

THE ARMENIAN TRANSLATION (1210 A. D.) OF THE CHRONICLE OF HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE

Ter-Vardanyan G. H.

Doctor of Sciences (in History)

We have set a research objective that can be called conditionally, "The Echoes of West-European Historiographical Thought among the Armenians"¹. We intend to study those large and small works, which have been translated or adapted from Latin into the Armenian language in medieval times. We plan to trace the evolution of these translations in Armenian medieval literature and the influences and changes they have undergone. We also seek to analyze the use in Armenian medieval literature of information derived from original and primary sources written in Latin or from their Armenian translations. The results of this research should increase our understanding of the mutual influences exerted by the two literary cultures. This is as important as is the study of non-Armenian sources and the information they provide for Armenian history and historiography in general. The most important of these translated works should, of necessity, be studied and published separately.

One of these translated works is the subject of this presentation. It is a chronological list of the Emperors and Popes of Rome: the first-ever text of a purely historical nature that was translated into Armenian from Latin. It has received very little attention in the past, and hence we will first make a brief review of the way it has been dealt with in the field of Armenian Studies.

According to Ghevond Alishan, Levon I the Great (Magnificent), the first king of Cilician Armenia, had forced Hetum Sebastos (1151-1218), the former lord of Lambron, to become a cleric in 1201 and the abbot of the monastery of Drazark under a new name, Heghi. In 1210, Levon sent Heghi on a mission to visit the Pope in Rome and the German Emperor so that he (Levon) could receive a royal crown from the latter and proclaim Ruben-Raymond, the son of his niece and the Duke of Antioch, as his nominal co-ruler and heir to the throne. Alishan mentions that Heghi reported this fact "at the end of a chronological list of rulers that he had translated during a land- and sea journey" (Ալիշան 1885. 510). On another page, Alishan quotes Hetum-Heghi's information fully and specifies that the work "translated from Latin at sea, [was a list of the] successive Emperors and Patriarchs of Rome" (Ալիշան 1885. 83).

Soon afterwards, Rev. Garegin Zarphanalian, who belonged to the same Mekhitarist monastic brotherhood as Alishan, stated that this translation is found "among the Armenian manuscripts of the Vatican Library in Rome". He published the colophons of these two chronological lists (Զարփախանյան 1889. 647-648). Then, Rev. Hovhannes Miskjian published an untidy description of this Vatican manuscript

¹ Or "Medieval Armenian Historiography and Western Europe".

(Միսրճէան 1892. 245-246). Alishan followed by referring to the issue of this translation again. He mentioned Heghi "as one of the historians" for he (Alishan) believed that Heghi "had described what he had seen and done during a one-and-a-half of year ambassadorship in Germany and other parts of Europe". It seems that Alishan only had access to the above-mentioned colophons.

Otherwise, he would not have written that Hetum-Heghi's "translation was that of a chronological list of the five patriarchates (Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Constantinople), compiled by an archimandrite (abbot) with the name of Nelos, also known as Doxopatrios, about a century before, to which (the author) has also added a history of the Emperors". Moreover, Alishan writes that "the writer [who compiled his work] during a sea-journey, most probably could have written and composed history more on land and in his monastery of Drazark" (Ալիշան 1901. 114). Rev. Nerses Akinian, another member of the Mekhitarist congregation, this time from the branch founded in Vienna, has correctly observed, with respect to the work of Nelos Doxopatrios, that the manuscripts indicate that the translator of this work is Nerses Lambronatsi, the younger brother of Hetum-Heghi. Akinian also rightly pointed out that "no writing has been found" where Hetum-Heghi has described what he saw in Germany and Europe (Ակինեան 1956. 130).

A few years later, the catalogue of all Armenian manuscripts in Vatican, which was compiled skillfully by Evgenius Tisserant, also included the detailed description of this (Hetum-Heghi's) manuscript (Tisserant 1927: 208-210). This was followed by the monumental study on Nerses Lambronatsi, where the author, Rev. N. Akinian, has scrupulously brought together all the information available on Hetum-Heghi and narrated the biography of this controversial political and cultural figure (Ակինեան 1956. 116-130)². Akinian says that Hetum-Heghi (who, according to Smbat Goundstable, the author of the history of Cilician Armenia, was an "extremely literate" man³) knew "the Armenian, Greek and Latin literary" languages and had "on board with him books" during his diplomatic trip" and was engaged in translating [books]" (Ակինեան 1956. 127). Akinian mentions that Hetum-Heghi has not only translated the above-mentioned work, but that it was on his bidding that Nerses Lambronatsi compiled *Patcar xndroy miabanutean*, a collection of documents on Armenian-Byzantine relations that enjoyed great authority from the 13th to the 19th centuries.

Another famous name in the field of Armenian Studies, Catholicos Garegin Hovsepien also published the colophons of Heghi's translation, reproducing them from

² To the biographical data provided by Akinian, we can today add perhaps another important fact that Hetum Sebastos is the scribe of the ancient part of the manuscript of the famous Gagik-Hetum Medical Codex's Jerusalem copy (12th century); see codex no. 370 of the St. James Library (Պողոսեան 1967. 279-288). Bogharian also has a brief bibliography of the latest literature pertaining to this medical book.

³ For the Venetian version of Smbat Goundstabl's Annals, see Սմբատայ Տարեգիրք 1956. 212:

G. Zarphanaleian's edition (Գարեգին Ա. Կաթողիկոս [Յովսէփեան] 1951. 741-744)⁴. Thus, Heghi's translation has been known among scholars in the field of Armenian Studies for over a century. However, little has been done except to use the information provided in the colophons or making incorrect assumptions regarding the actual translation. This should appear as surprising for it is the first-ever fully historical European text translated into the Armenian language and it should have been studied and evaluated as a significant cultural phenomenon. And since no additional copies have been discovered in addition to the Vatican manuscript in the last 100 years or so, we obtained a microfilm of that manuscript⁵ and started to look for the original Latin text used by Heghi.

This was not an easy task. The brief parallel lists and detailed chronologies of emperors and popes are so numerous in European historiography that they are considered as a separate genre of historiographical literature in their own right (which emerged in the 10th century and spread from the 12th to the 14th centuries in particular). Although Heghi's translation has been considered - because of its having two colophons - being composed of two separate works, the above-mentioned fact compelled us to consider it as a single work composed of two parts, which eased the task of finding the source-text, from which the translation had been made. After going through numerous historical-chronological primary sources in Latin and comparing them with the Armenian translation, we deduced that Hetum-Heghi had translated the last two sections of Hugo de Sancto Victore's *Chronology*, a work that had enjoyed great fame and prestige in its own time in Europe.

The reasons why a certain translation has been undertaken should be looked for, first of all, in the actual text, and only after that in the milieu where the translation was carried out. In this case, we should first find out what reputation Hugo and his chronology enjoyed in Europe of the 12th-13th centuries. After that, it will become obvious why Hetum-Heghi chose to translate the last two sections (and not the full text) of this work.

Hugo de Sancto Victore, a French philosopher, mystic and a scholastic theologian, was born in 1096 or 1097 either in Flanders or in Saxony. He was an aristocrat by birth and according to one view, descended from the German Blankensburger noble house. He received his early education in the monastery of Hamersleben (near Halberstadt). He then moved to Paris and studied under William of Champeaux. There, he entered

⁴ Recently the same colophons have been reproduced again from Zarphanalian's work (and this despite the existence of Tisserant's catalogue) in the extensive single-volume collection of the 13th century colophons: see (Մաթեոսեան 1984. 76-77). All the inaccuracies in Zarphanaleian's edition - that had been corrected in Tisserant's description - have been fully reproduced by Matevosian. The latter has also brought together in this and his other volume on the 5th-12th centuries colophons (Մաթեոսեան 1988) all the primary documents on which Akinian had tried to reconstruct Heghi's biography.

⁵ Vatican, Cod. Arm. 3: We deeply thank Mr. Hrant Bambakian of Milan and the former abbot of the Mekhitarist Congregation in Venice, the late Rev. Sahak Jemjemian, for preparing and sending the microfilms of this and two other manuscripts from the Vatican collection.

the monastery of St. Victor in Paris, became a teacher (*magister*) in the abbey school, later its director, and may have even become the prior of the abbey.

The abbey school Hugo directed became quite famous thanks to his theological and philosophical teachings, and the new method of instruction that he inaugurated⁶. He enjoyed the reputation of an excellent instructor. He is the author of the phrase most liked by the historian John of Salisbury (f 1180), who is famous for his encyclopedic knowledge: "*Omnia disce, postea videbis nihil esse superfluum*" - "Learn everything, You will discover in the end that nothing is superfluous". The basic trait of Hugo's teachings was the combination of religious mysticism and contemplative (or speculative) thought⁷.

Despite his short life († 1141) Hugo was highly prolific: 48 different works large and small of his are extant today. Almost all have been written as schoolbooks he used for didactic purposes⁸. Through these schoolbooks he had a big impact on European philosophical and historiographical thought in the next periods. He had his own scheme of the periodisation of history, that amended the old theory of three main periods (Old Testament, New Testament and the age of the Holy Spirit or the Kingdom of Heaven): a) natural law (sub lege naturali); b) Biblical, until the age of Christ, i. e. the period of Mosaic law; c) the reign of the Christian Church. He did not speak about the end of the third period, probably not to be seen as opposed to the teaching of the end of earthly life. He also accepted the largely compatible principle of dividing history into six epochs: 1. From Adam to Noah; 2. From Noah to Abraham; 3. From Abraham to David; 4. From David to the Babylonian Captivity; 5. From the Babylonian Captivity to the Birth of Christ; and 6. The period following the Birth of Christ.

His historical work, which in later copies received the simple title "Chronica", was originally called "*De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum, id est, per sortis, locis, temporibus*". He wrote it in 1130 and did not attempt to up-date it later. There have been, however, a few continuations by other authors (of which, four, dealing with the years 1130-1217, 1130-1255, 1098-1286 and 1152-1197 respectively, have been published). The work has no great value as a primary source in European historiography, for, like many other works of the same author, it was intended to be used as a schoolbook. It is, therefore, important for the new didactic method introduced by Hugo, which made the school of Sancto Victore quite famous. The chronology begins with an introduction⁹ addressed to the students, which is followed by the history of Old Testament times (from Adam to Christ), then by the lists of Old Testament

⁶ He was a close friend of Bernard from Clervos.

⁷ This information regarding Hugo's life and teachings can be found in almost all encyclopaediae and bibliographies (see, for example, Энцикл. словарь 1893: 856-857; Константинов 1960: 411; Константинов 1967: 581; Вайнштейн 1964: 82-83; 153-165).

⁸ See the detailed description of Hugo's works in Haureau 1886. See the bibliography of his works in Potthast 1896. A recent and more detailed bibliography can be found in Repertorium Fontium Historiae Medii Aevi 1984: 594-603.

⁹ It was published - based on the comparison of 20 manuscripts from the 12th and 13th centuries (Green 1943: 484-492).

patriarchs, kings and priests. The next section presents the lists of the kings of Germany, the Franks, Vandals, Goths and Lombardy, as well as the Dukes of Normandy, a list of historical-geographical place-names and, finally, the chronological tables of the emperors and popes of Rome. As is evident from the content, Hugo's Schoolbook is informative in nature and aims to teach its readers (i.e. the students) the main episodes of Biblical and post-Biblical history, the names of the main historical personalities, and the duration of their tenure. The work was basically a textbook to improve the memorising and quick-learning skills of the students. It enjoyed a great reputation and spread quickly because of its extremely brief content. It was used extensively, and many manuscript copies of it have reached us (*Repertorium Fontium Historiae Medii Aevi* 1984: 599). Its translation into the Armenian language can also be attributed to its fame in Europe.

In certain manuscripts scribes have altered the sequence followed by the author. Others have copied only certain parts of it - the introduction, some of the lists, etc. - depending on their particular needs. It seems that the Armenian translation was made from an original copy that included only the chronological tables pertaining to the emperors and popes, or perhaps Heghi had a more extensive or even a complete version of the source, but because of the practical nature of his undertaking, he simply ignored the other sections during the translation because the genealogy of Biblical patriarchs was already available in other works compiled in Armenian.

Heghi has little to say about the circumstances of this translation: "I translated this at sea, during our voyage at sea"; "I translated this [work] from the Roman [language] to our [language] when I was travelling by sea near the land of Abulia". This does not mean that the translation was motivated solely by the need to fill the time that otherwise he had to spend idly at sea. What Heghi writes in his two colophons ("the reign of Otto (Ադդին) to whom I, the humble Heghi, am travelling as a messenger from our king, Levon"; "Innocentius III, who reigns now, to whom we are going as a messenger of Leon, the king of Armenia") - makes us think otherwise. The official relations of Cilician Armenia with European royal courts went back to the time of the First Crusade at the end of the 11th century. They had been activated further at the time of the coronation of Levon I and the official recognition of Armenian statehood in Cilicia. Until the time of the translation undertaken by Heghi, however, there was not even the briefest guide in the Armenian language on the historical traditions of this new and influential political force, Catholic Europe¹⁰. We are therefore convinced that Hetum-Heghi's translation was undertaken to fill that gap. Indeed, it was destined to fill the role of such a guidebook for about nine decades, until King Hetum II compiled in 1296 the work he called "Պատմութիւն խրոնիկոնիս", which included more detailed information taken from other sources pertaining to the history of popes and emperors (Յակոբեան 1956. 33-

¹⁰ The Chronicle of Eusebius of Caesarea, the Church Histories of the former and of Socrates Scholasticos, and the "Book of the Emperors" belonged to the Roman-Byzantine tradition of the early Christian period.

93)¹¹. Finally both these works became less useful and important, when Nerses Palianents finished in Avignon in 1351 the Armenian translation of the Chronicle of Martin of Oppava, which included an extensive history of the popes and emperors. This is why the translation of Hetum-Heghi and the compilation of King Hetum II have been preserved in only a single manuscript each.

Heghi mentions the date of translation of this work on a few occasions. In the title of the list of the emperors he writes: "[the work] was translated into our [language] in the year 689 of the Armenian calendar [1210 A.D.]". At the end of the same section he reiterates that "I translated this from the Roman [language] in the year 689 of the Armenian [calendar]". He is more specific at the end of the section pertaining to the popes: "I translated this... when we were navigating near the land of Apulia, which is [also] called Lombardy, on the day of the Pentecost, on the 5th of June, in the year 689 of the Armenians". At the end of the section on the emperors he says that he stayed at Otto IV's court for "one year and three months", and then he returned to Cilicia with the crown he received from the Emperor. Then King Levon crowned Ruben-Raymond "on the feast of the Holy Virgin, on the 15th of August in the year 670 [1211 A.D.] of the Armenians". Therefore, we can deduce that Heghi first travelled from Cilicia probably in the spring of 1210 to meet the Pope in Rome, where he also obtained or received the work that he would translate. He then continued his way to Germany and near the shores of Lombardy (Apulia) finished the draft of his translation on 5 June 1210. He probably corrected and edited the translation after his return to Cilicia and the coronation of Ruben-Raymond on 15 August 1211 ("King Junior" of Armenia)¹². It is possible that he had consulted informed people in Rome on the issue of having a brief guide to the history of the popes and emperors. The informed people may have provided Heghi with a copy of Hugo's renowned work or his lists as the most appropriate source to fulfill his needs. Thus, it is possible that the choice of the primary source was not accidental either.

Hugo's work ends with mentioning the duration of the reign of Pope Honorius II: "Honorius secundus sedit annis V mensibus II". This pope died on 14 February 1130, and it is assumed that Hugo compiled his chronology around this period. In Heghi's translation no mention is made of the end of Hugo's original work and the next 13 popes are presented in the same style. The last pope mentioned, Innocent III, was a contemporary of Heghi's. The Armenian translation closely follows the first of the four continuations that are published and are hence known to us. It is the so-called "Continuato Itala", the chronological limits of which are the years 1130 and 1217. In the manuscript copy that Heghi had, this list of the popes understandably ended with Innocent III, who ascended the papal throne on 22 February 1198. Heghi's translation

¹¹ The information related to the Popes and Emperors - which concerns us here - has not been published in this edition. They have not been reproduced from the manuscript no. 1898 of the Mashtots Matenadaran, the only source of this edition.

¹² <http://gw.geneanet.org/comrade28?lang=en&p=king+leo+i+of&n=armenia>

reads: "Innocent III, who reigns now". This phrase is immediately followed by Heghi's last words: "to whom we are now going as a messenger from Levon, the King of Armenia".

In the Latin text, the list of the emperors ends under the year 1216 with the mentioning of the name of Lotharius II (the total duration of his reign, 12 years, is added by another hand). In this section, the Armenian version does not follow any known Latin continuation for the years after the end of the original work composed by Hugo. It seems that Heghi just had the names of the next five emperors, sometimes with the wrong number of years. Therefore, the translator inscribed under their names events related to Armenian history and to his own journey. Under Friedrich Barbarossa's (1152-1190) name, he writes that the emperor came to the East to free Jerusalem and that "he drowned in the river" near the city of Seleucia. It is stated that Henry VI (1190-1197) provided a royal crown for Levon the Rubenid and "restored" the "destroyed" Armenian Kingdom. In the section under the name of Otto IV (1208-1215), the circumstances of his (Heghi's) diplomatic mission are recounted.

Thus, in the Armenian version, the list of the emperors begins with Augustus (27 B.C.) and ends with Otto IV (1208-1215 A.D.), while that of the popes extends from the Apostle Peter until Innocent III (1198-1216). In both cases, Heghi registers the situation prevailing in 1210.

Finally, let us present in broad terms the external differences of the Latin original text and its Armenian translation. We have mentioned already that all of Hugo's lists - including the two that we are interested in - have been prepared in column-shaped tables. Hugo himself underlines in his introduction that the column-shaped arrangement helps students to memorize easily. He calls on the students to remember even the colour and shape of the capital letters, as well as the way the material is arranged on page, so that they can study better (Green 1943: 492). Hence, based on this principle, the two lists that we have, have been published - seemingly in the style of the original manuscript used (six manuscripts in all: four from the 12th century and two from the 14th century) - in six columns that have the following titles: 1. Anno Domini, 2. Indictiones, 3. Pontifices, 4. Anni, 5. Imperatores, 6. Anni (Waiz 1879: 90-102).

On the same page, therefore, the dates (according to the Christian calendar) are mentioned under one column in ascending order. Under the second column the corresponding year of the 15-year regular tax cycle is mentioned. The next columns respectively indicate the name of the pope, the duration of his reign, followed by (on the same line or a line or two below) the name of the emperor of that same period and the duration of the latter's reign. Let us pay attention to the fact that, according to the principle of the primacy of the papacy, popes are mentioned before the emperors.

There is no tabular arrangement in the Armenian version. The information pertaining to the dates in the Christian calendar is altogether missing. The section on the emperors is presented first, as mentioned, in two columns. Their regular numbers in the line of succession (1-96) are mentioned in the left margin. On the first page (246a) of the work in the sole manuscript the numbers 1-11 have been left out by error. For

example, the phrase "380. Gratianus imperavit cum Valentiniano fratre et Teodosio ann. 6" in Latin has been translated into Armenian: «Գրատիանոս եւ եղբայր սորա Վալենտիանաւ եւ Թէոդոսիաւ ամս 2 (6)». The list of the popes follows the same pattern, from number 1 to 182... The differences in the duration of the reign of certain popes and emperors in the Latin text and the Armenian translation can be explained either by (a) the different numbers provided in the Latin manuscripts that were used by Heghi himself or by (b) errors committed by Heghi himself when trying to understand and translate the Roman numerals.

The basic differences in the style of presentation between the Latin original and its Armenian translation can be explained either by the characteristics of the copy used by the translator or by the latter's preferences. That is, if a manuscript that resembles the Armenian translation in its presentation style is not found, we should go on assuming that the changes in style have been introduced by Heghi. Additional details will be clarified when we annotate the Armenian translation in detail and prepare it for publication.

REFERENCES

1. Միսուան. Համագրութիւն հայկական Կիլիկիոյ եւ Լեւոն Մեծագործ: Հաւաքեալ ի Հ. Ղեւոնդեայ վ. Մ. Ալիշան: Վենետիկ - Ս.Ղազար, 1885:
2. Հայապատում. Պատմիչք եւ պատմութիւնք Հայոց: Յօրինեալ եւ հաւաքեալի Հ. Ղեւոնդեայ վ. Մ. Ալիշան: Հ. Ա, Պատմիչք Հայոց: Վենետիկ, ի վանս Ս.Ղազարու, 1901:
3. Ալիսեան Հ. Ն. Վ., Ներսէս Լամբրոնացի արքեպիսկոպոս Տարսնի. Կեանքն եւ գրական վաստակները: Վիեննա. Մխիթարեան տպարան, 1956:
4. Զարպիանալեան Գ. Վ., Մատենադարան հայկական թարգմանութեանց նախնեաց (Դար Դ-ԺԳ): Վենետիկ. Մխիթ. տպ. 1889:
5. Մանր ժամանակագրութիւններ: ԺԳ-ԺԸ դդ., հ. Բ, աշխ. Յակոբեան Վ., Երեւան. ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ. 1956:
6. Գարեգին Ա. Կաթողիկոս [Յովսէփեան], Յիշատանարանք ձեռագրաց: հ. Ա (Ե դարից մինչեւ 1250թ.), Անթիլիաս. Տպ. կաթողիկ. հայոց Կիլիկիոյ, 1951:
7. Հայերեն ձեռագրերի հիշատակարաններ Ե-ԺԲ դարեր, աշխատ. Մաթեոսեան, Ա., Երեւան. ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 1988:
8. Հայերեն ձեռագրերի
9. Հիշատակարաններ, ԺԳ դար, կազմեց Մաթեոսեան, Ա., Երեւան. ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 1984:
10. Սմբատայ Սպարապետի Տարեգիրք: /հրատարակեց/ Հ. Սերովբէ Ա. Ազրբեան, ի Վենետիկ. Սուրբ Ղազար, 1956:
11. Միսքճեան Յ. (1892), «Տուցակ հայերէն ձեռագրաց քահանայապետական մատենադարանին Վատիկանու ի Հռովմ»: Հանդէս ամսօրեայ, էջ 211-4, 244-7, 273-5, 339-43:

12. Մայր ցուցակ հայերէն ձեռագրաց Սրբոց Յակոբեանց: Հատոր երկրորդ, կազմող Պողարեան Ն. եպս., 1967, Երուսաղէմ. Տպ. Ս. Յակոբեանց:
13. Green W. M. (1943). 'Hugo of St. Victor De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum'. *Speculum. A Journal of Medieval Studies* VIII, 4, October, pp. 484-92.
14. Haureau J. B. (1886), *Les oeuvres de Hugo de Saint Victor: Essai critique*. Paris.
15. Potthast A. (1896), *Bibliothecae historicae Medii Aevi*. T. I, W.Weber, B. 1, Berlin.
16. Potthast A. (1984), *Repertorium Fontium Historiae Medii Aevi*. Vol. V, Fontes, Gh- H, Romae, MCMLXXXIV. Apud Institute stotico Italiano per il Medio Evo. XIX
17. Vatican, Cod. Arm. 3: Mashtotz Matenadaran, microfilm N1103.
18. *Codices Armeni Bibliothecae Vaticanae Borgiani, Vaticani, Barberiniani, Chisiani...* Recensuit Evgenius Tisserant, Romae, 1927, Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, MCMXXVII, XIX, (especially pp. 208-210).
19. Waiz, G. (Ed., 1879). "Chronica quae dicitur Hugonis de Sancto Victore". *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum*, t. XXIV, Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXIX, pp. 90-102 (Repr. Stuttgart, New York, 1963).
20. Вайнштейн О. Я. (1964), *Западноевропейская средневековая историография*. М.-Л.: Наука.
21. Константинов, Ф. (ред.) (1960). *Философская энциклопедия*, т. 1. М.: Советская энциклопедия.
22. Константинов, Ф. (ред.) (1967). *Философская энциклопедия*, т.4. М.: Советская энциклопедия.
23. *Энциклопедический словарь*. т. IXA (1893). СПб: Изд. Ф. А. Брокгауз, И. А. Ефрон, Тип. А. И. Ефрона.

***Translated from Armenian
by Ara Sanjian***