25
Caperturi 24
Apamia $\quad 20$
Larissa 16
188. Epiphania $\quad 16$

Arethusa 16
Emesa $\quad 16$
Item ab Arabisso Muzana 48 sic
In medio 22
Muzana 26
Item a Gemanicia Edis-
sa
84 sic
Sicos Basilisses $\quad 15$
189. Dolicha 15

Zeugma 14
Cannaba 13

In medio $\quad 12$
Edissa15
Item a Cyrro Edissa 92 sic
Ciliza sive Urmagiganti ..... 12
190. Abarara ..... 10
Zeugma ..... 22
Bemmari Canna ..... 40
Bathnas Mari ..... 8
Edissa ..... 10
Item a Nicopoli Edissa ..... 137 sic
Aliaria ..... 13
Gerbedisso ..... 15
191. Dolicha ..... 20
Zeugma ..... 24
Canaba ..... 25
In medio ..... 22
Edissa ..... 18
Item a Callicome Edissa85 sio
Bathnas ..... 24
Hierapoli ..... 21
192. Thilaticomum ..... 10
Bathnas (Bathas) ..... 15
Edissa ... ..... 15
Item a Travia Sebas- tiam ..... 161 sic
204. Corniaspa ..... 21
Parbosena ..... 25
Sibora ..... 25
Agriane ..... 20
Simos ..... 30
Sebastia ..... 40
Item a Travia per Se-bastopolim
Sebastiam usque 166 sic
205. Mogaro ..... 30
Dorano ..... 24
Sebastopoli ..... 40
Verisa ..... 24
Fiarasi ..... 12
Sebastia ..... 36Item ab Ancyra per Ny -sam Caesaream usque198 sic
Gorbeus ..... 24
206. Orsologiaco ..... 18
Aspona ..... 20
Parnasso ..... 22
Nysa ..... 24
Osiana ..... 32
Saccasena ..... 28
Caesarea ..... 30
Item a Caesarea Satala324 sic
Eulepa ..... 16
Armaxa ..... 24
Marandara ..... 28
Scanatus ..... 39
207. Sebastia ..... 28
Camisa ..... 27
Zara ..... 18
Dagalasso ..... 20
Nicopoli ..... 24
Olotoedariza ..... 24
Dracontes ..... 26
Haza ..... 24
Satala ..... 26
Item a Satala Melitena
per ripam Samosatam usque ..... 341 sic
Suissa ..... 17
208. Arauracos ..... 28
Carsagis ..... 24
Sinervas ..... 28
Analiba ..... 28
Zimara ..... 16
209. Teucila ..... 16
Sabus ..... 28
Dascusa ..... 16
Claca ..... 32
Melitena ..... 18
210. Maisena ..... 12
Lacotena ..... 28
Perre ..... 26
Samosata ..... 24
Item a Caesarea Meli- tena ..... 228 sic
Artaxata ..... 24
Coduzalaba ..... 24
Comana ..... (16) 26
Siricis ..... 24
Ptandaris ..... 16
Arabisso ..... 12
211. Osdara ..... 28
Dandaxena ..... (34) 24
Arcas ..... 22
Melitena ..... 28
Item a Ceasarea Ana-
zarbo ..... 211 sic
Arassaxa ..... 24
Coduzalaba ..... 24
Comana ..... 24
Siricis ..... 16
Malandara ..... 39
Cocuso ..... 25
Laranda ..... 18
212. Badimo ..... 18
Praetorio ..... 22
Flaviada ..... 22
Anazarbo ..... 18
Item a Sebastia Cocuso ..... 206 sic
In medio ..... 25
Tonosa ..... 25
In medio ..... 25
Ariarathia ..... 25
Coduzalaba ..... 20
Comana ..... 24
Ptandari ..... 24
213. Cocuso ..... 38
Item a Nicopoli Arabis-
so ..... 226 sic
Dagalasso ..... 24
Zara ..... 20
Camisa ..... 18
Sebastia ..... 24
in medio ..... 25
Ariarathia ..... 25
Coduzalaba ..... 20
Comana ..... 24
Ptandari ..... 24
Arabisso ..... 22
214. Item a Sebastopoli Cae-saream usque 217 sic
Verisa ..... 24
Siara ..... 12
Sebastia ..... 36
Scanatus ..... 28
Armaxa ..... 28
Eulepa ..... 24
Caesarea ..... 26
Item a Cocuso Arabisso52 sic
Ptandari ..... 28
Arabisso ..... 24
Item a Cocuso Melite- nam ..... 153 sic
215. Ptandari ..... 28
Arabisso ..... 22
Asdara ..... 28
Dandaxena ..... 24
Areas ..... 22
Melitena ..... 28
Item a Melitena Samo- sata ..... 91 sic
Mesena ..... 12
Lacotena ..... 28
Perre ..... 27
Samosata ..... 24
Item a Nicopoli Satalam
122 sic
Olotoedariza ..... 24
Carsat ..... 24
216. Arauracos ..... 24
Suissa ..... 24
Satala ..... 26
Item a Trapezunta Sa- talam 135 sic

| Ad Vicensimum | 20 | Sedissa (fines Ponti) | 17 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zigana | 32 | Domana | 24 |
| 217. Thia | 24 | Satala ... |  |
|  |  | 18 |  |

## E. Tabula Peutingeriana

viii. Diocesis Ponticae ${ }^{14}$

| $x \mathrm{xc}$ |  | [Hippus] | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Stempeo | [12] |
| Calcedonia - Trapezunte - Ar- |  | [Lamupulis] | 4 |
| taxata - Sanora |  | Sebastopolis | 60 |
|  |  | Ad fontem felicem | 35 |
| Calcedonia ... |  | Ad mercurium | 45 |
| Trapezunte | 24 | Caspiae | 5 |
| Nyssilime | 18 | Apulum | 7 |
| Opiunte | 15 | Pagas | 40 |
| Reila | 18 | Gaulita | 14 |
| Ardinco | 16 | Misium | 10 |
| Athenis | 9 | Condeso | 14 |
| Agabes | 11 | Strangira | 30 |
| [Pyxites fl. | 16] | Artaxata | 20 |
| Cissa | 16 | Geluina | 24 |
| Apsaro | 6 | Sanora | 12 |
| Portualtu | 12 | Lalla | 10 |
| Apasidam | [12] | Ugubre | 40 |
| [Ad Isidem] | 3 | Teleda | 44 |
| Nigro | 6 | Philado | ? |
| Phasin | 3 | [Cyropolis] | - |
| Cariente | 16 | Lazo | 16 |
| Chobus | 19 | Satara | 18 |
| Sicanabis | 4 | Bustica | 24 |
| Cyanes | 12 | Sanora | - |
| Tassiros | [18] |  |  |

[^45]| xciii |  | Hassis | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ziziola | 12 |
| Nicomedia - Amasia - Neoce-saria-Polemonion |  | Satala | 20 |
|  |  | Salmalasso | 20 |
|  |  | Darucinte | 20 |
| Nicomedia ... |  | Aegea | 15 |
| Amasia | 15 | Lucus Basaro | 22 |
| Palalce | 12 | Sinara | 15 |
| Coloe | 10 | Calcidava | 12 |
| Pidis | 16 | Autisparate | 15 |
| Mirones | 10 | Tharsidarate | 20 |
| Neocesaria | 38 | Datamisa | 10 |
| Bartae | (?) 11 | Adconfluentes | 30 |
| Polemonio $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \\ & \text { xcv }\end{aligned}$ |  | Barantea | 26 |
|  |  | Andaga | 12 |
|  |  | Armanas | 17 |
|  |  | Chaldas | 24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ancyra - Tavio - Nicopoli - } \\ & \text { Satala - Artaxata } \end{aligned}$ |  | Colchion | 24 |
|  |  | Raugonia | 24 |
|  |  | Hariza | 24 |
| Ancyra ... |  | Coloceia | 33 |
| Tavio |  | Paracata | 23 |
| Tomba | 22 | Artaxata |  |
| Evogni | [40] |  |  |
| [Sebastopolis | $20]$ | xevi |  |
| ad stabulum 22 |  |  |  |
| Mesyla 16 |  | Amasia - Tavio - Zela - Neo- |  |
| Comana pontica 16 |  | cesaria |  |
| Gagonda | 5 |  |  |
| Magabula | 25 | Amasia ... |  |
| Danae | 25 | Tavio | 36 |
| Speluncis | [12] (?) | Rogonorum | 36 |
| Mesorome | 13 | Aegonne | 28 |
| [Nicopoli | 14 | Ptemari | 26 |
| - | [12] | Zela | 32 |
| [Olotoedariza] | [26] | Stabulum | 22 |
| Draconis | 13 | Seramisa | 16 |
| Cunissa | 10 | Neocesaria |  |


evii
Tavio - Cesarea - Melitene -
Amida - Nisibis

> Nisibi
Sardebar - Tigranocerta -
Raugonia
Sardebar ..... 10
Adipte ..... 12
Sitae ..... 10
Thalbasaris ..... 15
[Martyropolis] (?) ..... [22]
Tigranocarten ..... 30
Zanserio ..... 20
Cymiza ..... 22
Dyzanas ..... 27
Patansana ..... 26
Vastauna ..... 32
Molchia ..... 26
Dagnevana ..... 15
Flegoana ..... 15
Isumbo ..... [17]
[Nasabi] ..... [24]
[Anteba] ..... [24]
[Sorue] ..... [27]
[Catispi] ..... [39]Raugonia
cviii $a$
Amida - Tigranocerta
Amida ..... 27
Ad tygrem ..... 13
Nararra ..... 45
Colchana ..... 15
Tigranocarten

## x. 2. Parthia ${ }^{16}$

| xev |  | Filadelfia | 20 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Artaxata - Ecbatana |  |  | Trispeda |
|  |  | Peresaca | 45 |
| Artaxata |  | Arabum | 4 |
| Catispi | 39 | Eneca | 7 |
| Sorvae | 27 | Rhasum | 4 |
| Anteba | $[24]$ | Ad tomenta | 4 |
| Nasabi | 24 | Naucanio | 4 |
| Gobdi | 17 | Nicea Nialia | 6 |
|  | 24 | Ecbatanis Partiorum ... ${ }^{17}$ | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |

## F. Tovma Arcruni - History ${ }^{18}$

## The divisions of Vaspurakan
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## V. TOPONYMY

This appendix is an attempt at a partial synthesis of the geographical information found in Adontz's work together with the identifications of later scholars and the modern forms of toponyms. The material is presented in tabular form, with all the equivalents of a given toponym, ancient (Armenian and Classical) or modern, being given whenever possible. Every equivalent form of a toponym has been treated as a separate entry and provided with the available literary and map references relevant to it. Hence, all alternatives should be consulted in order to obtain the complete information. Variant forms, however, are given as part of their main entry without additional information, although, in the case of provinces, an attempt has been made to indicate the source in which the variant form occurs. Scholars continue to disagree as to the identification and position of a number of localities, so that no attempt has been made to reconcile divergent opinions which will be found in the references.

The main works consulted for this appendix have been: Eremyan, Hayastan ast "Ašðarhaçoyc̣" [E]; Toumanoff, Studies in Christian Caucasian History [T], (on the provinces), and the Department of the Interior's Gazetteer No. 46 : Turkey [G]; The maps used were : Eremyan's Hayastan ast " Aš $\chi a r h a c o y c$ ", and the Atlas of the Armenian SSR [AA], (for Armenian toponyms); Calder and Bean's A Classical Map of Asia Minor [CM], and the Grosser Historischer Weltatlas I [HW] (for Classical names); and the USAF Aeronautical Approach Chart [U] (for the modern equivalents). Miller's Itineraria Romana $[\mathrm{M}]$ is the references given for the stations in the Tabula Peutingeriana and the Itinerarium Antonini. Other references are given only where particularly relevant or if they are not included in the corresponding notes. References to Lynch's and Kiepert's maps have been omitted as incorporated in Adontz's work, and reflecting conditions existing in 1908 rather than at the present time.

Of necessity, references have been highly selective, or even arbitrary, and severely limited, since any pretence at exhaustiveness would have expanded this appendix beyond manageable size and far transcended its modest scope. The shortcomings of such a limited attempt
are far too obvious to require comment; the most that can be hoped here, is that this listing will provide some minimal assistance to the reader faced with the chaotic state of Anatolian toponymy at the present time.

## A. PROVINCES

The following abbreviations have been used in this section in addition to those given in the Bibliography and Notes :

Agat'. Agat'angelos, Patmut'iwn [History], 3rd ed. (Venice, 1930).
Aed. Procopius, "On Buildings", Works, H.B. Dewing and G. Downey edd. and trans (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1940), VII.
A.M. Ammianus Marcellinus, The Surviving Books of the History, J.C. Rolfe ed. and trans (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1950).
de B. Johannis Episcopi Ephesi ... Commentaria de Beatis Orientalibus ..., W.J. van Douwen and J.P.N. Land trans. (Amsterdam, 1889).
B.L. $\quad$ Girk' T' $\mathrm{H}^{\prime}$ oc [The Book of Letters] (Tiflis, 1901).

CJ "Codex Justinianus ", P. Krüger ed. in CJC, II, 8th ed. (1906).
C.Th. Codex Theodosianus, T. Mommsen ed. (Berlin, 1905).
D.A.I. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio, G. Moravscik et al. edd., (Budapest-London, 1949, 1962).
E. Eremyan, S.T., Hayastana ast "Aš $\chi$ arhaçoyc" [Armenia According to the " Armenian Geography "], (Erevan, 1963).
G.C. Georgius Cyprus, Descriptio Orbis Romani, H. Gelzer ed. (Leipzig, 1890).

Goth. Procopius, " The Gothic War", Works, H.B. Dewing ed. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1919-1928), III-IV.
H.S. Hierokles, Synekdemos, E. Honigmenn ed. and trans. (Brussels, 1939).

L " Laterculus Polemii Silui" in Seeck, Not. Dig.
ad L. "Collectio Sangermanensis, [Epistulae ad Leonem Imperatorem]", ACO, II-v.
M Mansi, Sacrorum Consiliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio, new ed. (Paris, 1901).
M.S. Chronique de Michel le Syrien ..., J.B. Chabot ed. and trans. (Paris, 18991904).

N "Novellae ", R. Schoell and W. Kroll edd., CJC, III, 6th ed. (1912).
N.D. Notitia dignitatum, O. Seeck ed. (Berlin, 1876).
N.H. Pliny, The Natural History, H. Rackam ed. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass.London, 1938-1965).
P. Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia, C. Müller ed. (Paris, 1901).

Pers. Procopius, "The Persian Wars", Works, H.B. Dewing ed. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1914), I.
P.P. "Ex historia Petri Patricii ...", I. Bekker and C. Niehbuhr edd., CSHB.

S Strabo, The Geography, H.L. Jones ed. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass.London, 1960-1961).
St. Byz. Stephanus Byzantinus, Ethnika, A. Meinicke ed. (Berlin, 1849).
S.O. Chabot, J.B., Synodicon Orientale (Paris, 1902).

T Toumanoff, C., Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown, 1963).
de Th. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, de Thematibus, A. Pertusi ed. (Vatican city, 1952).

VL "Laterculus Veronensis" in Seeck, Not. Dig.
$\mathbf{X}$ Xenophon, The Anabasis of Cyrus, C.L. Brownson ed. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1950-1961).
ZM Zacharias Rhetor, Historia Ecclesiastica, E.W. Brooks trans. (Paris, 1921). (d.) diocese.
(s.) strategy.
(th.) theme.
The coordinates given in Armenian letters in Eremyan's map have been transcribed into Latin characters, E.g. $f-4=$ B-4.

Coordinates are invariably given in the customary order: Latitude-Longitude.
For a translation of Eremyan's tables, Armenia, pp. 116-120; see Hewsen, Armenia, pp. 326-342.

| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Abaran Abasgia | - . . . | - - . . . . | - | . | . See Aparan. |
|  | Abasgoi | Awazov aš $\chi$ arh | E41, 101 |  | \# Basgun. |
|  | Abazgoi | Abkhazia |  |  | T. 60 n. 58, 209, 266, 405 nn .52 , |
|  | al-Abhäz |  |  |  | 54, 496-497. |
|  | Bazgun |  |  |  | See Ch. XII, n. 14. |
| Abasgoi | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | - . . . . | - - . - | . See Abasgia. |
| Abazgoi | . . . . . | - . . . . . . |  | . . . . . | . See Abasgia. |
| Abeleank' |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} .31,118-\mathrm{xv} / 3 \\ \mathrm{~B}-5 \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 220. |
| al-Abhāz | - • . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Abasgia. |
| Abkhazia |  | Abasgia . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Abasgia. |
| Aboc̣i . . | - . . - . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | .See Ašock' |
| Ac̆ara . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Adzharia. |
| Acisenē | - . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . | . See Akilisenē. |
| Aepwerk | Aras $\chi$ | Ovēa | E.38, 117-vii/4 |  |  |
|  | Arisi |  | D-6 |  |  |
| Adiabena . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | - . . . | . | . See Adiabenē. |
| Adiabenē | Adiabena | Hedayab | E.49, 72 | P. V, xvii, 4 | T. 129, 131, 133, 148, 163-166, |
|  |  | Nor Sirakan |  | S. XI, v, 8; | 197, 200, 305, 322 n. 76. |
|  |  | Median March |  | XI, xiv, 12 | See Ch. XIV n. 60, and Nor |
|  |  | Kadmē ? |  | XVI, i, 1, 19 | Sirakan and Kadmē. |
| Adzharia | Ačara | Egr | . . . | . . . . | . See Egr. |
| Aegyptus |  |  |  | P. IV, v |  |
|  |  |  |  | N.D. |  |
| Aegyptus I |  |  |  | N. VIII |  |
| Aegyptus II |  |  |  | N. VIII |  |
| Ainiana |  |  |  | S. XI, vii, 1 |  |



| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL |  |
| Alewan |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} .32,117-\mathrm{xi} / 10 \\ \mathrm{G}-7 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Aliovit | Alit hovit Alovit |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} .33,116-\mathrm{iv} / 13 \\ \mathrm{G}-5 \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 205-206. |
| Alit hovit . . . <br> Aliwn | Ariwe |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 33,116-\mathrm{i} / 2 \\ \mathrm{G}-3 \end{gathered}$ |  | . See Ałiovit. |
| Aljn | Ałjnik' <br> Arjn | Arzanenē <br> Arabian March <br> be $\theta$ Arzōn | E.33-34, 116-iii D-4 |  |  |
| Aljnik' . . | - . . . | - . . | - • | - - | . See Aljn. |
| Alovit . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | - | . . . . . . | . See Aliovit. |
| Ałwank' | Albania | Albania <br> Arran <br> Ran | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{E} .34,120 \\ \mathrm{~B} 6-\mathrm{B} 8 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Ałwanrot . . . <br> Atwē |  | . . . . . . | E.34, 118-xii/4 B-7 |  | . See Alandrot. |
| Amel . . . | . . | - • • . | - • . | - . . . . . | . See Amol. |
| Aml . . . | - | - • • - - | - . - | - . . . . . | . See Amol. |
| Amol | Amel Aml |  | E. 115 |  |  |
| Anaetica | Anaïtis Chōra | Anahtakan Akilisenē |  | N.H. V, xx | See Akilisenẽ. |
| Anahtakan |  | Anaetica | Agat., v |  | See Akilisenē. |
| Anaïtis Chōra |  | Anaetica |  | C.D. XXXVI, xlviii S. X, xiv, 16. | See Akilisener. |
| Angelenē <br> Angeł tun | Angl | Ingilenē | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} .35,116-\mathrm{iii} / \mathrm{I} \\ \mathrm{G} 3-\mathrm{G} 4 \end{gathered}$ | . . . . . . | . See Ingilenē. |



| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Arac kołmn | Arac |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 38,118 \cdot \mathrm{xv} / 21 \\ \mathrm{G}-6 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Aragacotn |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} .38,118-\mathrm{xv} / 10 \\ \mathrm{~B}-6 \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 197. |
| Arajin Hayk' . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Armenia I. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aranrot |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} .37,118-\mathrm{xii} / \mathrm{l} \\ \mathrm{~B}-7 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Arauenē P. V, vi, $25 \quad$ See Ch. IV n. 9. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arawaneanke . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Araweneanke |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arawelean See Ch. XIn. 16. |  |  |  |  |  |
| A ${ }^{\text {a }}$ aweneank ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Arawaneank ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  |  |  | See Ch. XI n. 16. |
| Araxenōn pedion Erasqajor S. XI, xiv, 4 See Aršarunik'. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ariberani | Arberan |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 37,117 \text {-viii } / 8 \\ \text { G-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 205. <br> See Ch. XI n. 57. |
| Arc̣a $\chi$ | Arja $\chi$ | Karabağ | E.41, 117-x |  | T. 129, 132, 148, 217 n. 250, 332. |
|  | Arcal | Sōdk' | B6-G7 |  | See Uh. IX p. 174. |
| Arčisakovit | Arčišahovit | Erçek | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 40,117-v i i i / 4 \\ \text { G-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  | See Ch. XI n. 56. |
| Ardozakan . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Artaz. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arē | Rē |  | E. 115 |  |  |
| Arewik ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 39,117-\mathrm{ix} / 11 \\ G-7 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Argastovit |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 39,117-\mathrm{v} / 7 \\ \text { D-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Argovteạ̣ovit . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Argwete. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argwelk . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Argwete. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argwet ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Argwelk ${ }^{\text {e }}$ <br> Argovteacovit |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 39,119 \\ \text { A- } 5 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Arisi . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | .See Açwerk. |




| PROVINCE | REFERENCES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Artaz | Ardozakan | Šawaršam | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. } 40,117 \text {-viii/ } 16 \\ & \text { M. } X . \text { II, lii } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T. } 197 . \\ & \text { See Ch. XI n. } 59 . \end{aligned}$ |
| Arwant ${ }^{\text {ani }}$ | - . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Erwandunike. |
| Arwastan | Arabastan | bē $\theta$ Arabaye <br> Mygdonia | S.0.272 |  | T. 179. |
| Arwenic jor |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. } 37-38,117-\mathrm{v} / 4 \\ & \mathrm{G}-5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Arxanenē | - . . . . |  | . - . | - . . . | .See Arzanenē. |
| Arzanenē | Arxanenē <br> Arzenē | Aljn bē $\theta$ Arzōn Arabian March | S.0. 272 | A.M. XXV, xix, 9 <br> PP. xiv <br> CM Pe | T. 129, 131-132, 149-150, 163, 165, 166 n. 63, 179-182, 183 n. $147,197,199,236,248,304-$ 305, 468 n. 138. <br> See Ch. II n. 25; IX n. 16. |
| Arzenē. | $\cdots \cdot \cdots \cdot$ |  | $\cdots \cdot{ }^{\circ} \cdot$ | - . . . . | . See Arzanenē. |
| bē $\theta$ Arzōn | bē $\theta$ Ostan | Arzōn Ostan Arzn | S.0. 272 |  | See Arzanenē. |
| Arzōn Ostan . | . . . . . . | - . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | . See bē $\theta$ Arzōn. |
| Aseac por | - . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | .See Arseac̣ por. |
| Asiana |  |  |  | N.D., N. VIII |  |
| Ašmunike | - • . . . . | - • . . . . - | - $\cdot$ | - | .See Aršamunik'. |
| Ašoc̣k' | Aboc̣i |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 36,118-\mathrm{xv} / 4 \\ \text { B-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 185-186, 187 n. 175, 190, 191 n. 199, 324 n. 81,440 n. 16 , 444-446, 468-474, 489, 499. <br> See Ch. XI n. 4. |
| Asorestan |  | Assyria | E. 38 <br> D5-D6 |  | See also Sophenē. |
| Aspakanuneac Jor . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Aspakuneac̣ Jor. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aspakuneaç Jor | Aspakanuneac̣ Jor Aspakunik' |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 38,116-\mathrm{iv} / 2 \\ \mathrm{G}-4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Aspakunik' . . | - . . . . . | - . | - . . . . | - . . . . | .See Aspakuneaç Jor. |

AznawajorSee Azwac jor.

| PROVINCE | REFERENCES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Aznawaç-jor | Aznawajor |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.31, } 116-\mathrm{iii} / 7 \\ \mathrm{G}-5 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Azordace-p ${ }^{\text {cor }}$ | Kapor |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 32,118-\mathrm{xiv} / 8 \\ \text { B-4 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bagan . . . . } \\ & \text { bē } \theta \text { Bagas } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\text { S.O. } 272$ |  | . See Bak'an. <br> See Ch. IX n. 33. |
| Bagrauandenē |  | Bagrewand |  | P. V, xii, 9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T. 132, 137, } 138 \text { n. 240, 201-202, } \\ & 209,218,241,309,324 . \\ & \text { See Ch. XI nn. 2b, 20, 27, } 27 \text { a. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Bagsen | . . . . . | - . . . . . | - . . . . | - • . | . See Basean. |
| Bagrawand | - • • . . | - • . . . . | , | - . . . . | .See Bagrewand. |
| Bagrewand | Bagrawand | Bagrauandenē | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.42, } 118-\mathrm{xv} / 6 \\ \mathrm{G}-5 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Bak'an | Bagan <br> Bak'ran | Marand | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.44, } 117 \text {-viii } / 29 \\ \text { G-6 } \end{gathered}$ |  | See Ch. XI n. 64. |
| Bak'ran | - • $\cdot$ | - • - | . . . . . | . | . See Bak'an. |
| Balabitenē | Balabitena <br> Bilabetines | Balahovit <br> Pasinler kazasi |  | C.J. I, 29, 5 <br> N. XXXI <br> Aed. III, i, 26 <br> CM Ne <br> G.C. | T. 131, 138 n. 240, 212, 241. |
| Balahovit | Balaxovit | Belabitenē <br> Palu kazasi ? | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.43, } 116-\mathrm{ii} / 4 \\ G-3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Balan rot | Rot i Bała |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 43-44,117-\mathrm{xi} / 4 \\ \mathrm{G}-8 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Balasakan |  | Gargarac̣ik' <br> P'aytakaran <br> Bazgun? <br> Kaspē? | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.42-44, 114-115 } \\ \text { B-7 } \end{gathered}$ |  | See Ch. IX n. 13; XIV n. 73, 76. |


N.D., V.L., L



Dainni.See Garini.






| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Haband II . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Miws Haband. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Haeretica . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Hairetikē. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hairetikē Haeretica P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hakkâri G. ${ }^{\text {a68, }} 37^{0} 35^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 43^{\circ} 50{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hânâzit . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Anjitc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Handsith . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Anjit. |  |  |  |  |  |
| HaniE.62, 117 -xi/6 <br> G-8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hanjit' . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Anjit'. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hanzith . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Anjit'. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harčlawnk* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Harčlanke. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hark' | Charka | Bulanik kazasi | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 62,116-\mathrm{iv} / 9 \\ \mathrm{G}-5 \end{gathered}$ |  | See Ch. XI n. 45, 52. |
| Hašteank' |  | Asthianenē | E.62, 116-ii/2 |  |  |
|  |  | Genç kazasi | G-4 |  |  |
| Hawnunik' |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 62,118-\mathrm{xv} / 4 \\ \mathrm{G}-5 \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 215 n. 246. |
| Haymana kazasi |  | Chamanenē? |  |  | G. $283,39^{0} 25^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 32^{03}{ }^{\prime}$ 'E. |
| Hayoc̣ jor |  |  | E. 62 |  |  |
|  |  |  | G-5 |  |  |
| Hedayab | Edaiab | Adiabenē | E.49, 72 |  |  |
|  |  | Nor Širakan |  |  |  |
|  |  | Median March |  |  |  |
| Helenopontus |  | Diospontus |  | N.D. |  |
|  |  | Pontus Amasia |  | N. VIII, XXVIII |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Ac |  |


| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Hēr | Xar <br> Xērakan dašt | Chera | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E.63, 117-vii } 9 \\ & \text { G-6 } \end{aligned}$ |  | Later fused with Zarewand into Rotak. <br> See also Zarewand. |
| Honoriada | Honorias |  |  | L., N. VIII |  |
| Honorias |  |  |  | N.D. | See Honoriada. |
| Hosdroenē |  |  |  |  | See Osrhoenē. |
| Iberia |  | Georgia <br> Gurzan <br> Varjan <br> Virk' |  | P. V, $x$ <br> S. XI, iii |  |
| Iberian March Ingilenē | Angelenē | Angel tun |  | C.J. I, 29, 5 <br> N. XXXI | .See Gogarenè. <br> T. 131, 137-138 n. 240,166 n. 63, 167, 170-172, 175-177, 224, 241, 297-303, 324 n. 81. See Ch. II n. 25b. |
| Išayr |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 54,117-\mathrm{v} / 1 \\ \mathrm{G}-6 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Išoc | Išuc̣ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 54,117-\mathrm{v} / 3 \\ \text { D-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Ispir kazasi |  | Suspiritis |  |  | G. $318,40^{0} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 41^{0} 00^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$. |
| Jawaxēti | - . . . . | . . . . . . . | . $\cdot$ - | - • - . | . See Jawaxk² |
| Jawa $\mathrm{k}^{\text {c }}$ | J̌awaxēt'i Jova $\chi^{\mathrm{k}^{e}}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.78, } 119-\mathrm{i} / 4 \\ \text { B-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Jermajor |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 78,117-\mathrm{v} / 8 \\ \mathrm{D}-5 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Jork ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} .64,117 \mathrm{i} \mathrm{i} / 10 \\ \mathrm{G}-7 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Jorop ${ }^{\text {or }}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 63,118-\mathrm{v} / 3 \\ \mathrm{~B}-6 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |



| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Kaspè . <br> Kaspianē | - | . . . . . . . | - | . . . . . | . See Kaspianē. |
|  | Kaspeè | Kazbk' |  | S. XI, iv, 5 | T. 129. 132, 148, 232 n. 287. |
|  | Caspiane | P'aytakaran |  | xiv, 5 |  |
| Kataonia | Cataonia |  |  | P. V, vi, 22 |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S. XI, xii, } 2 \\ & \text { XII, i, 4; ii, 2-6 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | N.H. VI, iii |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Ke |  |
| Katarzenē | Cholarzenē | Kłarjet'i |  | P. V, 12, 4 |  |
|  | Calarzene |  |  | CM Pe |  |
| Kazbk' | Kaspeè | Kaspianē | E. 57 |  |  |
|  |  | P'aytakaran | B-8 |  |  |
| Kelesenē |  |  |  | Pers. I, xvii, 11 | See Akilisenē. |
| Kèt'ik ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  | E.59, 116-iii/5 |  |  |
|  |  |  | G-5 |  |  |
| Khandchoot | - - . - | - • - . | - • . . . | - . . - | .See Anjit'. |
| Khordzen . | . . . | - . | . . | . . . . . | . See Xorjayn. |
| Kiǧi kazasi |  | Xorjayn |  |  | G. 386, $39^{0} 20^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 40^{0} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$. |
| Kilikia | Cilicia |  |  | P. V, vii |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM I - Jg |  |
| Kilikia (I) |  |  |  | N. VIII |  |
| Kilikia (II) |  |  |  | N. VIII |  |
| Klarjet'i | Kalarjk' | Cholarzenē | E.59, 118-xiii/9 |  | T. 142,188 n. 188,322 n. 76, |
|  | Klarjk ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Katarzenē |  |  | $334-335,382,439,442 \mathrm{nn} .22$, |
|  | Kalarčk ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Artanuj |  |  | 24, 452,453 n. 62, 457 nn. 89 . 93, 461 and n. 109, 462-468, 471-472, 474, 485-488, 491, 495498. |


| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Koȩhisar |  | Morimenē ? |  |  | G. 411 (7) $39^{0} 52^{\prime} \times 37^{0} 24^{\prime}$. See Ch. IV p. 58, also Cities. |
| Kogovit | Gogovit |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 59,118-\mathrm{xv} / 13 \\ G-5 \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 200, 202, 309, 321-322 and n. 77, 342-343, 398. <br> See Ch. XI, nn. 24-25. |
| Koł | Kola |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 59,118-\mathrm{xiv} / \mathbf{l} \\ \text { B-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 457. |
| Kołbop or |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 60,118 \text {-xiii } / 2 \\ \text { B- } 6 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Kołk ${ }^{\text {isē }}$ | - . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Colchis. |
| Kolt' | Koxt | Kolthenē ? | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 60,117-x / 12 \\ \text { B-7 } \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 259. <br> Not to be confused with Gołtn in Vaspurakan. |
| Kolthenē | Colthene | Goltn ? <br> Kołt ? |  | P. V, xii, 4 | T. 105 n. 160, 203, 204 n. 230, 323, 451 n. 2. |
| Kommagenē | Commagene |  |  | P. V, xiv, 8 <br> S. XI, xii, 2 <br> N.H. VI, iii <br> CM L - Mf |  |
| Kor | Korè |  |  | D.A. I. | See Ch. XI nn. 28, 52. |
| Korē | . . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . See Kor. |
| Korčayk' | - • • • | - . . . . . . | - . . . - | . . . . . . . | . Seè Korčēk'. |
| Korčēk' | Korčayk' | Gordyenē | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} .60,117-\mathrm{vi} \\ \mathrm{D} \cdot 5 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Kordè . | - . . . . | - . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . . - | . See Korduenē. |
| Kordrik' | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | - $\cdot$ | . See Tmorik'. |
| Korduenē | Corduene Kordē | Korduk' <br> bē $\theta$ Qardū |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A.M. XXV, xix, } 9 \\ & \text { P.P. xiv } \end{aligned}$ | T. 131, 180-182 and nn. 140, 142, 144, 146. |




| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Marac̣ amur ašxarh |  |  | E.65, 69, 115, 118 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Agat'. cxx |  |  |
| Mardahik' |  |  | E.65, 116-iv/5 |  | See Ch. III n. 1. |
|  |  |  | G-4 |  |  |
| Mardastan | Mardoc̣k' |  | E.65, 117-viii/15 |  |  |
|  | Marducayk' |  | G-6 |  |  |
| Mardoc̣k’ | . . . . . . | - . - . | . . . . . . | - . | . See Mardastan. |
| Mardpetakan |  | Mareptikon ? |  |  | T. 131, 139, 169 and n. 81, 170 |
|  |  | Sephakan? |  |  | n. 85, 200, 231 n .285. |
|  |  |  |  |  | See Ch. I p. 11. |
| Marduçayk ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | - . - . . | - - . . . | - • . . . . | - • - | . See Mardastan. |
| Mareptikon | Maperkiton | Mardpetakan? |  |  | See Ch. I p. 11. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mari |  |  | E.65, 117-vii/2 |  |  |
|  |  |  | D-6 |  |  |
| Mark ${ }^{\text {e }}$. | - . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . | - | . See Media. |
| Maseac̣ otn |  |  | E.65, 118-xv/12 |  |  |
|  |  |  | G-6 |  |  |
| Mazaz |  | Garni bazar ? | E.64, 118-xv/17 |  | See Ch. XI p. 238. |
|  |  |  | B-6 |  |  |
| Mec Alank ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | - . . . . . | - - . . . . . | . . . . . . | . $\cdot$ | . See Mecirank ${ }^{\text {e }}$. |
| Mec Hayk' | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . | . See.Ałbak Mec. |
|  |  | Armenia Maior | E.66-70 |  |  |
| Mec Kwank ${ }^{\text {© }}$ | Mec Kwenk ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  | E.66, 117-x/5 |  |  |
|  |  |  | B-7 |  |  |
| Mecirank ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Mec Ałank ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | E.66, 117-x/4 |  |  |
|  |  |  | B-7 |  |  |
| Meenunik ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  |  | E.70, 117-viii/23 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Moschic March . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Gogarenē. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ot'olank ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  | E.71, 117-vi/7 |  |  |
|  |  |  | D-6 |  |  |
| Moxoenē |  | Mokk' <br> bē $\theta$ Moksāyē | S.0. 272 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A.M. XXV, xix, } 9 \\ & \text { CM Ee } \end{aligned}$ | T. $129,148,166$ n. 63,180 , 181 n. 140, 197 n. 222, 200, 202, 468 n. 138. |
| Mrit |  |  | E.71, 119 |  |  |
|  |  |  | B-4 |  |  |
| Mrul |  |  | E.71, 119 |  |  |
|  |  |  | B-4 |  |  |
| Mughan |  |  | . . . . . | - - . . . | . See Muxank: |
| Mukan. |  | . . . . . . . | - | . . . . . . | .See Muxank'. |
| Munzur | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Muzur. |
| Murimenē | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . - | . . . . . . | .See Morimenē. |
| Muxank' | Mukan | Mughan | E.71, 117-x/7 |  |  |
|  | M $\chi^{\text {ank }}{ }^{\text {e }}$ |  | G-7 |  |  |
| Muzur | Menjur | Muzurōn | E.71, 116-i/3 |  |  |
|  | Mzur |  | G-3 |  |  |
|  | Munzur |  |  |  |  |
| Muzurōn |  | Muzur |  | G.C. |  |
| $\mathrm{M}_{\chi} \mathrm{ank}^{\text {e }}$ | - • . . . | . . . . . . . | - • - . | . . . . . . | . See Muxank ${ }^{\text {c }}$. |
| Mygdonia | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | .See Arwastan. |
| Mzur | . . . . . | , | . | . . . . . . | .See Muzur. |
| Nig |  | Aparan | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} .72,118-\mathrm{xv} / 15 \\ & \mathrm{G}-6 \end{aligned}$ |  | T. 198, 205-205, 207. |
| Nigal |  |  | E.72, 110, 119 |  |  |
|  |  |  | B-4 |  |  |
| Nihorakan . . | - . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Nixorakan. |


| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFERENCES |  |  | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL |  |
| Ni $\chi_{\text {orakan }}$ | Nihorakan | Daherrakān deh Naḥirakān | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} .72,118 \\ & \mathrm{D} 5-\mathrm{D} 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | T. 165. <br> See Ch. IX pp. 175-178. |
| bē $\theta$ Nōhādrā | Nohadra <br> Notartay |  | S.O., 272 |  | See Ch. IX nn. 33, 35. |
| Norduz |  | Anjewac̣ik' <br> Buzunik' |  |  | G. $489,37^{\circ} 51^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 43^{0} 32^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$. See Ch. XI p. 248. |
| Nor Širakan | Noširakan <br> Sirakan | Adiabenē <br> Median march | $\begin{array}{r} \text { E. } 27,49,52,59, \\ 64,67,72,77 \end{array}$ |  | See Ch. IX pp. 172-173,175-178. |
| Noširakan. | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . . | - - . - . | .See Nor Sirakan. |
| Notartay | - . . . . | - . . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . . | . See bē $\theta$ Nōhādrā. |
| Ok'ałē | Ok'al |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 76,118-\mathrm{xiv} / 6 \\ \text { B-4 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Orbalisenē | Basilisenē |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 | T. 54 n. 49, 451 n. 53. See Ch. III n. 25. |
| Orbisenē |  |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 | \# |
| Orisank ${ }^{\text { }}$ | - . . . | - - . . . . | . $\cdot$ | - - . | .See Orsirank ${ }^{\text {c }}$. |
| Ormizd Perož | Ormzdperož |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.75, } 117 \text {-xi/9 } \\ \text { G-7 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Ormzdperož | . . . . . . | - • - . - . | . . . . . . | - • • • - | . See Ormizd Perož. |
| Orsenē |  |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 | See Ch. III n. 25. |
| Orsirank ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Orisank ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.75, } 117-\mathrm{vi} / 8 \\ \text { D-6 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Orzianines |  |  |  | G.C. | See Chorzanē. |
| Osrhoenē | Osroenē <br> Hosdroenē |  |  | N.D., N. VIII <br> CM Mf | See Ch. III n. 25. |
| Osroenē | . . . . . . | - . . . . . . | - - . . . | . . . . . . | . See Osrhoenē. |
| Ossetia | - . . . . . | - . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Alania. |
| bē $\theta$ Ostan. | - . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See bē $\theta$ Arzōn. |
| Ostan Hayoọ |  | Dwin Ostan | E.49, 74, $116 \cdot \mathrm{xv} / 19$ |  |  |


| PROVINCE | REFERENCES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Otenē |  | Utik' |  | P. V, xii, 4 | T. 129, 132, 148, 220, 259, 467, 482. |
| Other Armenia . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Armenia Altera. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Otºłanke . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Motºłanke. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oves . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Aẹwerk. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Packank Panckank $^{e}$ E.77, 117-x/9 <br>  Parsakank G-7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paflagonia . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Paphlagonia. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pałanakan tun . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Pałnatun. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palankatun . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Palnatun. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palestina I N. VIII |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palestina II N. VIII |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palestina III N. VIII |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palestina Salutaris N.D. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pahinatun . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Pahnatun. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palines |  | Palnatun |  | G.C. | T. 212 n .240. |
| Palnatun | Pałankatun | Palines | E.76-77, 116-ii/3 |  | See Ch. III n. 1. |
|  | Pałanakan tun |  | G-3 |  |  |
|  | Pahinatun |  |  |  |  |
| Palu kazasi |  | Balahovit? |  |  | G. $505,38^{04} 0^{\prime} \times{ }^{39} 9^{0} 55^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$. |
|  |  | Palunik' |  |  |  |
| Palun . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Palunik'. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palunik' | Palun | Palu kazasi ? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. } 76 \text { (1), 117-viii/24 } \\ & \text { G-5 } \end{aligned}$ |  | T. 212. |
| Panckank ${ }^{\text {e }}$. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Packanke. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paphlagonia Paflagonia N.D., N. XXIX <br>  V.L., L. <br>  CM Gb-Jb |  |  |  |  |  |
| P'arnēs . . | - • | - • - | - • . . . . | - . | . See K'ust i p ${ }^{\text {carenk }}{ }^{\text {c }}$. |
| Parsakank ${ }^{\text {e }}$. . | . . . . . . | - . . . . . | - . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Packank'. |


| PROVINCE | REFERENCES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Parskahayk' |  | Persarmenia | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.77, 117-vii } \\ \text { G6-D6 } \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 129, 148, 152, 164 n. 48, 197. |
| Parspatunik' | Parspunik ${ }^{2}$ <br> Patsparunik' <br> Pasparunik ${ }^{\text {© }}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.77, } 117 \text {-viii/26 } \\ \text { G-7 } \end{gathered}$ |  | See Ch. XI n. 64. |
| Parspunik ${ }^{\text {e }}$ <br> Partizac per |  | - . - . | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 77,118-\operatorname{xiv} / 3 \\ \text { B-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  | . See Parsparunik'. |
| Parwar |  |  | E.77, 119-iv/4 |  |  |
| Pasinler kazasi | Pasen | Basean <br> Basianē |  |  | G. $507,40^{\circ} 00^{\prime} \mathrm{N} H 41^{0} 40^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$. |
| Pasparunik ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | - . . . | . . . . . . . | - • • | - | . See Parsparunik'. |
| Patakaranēs | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . See P'aytakaran. |
| Patsparunik'. | - . . . | - |  | - . . . . | . See Parspatunik'. |
| P'aytakaran | Patakaranēs | Kaspē | E.88, 117-xi |  |  |
|  |  | Kazbk' | G7-G8 |  |  |
|  |  | Bałasakan |  |  |  |
| Pentarchy . . | - . . . | . . . . . . . | - • . . . - | - • • • | . See Satrapiae. |
| Persarmenia | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | . See Parskahayk'. |
| Pharangion |  |  |  | Pers. II, xxix, 4 | See Suspiritis. |
| Phasianē |  |  |  | X. IV, vi, 5 | See Basianē. |
| Phauenē | . . . . . | - . . . . . - | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Phaunitis. |
| Phaunitis | Phauenē | Saunitis |  | S. XI, xiv, 4 |  |
| Phoenicia | Foenices |  |  | N.D. |  |
| Phrygia |  |  |  | P. V, ii, 17 | T. 53 n. 49. |
|  |  |  |  | CM Df-Fd |  |


| PROVINCE | REFERENCES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Phrygia Pacatiana |  |  |  | N. VIII |  |
|  |  |  |  | P. V, iv, 9; v, 7 |  |
| Phrygia Salutaris |  |  |  | N. VIII |  |
| Piank ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | E.77, 117-x/8 |  |  |
|  |  |  | B-7 |  |  |
| Pisidia |  |  |  | N. VIII, XXIX |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM E-Ff |  |
| P'ok'r Hayk' |  | Armenia Minor | E.88-89 |  |  |
|  |  |  | G2-B3 |  |  |
| Pontica (d.) |  |  |  | N.D. |  |
| Pontus |  |  |  | P. V, i |  |
|  |  |  |  | S. XII, iii, 1-2, 10-19 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Jc-Pb |  |
| Pontus Amasia |  | Diospontus |  | S. XII, iii, 38 |  |
|  |  | Helenopontus |  | L. |  |
| Pontus Cappadocicus |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P. V, vi, } 5,8 \\ & \text { xii, } 2 \end{aligned}$ | T. 450 n .53. |
|  |  |  |  | CMMe |  |
| Pontus Galaticus |  |  |  | P. V, vi, 3, 8 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Jc |  |
| Pontus Polemoniacus |  |  |  | P. V, vi, 4, 8 |  |
|  |  |  |  | N.D., V.L., L. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| bē $\theta$ Qardū |  |  | S.0. 272 |  | See Korduenē. |
| bḕ Rahimai . | - . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See bē $\theta$ Rehimè. |
| Ramōnin (d.) |  |  | S.0. 272 |  | See Ch. IX n. 33. |
| Ran | - . . . | - | - . . . . | - • • - | . See Albania. |
| Rē . . . . . | . . | . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Arē. |

P. V, vi, $5,8 \quad$ T. $\mathbf{4 5 0}$ n. 53. xii, 2

CM Me

CM Jc
P. V, vi, 4, 8
N.D., V.L., L
.J. J., 29, 5
CM Ke
S.O. 272 See Korduenē.
S.0. 272

See Albania.
See Arē.

| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | REFER ENCES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| bè $\theta$ Rehimē | bē $\theta$ Rahimai | Rehimenē | S.O. 272 |  |  |
| Rehimenē | Rehimena | bè̈ Rehimē |  | A.M., XXV , xix, 9 | T. 180, 182 n .147. |
| Revanduz | . . . . . | - . . . . . . | - - . . | . . . . . . | . See Mahkert tun. |
| Ŕostak | - . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | . See Rotak. |
| Rotak | Rostak |  | E. 63 |  | See Ch. XII nn. 27, 28. |
|  | Erutak |  |  |  | See also Zarewand and Her. |
| Rot-i-Bała | . . . . | . . . . . . | - . - . | - . . . . . | .See Bałan-riot. |
| Rotkrčunik ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | - . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Krčunik. |
| Rot-Parcean | Rot-Paçean |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 79,118-x i i / 3 \\ \text { B. } 7 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Rot-Pacean | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . - . | . See Rot Parcean. |
| R'štunik' | Ereštuni | Arrestōn ? | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.79, 117-viii } / \mathbf{l} \\ \text { G-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 213 n. 242. |
| Rwan | Rweł |  | E.114-115 |  |  |
| Rweł | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . . | .See Rwan. |
| Sacasena | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | .See Sakasenē. |
| Sahariunik' |  |  |  |  | T. 214 and n. 243. See Ch. XI p. 241. |
| Šahē | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Sophenē. |
| Sahib as-Serir | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Albania. |
| Šahunian Sophenē | - . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Sophenē. |
| Šakašēn | Šikašēn | Sakasenē | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.73, } 118-\text { xii } / 7 \\ \text { B6-B7 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Sakasenē | Sacasena | Šakašēn |  | P. V, xii, 4 <br> S. XI, xiv, 4 | T. 220, 467 n. 128, 482 and n. 199. |
| Salagomk ${ }^{\text {' }}$ | Šatgom |  | E.73, 116-i/8 |  | See Ch. III n. 1. |
|  | Šatgamk ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | B-4 |  |  |
| Salajor . | . . . . . | - • - . . | - - . . | - . . . . . | . See Salnoy-jor. |
| Šałgamk . . . | . . . . . | - . - . - | - - . . . | . . . . . . . | .See Šalagomk ${ }^{\text {e }}$. |

Šałgamke ${ }^{\circ}$.
See Šałagomke.

| PROVINCE | REFERENCES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Salnoy-jor | Salajor <br> Sanojor |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.79, } 116-\mathrm{iii} / 10 \\ \text { G-4 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Sanasunitai |  | Sasun |  |  | T. 210. |
| Sanasunk'. | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | - • . . | . . . . . | .See Sasun. |
| Šančan |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 73,115 \\ \text { D-8 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Sanojor | - • . . | - . . . . . . | - - . . | - - . - | . See Salnoy jor. |
| Saraponik ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | . . . . . | - . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . - . | . See Kart ${ }^{\text {chnik}}$. |
| Sarauenē |  |  |  | S. XI, i, 4 <br> CM Jd |  |
| Sargaurasenē |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P. V, vi, } 12 \\ & \text { S. XI, i, } 4 \\ & \text { ii, } 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Sarur dašt |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 73,118-\mathrm{xv} / 20 \\ \text { G-6 } \end{gathered}$ | CM Ke |  |
| Saspeiros | - • - . | - • - . - . | - - . - . | - • . . . | .See Suspiritis. |
| Sasun | Sanasunk' | Sanasunitai | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 79,116-\mathrm{iii} / 11 \\ G-4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Satgom | - . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . . | - • • - | .See Šałagomk'. |
| Satrapiae |  | Armenia Altera <br> Ethnē <br> Gentes <br> Pentarchy |  | C.J., I, 29, 5 <br> N. XXXI <br> Aed. III, iv, 17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T. 131-135, 137, } 138 \text { n. } 240 \text {, } \\ & \text { 170-175, 197. } \\ & \text { See Ch. II; V n. } 66 . \end{aligned}$ |
| Saunitis | - • . . | . . . . . . . | - • . . . | - • . . . | . See Phaunitis. |
| Sawarškan | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Sawaršam. |
| Sawaršam | Sawaršakan | Artaz ? | M. ${ }^{\text {P. II, lxii }}$ |  | See Ch. XI n. 59. |
| Sawdk' . | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | - | - . . . | . See Sōdk'. |
| Šawšedk ${ }^{\text {e }}$. . | - . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | . See Šawšēt ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |


| PROVINCE | REFERENCES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Šawšēt ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Šawšedk ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 73,119-\mathrm{i} / 2 \\ \text { B-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Sephakan |  | Mardpetakan? <br> Vaspurakan |  |  | See Ch. IX n. 38; XI nn. 66, 66a. |
| Sepuhrakan | - . . . . | . . . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | .See Vaspurakan. |
| Šikašēn |  | , | . . . . | . - . . . | . See Šakašēn. |
| Sirak |  | Sirakenē <br> Süregel | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 73-74,118 \cdot x v / 8 \\ \text { B-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Stirakan | - . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Nor Širakan. |
| Sirakenē |  | Širak <br> Süregel |  | P. V, xii, 4 | T. 202, 206 <br> See Ch. XI nn. 2c-d, 3. |
| Sisagan | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | - | - . . . . | .See Siwnik'. |
| Susajan | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | .See Siwnik'. |
| Sisakan |  |  | Z.M. 144 |  | See Siwnik'. |
| Sisakan i Kotak | Sisakan Ostan | Lesser Siwnik ${ }^{\text {e }}$ Miws Haband | E.70, 117 |  |  |
| Siwnik' | Sisakan <br> Sisajan | Sunitai | $\begin{gathered} \text { E.81, 117-ix } \\ \text { B6-G7 } \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 129, 131-132, 137, 148, 214 <br> n. 244, 241, 323, 332. <br> See Ch. IX nn. 13b, 14-15, XIV n. 72. |
| Sōdk' | Cawdk' <br> Sawdk' <br> Zawdk' <br> Sot'k' | Sodukenē <br> Arcax | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. } 80 \\ & \text { B-6 } \end{aligned}$ |  | See Ch. X pp. 194,199,230. <br> Not to be confused with Cawdēk' q.v. |
| Sodukenē |  | Sōdk' |  | P. V, xii, 4 | T. 182 n .146. |
| Sōf | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | .See Sophenē. |
| Sōphan-āyē | . . . . . | - . . . . . | - • - | - | .See Sophanenē. |



REFERENCES

|  |  | Ispir kazasi |  | S. XI, xiv, 9 <br> Pers. II, xxix, 4 CM Oc. | n. 76, 323 n. 77, 81, 326, 342, 455 <br> n. 73, 456 n. 77, 464 n. 117, 466 n. 123, 467 n. 126. <br> See Ch. I n. 43; III n. 12a. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Syria I |  |  |  | N. XX |  |
| Syria II |  |  |  | N. VIII |  |
| Syria, Coele |  |  |  | N.D. |  |
| Syria Salutaris |  |  |  | N.D. |  |
| Syrian March | - • • | - • . - | . . . . | - . | .See Sophenē. |
| Tamberk ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Tambët |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 84,117-\mathrm{vii} / 6 \\ \mathrm{D}-6 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Tambēt ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | - . . . |  | . . . . . | - . - . | . See Tamberk ${ }^{\text {c }}$. |
| Tamoritis |  | Tmorik' <br> Kordrik' |  |  | T. 200, 202, 322, 323 n. 78. |
| Tankriayn | . . . . | . . . . | - . - . | - . . | . See Taygrean. |
| Tanuterakan tun |  |  |  |  | See Ch. IX pp. 180-182. |
| Tao |  | Tayk' |  |  | See Tayk'. |
| Taparastan | - • • | . . . . | - • • - | - • - . | . See Taprestan. |
| T'ar . . | - . . | - • - | - . - . | - | . See T'awr. |
| Taprestan | Taparastan |  | E.114-115. |  |  |
| Taraunitis |  | Tarawn |  | Pers. II, xxv, 35 CM Pe | T. 132, 202, 209-210, 212, 215, 218, 314, 324 n. 81, 351. <br> See Ch. XI nn. 29-30, 34. |
| Tarawn | Tarōn | Taraunitis | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 85,116-\mathrm{iv} / 3 \\ \text { G-4 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Tarōn . . <br> Taruberan | - • • | - • - | - . - . | - • - . | . See Tarawn. |
|  | Tawruberan |  | E.85, 116-iv |  | T. 129, 132, 148, 199, 205 n. 234, |
|  | Turuberan |  | G4-G5 |  | 209, 212,312. |
|  |  |  |  |  | See Ch. XI n. 30. |


|  | REFERENCES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROVINCE | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | EASTERN | CLASSICAL | NOTES |
| Tašir |  |  | E.85, 119-v/4 |  |  |
|  |  |  | B-6 |  |  |
| Tatik |  |  | E.85, 116-iii/6 |  |  |
|  |  |  | G-5 |  |  |
| T'awr | T'ar |  | E.53, 119-ii/3 |  |  |
|  | T'or |  | B-5 |  |  |
| Tawruberan | - . . . . | - - . . . | - . . . . | - • • - | .See Taruberan. |
| Taxtin | Takhtin | Kars? |  |  | See Ch. XI n. 3b. |
| Taygrean | Tankriayn |  | E.84, 117-viii/31 |  |  |
|  | Tagrean |  | G-6 |  |  |
| Tayk' |  | Tao | E.84, 117-xiv |  | T. 129, 131-132, 148, 202, $204 \cdot$ |
|  |  |  | B4-B5 |  | 205, 209-210, 211 n. 238, 231 |
|  |  |  |  |  | n. 285, 324 n. 81, 439-445, 450, |
|  |  |  |  |  | 452-457, 460 n. 98, 467, 470, |
|  |  |  |  |  | 485-486, 491-498. |
|  |  |  |  |  | See Ch. III n. 24a; XI n. 31. |
| Tercan kazasi |  | Derxenē |  |  | G. $595,39^{\circ} 45^{\prime} \mathrm{N} \times 40^{0} 25^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$. |
|  |  | Derjan |  |  |  |
| Thospitis |  | Tosp |  | P. V, xii, 8 |  |
| Thracia (d.) |  |  |  | N.D. |  |
| T'ianet ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  | E.53, 119-vi/4 |  |  |
|  |  |  | A-6 |  |  |
| Tmorik* |  | Tamoritis | E. 86 |  |  |
|  |  | Kordrik ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | D-5 |  |  |
| T'onrawan | - • | - . . . . . | . | - . | .See T'ornawan. |
| T'or | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . | . See T'awr. |

REFERENCES



## REFERENCES

PROVINCE VARIANTS EQUIVALENTS EASTERN NOTES

| Vižanunik' |  |  |  |  | .See Varažnunik' (3) and Ch. XI n. 76. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Xanc̣ix ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | $X$ anic $\chi$ |  | E.55, 119-iv/5 |  |  |
| $\chi$ Xanic $\chi$ | . . . | . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | . See Xancix ${ }^{\text {ej }}$ |
| $X$ ar | . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . Hēr. |
| $X$ erhet ${ }^{\text {c }}$ ' ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . . . | . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | .Eruet $\mathrm{k}^{\text {e }}$. |
| Xerk |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 55,119-\mathrm{vi} / 2 \\ \mathrm{~B}-6 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Xōrasān k ${ }^{\text {c ustak }}$ | Khorrasan |  | E. 114 |  |  |
| Xorjayn | Xorjean | Chorzanē |  |  |  |
|  | $X$ orjēn | Kiği kazasi | E.55, 116-ii/1 |  |  |
|  | Khordzen |  | G-4 |  |  |
| Xorjean | - . . | - . . | - . . - . | - • - . | .See Xorjayn. |
| $X$ orjēn | . . . | - . . | - . - . | . . . . . | .See Xorjayn. |
| Xorwaran k $\mathrm{k}^{\text {c }}$ ustak |  |  | E.114-115 |  |  |
| Xor $\chi^{\text {orunik }}$ ' |  | Bulanik ? | $\begin{gathered} \text { E. } 55,116-\mathrm{iv} / 16 \\ \text { G-5 } \end{gathered}$ |  | T. 208-209. |
| Xoyt' |  |  | E.55, 116-iv/1 |  | T. 312. |
|  |  |  | G-5 |  | See Ch. XI n. 44. |
| Xerxenè |  |  |  | S. XI, xiv, 5 | See Derxenē. |
| bē $\theta$ Zabdē | Bzabdē |  | S.0. 272 |  | See Zabdikenē. |
| Zabdianē |  |  |  | A.M., XXV , xix, 9 | See Zabdikenē. |
| Zabdikenē | Zabdianē | bē $\theta$ Zabdē |  | A.M. XXV , xix, 9 | T. 131, 166 n. 63, 180, 182 |
|  |  | Cawdeayk' |  | P. P, xiv | n. 146. |
|  |  | Tur Abdin |  |  |  |
| Zachunuc . | - . . | - • - | . . . . . | - . . . . | . See Całkotn. |
| Zangi bazar |  | Kotayk' |  |  | See Ch. XI p. 238. |



## B. Cities - Towns - Villages

The following abbrevations were used in this section in addition to those previously given :
I.A. Itinerarium Antonini
T.P. Tabula Peutingeriana
M. Miller, C., Itineraria Romana (Stuttgart, 1916).

| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abaxa | Auaxa <br> Auasa | Awaz | N.D. |  | See Ch. V n. 15a. |
| Adamakert |  | . . . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . | . See Hadamakert. |
| Aeliana |  | Arna? | N.D. |  |  |
| Afision |  | . . . . . | . |  | .See Fis. |
| Afşin |  | Yarpuz | G. 7 | U. 341 B IV |  |
|  |  | Arabissos ? | . $\mathbf{3 8}^{\mathbf{0} 15}{ }^{\prime} \times 36^{\mathbf{0} 55}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Uarsapa? |  |  |  |
| Afumōn <br> Ağil . |  | Fum? |  |  | See Ch. I nn. 17, 17a, 19a. |
|  | - • • - | - | - • - . | - • - . | . See Eğil. |
| Akbas | Aqbā | Anöšarvän-Kala ? |  |  | See Ch. I nn. 14-16a. |
|  | Okbas |  |  |  |  |
| Akçan |  | Olakan | G. 16 (2) |  |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{053} \times 41^{034}$ | U. 340 A III | T. 209. |
| Akn . | - - . | - . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Egin. |
| Alacahan | Alayaxan | Aranis | G. 26 |  |  |
|  | Aladja Han |  | ${ }^{39}{ }^{\circ} 02, \times 37^{03}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | E. 37 | E. G-2 |  |
| Aladarariza | - • - | - • - . - | -•••• | -••• | . See Olotoedariza. |
| Aladja Han | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Alacahan. |
| Alajaxan | . . . . | - . . . - | - • - . | - . - . | .See Alacahan. |
| Alaleisos |  |  |  |  | See Ch. I n. 21a. |
| Aliorsk' |  |  |  |  | See Ch. XI n. 49. |






| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Astlberd |  | Azakpert? <br> Kitharizōn? |  | AA 104 | See Ch. I n. 33a. |
| Athenae | At'ina <br> Athenis |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. } 32 \\ & \text { T.P. } \end{aligned}$ | E. B-4, AA 106 M 648 and f. 212 CM Ob | See Ch. III n. 30. |
| Athenis | . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Athenae. |
| At'ina . | . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Athenae. |
| Attachas | At't'ax <br> Attacha | Hindis? |  | AA 106 | See Ch. I nn. 7, 8a; V n. lŏa. |
|  | Hattah ? |  |  | CMO |  |
| At't'ax | . . . . | . . . . . . | - • . . . . | - . . . . . | .See Attachas. |
| Auasa . | - . . . | - . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | .See Abaxa. |
| Auaxa | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Abaxa. |
| Avares. | - - . | - . - . - | - . . . . . | - . . . . . | .See Avaris. |
| Avaris | Avares | Arahez? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 58 \\ & 40^{0} 51^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 45^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C III |  |
| Awaz . | - . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Abaxa. |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\chi} \mathrm{k}$ an | - . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | . See Ołakan. |
| Aza | . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Haza. |
| Azaghberd | - • . . | . . . . . . | - - . . . | - . . . . . | .See Azakpert. |
| Azakpert | Azaghberd | Astłberd? <br> Aznaberd? <br> Kitharizōn? | G. 64 $39^{0} 14^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 30^{\prime}$ | U. 340 A I | See Ch. I n. 33b. |
| Aziran <br> Aziris <br> Aziziye | . . . . . | . . . . . | . | . . . . . . | . See Erēz. |
|  |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
|  |  | Pirnabaşin | G. 64 | U. 341 B IV |  |
|  |  | Ariarathia? | $38^{0} 44^{\prime} \times 36^{0} 24^{\prime}$ <br> E. 39 |  |  |
| Aznaberd | . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . . | . See Azakpert. |
| Baberd |  | Bayburt |  | AA 106 |  |
| Bāb-al-Abwāb | . . . . | - . . . . | . . . | . . . . . . | .See Darband. |



| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Baberd |  | $40^{\circ} 16^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 15^{\prime}$ <br> E. 44 | AA 108 <br> E. B-4 |  |
| Baytberd . <br> Baz | . . . . | - • • - . | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 84 \\ & 38^{\circ} 00^{\prime} \times 44^{0} 07^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\text { U. } 340 \text { B IV }$ | .See Bayburt. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bazanis <br> Bazmalbiwr | - . . . | - - . - | - . . . . | - . . . | . See Bizana. |
|  |  | Xaç |  | AA. 105 | See Ch. III n. 6 |
| Belhan | - $\cdot$ | . . . . . | - . . - . | . . . . | . See Belikân. |
| Belikân | Bilikân | Belhan? | G. 88 (2) | U. 340 A IV. |  |
|  | Babikan | Belkania? | $38^{0} 19^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 02^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Belkania |  | Belhan? |  |  | See Ch. IIn. 11 l . |
| Benabelōn. | - . . . | - . . . . | - • - . | . . . . | . See Bnabel. |
| Benabil |  | Bnabeł | G 89 |  |  |
|  |  |  | $37^{0} 19^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 51{ }^{\prime}$ |  | See Ch. II nn. 5a, 6. |
| Berdaa | - . . . | - • - . . | . . . . . | - . . . | . See Partaw. |
| Berisse | Barissara |  | ad L., G.C. |  | See Ch. IV n. 42a. |
|  | Verisa |  |  |  |  |
| Berkri | Bargiri | Muradiye | G. 77 | AA 106 |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{\circ} 00^{\prime} \times 43^{0} 43^{\prime}$ | U. 340 B IV |  |
| Berzend | Bzabdē |  |  |  | See Ch. IX n. 13. |
| Bezabdē |  | Jazirah ibn Omar |  | E. D-5 |  |
| Bitlis |  | Balaleisōn | G. 98 | U. 340 A III |  |
|  |  | Bałēš | $38^{02} 2{ }^{\prime} \times 42^{0} 06^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Bizana | Bazanis | Leontopolis I |  |  | See Ch. III n. 26; VI nn. 28k, |
|  | Vizana | Vižan |  |  | 29. |
| Blandos |  | Tutmaç? | I.A. | M 683 |  |
| Blur |  |  |  |  | See Ch. XI n. 27a. |
| Bnabel <br> Boğlan | Banabelōn | Benabil | E. 45 | E. D-4 | T. 137 n. 240, 168, 176-177. |
|  |  |  | G. 100 |  |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 58^{\prime} \times 41^{003}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Bol | - . | - . | . . . . | - . . . | .See Bołberd. |



| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bołberd | Bol Bolōn | Vałaršakert? <br> Buğakale? <br> Porpes | E. 45 | E. B-4 <br> AA 106 | See Ch. I nn. 39a, 40-43; XIn.3c. |
| Borbas | . . . . . | Pr | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . See Porpēs. |
| Bourg . | . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . . . | .See Bourgousnoes. |
| Bourgousnoes | Bourg |  |  |  | See Ch. III n. 27. |
| Brisa |  |  | N. XXXI |  |  |
| Brnakapan |  | Pirnakapan | E. 46 (2) | E. G-4 | See Ch. III n. 12. |
|  |  |  |  | AA 106 |  |
| Bubalia |  |  | T.P. | M. 680, f. 223 | See Ch. IV n. 17. |
| Buğakale |  | Bolberd ? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 108 \\ & 40^{\circ} 12^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 41^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C III |  |
| Büyük Tuy <br> Caene Parembole <br> Caesarea of Cappadoci | - . . . . | - • . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | . See Du. |
|  | Kainè Parembolē |  | N.D. |  | See Ch. V n. 19. |
|  |  | Eusebeia | I.A., T.P. | M 729 and f. 234 |  |
|  |  | Mazaka | E. 58 | HW 41 N-5 | See Ch. IV n. 7. |
|  |  | Kayseri |  | E. B-7 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Je |  |
| Çaldiran |  |  | G. 122 (3) | U. 340 B I |  |
|  |  |  | $3^{3} 009^{\prime} \times 43^{0} 52^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Caleorsissa | Kaltiorissa | Gölaris ? | P. V, vi, 18 | M. 679 and 680 f. 223 | See Ch. IV n. 16b. |
|  | Caltiorissa | Olotoedariza? | T.P., I.A. | CM Md |  |
| Całik <br> Całki | - • - . - | - • - . - . | - . . . | - - . | .See Zağki. |
|  | . . . . . | . . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Zağki. |
| Caltiorissa. <br> Camisa | - • - . | . | . | - . ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | . See Caleorsissa. |
|  | Comassa | Kemis ? | T.P., I.A. | M. 730 and 676 f. 222 |  |
|  |  | Hafik, Koçhhisar? |  | CM Ld |  |
| Capakjur | Capłjur | Kitharizōn? | G. 129 | AA 106 |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 50^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 12^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Carape. . | - • . . . | - - . . . | - . . . | - . . | . See Karape. |
| Carcathiocerta | - . . . . | . | - . $\cdot$ | . . . . . . | . See Karkathiokerta. |



| Claudia | Glaudia |  | T.P. | M. 684 and f. 224 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Klaudias |  | P. V, vi, 24 | CM Me |  |
|  | Klawdias |  | E. 59 | E. G-3 |  |
| Cmškacag. | . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | . See Çemisgezek. |
| Cocuso. | . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Kukusos. |
| Cölemerik . | . . . . | . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Julamerk. |
| Colonia | . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | . See Koloneia. |
| Comana | . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Komana. |
| Comassa | . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | - | . See Camisa. |
| Corne | Kornē |  | T.P. | M. 684 and 683 f. 224 <br> CM Me |  |
| Coucarizon | - . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | - - . . . . | .See Kukarizōn. |
| Covk' |  |  | E. 56-57 | E. G-3 <br> AA 106 |  |
| Craca . <br> Ctesiphon | . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | .See Ciaca. |
|  |  | Tizbon <br> Madā in |  | HW 41 O-6 | See Ch. XIII n. 25. |
| Cunissa |  |  | T.P., I.A. | M. 676 and 645 f. 212 | See Ch. IV n. 16a. |
| Dadima | - . . | - • - . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | . See Dadimon. |
| Dadimon | Dadima |  |  | CM Ne | See Ch. IX n. 42. |
| Dagalasso |  | Megalasso ? | I.A. | CM Md | See Ch. IV n. 16. |
| Dagona | Doganis |  | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
|  |  |  | T.P. | M. 730 and 676 f. 222 |  |
|  |  |  | E. 48 | E. G-2 |  |
| Dalana |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
| Dandaxena | Dandaxina |  | I.A. | M. 736 and f. 237 |  |
|  |  |  | E. 48 | E. G-2 |  |
| Dara | Kara Dara | Anastasiopolis | G. 168 | U. 340 D II | See Ch. I n. 3. |
|  |  |  | $37^{0} 10^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 58^{\prime}$ | HW 43 O-5 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Pf |  |
| Darband | Derbend | Bāb-al-Abwāb | E. 49 | E. A-8 |  |
|  | Derbent |  |  |  |  |



| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diyarbakir | Diyarbekir | Amida | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 190 \\ & 37^{0} 55^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 14^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 D I | See Ch. In. 8. |
| Diyarbekir | . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Diyarbakir. |
| Diza . | . . . | - • - |  | . . . . . . | .See Gever. |
| Djanik |  | Samsun | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 191 \\ & 41^{\circ} 17^{\prime} \times 36^{0} 20^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 D I |  |
| Djelu |  | Çal? |  |  | Unidentifiable. |
| Doganis | -•• | . . . . | . | - • • • - | . See Dagona. |
| Doğubayazit | Bayazet' | Dariwnk' | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 82 \\ & 39^{\circ} 32^{\prime} \times 44^{0} 08^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 B-I |  |
| Domana |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P. V, vi, } 18 \\ & \text { T.P., I.A. } \\ & \text { N.D. } \end{aligned}$ | CM Oc <br> M. 682 and 646 f. 212 |  |
| Dostal |  | Dasteira | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 195 \\ & 39^{\circ} 28^{\prime} \times 38^{0} 30^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 341 B II |  |
| Doubios | - . | - . . - | . | . | .See Dwin. |
| Dracones | Draconis <br> Dracontes | Melikşerif? <br> Chapul Köpru ? | T.P., I.A. <br> E. 49 | M. 676 and 645 f. 212 <br> E. B-3 <br> CM Mc | See Ch. IV nn. 16a, 17. |
| Draconis | . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . . | .See Dracones. |
| Dracontes. | - . . . | . | - • . $\cdot$ | - . . . . . | . See Dracones. |
| Du | Tuy | Büyük Tuy <br> Küçük Tuy | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 432 \text { (Küçüuk) } \\ & 40^{\circ} 00^{\prime} \times 41^{\circ} 26^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } 340 \text { A II } \\ & \text { (Büyük) } \end{aligned}$ | See Ch. I nn. 38c, 39. |
| Dwin |  | Doubios | E. 49 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. G-6 } \\ & \text { AA } 106 \end{aligned}$ | See Ch. I n. 18. |
| Eǧil | Ağil | Angł Berd | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 202 \\ & 38^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 05^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A IV |  |
| Egen | - . . . | - - . . | - . ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | - • . . . | .See Eğin. |
| Eğin | Ekin <br> Egen | Akn | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 202 \\ & 39^{\circ} 16^{\prime} \times 38^{0} 29^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 341 B III |  |
| Eken | . . . | - . . | - . . | - - . . . - | .See Eğin. |


| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elanc | Ełnut <br> Ołnut | Oğnut |  |  | See Ch. I nn. 29, 30. |
| Elbistan |  | Plasta | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 205(1) \\ & 38^{0} 13^{\prime} \times 37^{0} 12^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 341 B IV |  |
| Ełegaric |  |  |  | - . . . | . See Elegarsina. |
| Elegarsina | Ełegariic | Kamişli dere | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T.P. } \\ & \text { E. } 50 \end{aligned}$ | M. 682 <br> E. G-3 |  |
| Elind | Erind <br> Rint |  |  | T.A. 1/d |  |
| Elki | Alki |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 206 \\ & 37^{0} 24^{\prime} \times 43^{0} 10^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 C I |  |
| Ełnut . <br> Enderis | Endires <br> Endiryas <br> Henderis | Suşehri <br> Artalesōn? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 210 \\ & 40^{\circ} 11^{\prime} \times 38^{0} 06^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 D III | .See Oğnut. <br> See Ch. I n. 36. |
| Endires | . . . . | - . . . . . | - • • - | - • - . | . See Enderis. |
| Endiryas | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Enderis. |
| Erand. | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - | . See Rhandeia. |
| Eraxani | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Erkinis. |
| Erçiş | - • - | - - . - . | - . - . | - . - . | . See Arciş. |
| Erēz | Eriza <br> Erezawan <br> Erznka | Erzincan <br> Arizan? <br> Aziran? | E. 50 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. G-3 } \\ & \text { AA } 106 \end{aligned}$ | See Ch. I nn. 28, 28a, 32, 32a. |
| Erēzawan . | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - • - . | . See Erēz. |
| Erind | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Elind. |
| Eriza . | - . . . | - | - | . . . . . | . See Erēz. |
| Erkinis |  | Eraxani <br> Ir $\chi$ an | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 213 \\ & 40^{\circ} 33^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 43 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Erumya . | - • . | . . . . . . | - . . . | . . . | .See Urumya. |





Haris



| LOCALITY | VARLANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Işhan |  | Iš̌an | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G} .312(2) \\ & 40^{\circ} 48^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 45 \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C III | T. 455 n. 70. |
| Ispa |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
| Ispir |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 316 \\ & 40^{\circ} 29^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 000^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C III |  |
| Iš̌an |  | Işhan | E. 54 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. B-4 } \\ & \text { AA } 106 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Iuliopolis |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. } 72 \\ & \text { T.P. } \end{aligned}$ | CM Ne <br> M. 658 and f. 216 | See Ch. IV n. 9. |
| Ivora |  |  |  |  | See Ch. VII n. 18 |
| Iz oglu | - . . . . | - . . . . . | - . | . . . . . | .See Izolu. |
| Izolu | Iz oglu | ad Aras? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 317 \\ & 38^{\circ} 28^{\prime} \times 38^{0} 41^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Jazïrah ibn 'Omar | Jeziret ibn 'Omar | Bezabdē |  | AA 105 |  |
| Jenzan. . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | - • - . | - . . . . | . See Zenjān. |
| Jermay | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Çerme. |
| Jeziret ibn 'Omar | - . . . . | - . . . . . | - - . - | . . . . . | .See Jazīrah ibn 'Omar. |
| Jimin . . | . . . - . | - . . - | . . . . . | - • • - . | . See Cimin. |
| Jiwnakert | Jiwnkert | Porpēs <br> Harabe köy? | E. 62 | E. G-4 <br> AA 106 |  |
| Jiwnkert . | - . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | .See Jiwnakert. |
| Julamerk | Çölemerik |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 318 \\ & 37^{0} 34^{\prime} \times 43^{0} 45^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } 340 \text { C I } \\ & \text { AA } 108 \end{aligned}$ | See Ch. XI n. 55. |
| Justinianopolis |  | Cimin |  |  | See Ch.VI p. 117 and n.31;VII n.21. |
| Kağdariç | Büyük Kağdariç Gattaricic | $X$ aldoy aric | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 322 \\ & 39^{0} 58^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 47^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A II |  |
| Kaǧizman | Qaghyzman | Kalzwan | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 322 \\ & 40^{\circ} 09^{\prime} \times 43^{0} 07 \end{aligned}$ | M. 325 D IV |  |
| Kainē-Parembolē | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Caene Parembole. |
| Kainēpolis | . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . | - . . . | . See Vałaršapat. |
| Kalajik . . | . | - . . . . . | - | - . . . . | . See Kalecik. |


| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kalecik | Kalejcik Kalajik |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 326(16) \\ & 40^{0} 27^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 18^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C IV |  |
| Kalejcik | . . . . . . | - • . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . | . See Kalecik. |
| Kaltiorissa | . . . . . | . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Caleorsissa. |
| Kalzewan | . . . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . . | .See Kałzwan. |
| Kałzwan | Kałzewan | Kaǧizman | E. 57 | AA 106 |  |
| Kamacha | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - - . . . | . . . . | .See Kamax. |
| Kamakh | - . . . . . | - . $\cdot$ | . . . . . | - . . | .See Kamax. |
| Kamax | Kamacha <br> Kamakh | Kemah |  | AA 106 |  |
| Kamis | Kemis |  | E. 57 | E. G-2 | See Ch. IV n. 15a. |
| Kamişli dere | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Elegarsina. |
| Kamurjajor Vank' |  |  |  | AA 106 |  |
| Kân | Kjan |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 329(3) \\ & 39^{\circ} 57^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 16^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A II |  |
| Kangeva | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . | .See Kangowar. |
| Kangever . | - • . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . . | - . - | . See Kangowar. |
| Kangowar | Kangeva Kanguar | Kangever Gürpinar | E. 58 | E. G-5 AA 106. | T. 198. |
| Kanguar | Kang | , | . . . . . . | . . . . | . See Kangowar. |
| Kara Amida | . . . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . | .See Amida. |
| Kara Dara | - . . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . | . See Dara. |
| Karapē |  | Carape | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
| Karin | Karnoy k'ałak' | Theodosiopolis Erzurum | E. 58 | E. G-4 <br> AA 106 | T.193-194 n. 209. <br> See Ch. VI n. 28h, 36. |
| Karissa | - $\cdot$ | - . . . | . . . . . . | . | . See Garsi. |
| Karkathiokerta | Arkathiocerta Carcathiocerta | Martyropolis ? Angł berd | E. 35 | CM Ne | T. 75 n. $83,131,137$ n. 240 , 297 n. 80. <br> See Ch. II n. 5. |
| Karni | Gaini in Daranalik' |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 362 \\ & 39^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 14^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A I |  |


| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUTVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Karnoy k'ałak' Kars | Karuẹ berd | . . . | - . . . - | - • - . | . See Karin. |
|  |  |  | G. 362 | U. 325 D IV |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{40} 0^{0} 37^{\prime} \times 43^{0} 05^{\prime}$ | AA 106 |  |
|  |  |  | E. 58 | E. B-5 |  |
| Karuẹ berd . | . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | .See Kars. |
| Kasara |  | Casara | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
| Kašē |  | Konşa ? | E. 58 | E. G-1 | See Ch. III n. 6. |
|  |  |  |  | AA 105 |  |
| Kayseri |  | Caesarea of | G. 373 | U. 341 B IV |  |
|  |  | Cappadocia | $38^{043}{ }^{\prime} \times 35^{0} 30^{\prime}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Eusebeia |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mazaka |  |  |  |
| Keban-Maden |  |  | G. 375 | U. 341 B III |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{04} 8^{\prime} \times 38^{\circ} 45^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Keli | Kołoberd <br> Kamax | Kiǧi |  | AA 106 |  |
| Kemah |  | Ani in Daranalik' | G. 378 (3) | U. 340 A I |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{0} 36^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 02{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Kemaliye . | . . . . | . . . . - . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Eğin. |
| Kemis | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Kamis. |
| Kena | Cena |  |  |  | See Ch. III pp. 49,52 and n. 27. |
|  | Okena |  |  |  |  |
| Keomana . | - . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | .See Komana. |
| Keramon . | - . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | - • . | .See Krom. |
| Kerasos | Cerasus | Pharnakia | N. XXXI | HW 15c C-1 |  |
|  | Kerasunta |  |  | CM Mc |  |
| Kerasunta | . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . | . See Kerasos. |
| Kerčanis | - . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - • - | . See Gercanis. |
| Kharput | . . . . | . . . . . . | - - . . | . . . . | . See Harput. |
| Khart . | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Hart. |
| Khiaghid aridj | . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . | . See Xaldoy arič. |
| Kiakis | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Ciaca. |





| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Malazgirt | Masgirt <br> Mazgert <br> Mazgirt | Manazkert | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 455 \\ & 39^{\circ} 09^{\prime} \times 42^{\circ} 31^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 B I | See Ch. XI n. 45. |
| Mamahatun |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 456 \\ & 39^{\circ} 47^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 24^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A I |  |
| Manawazkert <br> Manazkert | Manawazkert Manzikert | Malazgirt | E. 65 | E. G-5 <br> AA 106 | .See Manazkert. <br> T. 218. <br> See Ch. XI nn. 45, 51. |
| Manzikert. <br> Maragay <br> Maragha | . . . . | . . . . . | - • - . | AA 105 | . See Manazkert. <br> See Ch. III n. 1. |
| Marakan | Marakert | Marakend | E. 65 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. G-6 } \\ & \text { AA } 106 \end{aligned}$ | See Ch. XI n. 61. |
| Marakert . <br> Marand |  |  | E. 65 | E. G-6 <br> AA 106 | .See Marakan. |
| Mardara <br> Mardē berd <br> Mardin | Mardē berd |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P. V, vi, } 18 . \\ & \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ & \text { G. } 459(1) \\ & 37^{0} 18^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 44^{\prime} \\ & \text { E. } 65 \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 D I <br> E. D-4 | . See Mardin. |
| Masgirt <br> Martyropolis |  | Tigranakert <br> Miyafarkin <br> Np'rkert | Aed. III, ii, 2-3 <br> Pers. I, viii, 22 xxi, 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HW } 43 \text { O-5 } \\ & \text { CM Oe } \end{aligned}$ | See Malazgirt. <br> T. 137-138 n. 240, 174. <br> See Ch. I nn. 4-6. |
| Mastara <br> Mazaka <br> Mazara <br> Mcbin | - . . . | Mezrē ? <br> Nisibis <br> Nusaybin | E. 71 | AA 109 <br> E. D-4 <br> AA 108 | .See Caesarea of Cappadocia. See Ch. II nn. 11b, 12a, 13. |




| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ninah . <br> Nineveh | Ninwè | Eski Mosul | E. 72 | - . . . . | . See Tortum. |
|  |  |  |  | E. D-5 <br> HW 10b C-1 |  |
| Ninwē . <br> Nisibis | . . . . |  | - . . . | . . . . . | .See Nineveh. |
|  |  | Antioch of Mygdonia | T.P. | HW $410-5$ |  |
|  |  | Mcbin |  | M 770-771 and 741 |  |
|  |  | Nusaybin |  | CM Pf |  |
| NisusNize | - . . | - . . . . . . | - . $\cdot$ | - . . . | .See Nyssa. |
|  |  | Nyssa ? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 489 \\ & 38^{046} \times 35^{0} \mathbf{4} 1^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 341 B IV |  |
| Nkan |  |  |  | AA 106 | See Ch. XI n. 60. |
| Np'rkert | Np’ret <br> Neferkert | Martyropolis | E. 73 | E. G-4 |  |
|  |  | Tigranakert |  | AA 106 |  |
|  |  | Miyafarkin |  |  |  |
| Np'ret <br> Nusaybin | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | $\cdot$ | .See Np'rkert. |
|  |  | Nisibis | G. 490 (4) | U. 340 DII |  |
|  |  | Mcbin | $37^{0} 03^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 13^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nysa } \\ & \text { Nyssa } \end{aligned}$ | - • . - | - • - . . . | - . | - $\cdot$ | .See Nyssa. |
|  | Nisus | Nize ? | I.A. | M 661 and f. 217 | See Ch. IV n. 10a. |
|  | Nysa |  |  | CM He |  |
| Oǧnut | Ełnut <br> Ołnut <br> Ołnuberd <br> Ołin | Elane | G. 492 | U. 340 A II |  |
|  |  |  | $3^{3} 08^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 53{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Okbas. <br> *Okena <br> Okhda <br> Ołakan | Ołkan | - . - . - | - . . . . | . . . . . | .See Akbas. |
|  |  | . . . . . . . | - - . - | . . . . . | . See Kena. |
|  |  | - • • - . | - . . . . | - | . See Otha. |
|  |  | Olanè | E. 74 | E. G-4 | T. 209. |
|  |  | Akçan |  |  | See Ch. I n. 30; XI nn. 32, 37. |
|  |  | $\mathrm{A}_{\boldsymbol{\chi}} \mathrm{kan}$ |  |  |  |



| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Otha |  | Okhda? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 501 \\ & 40^{\circ} 35^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 39^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C III | See Ch. In. 42. |
| Palin |  | Baǧin <br> Palios kastron | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G.c. } \\ & \text { E. } 76 \end{aligned}$ | E. G-3 | See Ch. III nn. 2-3. |
| Palios kastron | . . . | . . . . . | . . | . . . | . See Palin. |
| Palu |  | Balu <br> Baioulouos | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 505 \\ & 38^{0} 42^{\prime} \times 39^{\circ} 57 \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A IV |  |
| Partaw |  | Berdaa | E. 77 | E. B-7 | T. $476 \mathrm{n} .169,484$. |
| P'aytakaran |  | Phatakaranēs |  |  | See Ch. IX n. 13b. |
| Pekeriç |  | Bagayarieč | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 509 \\ & 39^{\circ} 43^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 13 \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A I |  |
| Peri |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 510 \\ & 38^{\circ} 51^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 42^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A IV |  |
| Pertek |  | Pistek? <br> Pistik | W. 250 |  | See Ch. II n. 19. |
| Petra |  |  |  |  | See Ch. I n. 46a; III n. 30. |
| Petrios |  |  |  |  | See Ch. VI n. 32c. |
| Pharnacia | - • - | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Pharnakia. |
| Pharnakia | Pharnacia |  |  |  | See Ch. IV n. 1. |
| Phathachōn |  | Thathax Fatax |  |  | See Ch. In. 21a. |
| Pheison | Phison | Fis |  |  | See Ch. I n. 20. |
| Phison. <br> Phitar | Phittur <br> Phtr <br> Pitar | Fittar | . | . . . . | See Pheison. <br> See Ch. II n. 6. |
| Phittur | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Phitar. |
| Phtr | - . . . | - . . . . . | . | . . . . | . See Phitar. |
| Phuphagena <br> Phuphena |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 <br> P. V, vi, 20 |  | See Ch. IV n. 23. |


| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Piriz |  | P'rris | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 514 \\ & 39^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 08^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 |  |
| Pirnabaşin | - . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . | . See Aziziye. |
| Pirnakaban | - . . ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | - . . . . | . . . . . |  | .See Pirnakapan. |
| Pirnakapan | Pirnakaban <br> Pirsnakapan | Brnakapan | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 514 \\ & 39^{\circ} 58^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 34^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 |  |
| Pirsnakapan | . . . . | . . . . | . . . . . | - . | .See Pirnakapan. |
| Pisingara |  |  | P. V, vi, 18. |  |  |
| Pisonos |  | Hasanbatrik | I.A. | M. 684 |  |
| Pistek . | . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . | .See Pertek. |
| Pitar | - • - | - . . . . | . . . . | . . | .See Phitar. |
| Pithia | Thia | Pitiunt? | I.A., N.D. | M. 681 | See Ch. V n. 19. |
| Pitiunt |  | Pithia ? | E. 77 | E. A-4 |  |
| Pkoür . | - • . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | . . | .See Pürk. |
| Plasta |  | Elbistan | E. 78 |  |  |
| Polemonion |  |  | T.P. | M. 647 <br> CM Lb | See Ch. IV n. 42a; VII n. 18. |
| Porpēs | Borbas | Xaraba-Barbas |  |  | See Ch. I n. 33. |
|  |  | Jiwnakert |  |  |  |
|  |  | Harabe köy? |  |  |  |
| ad Praetorium | Praetorio | Hasançelebi | I.A., T.P. | E. G-2 | See Ch. V n. 10. |
|  |  |  | E. 31 | M. 684 |  |
| P'rris |  | Piriz |  |  | See Ch. III n. 8. |
| Ptandari |  | Tanadaris | P. V, vi, 22 | CM Ke |  |
|  |  | Tanir? | I.A. | M. 736 |  |
|  |  |  | E. 78 | E. G-2 |  |
| PumPürk | Pürko | . | . . . . . |  | .See Fum. |
|  |  | Nikopolis | G. 518 | U. 324 |  |
|  |  |  | $40^{\circ} 08^{\prime} \times 38^{0} 09^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Pydna | - • • - | - . . . - | - | - | . See Fidi. |
| Qaghyzman | . . . . | . . . . . | - | . . | . See Kağizman. |




| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sebinkarahisar |  | Koloneia | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 544 \\ & 40^{\circ} 20^{\prime} \times 38^{0} 25 \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 D III |  |
| Seleobereia |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
| Sepik | Sipik | Sabus | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 550 \\ & 39^{\circ} 06^{\prime} \times 38032^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Seresekia | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | .See Şarkişla. |
| Sevastia | . . . | . | . . . . . | - . . | .See Sebasteia. |
| Sewanaberd |  | Seyvan kale |  | AA 106 |  |
| Seyvan kale |  | Sewanaberd | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 557(1) \\ & 38^{0} 33^{\prime} \times 43^{044} 0^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 B IV | See Cb. XI n. 60. |
| Sheikh Selim . Kala | - • . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | - • | .See Kitharizōn. |
| Sikefti. . . <br> Siluana | - • - . | Salona <br> Salonenica <br> Süle ? | T.P., N.D. | M. 682 and 646 f. 212 | . See Der. <br> See Ch. V n. 16. |
| Silvan . | . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . . | .See Miyafarkin. |
| Šimšat | . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Arsamosata. |
| Sinara. | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Sinera. |
| Sinekli | - . . | . . . . . . | - . - . | - . . . . | .See Sinikli. |
| Sinera | Sinerva <br> Sinara |  | $\text { P. V, vi, } 18$ T.P. | CM Md <br> M. 680 f. 223 |  |
| Sinerva | - . . | - . . . . | - . . . | - . . . . . | .See Sinera. |
| Sinikli | Sinekli | Siniscolon? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 562 \\ & 38^{\mathbf{0} 46^{\prime}} \times 38^{0} \mathbf{3 5} \end{aligned}$ | U. 341 B III |  |
| Siniscolon |  | Sinikli ? | P. V, vi, 21 |  |  |
| Sinna . | . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Zintha. |
| Sinope |  |  | T.P. | M. 644 and 642 f. 210 <br> HW 21 a F-1 <br> AA 104 <br> CM Ja |  |


| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sipik <br> Sirakawan | . . . . | Baš Soragyal Bassüregel | E. 74 | - • - | .See Sepik. <br> See Ch. XI n. 3. |
|  |  |  |  | E. B-5 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AA 106 |  |
| Širi | Sirin <br> Širni | Sirinan ? |  |  | See Ch. III nn. 6, 9. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Şirinan | Sirnan | Siri? | G. 564 | U. 340 A I |  |
|  |  |  | $3^{3} 0^{0} 8^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 35^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sirnan | ${ }^{\cdot} \cdot$. | - . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . - | .See Sirinan. |
| Sirni . |  | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | .See Širi. |
| Sisilia |  |  | N.D. |  |  |
| Sisilissōn |  | Ziziola ? |  |  | See Ch. III nn. 27, 31c-d. |
| Sismara |  |  | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
| Sivas |  | Sebasteia | G. 565 | U. 341 B-1 |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{0} 45^{\prime} \times 37^{0} 02^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sivastia |  |  |  |  | See Sebasteia. |
| Spunios |  |  |  |  | See Ch. IV n. 23. |
| Suissa |  |  | I.A. | M. 675-676 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Nd |  |
| Süle |  | Siluana? | G. 574 (2) | U. 324 C IV |  |
|  |  |  | $40^{0} 25{ }^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 44^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Suluk |  |  | G. 576 (2) | U. 340 A III | See Ch. XI n. 37. |
|  |  |  | $38^{051}{ }^{\prime} \times 41^{03}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sumaysat. <br> Sulusaray | - . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | - • - . | . See Samosata. |
|  |  | Sebastopolis | G. 576 (2) |  |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 42^{\prime} \times 344^{0} 44^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Surb Karapet <br> Sürmene |  | - • . - . | . |  | .See Bagawan. |
|  | Susurmenē | Usiportus | G. 578 (1) | U. 324 C IV |  |
|  |  | Humurgân | $40^{0} 55^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 07{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Arakli ? |  |  |  |
| Susarmia | . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . | .See Susurmenē. |


| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Suşehri <br> Susurmenē <br> Tablariensis <br> Tabriz | Susarmia | Sürmene | - . . . . | - . . . | . See Endires. |
|  |  |  |  |  | See Ch. III n. 28a. |
|  |  |  | N.D. |  |  |
|  | Tawriz |  |  | AA 106 |  |
| Tahtakiran |  |  | G. 581 | U. 324 C III | See Ch. XI n. 3b. |
|  |  |  | $40^{0} 53{ }^{\prime} \times 42^{03} 6^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Takht i Suleiman. | . . . - | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Ganjak. |
| Takhtuk . | . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Tutmaç. |
| Tanadaris. | . . . . | - . . . |  | - . . $\cdot$ | .See Ptandari. |
| Tanir |  | Tanadaris ? | G. 583 (2) | U. 341 C I |  |
|  |  | Ptandari ? | $37^{0} 52{ }^{\prime} \times 36^{041}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Tapura | - • • • | - . . . . | - . . . | - • - | . See Tephrikè. |
| Taranta |  | Derende | E. 85 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. G-2 } \\ & \text { CM Le } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Tateonk' |  | Diyadin | E. 85 | E. G-5 | See Ch. XI n. 22. |
| Tawriz |  | . . . . . | - . . . | . . . . | . See Tabriz. |
| Tephrikē | Abrik | Divrigi | P. V, vi, 20 |  |  |
|  | Tevrik |  | E. 86 | E. G-3 |  |
|  | Tapura |  |  |  |  |
|  | Teucila ? |  |  |  |  |
| Teucila | Teucira | Divrigi ? | I.A. | M. 682 |  |
|  | *Teurica |  |  | CM Md |  |
| Teucira . | . . . . | - | - • - . | . . . . | .See Teucila. |
| *Teurica | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Teucila. |
| Tevrik | . . . . | - . . . . | - - . . | . . . . | .See Tephrikē. |
| Thathax . | - . . . | - • - . - | - - . - | - • - | . See Phathachōn. |
| Theodosiopolis |  | Karin |  | HW 43 O-5 | See C. III n. 26; VI n. 28f. |
|  |  | Erzurum |  | CM Pd |  |
| Thia . . | - • . | - • . . | - . . . | . . . | .See Pithia. |
| Thilenzit . | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Tilenzit. |


| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tigranakert | Tigranokerta <br> Tigranocarten | Martyropolis <br> Np'rkert <br> Miyafarkin | T.P. | M. 746 and 738 f. 239 <br> HW 20a E-2 <br> CM Oe? Of? | See Ch. In. 10. |
| Tigranocarten Tigranokerta . Til | . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . . | . See Tigranakert. |
|  |  | - • . . . |  | - ${ }^{\text {c }}$ - | . See Tigranakert. |
|  |  | Tilenzit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 598(4) \\ & 38^{0} 49 \\ & \text { E. } 36 \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A IV | See Ch. III nn. 1, 5 |
| Tilenzit | Thilenzit | Til Anzita |  |  | See Ch. II n. 11a. |
| Timur agha |  |  |  |  | See Ch. I n. 22b. |
| Tizbon | Tispon | Ctesiphon | E. 23 | AA 104. |  |
| Tokat | Tokatli |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 601 \\ & 40^{\circ} 19^{\prime} \times 36^{\circ} 34^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 D IV |  |
| Tokatli <br> Tonosa | - • - . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - • . . . . | .See Tokat. |
|  |  | Tonus | I.A. | M. 730 <br> CM Kd |  |
| Tonus |  | Tonosa | G. 602 (5) | U. 341 B I |  |
|  |  | Şarkişla | $39^{0} 21^{\prime} \times 36^{026}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| T'ordan |  | Tortan | E. 53 | E. G-3 <br> AA 106 | See Ch. III n. l; XII n. 48. |
| Tortan |  | T'ordan | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 604(1) \\ & 39^{0} 40^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 09^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A I |  |
| Tortum |  | Ninah | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 604 \\ & 40^{\circ} 19^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } 324 \text { C III } \\ & \text { AA } 108 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Trabzon | Trebizond | Trapezos | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 605 \\ & 41^{0} 00^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 43^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 CI |  |
| Trapezos | Trapezunta | Trabzon | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T.P., I.A. } \\ & \text { N.D. } \end{aligned}$ | M. 647-648, and 645 <br> f. 212 <br> CM Nb | See Ch. III nn. 28, 30. |
| Trapezunta | - | - | - • . . | - - . . . . | .See Trapezos. |


| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trebizond |  | Trapezos | E. 86 | E. B-7 |  |
|  |  | Trabzon |  | AA 106 |  |
| Tutmaç | Tutmadj | Takhtuk | G. 609 |  | See Ch. IV n. 22. |
|  |  | Blandos | $39^{0} 32 \cdot \times 37^{0} 11{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Tutmadj | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . | . See Tutmaç. |
| T'uxars | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . |  |
| Tuy | - . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . | .See Du. |
| Tuzluca | . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . | . See Kulp. |
| Tzanzakōn |  | Zavzoka |  |  | See Ch. III nn. 27, 32. <br> See Ch. III n. 26; VI n. 30. |
| Tzumina |  | Cimin | E. 57 | E. G-3 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AA 106 |  |
| Ualentia | Varsapa Varpasa |  | N.D. |  | See Ch. IV n. 28b. |
| Uarsapa |  | Arabissos ? | P. V, vi, 18 |  |  |
|  |  | Sarsapa? |  |  |  |
| Ułêoy berd | Erumya | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . | .See Oleoberda. <br> See Ch. IV n. 18a. |
| Urumya khan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vałaršakert |  | Hasankale | E. 81 | E. G-5 | See Ch. I n. 41. |
|  |  |  |  | AA 106 |  |
| Vałaršapat | Vardišēn | Kainepolis | E. 82 | E. B-6 | See Ch. V nn. 10a,19. |
| Vardanakert |  |  | E. 83 | E. G-7 |  |
| Vardašēn |  |  |  | AA 106 |  |
| Vardenik |  | Vartinik |  | AA 106 |  |
| Vardišēn | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | . . | . See Vardašēn. |
| Varissa | . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . | . See Verise. |
| Varpasa | - . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . | .See Uarsapa. |
| Varsapa | - . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . |  | . See Uarsapa. |
| Vartinik |  | Vardenik | G. 621 | U. 324 |  |
|  |  |  | $40^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 40^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Vereuso |  |  | T.P. | M. 682 |  |




C. Mountains - Plains

The following abbreviations were used in this section in addition to those previously given :

| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abēş Mus. |  | Serefiye | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 2 \\ & 40^{\circ} 08^{\prime} \times 37^{047} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 D III | Coordinates given for town no mountains indicated by this name in Gazetteer. |
| Abus M. |  | Ararat? |  | CM Pd | See Ch. III n. 19a. |
| Ağri daği | - . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . | . See Ararat. |
| Ala daği |  | Całkē | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 26 \text { (2) } \\ & 39^{\circ} 20^{\prime} \times 43^{\circ} 35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 BI |  |
| Alagöz. . | . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | - . . | . See Aragac. |
| Aleluya P. |  | "Fair Plain" <br> $X$ arberd P. <br> Olu ovasi <br> Harput P. <br> Kalopedion |  |  | See Ch. II nn. 12, 16. |
| Anti Taurus M. |  |  | E. 36 | E. G-2 <br> CM O-Pe |  |
| Aragac M. |  | Alagöz | E. 38 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. B-6 } \\ & \text { AA } 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Ararat M. |  | Masis <br> Ağri daği <br> Abus? <br> Nibarus? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 40 \\ & 39^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \times 44^{0} 24^{\prime} \\ & \text { E. } 31 \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 B II <br> AA 7 <br> E. G-6 | See also P'ok'r Masis. |
| Araxenōn pedion |  | Ersxajor |  |  | See Ch. XI n. 2, also <br> Provinces: Aršarunik’. |
| Argaeus M. |  | Erciyas daği |  | CM Ie |  |

Erciyas daği
CM Ie



| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harput P. | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Aleluya P. |
| Hart ovasi | . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . | . . . . | . See Cities: Hart. |
| Hawasor . | - • . . | . . . . . |  | - . . . | . See Hayoc̣ jor. |
| Hayoç jor | Hawasor |  | E. 62 | E. G-5 |  |
| Illyrisum pass |  |  | Aed. III, iii, 4 |  |  |
| Izala M. . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Masios M. |
| Jorayn koys . | - . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . | .See Kleisurai. |
| Kalopedion | . . . . | - . . . . |  | - . . . | . See Aleluya P. |
| Kandil daği |  | Ciraneaç M. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 330(3) \\ & 40^{0} 11^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Kara daği |  | Gohanam M. <br> Sepuh M. <br> Maneay ayrk'? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 342(28) \\ & 39^{0} 45 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 Al |  |
| Kara Tonus M. |  |  |  | U. 341 BI |  |
| Karasakal daği |  | Kazikli M. ? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 355 \\ & 39^{0} 20^{\prime} \times 39^{\circ} 38^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Karayazi ovasi | Karayazi kazasi | Towarcatap' | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 359 \\ & 39^{\circ} 35^{\prime} \times 42^{0} 05^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  | See Ch. XI n. 53. |
| Karer M. . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | - . - | . See Kârir daǧi. |
| Karga bazar M. . | - . . . . | - . . . . | - . - . . |  | .See Kargapazari daği. |
| Kargapazari daği |  | Karga bazar M. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 360 \\ & 40^{\circ} 07^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C III |  |
| Kârir daği |  | Koher M. <br> Karer M. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 361 \\ & 39^{0} 05^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 40^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 Al |  |
| Kazikli M. . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . - | . See Küçükgöl daği and Karasakal daği. |
| Keraunian Caucasus | - . . . . | - . . . . . | - • - | - | .See Šant'ayin M. |
| Keşiş dağlari |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 383 \\ & 39^{0} 50^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 45^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 Al |  |
| Khalkhal M. . . | . . . . | - . . . | - . . | . . . . | .See Harhal daği. |



| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mułani dašt | Movkan dašt | Mughan P. | E. 71 | E. G-8 |  |
| Munzur sisilesi |  | Muzur M. | G. 479 | U. 340 A I |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 10^{\prime}$ <br> E. 71 | E. G-3 |  |
| Muşar daǧi |  |  | G. 481 |  |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{037}{ }^{\prime} \times 38^{025}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Muzur | - • - . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . | . See Munzur M. |
| Navšan pass | Navarshan dere |  |  |  | See Ch. I n. 33a. |
| Nemrut daği |  |  | G. 487 | U. 340 A III |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 40^{\prime} \times 42^{0} 12^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Ne $\chi_{\text {Masik' }}$ M. |  | Sip'an M. | E. 72 | E. G-5 | See Ch. XI n. 50. |
|  |  | Süphan daği |  |  |  |
| Nibarus M. | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . | . See Ararat. |
| Nimrud M. | . . . . . |  | - . . . . - | . . . . | . See Nemrut daği. |
| Niphates M. |  | Npatakan M. | P. V, xii, 1 |  |  |
| Npatakan M. | Npat | Niphates M. | E. 72-73 | E. G-5 |  |
| Olor | . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . | . See Olōray. |
| Olōray | Olor | Halōras |  |  | See Ch. I n. 22. |
|  |  | Halûras |  |  |  |
|  |  | Holûris |  |  |  |
| Olu ovasi . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . | . See Aleluya P. |
| Palandöken daği |  | Ayc Ptkunk' M. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 504 \\ & 39^{0} 47^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 15^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  | See Ch. In. 34. |
| Parhal | - . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . . | - . . . | . See Parhar M. |
| Parbar M. |  | Paryadres M. | E. 77 | E. B-4 | See Ch. I nn. 43a, 45. |
|  | Par $\chi^{\text {ar }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Paryar | . . . . . | - • - . | . . . . . . |  | . See Parhar. |
| Paryadres M. |  | Parhar M. |  | CM L-Ne | T. 445, 450-452. |
| Paxir M. |  | Bağirbaba daǧi | E. 76 | E. G-4 |  |
|  |  | Gaylaxazut M. |  |  |  |


| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P'ok'r Masis M. |  | Lesser Ararat M. | E. 89 | E. G-6 |  |
| Rahva pass | . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | .See Kleisurai. |
| Salbüs daǧi |  | Sipilus M. <br> Surb Lays M. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 529 \\ & 39^{0} 17^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 00^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Salin M. |  | Salnoy M. | E. 79 | E. G-4 |  |
| Salnoy M. . |  |  | . . . . . | . . . . . | .See Salin M. |
| Sant'ayin M. |  | Keraunian <br> Caucasus M. | E. 73 |  |  |
| Saphchae pass |  |  | Aed. III, iii, 4 |  |  |
| Sariçiçek yaylasi |  |  |  | U. 341 B II | The coordinates given in G. 537 do no fit the indicated location between Arapkir and Divrigi. |
| Šarur P. |  |  | E. 73, 118 | E. G-6 |  |
| Sasun M. |  |  | E. 79 | E. G-4 |  |
| Sebouh | $\cdots \cdot$ • | - • • - | . . . . . | . . . . . | .See Sepuh. |
| Sepuh M. | Sebouh | Kara daǧi Gohanam M. Maneay ayrk'? | E. 80 | E. G-3 |  |
| Serefiye . | - • . . | . . . . . . | - • - . | - • . - | . See Abeş. |
| Sinibel M. |  |  |  |  | See Ch. IV n. 16f. |
| Sip'an M. | Cip'an | - . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | . See Nex Masik'. |
| Sipikör daği |  | Surb Grigor M. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 563 \\ & 39^{0} 52^{\prime} \times 39^{0035} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 A I |  |
| Sipilus |  | Salbüs daği ? <br> Surb Luys M. |  | CM |  |
| Sołalar M. | . . . . | - . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | . See Ayc Ptkunke. |
| Srmane M. |  | Bingöl dağlari | E. 80 | E. G-4 | See Ch. In. 34. |
| Sübhan | - . . | . . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . | .See Süphan daği. |
| Süphan daği | Sübhan daği | Sip'an M. <br> Ne $\chi$ Masik' M. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 577 \\ & 38^{0} 54^{\prime} \times 42^{0} 48^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 B IV |  |
| Surb Grigor M. | . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . | - . . | .See Sipikör daği. |



## D. Rivers - Lakes - Seas

The following abbreviations were used in this section in addition to those previously given :

| L. | lake. |
| :--- | :--- |
| R. | river. |
| S. | sea. |



| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aras nehri |  | Araxes R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 41 \\ & 39^{\circ} 56^{\prime} \times 48^{0} 20^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 D IV |  |
| Araxes R. | Araks R. | Aras nehri <br> Eğri R. <br> Eras $\boldsymbol{X}$ R. <br> Murẹ R. | E. 38-39, 50 | E. G4-G7 <br> AA 6,105 <br> CM Pc |  |
| Arčisak L. | Arčak | Erçek gölü | E. 39-40 | E. G-5 <br> AA 105 | See Ch. XI n. 56. |
| Arčišak R. Ardanuç R. |  | . . . . . . | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 41 \\ & 41^{\circ} 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}{42^{0} 05}^{\prime}, ~ l$ | U. 324 C II | . See Mehmedik R. <br> The coordinates given are for the locality and district. |
| Arethusa | Aretissa | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | . See p. 460 n. 56. |
| Arghana su | . . . . | - | . . . . | . . . . . | .See Maden suyu. |
| Arpa çayi |  | Axuryan R. Rah R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 44 \\ & 40^{\circ} 06^{\prime} \times 43^{0} 44^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 325 D IV |  |
| Arsanas . | . . . | - . . | . . . . . . | . - . | .See Arsanias. |
| Arsanias R. | Arsanas <br> Aracani | Euphrates R. Murat nehri |  | AA 107 <br> HW 10a D-2 |  |
| Askar deresi | . . . . | . | - . . . . | . . . . | .See Aksar deres . |
| AXuryan R. | Akhurean R. | Arpa çayi <br> Rah R. <br> Kars R. | E. 32 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. B-5 } \\ & \text { AA } 107 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Azat R. |  | Garni çay | E. 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. B-6 } \\ & \text { AA } 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Bala rud | - • - | . . . . . . | $\cdot \cdot$ | - $\cdot$ | . See Bałan rot. |
| Balan rot | Bała rud <br> Bałas rot |  | E. 44 | E. G-8 | See Bolgara çay. |
| Bałas rotot . <br> Batmansuyu | . . . . | Nymphios R. Kalirt ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 81 \\ & 37^{0} 45 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 D II | .See Bałan rot. |

## D. Rivers - Lakes - Seas

The following abbreviations were used in this section in addition to those previously given :

| L. | lake. |
| :--- | :--- |
| R. | river. |
| S. | sea. |



| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aras nehri |  | Araxes R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 41 \\ & 39^{0} 56^{\prime} \times 48^{\circ} 20^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 D IV |  |
| Araxes R. | Araks R. | Aras nehri <br> Eğri R. <br> Eras $\chi$ R. <br> Murẹ R. | E. 38-39, 50 | E. G4-G7 <br> AA 6, 105 <br> CM Pc |  |
| Arčisak L. | Arčak | Erçek gölü | E. 39-40 | E. G-5 <br> AA 105 | See Ch. XI n. 56. |
| Arčišak R. Ardanuç R. | . . . . | - . . . . . | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 41 \\ & 41^{0} 05, \times 42^{0} 05^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C II | .See Mehmedik R. <br> The coordinates given are for the locality and district. |
| Arethusa | Aretissa | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . | . See p. 460 n. 56. |
| Arghana su | . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | .See Maden suyu. |
| Arpa çayi |  | Axuryan R. <br> Rah R. | G. 44 $40^{\circ} 06^{\prime} \times 43^{0} 44^{\prime}$ | U. 325 D IV |  |
| Arsanas | - • • | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . | .See Arsanias. |
| Arsanias R. | Arsanas Aracani | Euphrates R. <br> Murat nehri |  | AA 107 <br> HW 10a D-2 |  |
| Askar deresi | - | - . | . . . . . | - • | . See Aksar deres . |
| Axuryan R. | Akhurean R. | Arpa çayi <br> Rah R. <br> Kars R. | E. 32 | E. B-5 <br> AA 107 |  |
| Azat R. |  | Garni çay | E. 31 | E. B-6 AA 7 |  |
| Bała rud | - . . . | - . . . . | - • . - | . . . . | . See Bałan rot. |
| Balan rot | Bala rud Balas rot |  | E. 44 | E. G-8 | See Bolgara çay. |
| Bałas rot |  | . . . . . . | . . . . | - • . | . See Bałan rot. |
| Batmansuyu |  | Nymphios R. Kałirt ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 81 \\ & 37^{0} 45^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 00^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 D II |  |


| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bendimahi çayi |  |  | G. 89 | U. 340 B IV |  |
|  |  |  | $3^{80} 55^{\prime} \times 43^{\circ} 35{ }^{\prime}$ | AA 7 |  |
| Berklinzülkarneynsuyu |  |  | G. 90 | U. 340 A IV |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 31^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 29$ |  |  |
| Bingöl su |  | Harsanova suyu? |  |  | See Ch. I n. 32a. |
| Boas . . |  | . . . . . . | - | - • . | . See Akampsis. |
| Bohtan su. |  | - . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Botan çayi. |
| Bolgara çay |  | Balan rot | E. 44 | E. G-8 | See Ch. IX n. 13. |
| Botan çayi | Bohtan su | Kentrites R. | G. 103 | U. 340 D II |  |
|  |  | Jerm R. | $37^{\mathbf{0} 44^{\prime}} \times{ }^{41}{ }^{\mathbf{0} 48}$ |  |  |
| Bolya R. |  | Oltu çayi | E. 45 | E. B-4 |  |
| Bulam L. | - . . . | . . . . . . | - - . . | - • . | .See Haçli Gölü. |
| Bzang R. . | - . . . | - . . . . | - - . . | . . . . | . See Adzharis Tskali R. |
| Bznunik' $S$. <br> Calgar R. | - . - | . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . | . See Van L. |
|  |  |  |  |  | See Ch. II n. 19d. |
| Çaltisuyu |  | Kangal su | G. 123 | U. 341 B II | See Ch. IV p. 68. |
|  |  |  | $39^{023}{ }^{\prime} \times 38^{024}$ |  |  |
| Caspian S. |  | Kaspiç S. | E. 58 | E. A. 8-G-8 |  |
|  |  | Hyrkanian S. |  |  |  |
| Çekerek irmaği |  | Scylax R. | G. 138 | U. 324 D IV |  |
|  |  |  | $40^{0} 34^{\prime} \times 35^{0} 46^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Centritis . <br> Çeyhan nehri | - . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | - • • $\cdot$ | .See Kentrites R. |
|  | Jaihun çayi | Pyramus R. | G. 145 | U. 341 C IV |  |
|  |  |  | $36^{0} 45^{\prime} \times 35^{0} 45^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Çoruh nehri |  | Akampsis R. | G. 160 | U. 324 C III |  |
|  |  | Boas R. | ${ }^{41}{ }^{0} 36^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 35{ }^{\prime}$ | AA 6 |  |
|  |  | Voh R. |  |  |  |
| Covk' L. |  | Gölcuk gölü | E. 57 | E. G-3 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AA 105 |  |


| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cowarš rod |  | Ak çayi II | E. 64 | E. G-6 <br> AA 105 | See Ch. XI n. 61. <br> See also Karmir R. |
| Coxenis chali Cyrus R. <br> Değirmen deresi | - . . . | Kura <br> Pyxites R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 173(6) \\ & 41^{0} 00^{\prime} \times 39^{\circ} 46^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | HW 29a P-4 <br> U. 324 C IV | . See Adzharis Tskali. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dicle nehri <br> Dklat R. <br> Eğri R. <br> Elmali deresi |  | $\begin{array}{ccccc}\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 207 \\ & 39^{\circ} 25^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\cdot$ | . See Tigris R. |
|  |  |  |  |  | . See Tigris R. |
|  |  |  |  |  | . See Araxes R. |
|  |  |  |  |  | See Ch. XI n. 53. |
| Ep'rat R. . <br> Eras R . | . | . . . . . . |  | - . | . See Euphrates R. |
|  |  |  |  | - . - . | . See Araxes R. |
| Erçek gölü |  | Arčišak L. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 211 \\ & 38^{\circ} 39^{\prime} \times 43^{0.22} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 B IV |  |
| Euphrates R. | Ep'rat R. | Arsanias R. | E. 51 | E. B-4 |  |
|  |  | Kara su çayi |  | AA 6 |  |
|  |  | Murat nehri |  |  |  |
|  |  | Firat nehri |  |  |  |
| Firat nehri |  | Euphrates R. | G. 226 | U. 341 B III |  |
|  |  |  | $31^{0} 00^{\prime} \times 47^{025}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Gargar R. |  | Karkar R. | E. 46 | E. G-7 |  |
|  |  |  |  | AA 107 |  |
| Gaini çay |  | Azat R. |  | AA 105 |  |
| Gayl R. |  | Lykos R. | E. 46 (2) | E. B-2 | See Ch. III nn. 5, 24a. |
|  |  | Kelkit çayi |  | AA 106 |  |
| Gełakuneac̣ S . Gercanis R. | . | - . . . | - . . . | . . . . | . See Sevan L. |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 234 \\ & 39^{\circ} 54^{\prime} \times 38^{044} \end{aligned}$ |  | The coordinates given are for the locality. |
| Gernaoksuyu |  | Gernevik | G. 236 | U. 340 BI |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{0} 37^{\prime} \times 44^{0} 07{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |





| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lychnitis L. . | . . . . . | - . . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | . See Sevan L. |
| Lycus R. . | . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . | .See Lykos R. |
| Lykos R. | Lycus R. | Gayl R. <br> Kelkit çayi |  | CM Le |  |
| Maden suyu |  | Arghana su |  | U. 340 A IV | The coordinates in G. $\mathbf{4 5 2}$ do not suit the indicated locality. |
| Mahmedik çay . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .See Mehmedik. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maku çay |  | Tełmut R. <br> Zanginiardere |  | AA 7 |  |
| Maligir | Mirangir |  |  | U. 340 A III |  |
| Mananałi R . |  | Tuzlasuyu | E. 65 | E. G-4 <br> AA 105 |  |
| Marat . | . . . . | . | - . . . . | - | . See Mrit. |
| Marmet R. |  | Mermenid R. <br> Mermid R. <br> Kara su | E. 65 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. G-5 } \\ & \text { AA } 105 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Mec Zaw R. . |  | Arčišak R. | E. 39 | E. G-5 <br> U. 340 B IV <br> E. G-4 | .See Zab R. |
| Mehmedik deresi | Mahmedik çay <br> Memedik deresi |  |  |  |  |
| Mel R. |  | Teleboas R. <br> Kara suyu | E. 70 |  |  |
| Memedik . | - . . . . | Harbe deresi ? | - • . . . - | - • • • | .See Mehmedik deresi. See Ch. I n. 32b. See Marmet R. |
| Menaskut R. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mermenid | - . . . . |  |  |  |  |
| Mermid | . . . . . | - . . . . . | . . . . . | . . . . . | . See Marmet R. |
| Meruli . | - . . . . | . . . . . . | . . . . . | - . . . . | . See Imerhav çayi. |
| Mirangir . . | - . . . | - . . . . . | - . . . . | . . . . . | . See Maligir R. |
| Miws Gayl R. | Mews Gayl | Keli R. | E. 70 | E. G-4 | See Ch. I nn. 25-26. |
|  |  | Ličik R. <br> Perisuyu |  | AA 105 |  |


| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mrit R. |  | Marat R. | E. 71 | E. B-4 |  |
| Mruł R. |  |  | E. 71 | E. B-4 |  |
| Mtkvari . |  | . . . . | . . . . . | . . | .See Kura R. |
| Munzur deresi | Muzur <br> Mzur |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 479 \\ & 38^{\circ} 46^{\prime} \times 39^{\circ} 27^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 AlV |  |
| Murat nehri |  | EuphratesArsanias R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 480 \\ & 38^{\circ} 52^{\prime} \times 38^{0} 48^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 341 B III |  |
| Murẹ . |  | . . . . . | - . | . | .See Murcamawr. |
| Mureamawr R. | Murẹ R. | Araxes R. <br> Eğri | E. 71 | E. G-4 |  |
| Murgulsuyu deresi |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 480 \\ & 41^{0} 20^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 40^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C II |  |
| Muzur R. |  | Munzur deresi Mzur R. | E. 71 | E. G-3 <br> AA 105 |  |
| Mzur . | . . . . | . . . . . . | - | . | .See Muzur R. |
| Nazik gölü |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 486 \\ & 38^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \times 42^{0} 16^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } 340 \text { A III } \\ & \text { AA } 105 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Nikephorios . . <br> Nymphios R. | Nikephorios | K'atirt' R. <br> Sit'it'ma R. <br> Batmansuyu |  | CM Pf | .See Nymphios. |
| Oltuçayi |  | Bolya R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 493 \\ & 40^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 40^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } 324 \text { C III } \\ & \text { AA } 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Palin R. |  | Perisuyu <br> Miws Gayl R. <br> Keli R. | E. 76 | E. G-3 |  |
| Perisuyu |  | Pałin R. <br> Miws Gayl R. <br> Keli R. <br> Ličik R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 510 \\ & 38^{0} 50^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 35{ }^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } 340 \text { A IV } \\ & \text { AA } 6 \end{aligned}$ | See Ch. I n. 25. |
| Piramis . . . | - . . . | - . . . | - . . . | - • . | .See Pyramus. |

Piramis .See Pyramus.

| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pontos Euxeinos |  | Black S. | E. 78 | E. B2-B4 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Da-Oa |  |
| Pulat dere |  | Aksar |  | U. 324 D III |  |
| Pülk çayi |  |  | G. 517 | U. 340 A I |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{0} 51^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 07{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Pyramus R. | Piramis | Ceyhan nehri |  | CM Jg-Kf |  |
| Rah R. |  | Axuryan | E. 78 | E. B-5 |  |
|  |  | Arpa çayi |  |  |  |
|  |  | Kars R. |  |  |  |
| Saris su | . . . | . | , | , | . See Göksu nehri. |
| Saromsuyu |  | Lice R.? | G. 541 | U. 340 A III |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 21^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 54^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sarsap deresi |  |  | G. 541 | U. 341 B IV |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 21^{\prime} \times 37^{0} 13^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sarus R. | Saris su | Göksu nehri |  | CM Jf-Jg |  |
| Scylax R. |  | Çekerek irmaği | E. 81 | E. B-2 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Je |  |
| Serçeme deresi |  |  | G. 550 | U. 324 C IV |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{0} 56^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 45^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sevan L. |  | Gelakuneac S. | E. 47 | E. B-6 |  |
|  |  | Lychnitis L. |  | AA 7 |  |
| Stit'it'ma R. | Šit'ma |  |  |  | See K'alirt' R. |
| Spautan S. | . . . . | - . . . . | - . . . | . $\cdot$ | . See Urmiah L. |
| Talori deresi |  |  | G. 582 | U. 340 A III |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 12^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 10^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Tatta L. |  | Tuz gölü |  | CM He | See Ch. IV n. 7. |
| Thospitis L | . . . . | . | - • . - | . . . . | . See Van L. |
| Tigris R. |  | Dicle nehri | G. 597 | CM Pe Of |  |
|  |  | Dklat R. | $31^{0} 00^{\prime} \times 47^{02} 25^{\prime}$ | AA 6 |  |
|  |  |  | E. 86 | E. G-4 |  |

Dicle nehri
Dklat R.
CM Pe Of
E. 86
E. G-4

| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mrit R. |  | Marat R. | E. 71 | E. B-4 |  |
| Mruł R. |  |  | E. 71 | E. B-4 | . See Kura R. |
| Mtkvari | Muzur <br> Mzur | - . . . | . . . . . | . . . . |  |
| Munzur deresi |  |  | G. 479 | U. 340 A IV |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{\mathbf{0} 46}{ }^{\prime} \times 39^{0} 27{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Murat nehri |  | Euphrates- | G. 480 | U. 341 B III |  |
|  |  | Arsanias R. | $38^{0} 52^{\prime} \times 38^{04} 8^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Murc̣ . . . <br> Murcamawr R. |  | . . . . . | - | - • • | .See Murçamawr. |
|  | Murẹ R. | Araxes $R$. | E. 71 | E. G-4 |  |
|  |  | Eğri |  |  |  |
| Murgulsuyu deresi |  |  | G. 480 | U. 324 C II |  |
|  |  |  | $41^{020} 0^{\prime} \times 41^{040}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Muzur R. |  | Munzur deresi | E. 71 | E. G-3 <br> AA 105 |  |
|  |  | Mzur R. |  |  |  |
| Mzur . . <br> Nazik gölü | - . . . | . . . . . | - $\cdot$ | - . | .See Muzur R. |
|  |  |  | G. 486 | U. 340 A III |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 50^{\prime} \times 42^{0} 16^{\prime}$ | AA 105 |  |
| Nikephorios Nymphios R. |  | - . . - . | . . . . . | . . . . | .See Nymphios. |
|  | Nikephorios | K'ałirt' R. <br> Sit'it'ma R. |  | CM Pf |  |
|  |  | Batmansuyu |  |  |  |
| Oltuçayi |  | Bol $\chi^{\text {a }}$ R. | G. 493 | U. 324 C III |  |
|  |  |  | $40^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \times 41^{\mathbf{0} 40^{\prime}}$ | AA 6 |  |
| Palin R. |  | Perisuyu | E. 76 | E. G-3 |  |
|  |  | Miws Gayl R. Keli R. |  |  |  |
| Perisuyu |  | Pałin R. | G. 510 | U. 340 A IV | See Ch. I n. 25. |
|  |  | Miws Gayl R. | $38^{\circ} 50^{\prime} \times 39^{\circ} 35^{\prime}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Keli R. |  |  |  |
|  |  | Ličik R. |  |  |  |
| Piramis | - • • | - • . . . | - • . . | - . | .See Pyramus. |

Piramis .See Pyramus.

| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pontos Euxeinos |  | Black S. | E. 78 | E. B2-B4 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Da-Oa |  |
| Pulat dere |  | Aksar |  | U. 324 D III |  |
| Pülk çayi |  |  | G. 517 | U. 340 Al |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{0} 51{ }^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 07{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Pyramus R. | Piramis | Ceyhan nehri |  | CM Jg-Kf |  |
| Rah R. |  | Axuryan | E. 78 | E. B-5 |  |
|  |  | Arpa çayi |  |  |  |
|  |  | Kars R. |  |  |  |
| Saris su | - . . - | . . . . . . | . | - • • • | . See Göksu nehri. |
| Saromsuyu |  | Lice R. ? | G. 541 | U. 340 A III |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{02} 21^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 54{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sarsap deresi |  |  | G. 541 | U. 341 B IV |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{02} 1^{\prime} \times 37^{0} 13^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sarus R. | Saris su | Göksu nehri |  | CM Jf-Jg |  |
| Scylax R. |  | Çekerek irmaği | E. 81 | E. B-2 |  |
|  |  |  |  | CM Je |  |
| Serçeme deresi |  |  | G. 550 | U. 324 C IV |  |
|  |  |  | $39^{0} 56^{\prime} \times 40^{0} 45^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Sevan L. |  | Gełakuneace S. | E. 47 | E. B-6 |  |
|  |  | Lychnitis L. |  | AA 7 |  |
| Sit'it'ma R. | Sit'ma |  |  |  | See K'akirt' R. |
| Spautan S. |  | - . . . . | - . ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | . . . . | . See Urmiah L. |
| Talori deresi |  |  | G. 582 | U. 340 A III |  |
|  |  |  | $38^{0} 12^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 10^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Tatta L. |  | Tuz gölü |  | CM He | See Ch. IV n. 7. |
| Thospitis L | - • - | . . . . . | - • - . | - . - . | . See Van L. |
| Tigris R. |  | Dicle nehri | G. 597 | CM Pe Of |  |
|  |  | Dklat R. | $31^{0} 00^{\prime} \times 47^{0} \mathbf{2 5}{ }^{\prime}$ | AA 6 |  |
|  |  |  | E. 86 | E. G-4 |  |


| NAME | VARIANT | EQUIVALENT | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tlmut R. |  | Ak çayi <br> Maku çay <br> Zanginiardere | E. 86 | E. G-6 <br> AA 105 |  |
| Tortum çayi |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 604 \\ & 40^{\circ} 47^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } 324 \text { C III } \\ & \text { AA } 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Tortum gölü |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 604 \\ & 40^{\circ} 47^{\prime} \times 41^{0} 42^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 C III |  |
| Tuz gölü |  | Tatta L. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 610(2) \\ & 38^{0} 45^{\prime} \times 33^{0} 25^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Tuzlasuyu |  | Mananati R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 610 \\ & 39^{\circ} 43^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ} 16^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } 340 \text { A I } \\ & \text { AA } 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Urcajor R. |  | Vedi R. | E. 76 | E. G-6 |  |
| Urmiah L. |  | Kapudan S . Kapautan S. Spautan S. | E. 58 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. D-6 } \\ & \text { AA } 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Van L. |  | Bznuneaç S. <br> Thospitis L | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. } 620 \\ & 38^{\circ} 33^{\prime} \times 42^{0} 46^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 340 B IV | See Ch. XI n. 56. |
| Varšak springs |  |  |  |  | See Ch. XI n. 21. |
| Vedi R. |  | Urcajor R. |  | AA 7 |  |
| Voh | Yoh | Akampsis R. <br> Boas R. <br> Çoruh nehri <br> Kakamar R. | E. 32, 84 | E. B-4 | See Ch. III n. 24a. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Xabor . . . } \\ & \text { Xošab R. } \end{aligned}$ | - . . | Hayoc jor R. <br> Hoşap suyu | E. 62 | E. G-5 | . See Khābūr R. |
| Yenice irmaği |  | Zamantisuyu <br> Karmalas R. ? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 658 \\ & 37^{\circ} 36^{\prime} \times 35^{\circ} 35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 341 C I |  |
| Yeşil irmaği |  | Iris R. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { G. } 643 \\ & 41^{0} 24^{\prime} \times 36^{0} 35^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | U. 324 D IV |  |


| LOCALITY | VARIANTS | EQUIVALENTS | REFERENCES | MAPS | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yoh <br> Zab R. | . . . . | . . . | - . . . | . | . See Voh. |
|  |  | Mec Zaw | G. 657 | AA 6 |  |
|  |  |  | $36^{0} 00^{\prime} \times 43{ }^{0} 21^{\prime}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | E. 66 | E. D-5 |  |
| Zamanti suyu | - • - | . . . . - | - | . . | . See Yenice irmaǧi. |
| Zanga. <br> Zanginiardere | . . . . | - • • • • | . . . . . |  | . See Hrazdan R. |
|  |  | Maku çay |  | AA 7 |  |
|  |  | Tłmut R. |  |  |  |
| Zegam R Ziban Tigris | - • . . | . . . . . . | - . . . | - - | . See Jegam. |
|  | . . . . | - | - | - . | . See Tigris. |

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE *

Since the original bibliography of Armenia in the Period of Justinian has of necessity become obsolete after the passage of more than half a century, and its form did not correspond to modern standards, this Bibliographical Note and the Bibliography which follows it are an attempt to indicate to the reader some of the major studies which have appeared since its publication. The vastness of Adontz's interests and the expansion of Armenian, Byzantine and Iranian studies in the intervening period preclude any suggestion of bibliographical completeness, so that only the most general outline has been attempted here. Wherever possible, more recent works subsuming earlier scholarship and bibliography have been listed to remain within manageable bounds. Consequently, a number of familiar works have had to be omitted. A number of more specialized studies will be found in the Bibliography and in the relevant notes. In all these cases, however, numerous lacunae of which the editor remains painfully a ware must strike the various specialists. At best, therefore, this Note is intended as an introduction to the student, and not as a guide to the experienced scholar.

Before turning to the works of other specialists, we should note that Adontz, himself, developed and reworked much of the material found in Armenia in the Period of Justinian in a number of subsequent studies many of which will be found listed below in the Bibliography. For a more extensive listing, both the obituary article in Handēs Amsorya, LXI (May, 1947) and the bibliography in the Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientale et slave of the Université Libre de Bruxelles, IV (1936) should be consulted as well as the article of K. Yuzbašyan in PBH (1962/4).

The single most relevant work at present for the study of Armenia in the Period of Justinian is unquestionably Cyril Toumanoff's Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown, 1963) in which he has expanded and re-worked most of the subjects treated earlier by Adontz, with the possible exception of the Armenian Church which

[^47]is discussed only tangentially. Toumanoff's extensive work on the history, geography and particularly the social structure of ancient and mediaeval Armenia, as well as of Transcaucasia, provides in one sense a new edition of Armenia in the Period of Justinian incorporating both the subsequent scholarship and the necessary revisions. Hence, Adontz's work now benefits by being read in conjunction with Toumanoff's attendant commentary.

## I. The Sources

In a number of cases the sources cited by Adontz have received more satisfactory editions, and for several classical works he relied on the obsolescent Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, even though both Theophanes the Confessor and Theophylakt Simokattes had already appeared in the preferable editions of C. de Boor (1883 and 1887). To these should now be added A. Pertusi's edition of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' de Thematibus (1952) and Moravcsik, Jenkins, et al.'s publication of the same emperor's de Administrado Imperio (1949, 1962). The Mommsen, Krüger, et al. edition of the Corpus Juris Civilis has become standard despite some of the misgivings voiced by Adontz, and where it is available, the Conciliar documentation is probably better cited according to Schwartz's Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum (1914) than according to Mansi. There are better editions of several of the Episcopal Notitiae than the one of Pinder and Parthey, as was already observed by Louis Robert, Villes d'Asie Mineure, pp. 428 sqq., and Honigmann's Le Synekdemos d'Hieroklès et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypre (1939) should now be consulted on both these treatises. Finally, Miller's Itineraria Romana (1916) is the standard edition for the Itinerarium Antonini and the Tabula Peutingeriana. Although the volumes of the Loeb Classical Library are of variable quality and in numerous instances to be checked against the critical edition of the text, they provide a convenient and generally accurate English translation of the original; when available, however, the French translations in the parallel Budé series are often preferable.

In the case of Syriac sources such as Ephraem Syrus, John of Ephesus, or Ps. Zacharias of Mitylene, the versions published in the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium have superseded earlier ones.

Armenian sources unfortunately continue to lack critical editions in far too many instances; moreover, such editions as " Agat'angelos", Movsēs Kałankatwac̣, and Movsēs Xorenac̣i (Tiflis, 1909, 1912, 1913), Mal $\chi$ asyanc̣'s Sebëos (Erevan, 1939), and Abrahamyan's Yovhannēs Mamikonean (Erevan, 1941), are still difficultly obtainable, and were regrettably inaccessible to this editor. Nevertheless, a number of new editions have replaced those used by Adontz: Akinian's Koriwn (Vienna, 1952), Ter Minaseanc̣'s Etišē (Erevan, 1957), Melik' - Ohanǰanyan's Kirakos Ganjakec̣i, (Erevan, 1961), Yuzbašyan's Aristakēs Lastivertci (Erevan, 1963). A new version of Yakovb Karnec̣i is to be found in volume II of Hakobyan's Minor Chronicles of the XIIIXVIII C. (1958), and the first volume of the Armenian Book of Canons containing the Canons of St. Sahak, appeared in 1964. The so-called Diegesis or Narratio de Rebus Armeniae, which Adontz preferred to cite in his own copy of the MS rather than according to the Combefisius' edition fathered by Migne simultaneously on the elusive "Isaac Katholikos" ( $P G$ CXXXII) and Philip the Solitary ( $P G$ CXXVII), has now received the excellent edition of Garitte in the CSCO (1952).

Translations of Armenian sources into western languages, with the outstanding exception of Dowsett's The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movsēs Dasxuranci (1961) and his Penitential of Dawit' of Ganjak in the CSCO (1961), have hardly changed since Adontz's time, and remain almost uniformely unsatisfactory.

Considerable epigraphic material unavailable to Adontz has come to light in recent years. The pre-Armenian, Urartian period has been illuminated by Melikishvili's edition and translation of the Urartian inscriptions, Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi (1960), complemented by D'iakonov's Urartskie pis'ma i dokumenty (1963) and his " Assyro-Babylonian Sources on the History of Urartu ", VDI (1951). The Armavir inscriptions of the formerly unidentified ErwandianOrontid rulers of Armenia, some of the Aramaic inscriptions of the Artaxiad dynasty, and the Garni inscription of king Trdat III, together with a number of other epigraphic sources, have been collected in K. Trever's Ocherki po istorii kultury drevnei Armenii (1953). The Nemrud dağ inscriptions of the kings of Kommagenē, whom Toumanoff has linked with the Zariadrid dynasty of Sophenē, are found in Jalabert and Mouterde, Inscriptions de Syrie, I, until the expected publication of the final report on Nimrud dag by T. Goell and F.K. Dörner,
and a list of the more recently discovered Artaxiad Aramaic inscriptions is given by Perikhanian in her latest article in the $R E A$ (1966). Three volumes of the Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum are now out (1960, 1966, 1967), and such collection of foreign sources on Armenia as Melik'set'-Bek, Georgian Sources concerning Armenia and the Armenians (1934, 1936, 1955) and Nalbandian, Arabic Sources Concerning Armenian and the Neighbouring Lands (1965), should likewise be consulted.

The great Sasanian inscriptions, whose discovery has greatly affected Armenian chronology especially in the third century, are to be found in the following publications: Herzfeld, Paikuli (1924), Nyberg, Häд̌j̄ääbäd (1945), Sprengling, Third Century Iran (1953), and Maricq, Res Gestae Divi Saporis (1958) which contains the earlier bibliography. For the earlier Achemenian inscriptions, the standard text at present is Kent, Old Persian (1953). Finally, the Greek and Latin inscriptions found in Armenia and Pontus were collected by Anderson, Cumont and Grégoire in Studia Pontica, III (1910).

Adontz was acutely aware of the fact that all hypotheses on Armenian history and culture were, of necessity, only as sound as the sources on which they were based, and he turned repeatedly to this problem both in Armenia in the Period of Justinian, and in subsequent studies. Nevertheless, the status of many crucial Armenian literary sources remains equivocal and controversial at best. The most convenient introduction to the multiple problems of this subject is found in M. Abełyan's Hayoc hin grakanut'yan Patmut'iwn (1944, 1946), but this work should be complemented in most cases, since Abełyan's views have not been invariably shared by his colleagues. The most convenient resumé of the continuing controversy over the date and purpose of the History attributed to Movsēs Xorenac̣i in which Adontz actively participated is given by Toumanoff in his Studies, and his recent article in $H A$ (1961). On the various problems of the compilation traditionally associated with the name of Agat'angełos, but for which recent scholars tend to prefer the descriptive title of Gregorian Cycle, the fundamental study is Garitte's admirable Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange (1946), now complemented by his study in $A B$ (1965). A resumé of the literature on the Armenian Geography formerly attributed to Movsēs Xorenac̣i can be found in Eremyan's Hayastan est "Ašzarhacoyc" (1963) and in Hewsen's useful abstract in the REA (1965). On the so-called Anonymous or Primary History of Armenia, usually found in conjunction with the History of Sebēos, see Adontz's own
study, Markwart in Ca (1930), Malqasyanc̣ in VV (1949) Abgaryan, Sebëosi Patmut'iwn (1965) and Toumanoff, Studies. On Koriwn's Life of Mesrop Maštoc, see once again Adontz's work, Akinian in $H A$ (1949), and the collections of articles on Mesrop Maštoc published by the Armenian Academy of Sciences (1962) and the University of Erevan (1963). On P'awstos Buzand, see Excursus U in Stein's Histoire du Bas Empire, II (1949), on Elišē, Akinian's numerous articles in $H A$ (1931-1937, 1950-1951), on Łewond, likewise Akinian, HA (1929). On Sebēos, the most recent extensive study is Abgaryan's Sebēosi Patmut'iwn (1965), though Abgaryan's conclusions have not been definitively accepted. On the alteration of the date of U $\chi$ tanēs' History of Armenia, see Peeters, "Sainte Sousanik" in $A B$ (1935), on Movsēs Kałankatwac̣i or Das $\chi$ uranc̣i, Akinian, HA (1952, 1956-1958) and Dowsett, History of the Caucasian Albanians (1961). On the Treatise attributed to Eznik the Priest, see Akinian's answer to Adontz, HA (1938). Finally the Code of M $\chi$ it'ar Gōš and its relationship with other such works has attracted considerable attention e.g. Samuēlean, Muit'ar Göši Datastanagirk'n (1911), Tigranian, IKIAI (1925), Kiwlēserean, HA (1926), Harut'yunyan's Introduction to Papovian's translation, Armianskii Sudebnik Mkhitara Gosha (1954), Galstyan in his edition of Smbat Sparapet's Datastanagirk' (1958), Pivazyan, $B M$ (1960), and T'orosyan, $B M$ (1962). See also Mécérian, BA (1947-1948), and Pigulevskaia's article on the Syrian Lawcode, UZL (1952). As in all cases of actively controverted subjects, all these interpretations and the bibliography must remain provisional.

## II. Geography

Adontz's book was composed at a time when Hübschmann's great study, Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen (1904) had already appeared as had the earlier works of Lehmann-Haupt and of Markwart. The later publications of these authors should, however, be consulted, especially Lehmann-Haupt's Armenian einst und jetzt (1910-1931) and Markwart's Skizzen zur historischen Topographie (1928), Suidarmenien und die Tigrisquellen (1930), and his recently published MS on the province of Parskahayk' in REA (1966).

The major recent study of the eastern frontier of the Byzantine Empire is Honigmann's Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches (1935), and a systematic attempt not only to identify and locate,
but also to estimate the territory of the various districts and provinces mentioned in the Armenian Geography has been presented in Eremyan's Hayastan ast "Aš̌arhaçoyc" (1963). Wherever possible the multiple articles of Barthold and of Minorsky in the $E I$ should likewise be consulted as well as Hakobyan's Aš̌arhagrut'yun (1968).

The topographical information provided by the various Itineraries crossing Armenia has been studied by Miller, Itineraria Romana (1916), and with a more precise focus on their sections dealing with Armenia, by Eremyan, VDI (1939), and Manandian, Manr hetazotut'yunner (1932), Hayastani glxavor čanaparhnera (1936), and the Trade and Cities of Armenia (1944).

Considerable information on Armenian ecclesiastical geography, as well as on secular topography, is provided in Honigmann's other studies, particularly in his notes to the Synekdemos of Hierokles, in Evêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie Antérieure (1951), and in the article on the location of Romanopolis, which appeared in his Trois mémoires posthumes (1961). The same is true of Garitte's commentaries to both the Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange, and the Narratio de rebus Armeniae.

In addition to these works, information on Armenian geography is also found in Ruge's articles in PW, Minorsky's "Transcaucasia", $J A(1930)$ and his notes to the Hudud al-'Alam (1937), Kanayeanc, Anyayt gawarner hin Hayastani (1914), Manandian, Hin Hayastani mi k'ani problemneri masin (1944), and Patmakan-Aš̌arhagrakan manr hetazotut'yunner (1945), Dashian's articles on the western borderlands of Armenia, HA (1937-1945), Appendix X of Goubert's Byzance et l'Orient, I (1951), Canard's, Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdanides, I (1951).

For the peripheral lands discussed by Adontz as being at times part of Armenia, see, in addition to the notes in the Hudud al-'Alam, Minorsky's History of Sharvän and Darband (1958) and Barthold's earlier Mesto prekaspiiskikh oblastei (1924), for the Caspian districts; Pigulevskaya, Mesopotamiia na rubezhe V-VI vv. (1940), Honigmann, Die Ostgrenze, Evêques et évêchés, and Le Couvent de Barsauma (1954), as well as Canard, Histoire des H'amdanides, and Dillman's article in $S$ (1961) together with his La Haute-Mesopotamie orientale (1961), for Mesopotamia and north Syria; Honigmann's Ostgrenze, and his article "Kommagene", $P W$, IV, Dashian's articles in $H A$ (19371945), Pertusi's commentary on Costantino Porfirogenito de Thema-
tibus (1952), and Tiracean's article on Kommagenē in IANA (1956), on the west; and finally, Markwart's Skizzen, Honigmann, Ostgrenze, Manadian, The Trade and Cities of Armenia, Excursus II in Mnc̣akanyan's Alvanic Aš̌arhi ... šurja (1966), and Hakobyan's Siuniki T'agavorut'yuna (1966), for the northern borders.

Throughout the area studied by Adontz, the problem of the toponymy remains a nightmare for the investigator. Western Asia Minor has received considerable attention lately in the many studies of Louis Robert, but the east of the peninsula remains well nigh terra incognita, especially since maps of this area are generally either totally inadequate or unobtainable as classified military information. The survival of ancient Urartian toponyms in Armenian is discussed by Banateanu, HA (1961), Wittek's article on the transition from Byzantine to Turkish Toponymy, $B$ (1935) is very useful, and the Department of the Interior's Gazetteer No. 46 : Turkey provides coordinates for most sites together with the version of their name as of ca. 1960, but a systematic concordance of ancient and modern toponyms, and particularly of their recent, multiple, and rapidly changing avatars is an imperative necessity.

## III. Philology

Armenian linguistics and philology have been until now the most active fields of Armenology. Consequently, there can be no question of attempting to give here a review of the extensive literature which has been added to this subject, all the more so because of Adontz's generally peripheral treatment thereof.

The first edition of Meillet's Grammaire comparée de l'Arménien classiques appeared as early as 1902, though Adontz gives no indication of his being familiar with it as he was with the works of both Hübschmann and de Lagarde. Of Meillet's other works and Benveniste's constant studies in $B S L, R E A, H A$, etc., such studies as Meillet's "Quelques mots parthes", REA (1922), Benveniste's "Titres iraniens en Arménien ", REA (1929), and Titres et noms propres en Iranien ancien (1966) should be mentioned here as directly relevant to Adontz's interpretation of naxarar terminology, as is Dowsett's challenge of the etymologies proposed by him for such terms as tēr, tikin, in the Mémorial du Centenaire de l'École des langues
orientales anciennes of the Institut Catholique (1964). In view of Dowsett's query of Adontz's capacities as a philologist, of Benvenist's suggestion of an Iranian origin for such a term as awžit, which Adontz derived from Syriac, and of the growing evidence for the close connexion between mediaeval Armenian and Parthian, the linguistic aspects of Armenia in the Period of Justinian should probably be revised in the light of new scholarship.

For the characteristics of Classical Armenian and its development, see in addition to Meillet's Grammaire comparée, Karst, Geschichte der armenischen Philologie (1930), Ačaryan, Liakatar k'erakanut'yun Hayoc lezvi (1955), and Benveniste, BSL (1959) on phonetics and syntax. On the evolution of the language, see Akinian, $H A$ (1932), Łap'anc̣yan, Hayoc lezvi patmut'iwn (1961), Łazaryan, Hayoc grakan lezvi patmut'iwn (1961), and Manandian's Yunaban dproca (1928), on the influence of the Hellenistic school. When possible, Ačaryan's difficultly procurable Hayerēn armatakan bararan (1926-1935), should also be consulted, even though not all of his etymologies have proved acceptable.

On the origin of Armenian and its relationship with other IndoEuropean and non Indo-European languages, see Łap'anc̣an $K$ proiskhozhdeniiu Armianskogo iasyka (1946), and the articles in his Istorikolingvisticheskie raboty (1956) together with the objections of D'iakonov, "Khetty, Frigiitsy i Armiane ", Peredneaziatskii Sbornik (1961), as well as Haas, HA (1961). For the classification of Armenian within the Indo-European system, see Pedersen, Le groupement des dialectes indo-européens (1925), Solta, Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprache (1960), and Garibian's report to the XXV Congress of Orientalists (1960). On the relations of Armenian and Iranian, see Meillet, $R E A$ (1921), Benveniste, HA (1927) and REA (1964), Bolognesi, Le fonti dialettali degli imprestiti iranici in Armeno (1960), and his article in $H A$ (1961); for Armenian and Phrygian, Haas, $H A$ (1939), and Bonfante, $A Q$ (1946). See also Deeters, "Armenisch und Südkaukasisch" (1926-1927), Vogt, NT (1938), and for Marr's highly controversial theory, Thomas, The Linguistic Theories of N. Ja. Marr (1957). Finally, for a survey of the work of the Institute of Linguistics of the Armenian SSR, see Kostanyan, VIA (1958).

## IV. Rome and Iran

For works relating to Armenia see below section V.
On the administrative system of the Later Roman Empire and its eastern provinces, the main general works at present are Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor (1950), Jones, The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces (1937), and The Later Roman Empire (1964), although Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (1926), Broughton, Roman Asia Minor (1938), Pigagnol, L'Empire chrétien (1947), and Palanque's edition of Stein's Histoire du Bas Empire (1949, 1959), should also be consulted. For the post-Justinianic period, as well as the earlier one, the most recent Byzantine histories, such as Ostrogorsky's History of the Byzantine State (1957) and the new edition of volume IV of the Cambridge Medieval History, are the most convenient references.

For a more recent discussion of Diocletian's reforms and eastern policy, and the pre-Justinianic administration of the Armenian territories, see Costa's article in the Dizionnario Epigrafico (1912), Seston, Dioclétien (1946) Cumont's "L’annexion ... de la Petite Arménie ", in Anatolian Studies (1923), and Ensslin's "Zur Ostpolitik des Kaiser's Diokletians", $S B A W$ (1952). On Diocletian's military system, see Nischer's article in the JRS (1923), and van Berchem, L'armée de Dioclétien (1952); on the praetorian prefecture: Stein, Untersuchung über das Officium Prätorianerpräfektur (1922), Palanque, Essai sur la préfecture du prétoire (1933), and de Laet, ARBEL (1946-1947); and on the fiscal policy: Pigagnol, L'Impôt de capitation sous le BasEmpire Romain (1916), Déléage, La Capitation du Bas-Empire (1945), and Karayannopoulos, Das Finanzwesen des frühbyzantinischen Staates (1958).

On the period of Justinian, the latest major study is volume I of Rubin's Das Zeitalter Iustinians (1960), but Palanque's edition of volume II of Stein's Histoire du Bas-Empire (1949) should also be consulted, as well as Vasiliev's Justin I (1950), Pigulevskaia's Mesopotamia na rubezhe V-VI vv. (1940), and Hannestad's articles on the relations with Transcaucasia and Central Asia in $B$ (1955-1957), for the immediate background of the reign. On Justinian's legal activities, see Collinet, Etudes historiques sur le droit de Justinien I (1912).

For the partition of A.D. 591 and the relations of Maurice and Xusrō II, see Goubert, Byzance et l'Orient (1951) and his preliminary
article in $B$ (1949), Higgins' The Persian Wars of the Emperor Maurice (1939), with the clarification of the problem of chronology, and his article in the $C H R$ (1941) on "International Relations at the close of the Sixth Century ", also Minorsky's article in BSOAS (1945), Pigulevskaia's Vizantiia i Iran na rubezhe VI i VII vekov (1946), and Iskanyan, PBH (1960, 1963).

On the still disputed problem of the Byzantine Themes and the date of their appearance, see the article of Baynes, in the $E H R$ (1952), Ensslin, BZ (1953), Pertusi, Aevum (1954), Ostrogorsky, B (1954), Dölger, Historia (1955), again Pertusi and Ostrogorsky in the Acts of the XI International Congress of Byzantine Studies (1958), and particularly the book of Karayannopoulos, Die Entstehung der byzantinischen Themenordnung (1959) which contains a historiographical survey. On the similarity of the Byzantine administrative re-organization and the Sasanian reforms of the sixth century, see Stein, $B N J$ (1920) and his review of Christensen's first edition of L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Le Muséon (1940), as well as Christensen's own acceptance of Stein's thesis in the second edition of his work (1944), excursus II. This thesis has, however been rejected by most recent Byzantinists among them Ostrogorsky, Pertusi, and Karayannopoulos.

On Early Iranian studies in general, see Henning's Bibliography of Important Studies on Old Iranian Subjects (1950). Minorsky's articles in $A O$ (1932-1951), and Frye's The Heritage of Persia (1963), which gives a good summary of recent interpretations together with useful bibliographical notes, particularly for Russian publications. For surveys of Iranian monuments and inscriptions see Henning, Mitteliranisch (1959), and Vander Bergh, L'Archéologie de l'Iran ancien (1959).

On the successive periods of Iranian history relevant to Adontz's discussion, see, for the pre-Persian era, D'iakonov, Istoriia Medii (1956) and Aliev, Midiia - drevneishee gosudarstvo na teritorii Azerbaidzhana (1956), and for the Achaemenians: Echtécham's L'Iran sous les Achéménides (1946), Olmstead's posthumously published, Persian Empire (1948): and Leuze's Die Satrapien (1935). Much still remains to be done on the Seleucid-Parthian periods despite Tarn's " SeleucidParthian Studies", in PBA (1930), Bikerman's, Les Institutions des Seleucides (1938), the vast material accumulated in the notes to Rostovtzeff's Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World (1941), the appearance of Debevoise's Political History of Parthia (1938),
and particularly of Wolski's articles in Eos (1946, 1954), the Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences (1947), and Ber. (1956-1957). Numerous studies on the archaeological finds at Nisa and their evidence as to the nature of early Parthian society have been published in the Soviet Union: e.g. Masson, VDI (1950), D'iakonov and Livshits, Dokumenty iz Nisy (1960), VDI (1960), Sbornik v Chest' Akad. I.A. Orbeli (1960), and new material is constantly appearing. On the contacts between the Parthian Arsacids and Rome, see Dobias' article in Archiv Orientalni (1931), and the recent synthesis by Bokshanin, Parfiani i Rim (1960).

For the Sasanians, the locus classicus is still the second edition of Christensen's L'Iran sous les Sassanides (1944), although the various studies on the inscriptions should also be consulted, especially Honigmann and Maricq, Recherches sur les Res Gestae Divi Saporis (1953), and Sprengling's critique of earlier accounts of Sāhpuhr I's campaigns in his Iran in the Third Century (1953). On the early period see also Taquizadeh, BSOAS, XI (1943-1946), Frye, in the Studi dedicated to Levi della Vida (1956), and Lukonin, Iran v epokhu pervykh Sasanidov (1961). On the wars against the Romans, see in addition to the studies listed above in reference to the partition of 591, Olmstead, CP (1942), Rostovtzeff, Ber. (1943), Caratelli, La Parola del Passato (1947), and Ensslin, SBAW (1947), all on the activities of Sāhpuhr I, together with their critique by Sprengling in Third Century Iran. On the Sasanian north and west frontier, see also Eremyan, IAFAN (1941) and Nyberg, in the Studia dedicated to Bernhard Karlgren (1959). Finally on the administration of the empire, see, in addition to Christensen, Stein's earlier article in $B N J$ (1920) and his review of Christensen in Le Muséon (1940).

Duchesne-Guillemin's La religion de l'Iran ancien (1962) provides a convenient introduction to the subject, but see also: Unvala, Observations on the Religion of the Parthians (1925), Jackson, Zoroastrian Studies (1928), Bidez and Cumont, Les mages hellenisés (1938), Sprengling, " Kartir" AJSL (1940), Wikander, Feuerpriester in Kleinasiens und Iran (1946), Widengren, Numen (1956) and Les religions de l'Iran (1968), Chaumont, RHR (1960), Zaehner, The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism (1961), Benveniste, JA (1964), and on Kartir's missionary activity, de Menasce, $A E H E$ (1956).

For the Iranian social structure and its bases, see Benveniste's articles, $J A(1932,1938)$, Le vocabulaire (1969) and Dumézil's controver-
sial thesis in Naissance d'archanges (1945), and L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens (1958); on existing institutions, Mazahéri, La famille iranienne (1938), Henning, JRAS (1953), Wolski's article on the Arsacid period, Eos (1954) and Widengren's " Recherches sur le féodalisme iranien", OS (1956). Finally, on the system of taxation and the lower classes of society, see Fateh, BSOAS (1938), Solodukho, SV (1948), Perikhanian, VDI (1952), Pigulevskaia, VDI (1937), and Les villes de l'état iranien (1963), and Altheim and Stiehl's highly controversial Ein asiatischer Staat (1954).

## V. Armenia

Despite the passage of more than half a century, no satisfactory general history of Armenia has appeared in a western language since the publication of Armenia in the Period of Justinian. De Morgan's Histoire du peuple arménien (1919) and Grousset's Histoire de l' Arménie (1947) are on the whole disappointing, or too old to incorporate recent discoveries. In spite of its great value for reference purposes, Toumanoff's Studies in Christian Caucasian History, provides no systematic historical treatment, as is evident from its title. The most useful general history of ancient and medieval Armenia at present consequently is Manandian's K'nnakan tesut'yun Hay zolovrdi patmut'yan (1945-1952), and for the Roman period, Asdourian's Die politischen Beziehungen zwischen Armenien und Rom (1911), although it too requires rectification on a number of points. See also Sarkisian's bibliographical survey, VDI (1967).

On the periodization of Armenian history presented by Adontz, see the critique of Manandian, Feodalism hin Hayastanum (1934) and The Trade and Cities of Armenia (1944), and Toumanoff, Studies, as well as the suggestions of Eremyan in VI (1951).

Armenian chronology is still studded with problems and contradictions even on such crucial points as the date of the Christianization of the country, a point on which Adontz, himself proposed a revision in his subsequent study " Les vestiges d'un ancien culte en Arménie ", AIPHO (1936). A number of corrections in the chronology were already made by Asdourian in his Beziehungen, and for the third century A.D., the studies of Maricq, $S(1955,1957)$ and Kasuni, Akos (1957) have helped bring a modicum of precision into a picture
which is still extremely confused. For the date of Diocletian's reestablishment of Trdat III on the throne of Armenia, the evidence of the Sasanian inscriptions must now be taken into consideration, cf. Herzfeld, Paikuli, Sprengling, Third Century Iran, HonigmannMaricq, Recherches, and Eremyan's relation of this material to Armenia, $P B H$ (1966). For the period of the Christian Arsacids, see the major revision proposed by Baynes, $E H R$ (1910), which has not, however, been accepted by all scholars, and on particular events, Peeters, "L'Intervention politique de Constance II ", $A R B B L$ (1931), "Le début de la persecution de Sapor", REA (1921). as well as the notes and commentary in Garitte's Documents pour l'étude du livre d'Agathange and the Narratio de rebus Armeniae. The most recent discussion of Armenian fourth century chronology, hinging on the date of the Christianization of Armenia, has been given by Ananian, Le Muséon (1961), who includes a résumé of other theses, but holds to the general chronological framework of Manandian and Garitte, rejecting Baynes' revision.

The period of Armenian history which has benefitted from the most attention of late, is the earliest pre-Christian era of which Adontz regretted the almost total ignorance in Armenia in the Period of Justinian, but to which he too devoted himself in his last major work, Histoire d'Arménie (1946). The enormous quantity of material uncovered by Urartian archaeology, complemented by the deciphering of the Urartian inscription, cannot even be broached in a brief introduction such as this. The most convenient summaries of the scholarship and bibliography of the subject can be found in Piotrovskii, Vanskoe Tsarstvo (1959), Melikishvili, Nairi-Urartu (1954), Manandian, $O$ nekotorykh spornykh problemakh (1956), Lap'anc̣ean, IstorikoLingvisticheskie raboty (1957), and van Loon, Urartian Art (1966), but the constant publication of new excavation reports and articles make all syntheses rapidly obsolete and the periodical literature must invariably be consulted. For the ethnographic pattern of early Armenia and the neighbouring lands, see below section VII.

On the Achaemenid and Hellenistic periods, our knowledge has likewise been radically altered by Manandian's identification of the native Erwandian-Orontid dynasty, cf. Manandian, The Trade and Cities of Armenia (1944) and Trever's Ocherki po istorii kultury drevnei Armenii (1953), which contains most of the relevant inscriptions. For the development of Manandian's thesis, and the link between
the Orontids, the Zariadrids of Sophenē, and the dynasts of Kommagenē commemorated in the Nimrud-dağ inscriptions, see Toumanoff's Studies in Christian Caucasian History, which incorporates the material and conclusions of earlier articles, and Sargisyan, Hellenistakan darašrjani Hayastana (1966). See also Tiracyan in IANA (1956), and his report to the XXVth Congress of Orientalists (1960). The discovery of the Aramaic inscriptions of the Artaxiads have also suggested the need for a re-evaluation of the nature of both the Artaxiad and the Zariadrid dynasties in relation to each other and to the contemporary powers, $c f$. in addition to the works of Toumanoff and Trever already mentioned, Perikhanian's article, REA (1966) for the recent bibliography.

For Armenia's history as a buffer state between the Romans and the Persians, see the following studies in addition to Asdourian's Beziehungen and the relevant works listed in section IV: on the reign of Tigran II and the distorting image given by Roman sources- Manandian, Tigran II i Rim (1943), as well as Eckhardt, K (1909-1910), Güze, $K$ (1926), Manandian, VDI (1939, 1940); on the wars of Nero ending in the compromise peace of Rhandeia, Schur- $K(1923,1925)$, Kudriavtsev, VDI (1948, 1949); and for Trajan's temporary annexa-tion- Lepper, Trajan's Parthian War (1948). On the period of the Christian Arsacids, see, in addition to the works already mentioned under chronology, Akinian. $H A$ (1935), Ensslin, $K$ (1936), Stein, Histoire du Bas-Empire, I (1959), and Doise, REAnc. (1945), for the fourth century; Mécérian, BA (1953), Eremyan, VDI (1953), and Iskanyan, $P B H$ (1966), for the Persian war of 450-451; and Goubert, Byzance et l'Orient, on the period of Maurice.

## VI. The Church

On the general history of the early Church and its institutions touched upon in Adontz's discussion, the most convenient survey is still Fliche and Martin, Histoire de l'Église (1946), and on specific points, the $D T C$ and $D H G E$ are useful as are Grumel's Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople (1932). See also Stein, ZNW (1935) and Dvornik, The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium (1958).

On the first œcumenical councils and their participants, Laurent's " Les sources à consulter ", EO (1931), Honigmann's valuable articles
in $B(1939,1944)$, and his Patristic Studies (1953), must be consulted, as well as Schwartz's study in $A B A W M$ (1937) and the Prosopographia and Topographia which he included in volume II-vi of the $A C O$. On the Council of Chalcedon in particular, see the collection of articles in Grillmeier and Bacht, Das Konzil von Chalkedon (1951-1954), Sellers, The Council of Chalcedon (1961), and in its relation to Armenia, Sarkissian, The Council of Chalcedon and Armenia (1965).

On the geography of the eastern church, Schwartz's and Monigmann's above mentioned articles are indispensable, as are Honigmann's notes to the Synekdemos of Hierokles, and his Evêques et évêchés monophysites (1951), Le Couvent de Barsauma (1954), and Trois mémoires posthumes (1961). Peeter's Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientates (1951), and his articles in $A B$, some of which are included in the preceeding collection, as well as Garitte's notes to "Agathangełos" and the Narratio are likewise essential.

For the Armenian Church, studies still begin with Ormanian's Azgapatum (1914-1927). Tournebize's Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie (1910) can occasionally be useful despite its age and bias, and Kogean's recent and controversial Hayoc Ekelecin, should also be consulted, but Mécérian's Histoire et institutions de l'Église arménienne (1965) has proved unexpectedly disappointing. All the works of Honigmann, Peeters, and particularly Garitte, already cited, are directly relevant for a study of early Armenian Christianity, as is Markwart's posthumous Die Entstehung der armenischen Bistïmer (1931). The most recent survey of the numerous points of controversy is given by van Esbroeck in $A B$ (1962). On the question of hereditary ecclesiastical estates, Perikhanian's study on pagan temple-estates, Khramovye Ob'edinenie (1959) is of considerable interest, albeit dealing exclusively with the pre-christian period.

## VII. The Naxarar System

As indicated at the beginning of this note, all future investigations of the Armenian naxarar system should begin with Toumanoff's extensive Studies in Christian Caucasian History (1963), and the studies of Iranian institutions and terminology mentioned above will invariably prove relevant.

For the early social structure of Transcaucasia and the neigh-
bouring lands, and the complicated ethnographic pattern of the area, the first section of Toumanoff's Studies may be complemented by a number of additional works: Hüsing's Die Völker Altkleinasiens und am Pontus (1933), Anderson, Alexander's Gate (1932), J̌avaגišvili's and Ušakov's articles in VDI (1939), Manandian's Hin Hayastani mi k'ani problemneri masin (1944), Eremyan, VI (1952), Fields' Contribution to the Anthropology of the Caucasus (1953), Aliev's article in the Sborntk v chest' Akad. I. A. Orbeli (1960), Melikishvili's report to the XXVth Congress of Orientalists (1960), and the collection of archaeological articles under the editorship of M. Mellink, Dark Ages and Nomads (1964). For recent studies of Armenia's northern borderlands, see Trever, Ocherki po istorii i kultury kavkazskoi Albanii (1959), the collection of articles on Albania published by the Academy of Sciences of the Azerbajanian SSR (1962), Mnac̣akanyan's Alvanic aš̌Xarhi ... šurj (1966), and Hakobyan's Syuniki T'agavorut'yuna (1966). On early Armenian society see Manandian IZ (1945) for the pre-Arsacid period and Eremyan IANA (1948) for the Hellenistic epoch.

The entire validity of Adontz's thesis of a similarity between the Armenian naxarar system and western feudalism hinges on the premise that the term "feudalism" may properly be applied to other than medieval european institutions. In recent years, however, this assumption has been both challenged and defended, and the definition of "feudalism" as a rigorously circumscribed term, or as a general stage of development has been hotly debated, especially between western and Marxist scholars. Cf. Coulborn, Feudalism in History (1956), and Kosminski, Problemy angliskogo feodalisma (1963). Moreover extensive new studies of western feudalism have altered the interpretation of this institution, so that a number of Adontz's conclusions rest on concepts no longer acceptable to scholars. Consequently, much of the argument in Adontz's last chapter must now be revised in the light of such studies of feudalism as Bloch's epochmaking La société féodale (1939), as well as more recent works such as Lot and Fawtier's Histoire des institutions francaises au Moyen-Age (1957-1958), Boutruche's Seigneurie et féodalité (1959), and Duby's L'économie rurale (1962). Although less directly related to Adontz's argument, the studies on Iranian "feudalism" and the Byzantine Themes, mentioned in section IV, as well as Ostrogorsky's Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine (1954), and Lemerle's series of articles
on Byzantine agrarian history in $R H$ (1958), provide valuable comparative material.

Adontz developed his views on the Armenian social structure in his later study "Aspect iranien du servage", (1937), and his comparison of the nađarar system to western feudalism was continued and elaborated by Manandian, Feodalism Hin Hayastanum (1934). Armenian medieval society has also been investigated by Kherumian, " Esquisse d'une féodalité oubliée ", (1948-1949), more recently in Sukıasyan's Obshchestvenno-politicheskii stroi i pravo Armenii (1963) and M.L. Chaumont JA (1966).

On Armenian medieval law, see the studies of the Codes of MXit'ar Gōs and Smbat Sparapet listed in section I, and works dealing with the Church, as well as Samuelyan's Hin Hay iravunk'i patmut'yun, I (1939), also the above mentioned studies of Manandian and Sukiasian, both of which give considerable attention to the regulations found in ecclesiastical canons.

The status of the lower classes of society has attracted a good deal of attention in recent years, both in general works, and in such specialized studies as Manandian's Ditolat'yunner hin Hayastani šinakanneri drut'yan masin (1925) and Nyut'er hin Hayastani tntesakan kyank'i patmut'yan (1928), Samuelyan's article in the Journal of the University of Erevan (1937), Hakobyan's in IANA (1948), and Eremyan's VD1 (1950), all on slavery, Eremyan's study of city-life, VDI (1953), Xac̣ikyan's survey of popular movements, P'ok'r Hayk'i socialakan šaržumnere (1951), Hakobyan's major work on the Armenian peasantry, Hay gyulaciut'yan patmut'yun (1957), and his articles PBH (1962, 1966).

Finally for the history of individual nazarar houses, see also Muyldermans, HA (1926), Scöld, REA (1929) and Mlaker, WZKM (1932), on the Mamikonean; Kogean, Kamsarakannera (1926); Markwart, Ca (1930) and Sahnazaryan, Bagratunyac naұararakan tohmi caguma (1948), on the Bagratids; Oskean, $H A$ (1952), on the Rštuni; and Bakhudarian in the Sbornik $v$ chest' Akad. I. A. Orbeli (1960), on the Arcruni.
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Note. All works have been listed according to the systems of abbremations used in the notes. For the sake of convenience, titles in Armenian and in Russian have been transliterated as well as translated.

All transliterations follow the systems indicated in the Preface to this edition. Diacritical marks have been used where required, but they have been disregarded insofar as English alphabetical order is concerned. In Armenian, the letter $\angle$ between two vowels has been rendered as $-w$-, e.g. $7 n \iota / \dot{\mu}=$ Dwin. The letter $\mu u=\chi$, although in Greek, the traditional transliteration, $\chi=c h$, has been preserved.

Familiar proper names have been given according to their traditional spelling, e.g. Dashian, rather than Tašean, and only one form has been used for each name irrespective of extant variants.

* This Bibliography incorporates both the works listed in the original Russian edition and those which appeared subsequently. Works marked with an asterisk are those which were listed in the original edition.


## I. Sources

Whenever available, the editions of the Loeb Classical Library [L] have been used for the sake of the parallel English text.

For Armenian sources, the best obtainable edition has been used, but in a number of cases, the edition cited is regrettably less an index of its intrinsic value, than of its accessibility to the editor.
** Sources marked with a double asterisk are those listed by Adontz in the original Bibliography without an indication of the edition used.
$A a$
$A g$
Agat'.
"Agat'angełos"

```
see " Agat'angełos ", Agat'.
see "Agat'angełos", Ag.
see " Agat'angelos ", Agat".
*Agat'angełos, Patmut'iwn [History], (Tiflis, 1883).
```

| $A g$ [Greek Version] | " Agathangelus ", P. de Lagarde ed., $A K G W G$, XXXV (1889). Trans. : in CHAMA, I (1867), pp. 109-193. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agat'. [Aa-Armenian | 'angełos, Patmut'iun [History], 3rd ed. (Venice, 1930). |
| $V a[$ Arabic Version] | *" Martyrium sanctorum Gregorii et Rhipsimiae et Gaianae ', in Marr, Christianization, pp. 66-148. <br> Latin trans. : in Garitte, Agathange, pp. 27-116. <br> Agat'angelosi arabakan nor xmbagrut'iuna [A New Arabic Version of $\mathrm{Agat}^{\text {en angelos], A. Ter Łewondyan ed. (Erevan, }}$ 1968). |
| $V g[$ Life of St. Gregory] |  <br>  ge, pp. 23-116. |
| Vo | "La Vie grecque inédite de saint Grégoire d’Arménie ", <br> G. Garitte ed., $A B$, LXXXIII (1965), pp. 233-290. |
| $A L$ | *Aristakēs Lastivertc̣i, Patmut'iun Aristakeay vardapeti Lastivertc̣woy [History of the vardapet Aristakes Lastivertci], (Venice, 1844). <br> Aristakēs Lastivertc̣i, Patmut'iwn Aristakisi Lastivertcwoy [History of Aristakēs Lastivertc̣i], K.E. Yuzbasyan ed. (Erevan, 1963). <br> Trans. : Histoire d'Arménie ... par Arisdaguès de Lasdiverd, traduite pour la première fois ... par M. Evariste Prud'homme (Paris, 1864). |
| Amm. Marc. | *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt, V. Gardthausen ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1874-75). <br> Ammianus Marcellinus, The Surviving Books of the History [L], J.C. Rolfe, ed. and trans., 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1950). |
| Anania Širakaç | *" Anania Širakaçi ", Miaban ed., Ararat (1906). Anania Sirakac̣i, Yalags harc̣man ew lucman [On Questions and Answers], I.A. Orbeli ed. (Petrograd, 1918). Repr. in I.A. Orbeli, Izbrannye trudy [Selected Works], (Erevan, 1963). |
| Anastas Vardapet, List | *Anastas Vardapet, "Vasn vanorēnic̣ Hayoc̣ or Yerusałem [On the Armenian Monasteries in Jerusalem]", in Alishan, Hayapatum, pp. 227-229. |
| Anderson, J.G.C., Cumont, E., and Fr., Grégoire, H. | " Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines du Pont et de l'Arménie, " Studia Pontica, III/l (1910). |
| Anonymous History | see, Primary History. |
| Answers | " Collectio Sangermanensis ", ACO, II/v (1936), pp. 71-75. |
| Appian | *Appiani Historia Romana, L. Mendelssohn ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1879). |
| App. Mithr. | Appian, "The Mithridatic Wars", in Appian's Roman History [L], H. White ed. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass.London, 1928-1955), II, pp. 239-477. |
| App. Syr. | Appian, "The Syrian War ", in Appian's Roman History |


|  | [L], H. White ed. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1928-1955), II, pp. 103-237. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Aristotle, Politics | *Aristotelis Politica, F. Susemihl ed., new ed. (Leipzig, 1894). |
|  | Aristotle, Politics [L], H. Rackham ed. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1932). |
| Arm. Geogr. I [Long Version] | *Aśxarhacoyc $E$ daru [A Geography of the VIIth Century], K.P. Patkanian ed. (St. Petersburg, 1877). <br> *Ašzarhac̣oyc Movsési Xorenac̣woy [Géographie de Moise |
|  | de Corène], A. Soukry ed. and trans. (Venice, 1881). [Adontz lists both editions without indicating the one he used. The latter has been used in this edition]. |
| Arm. Geogr. II [Short version] | *"Aš̌arhaçoyc̣ stoy Movsisi Xorenac̣woy [Géographie |
|  | attribuée à Moyse de Khoren] ", in Saint-Martin, Mémoires, II, pp. 318-377. |
|  | "Aš̌arhacoye [Geography]", in MX, pp. 585-616. |
| Arrian, Anab. | **Arrian, Anabasis of Alexander [L], E. Hiff ed. and trans., 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1958-1961). |
| Arrian Periplus | *" Anonymi (Arriani ut fertur) Periplus Ponti Euxini ", GGM, I, pp. 402-423. |
|  | Arriano, Periplo del Ponto Eusino, G. Marenghi ed. and trans. (Naples, s.d. [1958]). |
| AS - ASSR | Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, Divan Hay <br> Vimagrut'yan [Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum], |
|  | 3 vols., in progress (Erevan, 1960-). |
| Asolik | *Asolik, Patmut'iwn Tiezerakal [Universal History], 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg, 1885). |
|  | Trans. : Part I - Histoire universelle par Etienne Asogh'ig de Daron, E. Dulaurier trans. (Paris, 1883). |
|  | Part II - Histoire universelle par Etienne Asolik de Tarôn, F. Macler trans. (Paris, 1917). |
| Barhebraeus, Chron. Eccl. | *Barhebraeus, Chronicon Ecclesiasticum, J.B. Abbeloos and T.J. Lamy edd. and trans., 3 vols. (Louvain, 18721877). |
| Barhebraeus, Chron. Syr. | *Barhebraeus, Chronicon Syriacum, P. Bedjan ed. (Paris, 1874). |
|  | Trans. : The Chronography of Gregory Ab̂̀l Faraj ... Bar Hebraeus, E.A.W. Budge trans. (London, 1932). |
| Basil, Notitia | " Basilii notitia ", in Georg. Cypr., pp. 1-27. |
| Basil. Caes., Ep. | **St. Basil of Caesarea, Collected Letters of Saint Basil [L], R.J. Deferrari ed., 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1961). |
| Beneševic, Syntagmata | *Drevne-slavianskaia Kormcheia XIV titulov [Syntagmata XIV titulorum sine scholiis secondum versionem palaeo-slovenicam], V.N. Benesevic ed., Vol. I, (St. Petersburg, 1906-1907). |
| $B L$ |  |


| Cass. Dio | *Dionis Cassii Cocceiani Historia Romana, L. Dindorf ed., 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1863-1865). <br> Cassius Dio, Roman History [L], E. Cary ed. and trans., 9 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1954-1955). |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cedrenus | *Cedrenus, "Synopsis Historiarum ", I. Bekker ed., 2 vols. CSHB (1838-1839). |
| Charmoy | *Charmoy, F.B. trans., Chèref-Nâmeh ou Fastes de la nation Kourde par Chèref-ou'ddîne, Prince de Bidlîs dans l'Iialet d'Arzeroüme, 2 vols. in $4^{0}$ (St. Petersburg, 1868-1875). |
| Chron. Pasch. CJ | *' Chronicon Paschale ", B.G. Niebuhr ed., CSHB (1832). **" Codex Justinianus ", P. Krüger ed., in CJC, II, 8th ed. (1906). |
| Cod. Th. | **Codex Theodosianus, T. Mommsen ed. (Berlin, 1905). Trans. : The Theodosian Code, C. Pharr trans. (Princeton, 1952). |
| Const. Porph., DAI | *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, " De Administrando Imperio ", I. Bekker ed., CSHB (1829). <br> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio, G. Moravcsik, R.H. Jenkins, et al. edd. and trans. (Budapest-London, 1949, 1962). |
| Const. Porph. de Themat. | *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, " De Thematibus". <br> I. Bekker ed., CSHB (1840). <br> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Costantino Porfirogenito de Thematibus, A. Pertusi ed. (Vatican City, 1952). |
| D'iakonov | D'iakonov, I.M. ed. and trans. "Assyro-vavilonskie istochniki po istorii Urartu [Assyro-Babylonian Documents on the History of Urartu]", VDI (1951). D'iakonov, I.M. ed. and trans. Urartskie Pis'ma i Dokumenty [Urartian Letters and Documents], (Moscow, 1963). |
| Diegesis | see Garitte, Narratio. |
| Diod. Sic. | **Diodorus Siculus, The Library of History [L], F.R. Walton ed. and trans., 12 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1933-1967). |
| Dionysios, Perigesis | *" Dionisii Orbis Descriptio ", GGM, II (1861), pp. 103176. |
| Disputation | *" Srboc̣ vardapetac̣n Hayoc̣ Movsēsi ew Dawt'i harc̣munk' ənd erkbanak çarap'arsn [Disputation of the Holy vardapets Movsēs and Dawit' with the Heretical Dyophysites]", G. Srwanjteanc ed., Hnoc Noroc̣ (1874). *' M. Xorenac̣woy patmut'ean žamanaki masin [On the Date of the History of Xorenaci] ", F.C. Conybeare ed., HA, XVII (May, 1903), pp. 152-155. <br> [Adontz cites both editions, but does not indicate the one he used. The latter has been used in this edition]. |
| Dwin Canons | *"Kanonk' Dunay S. Žolovoyn [Canons of the Holy Council of Dwin] ", Ararat (1905). |



| Herod. | *Herodoti Historiarum libri IX, H.R. Dietsch and |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | H. Kallenberd eds., 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1899-1901). |
|  | Herodotus, Histories [L], A.G. Godley ed. and trans., 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1960). |
| Herzfeld, Paikuli | Herzfeld, E., Paikuli. Monuments and Inscriptions of the Early History of the Sasanian Empire, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1924). |
| Hierokles | *Hieroclis Synecdemus et Notitiae Graecae Episcopatum accedunt Nili Doxopatrii Notitia Patriarchatuum et |
|  | Locorum Nomina Immutata, G. Parthay ed. (Berlin, 1866). |
|  | Hierokles, Le Synekdemos d'Hieroklès et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypre, E. Honigmann ed. (Brussels, 1939). |
| Homer, Iliad | *Homeri Ilias, G. Dindorf ed. 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1899). Homer, The Iliad [L], A.T. Murray ed. and trans., 2 vols. (New York-London, 1925). |
| Ibn al-Fakih | *Ibn al-Fakīh, " Kitāb al-buldān ", $B G A, \mathrm{~V}$ (1885). |
| Ibn Khurdādhbih | *Ibn Khurdādhbih, "Liber viarum et regnorum", $B G A$, VI (1889). |
| Ibn Serapion | *Ibn Serapion, "Description of Mesopotamia and Baghdād written about the Year 900 A.D. by Ibn Serapion ", G. le Strange, ed. and trans., JRAS, XLVII, n.s. XXVII (1895), pp. 1-76, 255-316. |
| Isidore of Charax | *" Isidori Characeni Mansiones Parthicae ", GGM, I (1855), pp. 244-256. |
|  | Isidore of Charax, The Parthian Stations, W.H. Schoff ed. and trans. (Philadelphia, 1914). |
| Itin. Ant. | *" Itinerarium provinciarum omnium Imper. Antonini |
|  | Augusti, "Recueil des itinéraires anciens, de Fortia d'Urban ed. (Paris, 1845), pp. 1-148. |
|  | "Das Itinerarium Antonini", Itineraria Romana, K. Miller ed. (Stuttgart, 1916), pp. liv-lxvii. |
| Jalabert, Commagène | Jalabert, L. and Mouterde, R. edd. Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie I : Commagène et Cyrrhestique (Paris, 1929). |
| Jamblichus | "Jamblichus ", as cited in Photius, Bibliothèque, R. Henri ed. and trans. (Paris, 1959), II, pp. 34-48. |
| Joh. Ant. | *Johannes Antiochenus, "Fragmenta ", FGH, IV. |
| Joh. Eph., de beatis | *Johannes Ephesinus, Johannis Episcopi Ephesi Syri Monophysitae Commentaria de Beatis Orientalibus et Historiae Ecclesiasticae Fragmenta, W.J. van Douwen and J.P.N. Land trans. (Amsterdam, 1889). <br> Eng. trans. : Joannes of Ephesus, "Lives of the Eastern Saints ", E. W. Brooks trans., PO XVII, 1 (1923) ; XVIII, 4 (1924); XIX, 2 (1925). |
| Joh. Eph., HE | *Johannes Ephesinus, Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes |


| 270* | BIBLIOGRAPHY |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | von Ephesus, aus dem Syrischen übersetzt u.s.w. von J.M. Schönfelder (Munich, 1862). <br> Johannes Ephesinus, "Iohannis Ephesini Historiae ecclesiasticae pars tertia ", E.W. Brooks ed. and trans., CSCO, CVI (1936, repr. 1964). <br> Eng. trans. : The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus. Now first translated from the Original Syriac by R. Payne Smith (Oxford, 1860). |
| Joh. Erznk. | *Yovhannēs Erznkaçi [John of Erznkay], Yovhannu Erznkacwoy Nerboteank' $i$ Surb Grigori Lusaworiと̧ [Yovhannēs Erznkac̣i, Panegyric of St. Gregory the Illuminator], Sop'erk', V (Venice, 1853). |
| Joh. Kat'. | *Yovhannēs Kat'ołikos [John the Kat'ołikos], Patmut iwn [History], (Moscow, 1853). <br> Yovhannēs Kat'ołikos, Patmut'iwn [History], (Jerusalem, 1867). <br> Trans. : [notoriously inadequate] Histoire d'Arménie par le patriarche Jean VI dit Jean Catholicos, par M.J. Saint-Martin, ouvrage posthume (Paris, 1841). |
| Joh. Lyd., de mag. | Johannes Lydus, De magistratibus, O. Seeck ed. (Berlin, 1876). <br> Johannes Lydus, De magistratibus, populi Romani, R. Wünsch ed. (Leipzig, 1903). |
| Joh. Mam. | *Yovhannēs Mamikonean [John Mamikonean] Yovhannu Mamikoneni episkoposi Patmut'iwn Tarōnoy [History of Tarōn by Bishop Yovhannès Mamikonean], 2nd ed. (Venice, 1889). <br> Trans. : in CHAMA, I (1867), pp. 361-382. |
| Josephus, Ant. | **Fl. Josephus, Jewish Antiquities [L], R. Marcus and L.H. Feldman edd. and trans. 9 vols. (Cambridge, Mass-London, 1926-1965). |
| Josephus, Bell. Jud. | **Fl. Josephus, The Jewish War [L], H. St. John Thackeray ed. and trans., 9 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1926-1965). |
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