

Fourteenth-Century Developments in Armenian Grammatical Theory through Borrowing and Translation: Contexts and Models of Yovhannes K'ṙnets'ī's¹ *Grammar Book*

Gohar Muradyan

Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, Yerevan

gohar_muradyan@yahoo.com

The description of Armenian grammar has a long history. Several decades after the invention of the alphabet by Mesrop Mashtots, probably in the second half of the fifth century, Dionysius Thrax' *Ars grammatica* was translated from Greek. Until the fourteenth century, eleven commentaries were composed on Thrax's work. The *Ars* created the bulk of the Armenian grammatical terminology and artificially ascribed some peculiarities of the Greek language to Armenian. In the 1340s Yovhannēs K'ṙnets'ī wrote a work entitled *On Grammar*. He was the head of the Catholic K'ṙna monastery in Nakhijewan which was founded by Catholic missionaries sent to Eastern Armenia and by their Armenian collaborators, the *fratres unitores*. K'ṙnets'ī's grammar survived in a single manuscript copied in 1350.

In K'ṙnets'ī's work, the section on phonetics, the names of the parts of speech and many grammatical categories follow Dionysius' *Ars grammatica*. K'ṙnets'ī also used Latin sources, introducing two sections on syntax, mentioning Priscian, and borrowing definitions from Petrus Helias' *Summa super Priscianum* and other commentaries. This resulted in distinguishing substantive and adjective in the section on nouns, in a more realistic characterization of Armenian verbal tenses and voices and the introduction of notions and terms for sentences, their kinds, case government and agreement.

Keywords: *Fratres unitores*, Yovhannēs K'ṙnets'ī, Priscianus, Petrus Helias, syntax

1 The transliteration of Armenian names follows the Library of Congress Armenian Romanization Table (<https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/romanization/armenian.pdf>, last accessed Jan 10, 2025). The Mss I refer to from the collection of Matenadaran (Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts in Yerevan) start with M followed by shelf numbers. The numbers of Armenian manuscripts in the collections of the congregation of Mekhitharists are preceded by the acronyms V (Venice, San Lazzaro) and W (Vienna). The acronym J represents the collection in the Saint James monastery in Jerusalem.

What influence did Greek and Latin models exercise on fourteenth-century Armenian grammatical theory? Did Latin models become more authoritative with the arrival of Catholic missionaries in late medieval Armenia? After offering a brief overview of the activities of the *fratres unitores*, this paper focuses on Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī's *Book on Grammar* as a case study which shows how textual imports enriched Armenian grammatical theory and the Armenian language.

Based on the works of Levon Kachikyan and Suren Avagyan, the essay shows that Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī relied on the early Armenian translation of Dionysius Thrax and Dionysius' commentaries and wrote his section on syntax based on the Latin grammarian Priscianus and also on the works of Priscianus' commentators. Other scholars, such as Tigran Sirunyan and Peter Cowe, substantiated Avagyan's and Khachikyan's speculations on Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī's Latin sources. Sirunyan in particular showed a series of borrowings from these sources. The paper brings substantial new evidence concerning K'ṛnets'ī's reliance on the works of Priscianus and his commentators, namely Petrus Helias. It shows that with the help of Latin grammarians, K'ṛnets'ī elaborated a more subtle Armenian grammatical theory compared to the Armenian grammatical tradition that had preceded K'ṛnets'ī, which had been overwhelmingly influenced by Dionysius Thrax's Greek grammar book.

1 *Fratres Unitores: Knowledge Hubs, Cultural Impact, and Translations*

In the early fourteenth century, Armenia was under Mongol rule. After proselytizing in the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, Pope John XXII (1316–1334) sent first Franciscan and later Dominican Catholic missionaries to Eastern Armenia. They founded centers for the spread of Catholicism among Armenians in Armenia, such as Artaz and Ernjak (in the Nakhijewan² province³) and also in neighbouring regions, such as Maragha and the capital of the Mongol Ilkhanate Sult'aniē in northern Iran and also in Tiflis. The goal of this mission was to convert the Ilkhans of Persia and other khans to Christianity, but these efforts ultimately failed, since the khans embraced Islam and the conditions for Christians deteriorated. The special attitude of Ilkhan Abu Said towards the “Latin friars,”

2 In 1921, this Armenian province was annexed to Azerbaijan.

3 The majority of the inhabitants of several villages in this province adopted the Catholic faith, Khachikyan, “The Armenian Princedom of Artaz,” 83, footnote 2.

whom he put under his protection in 1320, encouraged local Christians to turn their mind towards the missionaries.⁴

The Catholic mission was headed by Bartholomew of Podio,⁵ bishop of Maragha between 1318 and 1330, and his fellow friars, Peter of Aragon and John the Englishman of Swineford.⁶ Bartholomew was known as an engaging preacher who had gathered around him many young Armenians. Part of the local clergy converted to the new faith. They assisted the missionaries and were called “*fratres unitores*.”⁷ They were preceded by the Franciscan Tsortsor monastery founded in the early fourteenth century by Zak’aria Tsortsorets’i, aided by Yovhannēs Tsortsorets’i, vardapet Israyēl, and Fra Pontius.⁸ The leaders of the Armenian Apostolic Church, in their zeal to preserve its independence, resisted the missionaries and their Armenian adherents and wrote several letters defending the doctrines and rites of the Armenian Apostolic Church.⁹ Esayi Nch’ets’i, the head of the famous Gladzor monastic school, and in particular Nch’ets’i’s student Yovhannēs Orotnets’i and Maghak’ia Ghrimets’i in the subsequent generation, as well as Yovhannēs Orotnets’i’s student, the famous theologian and philosopher Grigor Tat’ewats’i (1344–1409), were particularly active in these resistance efforts.¹⁰ In the course of this controversy, the pro-Latin faction also produced documents, but few of them have survived.¹¹

The *fratres unitores* founded several monastic centers. After his arrival to Maragha in 1318, Bartholomew moved to the monastery of K’rna. This monastery was founded by Yovhannēs K’rnets’i in 1330 in the village of the same

4 Stopka, *Armenia Christiana*, 205–6.

5 In the fifteenth century, he also began to be referred to as Bartholomew of Bologna or Parvus as a result of a confusion with his namesake, see Casella, *Bartolomeo de Podio (da Bologna)*, 75, n. 3. In Armenian manuscripts he figures as “bishop of Maragha” (Ms M3372, copied in 1761, fol. 356r), “Frank bishop” (M2515, copied in 1323, fol. 82r), “Frank bishop of Maragha” (Ms W312, copied in 1329, fol. 13r), “Latin bishop” (Ms J815, copied in 1325), “saint bishop Lord Bartholomew” (Ms V12, copied in 1332, fol. 188r). *Frank/Frank* is the denomination of Westerners, especially Catholic French and Italians. In Armenian scholarly literature, he is usually called Bartholomew of Maragha.

6 Joannes Anglus, according to Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 24, 194, 195.

7 Khachikyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K’rnets’i *On Grammar*, 16–51.

8 Khachikyan, “The Armenian Princedom of Artaz,” 204–7.

9 Tsaghikyan, “Catholic Preaching in Armenia,” 51–53.

10 La Porta, “Armeno-Latin Intellectual Exchange in the Fourteenth Century,” 274, 285–93.

11 Chapter 33 of one of such documents, the *Գիրք ուղղափառաց* (*Libro dei Ortodosi*) by Mkhit’ar Aperanec’i written in 1410, was recently published, with a study and Italian translation, see Alpi, “Il dibattito.”

name in the historical Armenian province Nakhijewan.¹² After Bartholomew died in 1333, the monastery was led by Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi (until his death in 1347).¹³ Kʻrnetsʻi cooperated extensively with Yakob Kʻrnetsʻi, Peter of Aragon and John of Swineford (Joannes Anglus¹⁴), who made good progress in learning Armenian. The Kʻrna monastery was named “New Athens” (նոր Աթենք), and it remained active until 1766.¹⁵ Another center for the *fratres unitores* was the St. Nicholas monastery in Kaffa (Crimea).¹⁶ As a whole, the congregation consisted of about 14 monasteries at its zenith.¹⁷ In 1356, the community of the unitors reached its heyday, running 50 monasteries with about 700 monks. By 1374, the community had declined substantially.¹⁸

The *fratres unitores* translated from Latin Catholic ritual books and Western scholastic authors’ writings, and they also wrote original philosophical, logical, and theological works.¹⁹ As a result of their activities, the most important Roman liturgical books became accessible in Armenian.²⁰ Another example, showing the importance of the *fratres unitores’* cultural contributions was Bartholomew

12 Bartholomew’s activity in Maragha, including the founding of the school of Kʻrna and the related events, are known from the work of an unitorian author Mkhitʻar Aperanecʻi, Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 216–28.

13 On his life, see Tsaghikyan, “Catholic Preaching in Armenia,” 53–57.

14 Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 195.

15 Zaphanalean, *History of Armenian Literature*, 194–212: «Միաբանասիրաց դպրոց» (The School of the Union Supporters); Abeghyan, *Երկեր* (Works), vol. IV, 403–4: «Ունիթորական գրականություն և լատինաբան աղմուտ հայերեն» (The Literature of the Unitors and the Distorted Latinizing Armenian); Ter-Vardanyan, «Ունիթորություն» (The Unitorian Movement); Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*. This book contains a brief history of the *fratres unitores* (19–72) and a comprehensive bibliography (mentioning editions and manuscripts) of their literary production: Armenian-Dominican sacred books (73–122), sermons and sermonaries (123–72), theological writings (173–244), and “De fratribus armenis citra Mare consistentibus” (245–95). A bibliography (manuscripts and editions) of writings by Albert the Great and Bartholomew of Bologna can be found in Anasyan, *Armenian Bibliography, 5th-17th cc.*, vol. 1, 388–402, vol. 2, 1284–1320.

16 Seidler, “Medieval Armenian Congregations in Union with Rome,” 153. A considerable Armenian population lived in Kaffa, which was under Genoese rule at the time. For this reason, the *unitores* not only built monasteries in Armenia and Georgia but also crossed the Black Sea and founded a public university (“universale studiorum collegium”) in Kaffa, Khachikyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi, *On Grammar*, 42. The source for this is Clemens Galanus, *Conciliatio*, vol. 1, 523. The chapters “De progressibus fratrum praedicatorum in reducendis ad Catholicam fidem Armenis” (508–26) and “De Armeniorum episcopis ex Ordine fratrum praedicatorum assumptis” (527–531) are important sources for the *fratres unitores*.

17 Seidler, “Medieval Armenian Congregations in Union with Rome,” 152.

18 La Porta, “Armeno-Latin Intellectual Exchange in the Fourteenth Century,” 281.

19 For an overview of the translations in chronological order see Stopka, *Armenia Christiana*, 215–21.

20 See in detail, Seidler, *Römische Liturgien*.

of Bologna's *On Hexaemeron* (Ms M1659, copied in the fourteenth century). It contains considerable information on celestial bodies, plants, and animals based on the writings of several ancient Greek philosophers, medieval theologians, and scholars.²¹

Most of the translated and original works of the *unitor* brothers have not yet been published.²² It should be also noted that Marcus van den Oudenrijn's bibliographic work lists are largely based on the holdings of Western collections.²³ At the same time, the largest collection of Armenian manuscripts in Matenadaran (Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts in Yerevan) includes early manuscripts, which contain the bulk of the works listed by Oudenrijn.

The unitors' intellectual achievements seem to have aroused interest among their adversaries. Although little research has been done on this, it has been stated that the works created in the milieu of the unitors soon reached Armenian intellectual circles, despite the fact that the unitors themselves were trying to ban their spread among their adversaries.²⁴ In a colophon to Bartholomew's *Sermonary*, Yakob K'ṛnets'ī (the most prolific translator of the K'ṛna school)²⁵ threatens to anathematize and excommunicate anyone who gives it to them.²⁶ In 1363, at the request of Yovhannēs Orotnets'ī, Grigor Tat'ewats'ī copied Ms M2382 containing Bartholomew's *Dialectics*, Gilbertus Porretanus' *Liber sex rerum principiis*, and its commentary by Peter of Aragon. In 1389, Yakob Ghrimets'ī, a renowned scholar, copied Ms M3487, a codex encompassing the works of John of Swineford. Yovhannēs Orotnets'ī's commentaries on Aristotle's *Categories* and *On Interpretation*, on Pophyry's *Isagoge to Aristotle's Categories* and on Philo of Alexandria's *De Providentia* witness to his awareness of European methodology applied in philosophical and logical writings.²⁷ It was Grigor Tat'ewats'ī, the most prominent theologian of the Armenian Church, on whose writings Western

21 Khachikyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī, *On Grammar*, 35–38.

22 For the existing editions, see Appendix.

23 Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*.

24 Khachikyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī, *On Grammar*, 33.

25 Manuscript colophons mention him as the translator of Bartholomew's, Peter of Aragon's and John of Swinford's works. On the other hand, some translations are attributed to Peter of Aragon and to Bartholomew. Peter and Yakob cooperated in translating other texts.

26 Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 130 (Armenian text), 133 (Latin translation).

27 Minasyan, "Yovhannēs Orotnets'ī," 16.

philosophy and theology had exerted the strongest influence, and he passes this influence on in his work.²⁸

The language of the texts produced by the unitorian brothers bears Latin influence. This influence resembles the use of the artificial grammatical forms and neologisms in the translations of the so-called Hellenizing school, which was a literary trend in old Armenian literature marked by extreme adherence to the literal translation method and by Greek influence on vocabulary, syntax, and even morphology.²⁹ The tendency to copy Latin words and grammatical features gathered further impetus in the so-called Latinizing (լատինաբան) translations and original works produced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by the Catholic preachers, who were alumni of the Collegium Urbanum.³⁰ This collegium was founded in 1627 in Rome and belonged to the Congregation “De propagande fide” founded in 1622 to promote the Catholic faith in eastern Christian countries. Works of the alumni of the Collegium Urbanum included a series of Armenian grammars. Scholars held different views on whether the fourteenth-century and seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts should be viewed as two separate groups³¹ of Latinizing Armenian literature or it is one and the same trend which regressed for some time and was revived in the seventeenth century.³²

After these introductory remarks on the *fratres unitores*, I now turn my focus to Yovhannēs K’rnets’i’s grammatical work.

28 His *Book of Questions* is characterized as a real *Summa*, see Arevshatyan, “Grigor Tat’ewats’i and his *Book of Questions*,” 1.

29 The Hellenizing school’s translations of mainly scholarly and theological works were made roughly speaking from the late fifth to the early eighth centuries, and they bear considerable Greek influence. Many new words (among them terms) were coined, especially words with newly invented prefixes which corresponded to the Greek ἀντι-, συν-, περι, προσ-, etc. The use of such prefixes is the most striking feature of the Hellenizing translations, see Weitenberg, “Hellenophile Syntactic Elements in Armenian Texts”; Calzolari, “L’école hellénisante. Les circonstances”; Calzolari, “Les traductions Arméniennes de l’École hellénisante”; Tinti, “Problematizing the Greek Influence on Armenian Texts”; Muradyan, *Grecisms in Ancient Armenian*, 215–24, and Appendix 3: “Latinizing Armenian and its Relation to Hellenizing Armenian.”

30 Many of them were published in Europe, especially in Venice, Rome, Amsterdam, Marseille, Livorno and elsewhere.

31 Acharyan, *History of Armenian Language*, 311; Ĵahukyan, *History of the Grammar of Grabar*, 8.

32 Zarphanalean, *History of Armenian Literature*, 45–55; Hambardzumyan, *History of Latinizing Armenian*, 27, 85.

2.1 *Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi and His Grammatical Work: The Circumstances of its Composition and the Influence of Dionysius Thrax*

Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi (ca. 1290–1347) was a student of the abovementioned Esayi Nchʻetsʻi, an outstanding scholar himself and one of the most ardent adversaries of the Catholic faith. In 1328, Esayi sent Kʻrnetsʻi to Maragha to explore the curriculum taught there by Bartholomew of Podio. There, Kʻrnetsʻi adopted Catholicism,³³ learned Latin, and taught Armenian to Bartholomew (before learning Armenian, the latter communicated with the Armenian brothers in Persian). In 1330, Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi returned to Kʻrna and persuaded the feudal lord of the village (who was his uncle) and his wife to convert to Catholicism. With their financial aid, Kʻrnetsʻi built a new church on the territory of the local Surb Astuatsatsin (Holy Theotokos) monastery and donated it to the Dominican order. Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi was the head of the Kʻrna monastery between 1333 and 1347. Peter Cowe refers to him as the leading figure among the Armenian scholars who joined the Dominican congregation.³⁴ In 1342, Kʻrnetsʻi traveled to the papal see in Avignon to discuss his future efforts towards the union of the Armenian and Roman Churches.³⁵ One of the colophons of Ms M3276³⁶ reads:

In the upper monastery of Kʻrna, under the protection of the Holy Theotokos, headed by doctor Yovhannēs nicknamed Kʻrnetsʻi, in whose name pious lord Gorg (sic!) and his wife lady Ēltʻik founded the holy congregation. And those three, doctor Yohan and Lord Gēorg and lady Ēltʻik, willingly donated the monastery to the Order of Preachers of Saint Dominic, an eternal gift. This Yovhannēs caused much benefit; he collected here doctors from Latins and Armenians, taking care of all concerning their soul and body, and he translated and is translating many salutary and enlightening writings... and he brought the redeeming tidings to the Armenian people and led those worthy to the obedience to the high throne of Rome...³⁷

33 Many of Esayi Nchʻetsʻi's students, after attending classes in monasteries in which Latin bishops resided, became Franciscans or Dominicans, Stopka, *Armenia Christiana*, 212–13.

34 Cowe, "The Role of Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae*," 96.

35 La Porta, "Armeno-Latin Intellectual Exchange in the Fourteenth Century," 280; Stopka, *Armenia Christiana*, 214.

36 It reveals that in 1337 fra Juan (John), the Englishman from the village of Swinford and a member of the order of Dominical Preachers, copied a compendium of works on the soul and its virtues and abilities, which was translated by Yakob the Armenian.

37 Khachikyan et al., *Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts*, 283: ի Վերին վանքս Քոնոյ, ընդ հովանեաւ Սուրբ Աստուածածնին, որոյ առաջնորդ էր՝ հոգաբարձու Յոհան վարդապետն, որ մականունն կոչի Քոնեցի, որոյ անուն շինեցին զսուրբ ուխտս աստուածասէր եւ բարեպաշտ պարոն Գորգն եւ

Only one of Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi's translations survives: Bartholomew's *Liber de inferno*, probably translated between 1328 and 1330 in Maragha.³⁸ Alberto Casella summarized information concerning three other translations from Yovhannēs' quill:³⁹ Bartholomew's *Liber de iudiciis*, translated in 1328–1330 in Maragha;⁴⁰ the *Regula S. Augustini episcopi de vita religiosorum*, translated either by Yovhannēs or by Bartholomew;⁴¹ and the *Constitutiones ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, probably translated by Yovhannēs, from which two lines are cited by Clemens Galanus.⁴²

Marcus Van Oudenrijn contends that another treatise entitled *Disputatio de duabus naturis et de una persona in Christo*, composed, according to the colophon “by Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi and bishop Bartholomew” (MS M3640, 14th c., 121r–150v), was written by Bartholomew and translated by Yovhannēs.⁴³ In contrast, Arevshatyan claims that they wrote it together in Armenian before Bartholomew moved from Maragha to Kʻrna.⁴⁴

As to original works by Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi, his grammatical work and a letter addressed to the *fratres unitores* have survived. In the letter, Yovhannēs explains his motifs for conversion to the Catholic faith and ascribes 19 “unforgivable errors” to the adherents of the Armenian Apostolic Church.⁴⁵

ամուսինն իւր՝ տիկին Էլթիկն: Եւ սորայ երեքեանն Յոհան վարդապետն եւ պարոն Գեորգն եւ տիկին Էլթիկն ինքնայօժար կամօք նուիրեցին զվանս կարգին քարոզողաց Սրբոյն Դօմինկիոսի՝ տուրք յաւիտենական: Արդ, վերոյասացեալ վարդապետն Յոհան եղև պատճառ բազում օգտութեան եւ ժողովեաց աստ վարդապետք ի յատինացոց եւ ի հայոց, տաժելով զանմենեսեան ըստ հոգւոյ եւ ըստ մարմնոյ եւ թարգմանեաց եւ թարգմանէ՛ զիրս բազումս ոգեշահս եւ յուսատրիչս... եւ երկր ազգիս Հայոց զփրկական համբան եւ առաջնորդեաց արժանաւորացն մտանել ի հնազանդութիւն գերադրական Աթոռոյն Հռոմս:

38 Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 186. In addition to the MSs kept in Venice (V244, V681), Vienna (W263, W507) and Bzommar (90, 96) mentioned here, recently Sen Arevshatyan pointed to two MSs of Matenadaran, M5097 (14th c., 196r–213v) and M2183 (copied in 1662, fols. 433v–461r), see Arevshatyan, *The Armenian Legacy of Bartholomew of Bologna*, 25. The work also exists in MSs M3640 (14th c., 121r–150r), M842 (copied in 1738, 1r–142r) and M5375 (copied in 1841, 143v–164r).

39 Casella, *Bartolomeo de Podio (da Bologna)*, 124–25.

40 Clemens Galanus, *Conciliatio*, vol. I, 510; Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 177.

41 Clemens Galanus, *Conciliatio*, vol. I, 509; Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 191.

42 Clemens Galanus, *Conciliatio*, vol. I, 522; Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 192.

43 Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 189. He also mentions MSs M842 (1738, the whole MSs), J486 (undated, 320–442), J574 (copied in 1718, 505–78r) and J1357 (copied in 1735, the whole MS). According to catalogues, all these MSs contain the same colophon, as the MS M3640.

44 Arevshatyan, *The Armenian Legacy of Bartholomew of Bologna*, 25.

45 Cited in Clemens Galanus, *Conciliatio*, vol. I, 513–22: “Epistola ad fratres unitos Armeniae,” Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 203. Another letter written by Bartholomew in Armenian and stylistically revised by Yovhannēs is mentioned by Clemens Galanus (*ibid.*, 510), see also Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 176: “Epistola convocatoria ad synodum in conventu Qʻrnayensi habendam (1330);” Casella, *Bartolomeo de Podio (da Bologna)*, 122.

Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi probably wrote his *Grammar* (*Յաղագս քերականին*)⁴⁶ in the 1340s. The text has survived in a single manuscript kept in the Mekhitharist congregation in Vienna (Ms W293, 2r–29r).⁴⁷ It was copied in 1350, three years after the author’s death in Kaffa (Crimea). Marcus van den Oudenrijn, judging by the short information on this text in the catalogue,⁴⁸ wrote, “Est commentarius in antiquam versionem *Artis Grammaticae* Dionysii Thracis.”⁴⁹

However, the colophon at the end reads:

I, fra Yohan Kʻrna, called by the nickname Kʻrnetsʻi, has made a short compendium from Armenians and Latins, [small] bits from many authors and grammarians, giving a door and a road for the novices to enter the cities of wisdom, to ascend from practice to knowledge, and with this minor art to the art of arts which is the mother and dwelling and abode for those who are directed towards wit and wisdom (as if aroused by a goad and awakened from the vacillation of drowsiness), so that they arrive at the knowledge of the truth and good, which is the perfection of logic.⁵⁰

Kʻrnetsʻi did indeed write a “short compendium,” and he combined grammatical knowledge from different sources.⁵¹ He used the Armenian version of *Ars grammatica* by Dionysius Thrax,⁵² translated from Greek in the second

46 This title is on the title-page of the edition. A longer title preceding the text reads: Համառոտ հասարդման յաղագս քերականին (*A Short Compendium on Grammar*), Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi, *On Grammar*, 157.

47 This MS contains logical works of other *unitores*, but also David the Invincible’s *Definitions of Philosophy*, a Neoplatonic work translated from Greek in the late 6th c.

48 Dashian, *Catalog*, 719.

49 Oudenrijn, *Linguae haicanae scriptores*, 205. Oudenrijn’s opinion is repeated by Stopka with the following addition: “using examples from Armenian and Latin authors,” *Armenia Christiana*, 216–17. Casella too is unaware of the edition and the study of the grammatical work and repeats the same information, *Bartolomeo de Podio (da Bologna)*, 123 (although a reference to the edition is found *ibid.*, 231).

50 Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻi, *On Grammar*, 221: Ես Փրա Յոհան՝ մականուն կոչեցեալ Քոնեցի, համառոտ հաւաքեցի ի հայոց և լատինացոց գաականս ի բագում շարագրաց և ի քերթողաց, տալով դուռն և ճանապարհ նորամարզիցն՝ մտանել և ընթանալ ի քաղաքս իմաստից, զի ի հմտութենէ ելանել ի մակացութիւնս, և փոքրագունակ արունստիւս՝ առ արհեստից արհեստն, որ է մայր և օթևանք և հանգիստ ընթերցելոցն առ ինչս և իմաստութիւնս, իբր խթանաւ ընդոստեալ և ի դանդաչմանէ թմբութեանցն զարդեալ, զի ի ճանաչումն ճշմարտին և բարոյն եկեացեն, որ է կատարումն բանականին.

51 So Cowe calls it “eclectic hybrid,” Cowe, “The Role of Priscian’s *Institutiones Grammaticae*,” 96.

52 Adontsʻ, *Dionysius the Thrax*. This is regarded as the first translation of the so-called Hellenizing School in old Armenian literature (see above and footnote 29). More importantly, the translation of the Dionysian *Ars grammatica* initiated the Armenian literature on grammar. This translation created the bulk of the grammatical terminology which was used over the course of centuries and remains in use today. This translation also established the principles of how to coin an abstract and scientific lexicon in general. The most important Armenian grammatical terms (like their Latin counterparts) were calqued from Greek. The

half of the fifth century.⁵³ In addition, K'ṛnets'ī used some of the several commentaries on Dionysius Thrax's work, which Armenian authors wrote between the sixth and fourteenth centuries, in particular, the commentary written by his teacher in the Gladzor monastery Esayi Nchets'ī.⁵⁴ Yovhannēs also included information on syntax that he borrowed from Latin grammatical works. Yovhannēs' work bears some influence of the sections on the noun and verb in Bartholomew's *Dialectics*, as has been noticed.⁵⁵ The grammar book is written in Grabar (Classical Armenian), but some examples are in Middle Armenian (appearing most apparently in the verbal forms with the prepositive particle *լու* – *ku*).

Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī applied most of the terms which Dionysius Thrax' Armenian translator coined, such as the names of the parts of speech and the main grammatical categories. In this respect, K'ṛnets'ī followed Dionysius' abovementioned commentators. At the same time, he also created some new terms, especially those about syntax.

In the introduction to the edition of Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'īs grammatical work, Suren Avagyan has pointed out that some parts had been influenced by (sometimes cited from) the work of Dionysius Thax, whom K'ṛnets'ī mentioned as “the grammarian” (Քերթող, 220).⁵⁶ Most affected by the Dionysian *Grammar* are the phonetic sections of the first and longest part, titled “Part One, on the Simple Knowledge,” which contains the following sections: “[1] On the letter,” “[2] On syllables,” “[3] On long syllables,” “[4] On short syllables,” and “[5] On common syllables” (K'ṛnets'ī also reflects some real features of Classical Armenian,⁵⁷ in contrast with the Armenian version of Dionysius⁵⁸). The last

Armenian version of Dionysius' grammatical work followed the word-order and syntax of the Greek original, Weitenberg, “Greek Influence in Early Armenian Linguistics.”

53 More precisely, between ca. 450 and the early 480s. There is also a later dating, namely the first half of the sixth century. The controversy concerning the process of dating the earliest translations is summarized in Muradyan, *The Creation of the Armenian Grammatical Terminology*, 76–111.

54 Avagyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī *On Grammar*, 53, 69, 77, 79.

55 Khachikyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī *On Grammar*, 48; Avagyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī *On Grammar*, 114.

56 The citations from the text in question are followed by the page numbers of Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī, *On Grammar*, which is the only edition of the work.

57 Avagyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K'ṛnets'ī *On Grammar*, 58. Avagyan argues that K'ṛnets'īs classification of the types of syllables resembles Priscian's classification into six categories (*ibid.*, 67–68).

58 The anonymous translator of that work also adapted the Greek model to Armenian grammar, e.g. by introducing phonetical features and grammatical categories alien to Armenian (short and long vowels, short and long syllables, grammatical gender, dual number). He created whole paradigms of artificial verbal

short “philological” chapters also show the influence of Dionysius’ *Grammar*, which are “Part Four, on Prosody,” “Part Five, on Metric Elements,”⁵⁹ and “Part Six, on Reading.” In the description of the parts of speech (sections 6–14 of “Part One”), K’rnets’i combines details found in Dionysius’ *Grammar* and Dionysius’ Armenian commentaries with Latin sources and his observations.

Like Dionysius Thrax, Yovhannēs K’rnets’i also discussed some grammatical categories which are not characteristic of the Armenian language.⁶⁰ One of these features is the gender of nouns. He writes: սեքք աճնուանց... արական է *hp* – այր, իգական է *tp* – կին, չեզոք է *op* – երկին (168, “the gender of nouns... masculine is *ik*’ – man, feminine is *ek*’ – woman, neuter is *ok*’ – sky”). The strange *ik*’, *ek*’, *ok*’ forms are transliterations of the Latin pronoun *hic*, *haec*, *hoc*,⁶¹ indicating the gender of the related nouns (cf. Petrus 323–327),⁶² and are called *articula* (Petrus 326). The same pronoun with various nouns figures in Priscianus’ section “De generibus” (Pr. 141–144).⁶³ Later, Yovhannēs K’rnets’i cautions that one should “be aware that there is difference of genders... in the Greek and Latin languages, but not in the Armenian speech [where it occurs] just scattered and at random.”⁶⁴

Yovhannēs K’rnets’i applied a considerable number of grammatical terms, drawing their origins from Dionysius Thrax’s *Ars grammatica*, which became common in Armenian grammatical works. The following are the main terms, followed by the corresponding Latin terms in Priscianus’ work:⁶⁵

աճնու (163–72) = Dion. 12–22⁶⁶ – ὄνομα (23.1, 24.3, 6, 29.1, 5, 36.1, 5,⁶⁷ etc.), “nomen;”

forms for verbal tenses non-existent in Armenian, etc. He did, however, also manage to reflect some features of Classical Armenian.

59 In Dionysius this title differs: “On Feet,” see Adonts’, *Dionysius the Thrax*, 43.

60 See the underlying theory in Alessandro Orenco’s paper in this Special Issue.

61 Avagyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K’rnets’i, *On Grammar*, 69.

62 The citations from Petrus’ commentary on Priscianus are followed by “Petrus” and the page numbers of Petrus Helias, *Summa*.

63 The citations from Priscianus are followed by “Pr.” and the book and page numbers of Prisciani *Institutionum I–XII & XIII–XVIII*.

64 Yovhannēs K’rnets’i, *On Grammar*, 169.

65 Most of them are used throughout the text, so references to pages do not seem reasonable.

66 The references to Armenian Dionysius are “Dion.” followed by page and line numbers of Adonts’, *Dionysius the Thrax*.

67 The references to Greek Dionysius are indications of page and line numbers in Dionysius Thrax. *Ars grammatica*.

թուական (165–6, 198) = Dion. 18.7, 21.22 – ἀριθμετικόν (33.5, 44.4), “numerales;”

բայ (176–81) = Dion. 12.4, 22.11, 15, 24.10, 25.20, etc. – ῥῆμα (23.1, 29.3, 46.4, 53.5, 54.1, 57.5, etc), “verbum;”

ընդունելութիւն (183–6) = Dion. 12.14, 26.23, 24 – μετοχή (23.1, 60.1), “participium;”

մակբայ (181–3) = Dion. 12.16, 31.1, 2, 5 – ἐπίρρημα (23.2, 72.3, 73.1), “adverbium;”

դերանուն (172–6) = Dion. 12.5, 30.1 – ἄντωνυμία (23.2, 63.1), “pronomens;”

նախդիր (189–90), cf. Dion. 12.15, 30.7 նախադրութիւն⁶⁸ – πρόθεσις (23.2, 70.2), “praepositio;”

յօդ (190–1) = Dion. 12.15, 27.2 – ἄρθρον (23.2, 66.1), “articulum;”

շաղկապ (186–9) = Dion. 12.6, 35.7, 11 – σύνδεσμος (23.2, 86.2, 87.1), “conjunctio.”

Among specific terms designating grammatical categories,⁶⁹ the following are worth mentioning:

սեռ մականասար ... երկբայական (168) – Dion. 13.10 = ἐπίκοινων (25.1), “genus epichenum⁷⁰ et dubium” (Petrus 325);

գերադրական (167) = Dion. 13.24, 15.12 – ὑπερθετικόν (25.7, 28.3), “superlativus” (Pr. III.86);

հրամական (177), cf. Dion. 22.21 հրամայական – προστακτική (47.3), “imperativus” (Pr. VIII.406);

ըղծական (177) = Dion. 22.21– εὐκτική (47.3), “optativus” (Pr. VIII.407);

ստորադասական (178) = Dion. 22.21 – ὑποτακτική (47.3), “subjunctivus” (Pr. VIII.408);

բայածական (197) = Dion. 13.25, 16.3 – ῥηματικόν (25.7, 29.3), “verbalium” (Petrus 1026);

աներևոյթ (178) = Dion. 22.20 – ἀπαρέμφατος (47.4), “infinitivus” (Petrus 202).

68 This term is made of the same components as նախդիր (prefix նախ- and root դիր/իր), with the addition of the suffix -ութիւն.

69 Those meaning “gender” (սեռ), “masculine” (արական), “feminine” (իգական), “neuter (gender)” (չեզոք), “number” (թիւ), “nominative” (ուղղական), “genitive” (սեռական), “dative” (տրական), “accusative” (հայցական) “person” (դէմք), “tense” (ամանակ/ժամանակ), “present” (ներկայ), “future” (ապագայ), “past” (անցեալ) are the same.

70 This term is borrowed from the Greek ἐπίκοινων.

2.2 *The Influence of Priscianus and His Commentators on Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻiʻ Grammar Book: Findings in the Scholarship*

The first and last sections of Kʻrnetsʻiʻs grammatical work, therefore, are indebted to Dionysius Thrax and his Armenian commentators. In contrast, the second section, titled “Part Two, on the Knowledge of Combination, that is of the Utterance,” and the third section, titled “Part Three, on Syntactic Links,” deal with syntax. These chapters offered something new, since neither the text of Dionysius nor of his commentators had included sections on syntax. The only name Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻiʻ mentioned in these parts on syntax⁷¹ was Priscianus (Պրիսիանոս) of Caesarea, the sixth-century author of the *Institutiones Grammaticae*, a systematic Latin grammar. Priscianus’ grammar book became the most influential work during the Middle Ages (especially books XVII and XVIII, the so-called *Priscianus minor*).

In a recent article, Tigran Sirunyan has demonstrated a considerable number of textual parallels, literal translations, or paraphrases in Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻiʻs work from Priscianus’ *Institutiones grammaticae*.⁷² Sirunyan has also shown that some passages in Kʻrnetsʻiʻs grammar can be traced back to Petrus Helias’ *Summa super Priscianum* (ca. 1150)⁷³ and to Sponcius Provincialis’ commentary on Priscian’s work (from the thirteenth-century).

Sirunyan is convinced that Yovhannēs drew information heavily from Priscianus’ grammar book when describing morphology, though without referring to Priscianus. Sirunyan also contends that in the sections on syntax Yovhannēs relied to Priscianus’ commentator(s). Such remarks as “Priscianus says”⁷⁴ are borrowed from Priscianus’ commentators.⁷⁵ For instance, Petrus Helias often used phrases such as “dicit Priscianus” (246), “tractat” (passim, e.g. 258), and “ponit” (passim, e.g. 244). I provide below the main parallels that Sirunyan offered:

Վանկ է պարառութիւն տառից ի ներքո միո ձայնի և միո շնչո անբաժանելի արտաբերեալ (161), “Syllable is a combination of letters pronounced indivisibly

71 Yovhannes Kʻrnetsʻiʻ, *On Grammar*, pp. 191 and 209.

72 Sirunyan, “The Latin Archetypes.”

73 Khachikyan had opined that the Armenian author either made use of both Priscianus and the commentary of Petrus Helias or even that he may have known Priscianus through the mediation Petrus, Khachikyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs Kʻrnetsʻiʻ, *On Grammar*, 48.

74 Yovhannes Kʻrnetsʻiʻ, *On Grammar*, pp. 191 and 209.

75 Sirunyan, “The Latin Archetypes,” 135.

in one sound and in one breath” – “Syllaba est comprehensio literarum consequens sub uno accentu et uno spiritu prolata” (Pr. I.44).

The features գոյացութիւն և որակութիւն (164 = “substantia et qualitas,” Pr. I.55) are added to the Dionysian definition of the noun (Dion. 12.22).

Դերանուն է մասն բանի յոլովական, եղեալ փոխանակ յատուկ անունան և նշանակէ զյատուկ իմն անձն (172), “Pronoun is a declinable part of speech put in the place of a proper noun and shows a certain person”), cf. “Pronomen est pars orationis, quae pro nomine proprio uniuscuiusque accipitur personasque finitas recipit” (Pr., XII.577).

Բայ է մասն բանի հոլովական⁷⁶, թարց անգման, հանդերձ ամանակաւ և դիմօք, որ նշանակէ ներգործութիւն և կիր կամ գերկոսեանն (176), “Verb is a declinable part of speech, without case, with tense and person, which shows activity and passivity or both” – “Proprium est verbi actionem sive passionem sive utrumque cum modis et formis et temporibus sine casu significare” (Pr. I.55); “Verbum est pars orationis cum temporibus et modis, sine casu, agendi vel patiendi significativum” (Pr. VIII.369).

Կերպ բային է ձայն, որ ցուցանէ զախորժակ սրտին (177), “Verbal mood is an expression (lit. voice) showing the inclination of the heart” – “Modi sunt diversae inclinationes animi, varios eius affectus demonstrantes” (Pr. VIII.421).

Մակբայ է մասն բանի անհոլովական, որո նշանակութիւնն յաւելեալ լինի բային, որպէս մակադրական անունանքն գոյականացն, քանզի որպէս ասեմք «խոհեմ մարդ», այսպէս և ասեմք, թէ՛ «խոհեմաբար առնէ» (181), “Adverb is an indeclinable part of speech the meaning of which is added to the verb, as the adjectives to the nouns, for as we say ‘prudent man,’ likewise we say ‘he acts prudently’ ” – “Adverbium est pars orationis indeclinabilis, cuius significatio verbis adicitur... quod adjectiva nomina... nominibus, ut ‘prudens homo prudenter agit’ ” (Pr. XV.61).

The following kinds of adverbs correspond to the Latin ones: երդմնական (182) – “jurativa” (Pr. XV.85), ըղձականք (182) – “optativa” (86), կարծողականք (182) – “dubitativa” (86), որպիսականք (182) – “qualitatis” (86), ժամանակականք (182) – “temporales” (81), տեղականք (182) – “locales” (83), հաստատականք (182) – “confirmativa” (85), յորդորականք (182) – “hortativa” (86), քանակականք (182) – “quantitatis” (86), ժողովականք (182)

76 Corrected by the editor to անհոլով (“indeclinable”). Cf. the arguments against this correction, Sirunyan, “The Latin Archetypes,” 125–26.

– “congregativa” (87), որոշականք (182) – “discretiva” (87), նմանականք (182) – “similitudinis” (87):

Շաղկապ է մասն բանի անհոլովական, շաղկապական կամ տարալուծական այլոց մասանց բանին՝ ընդ որս նշանակել կարգաւորեալ զմիտս բանին, ցուցանելով զօրութիւն կամ զկարգ իրաց (186), “Conjunction is an indeclinable part of speech, connective or disjunctive of other parts of speech, with which it manifests the ordered meaning of the utterance, showing the sense (lit. power) or the order of things” – “Conjunctio est pars orationis indeclinabilis, conjunctiva aliarum partium orationis, quibus consignificat, vim vel ordinationem demonstrans” (Pr. XVI.93).

Զօրութիւն, որպէս թէ ասել. «այս անուն էր գթած և խոհեմ» (186), “Sense (lit. power) – as if [one may] say: ‘so-and-so was merciful and prudent’ ” – “vim, quando simul esse res aliquas significant, ut et ‘pius et fortis fuit Aeneas’ ”⁷⁷ (Pr. XVI.93); զկարգն, յորժամ ցուցանէ զհետևումն իրաց (186, “order, when he shows the sequence of events”) – “ordinem, quando consequentiam aliquarum demonstrat rerum” (Pr. XVI.93).

The following kinds of conjunctions correspond to the Latin ones: բաղիիւսական – “copulativa,” շարադրական – “continuativa” (Pr. XVI.94), ենթաշարադրական – “subcontinuativa,” շարայարադրական – “adjunctiva” (Pr. XVI.95), փաստաբանական (the same in Dion. 36.14 – αἰτιολογικός, 88.1) – “causalis” (Pr. XVI.96), հաստատական – “approbativa” (Pr. XVI.97), տարալուծական – “disjunctiva, ենթատարալուծական – “subdisjunctiva” (Pr. XVI.98), ընտրողական – “electiva,” դիմադրական – “adversativa” (Pr. XVI.99), բաղբանական (= Dion. 37.1 – συλλογιστικός, 88.2) – “collectiva” (Pr. XVI.100), տարակուսական (= Dion. 36.22 – ἀπορηματικός, 94.2) – “dubitativa” (Pr. XVI.101), թարմատար (187 = Dion. 37.8 – παραπληρωματικός, 96.3) – “completiva” (Pr. XVI.102).

Նախդիր է մասն բանի ոչ հոլովական, որ նախադասի այլոց մասանց բանին յաւելմամբ կամ բաղբանութեամբ (189, “Preposition is an indeclinable part of

77 The replacement of “Aeneas” by “so-and-so” and “Virgil” and “Socrates” by biblical names (section 2.3.3, example 22) is consonant with the common practice in earlier Armenian translations from Greek, e.g. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ καὶ Πάρις (38.1), replaced by “Eleazar, who is also Avaran” (Dion. 19.19–20). For more examples see Muradyan, “The Reflection of Foreign Proper Names.” This wasn’t an absolute rule; in example 3 (2.3.3) Achilles’ name is preserved in the Armenian text. As to “Socrates” in example 21 (instead of “Priscianus”), his name was used by Aristotle in logical examples both in the *Categories* and in *On Interpretation*, which were accurately translated into Armenian in the sixth century and incorporated into commentaries on them, see Muradyan, Topchyan, “Commentaries on Aristotle’s *Categories* and *On Interpretation*.” Such use of Socrates’ name is also found in other Armenian commentaries on Aristotle.

speech, which is placed before other parts of speech by addition or connection”) – “Est igitur praepositio pars orationis indeclinabilis, quae praepositur aliis partibus vel appositione vel compositione” (Pr. XIV.24).

Բանն է պատշաճաւոր շարակարգութիւն ասութեանց (191, “Utterance is a suitable order of phrases”) – “Oratio est ordinatio dictionum congrua” (Pr. II.53).

Փրօլեմսիս, սէլէմսիս, սիմթոսիս, զէօմայ, անտիթոզիս (206, transliterated terms: “P^rolemsis, sēlēmsis simt^osis, zēōmay, antit^osis”) – prolemsis et silemsis et zeuma (Petrus 1003), antitosis (Petrus 1005).

Արծիւքն թռեան, այս արևելից, և այն արևմտից (207, “The eagles flew, this one from the east, and that one from the west”) – “Aquilae devolaverunt, haec ab oriente, ille ab occidente” (Pr. XVII.125).

Վերբերականութիւն է նախասացեալ իրին վերստին յիշեցումն (209, “Relation is reminding anew of the thing said before”) – “Relatio est, ut ait Priscianus, antelate rei repetitio” (Sponcius Provincialis).⁷⁸

Իսկ վերբերականացն ոմն է պակասական և ոմն ոչ պակասական: Պակասական է՝ «այն, որ կու ընթեռնու», ի յո դնի վերբերականն առանց նախադասութեանց, հիբար՝ «այն, որ կու ընթեռնու, կու տրամաբանէ». զի այն և որն է վերբերական և ոչ ունի նախադասեալ: Ոչ պակասական է այն, ի յոր դնի վերբերականն և նախադասեալն, հիկէն՝ «մարդն, որ կու ընթեռնու, կու տրամաբանէ»: Եւ զիտելի է, զի վերբերականս այս՝ «որ», կարէ դնիլ ընդ ամենայն անգմունս իւր, առանց նախադասելոյն (209, “Of relatives some are defective and others non-defective. Defective is: ‘the one who reads’ (in which the relative is put without antecedent,⁷⁹ as ‘the one who reads, reasons’), since ‘the one’ and ‘who’ is relative and has no antecedent. And not defective is that in which the relative and the antecedent are put, as ‘the man who reads, reasons.’ And it should be known that this relative, ‘who’ may be put in all its cases without antecedent”) – “Relationum alia est eclectica, et alia non eclectica. Eclectica est illa quando relativum ponitur per defectum antecedentis, ut ‘qui legit disputat’. Non eclectica est, quando relativum et antecedens ponuntur in locutione, ut ‘homo, qui legit, disputat’. Et notandum quod hoc relativum ‘qui’ potest poni per omnes suos casus per defectum antecedentis” (ibid.).

⁷⁸ Thurot, *Extraits des manuscrits Latins*, 357.

⁷⁹ առանց նախադասութեանց; the related նախադասելով (instrumental of the infinitive) was calqued from προτασόμενα (Dion. 5.14). Above նախադասի was rendered with *praepositur*.

Համրն է, յորժամ մի վերբերական վերաբերի առ միւսն, որպակ «այն, որ կու ընթեռնու, կու տրամաբանէ» (209, “[A relation] is mute⁸⁰ when one relative relates to another, as: ‘he who reads, reasons’”) – “Mutua relatio est illa, quando unum relativum tenetur alteri relativo, ut ‘ille qui legit, disputat’ ” (ibid.).

Անձնական է, յորժամ նախադասեալն և վերբերականն ենթադրին վասն նոյնին, որզոն «մարդ, որ կու ընթեռնու, կու գրէ»: Պարզ է... յորժամ նախադասեալն ենթադրէ վասն միո և վերբերականն վասն այլո, որզունակ «կինն, որ դատապարտեաց, փրկեաց» (210–211, “[A relation] is personal when the antecedent and the relative are supposed for the same, as ‘the man who reads, writes.’ [A relation] is simple... when the antecedent supposes one and the relative another, as ‘the woman who condemned, saved.’”) – “Personalis relatio est, quando antecedens supponit pro uno appellativo et relativum pro eodem, ut ‘P. legit, qui disputat’. Simplex est, quando antecedens supponit pro uno appellativo et relativum pro alio, ut in theologia ‘mulier quae damnavit, salvavit’⁸¹ ” (ibid. 358).

Sirunyan concludes that K՛րnets՛i is an innovator of Armenian grammatical thought who complemented the Hellenizing Armenian tradition with excerpts from Latin sources.

In addition to Sirunyan, Peter Cowe dedicated an article to K՛րnets՛i's grammar book. Cowe called attention to K՛րnets՛i's reference to the seven liberal arts in the introduction⁸² and noted that K՛րnets՛i had modified the order of his grammatical material compared to Dionysius.

Yovhannēs K՛րnets՛i discussed the parts of speech so that the pronoun immediately follows the noun, and the participle follows the verb, and he moved Dionysius' “philological” chapters from the beginning to the end.⁸³ Cowe also analyzed some aspects of his treatment of the verb (the definition of the verb, the imperative mood, the subjunctive mood) and of the pronoun,⁸⁴ and he made some remarks on the parts of the book devoted to syntax.⁸⁵ Cowe mainly collated passages from K՛րnets՛i's text with those of Priscianus. He examined the role of Middle Armenian examples in the grammatical book in question and concluded

80 The translator confused the Latin adjective *mutuus* (the Latin phrase speaks of a “reciprocal relation”) and *mutus* (“mute”).

81 Such syntax is explained by the influence of the twelfth-century logical theories; the woman is both Eve and Mary. Kneepkens, “Mulier qui damnavit,” 3.

82 Yovhannēs K՛րnets՛i *On Grammar*, 157–58; Cowe, “The Role of Priscian's Institutiones Grammaticae,” 98.

83 Ibid., 99–100.

84 Ibid., 101–8.

85 Ibid., 110–12.

it with the assertion that its author's "motive was rather one of enlightened pedagogy to facilitate his pupil's entry through the door of learning rather than embarking on path of *obscurum per obscurius*."⁸⁶ This means that some of K'ṛnets'i's examples were not taken from the "obscure" literary language but from the living language of his time. Cowe also cited K'ṛnets'i's ideas concerning the grammatical gender peculiar to Greek and Latin and the dual number in Greek and Arabic, which are absent from Armenian. Cowe highlighted K'ṛnets'i's combination of two cases of Armenian under one denomination (see the "sending" case below) and K'ṛnets'i's comments concerning the absence of short and long syllables in Armenian.⁸⁷

2.3 *Further Borrowings from Priscianus and his Commentators*

A close reading of K'ṛnets'i's grammar reveals further parallels with the works of Priscianus and Petrus Helias that escaped the attention of the scholars mentioned above. These parallels can be grouped into the following categories.

2.3.1 Terms Created by Yovhannēs by Calquing them from Latin

1. մակդրական (165) – "adjectivum" (Pr. II.60, Petrus 219, 220, 833, 1031)⁸⁸;
2. գոյացական (165) – "substantivum" (Petrus 766);
3. սեր հաւասար (168) – "genus commune" (Petrus 325);
4. ցուցական դերանուն (173) – "pronomen demonstrativum" (Pr. XII.577, Petrus 629);
5. վերաբերական դերանուն (173) – "pronomen relativum" (Pr. XII.577, Petrus 641)⁸⁹;
6. ազգական դերանուն (173) – "pronomen gentile" (Petrus 641);
7. ստացական դերանուն (173) = cf. Dion. 29.16–17 – κτητική (68.4) – "pronomen possessivum" (Pr. XII.581, Petrus 629);

86 Cowe, "The Role of Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae*," 110.

87 Ibid., 114–17.

88 Cf. մակդիր (Dion. 17.25), մակդրական (Dion. 18.15) – επίθετον (33.1, 34.3).

89 Cf. ցուցական (Dion. 18.3, 20.16) – (ὄνομα) δεικτικόν (33.3, 40.1); վերաբերական (Dion. 18.2, 20.17) – (ὄνομα) ἀναφορικόν (33.3, 40.1). In Dionysius, these two species are the same species of the noun: "*Anaphoric* noun (called also... a demonstrative)."

8. բայածականք (խնդրեն տրական անգումն... «ինձ գովելի» (197), “verbal [noun]s require the dative case... ‘praiseworthy for me’ ” – “verbalia (... construuntur cum dativo casu... ‘laudabilis’)” (Petrus 1026)⁹⁰;

9. անցեալ անկատար, անցեալ կատարեալ, անցեալ գերակատար (177), “past imperfect, past perfect, past pluperfect” – “praeteritum imperfectum, praeteritum perfectum, praeteritum plusquamperfectum” (Pr. VIII.405, Petrus 488)⁹¹;

10. կերպ բային (177) – “modus verbi” (Pr. VIII.406, Petrus 451)⁹²;

11. սեր բային (176) – “genus verbi” (Petrus 455)⁹³;

12. ցուցական (177) – “indicativus” (Pr. VIII.406, Petrus 523)⁹⁴;

13. բայք առնողականք (179) – “verbum activum” (Petrus 505), cf. Dion. 22.24 ներգործական = ἐνέργητικός (45.1);

14. անձնական բայք (180) – “personale verbum” (Petrus 874);

15. անանձնական բայք (180) – “impersonale verbum” (Petrus 505);

16. գոյացական բայք (200, 206, 208) – “verbum substantivum” (Pr. VIII.414, Petrus, 1017);

17. կոչնական բայք (200, 208) – “verbum vocativum” (Petrus 507);

18. անգումն (passim) – “casus” (Pr. 57, Petrus passim)⁹⁵;

19. խնդրել զսեռական / զտրական / զհայցական / զառարական անգումն (179–180, 195, 197), “to require the genitive/dative/accusative/ ‘sending’ case” – “verba... genetivum exigunt casum” (Pr. 159), “casum exigere” (Petrus passim, e.g. 963, 1055, 1056), the “sending” (առարական) case was added by the translator of Dionysius after the dative (Dion. 17.18) for the Armenian instrumental case,⁹⁶ since the Greek dative has such a function. In Kʻnets’i’s

90 Dionysius too speaks about verbal nouns, but there is no indication of any case required by them: բայածական (Dion. 13.25, 16.3) – ῥηματικός (25.7, 29.3).

91 Cf. յարածգական, յարակալ, գերակատար, անդրիշ (Dion. 22–24) – παρατακτικόν/παρακείμενον, ὑπερσυντέλικον, ἄριστον (53.2–3).

92 Cf. խոնարհումն (Dion. 22.19) – ἔγκλισις (47.1).

93 Cf. տրամադրութիւն (Dion. 22.23) = διάθεσις (47.1).

94 Cf. սահմանական (Dion. 22.23) = ὀριστική (43.3).

95 Cf. հղով (Dion. 13.6) – πῶσις (12.2). Kʻnets’i replaced the old հղով (literally “circular motion, rolling”) by անգումն (lit. falling) calqued from Latin, and he used the term հղով (164, 170, 188–190) to indicate various declensions, which was an innovation.

96 Its name is an adjective deriving from the verb առարել – “to send,” since “the dative” is followed by an explanation related to the verb ἐπιστέλλω – “to send” (ἡ δὲ δοτική ἐπισταλτική, 31.7), see Jahukyan, *Grammatical and Orthographical Works*, 69; Muradyan, *The Creation of the Armenian Grammatical terminology*, 247.

work, the “sending” case combines the Armenian ablative and instrumental cases, and he offers examples of both (197–198);

20. կառավարել զանգումն (189), “to govern a case,” կառավարութիւն անգմանց (195), “government of cases” – “nomen regit adiectivum... adiectivum regitur a substantivo... substantivum regit adiectivum” (Petrus 1051);

21. կատարեալ շարամանութիւն (198), “perfect construction” – “perfecta constructio” (Pr. XVIII.270, Petrus 648);

22. անկատար քան (198), “imperfect utterance” – “imperfecta oratio” (Pr. XVII.116, Petrus 220);

23. ոչ անցողաբար (199) – “intransitive” (Petrus 874);

24. ձևական շարամանութիւն (206) – “constructio figurativa” (Petrus 902).

2.3.2 Terms Transliterated by Yovhannēs

In addition to փրօլենսիս, սելենսիս, սիմթոսիս, զէօմայ, and անսիթոզիս (examples mentioned above), the following words are also transliterated: “gerundium” (Pr. VIII.410, Petrus 497) – ջերունիդական (178), “supinum” (Pr. VIII.410, Petrus 503) – սուփիննական (178), “dialectic” (Petrus 859) – դիալեկտիկոս (193).

2.3.3. Passages More or less Accurately Translated from Latin

1. Հետևին անուանն վեց՝ տեսակք, սերք, թիւք, ձևք, հոլովք, անկումն (164, “Six (accidents) accompany (lit. follow) the noun: species, genders, numbers, forms, declensions, and cases”) – “Accidunt igitur nomini quinque: species, genus, numerus, figura, casus” (Pr. II.57).

2. Մակերական է, որ յաւելեալ լինի ի վերայ իսկականին (165), “Adjective is what is added to the essential” – “Adiectivum est, quod adicitur propriis...” (Pr. II.60).

3. Գերադրական... Աքիլևս է զօրաւորագոյն ևս յունաց, այսինքն վերադրի քան զամենայն յոյնս (167–8), “Superlative... Achilles is the strongest of Greeks, that is he is put higher than all Greeks” – “Fortissimus Graiorum Achilles... sed superlativus multo alios excellere significat” (Pr. III.86).

4. Հետևին բային ութ, այսինքն՝ սերք, ժամանակ, կերպ, տեսակ, ձևք, լծորդութիւն, դէմք, թիւք (176), “Eight (accidents) accompany (lit. follow) the

verb,⁹⁷ that is voices, tense, mood, species, forms, conjugation, person, numbers”) – “Verbo accidunt octo: significatio sive genus, tempus, modus, species, figura, coniugatio et persona cum numero” (Pr. VIII.369).

5. Արդ սերք բային է որակութիւն իմն կազմեալ ի ձայնական աւարտմանէն և ի բնական նշանակութենէն (176), “Now the voices of the verb are a certain quality fashioned by a word (lit. sound) ending and natural meaning” – “Est igitur genus verbi qualitas verborum contracta ex terminatione et significatione (Petrus 455).

6. Են սերք բային հինգ՝ առնողական, կրողական, չեզոքական, հաւասարական, չեզոքական-կրողական (176), “The voices of the verb are five: active, passive, neutral, common (lit. equal), neutral-passive”) – “Nam cum quinque sint significationes, id est activa, neutra, passiva, communis, deponens” (Pr. XI.564).

7. Չեզոքական է, որոյ գործն նշանակէ առնողական կերպիւ, այլ ոչ անցողական (176), “The neutral [voice] is which signifies action in an active form, but not transitive” – “Neutrum vero genus est qualitas desinendi in *o* et significandi aliquid quod non sit actio transiens in homines” (Petrus 456).

8. Հաւասարական է, որ միով ձայնիւ նշանակէ զառնելն և զկրելն (176), “The common [voice] is which signifies activity and passivity with the same word” – “Commune vero genus est qualitas desinendi in *or* et significandi utrumque, scilicet, actionem et passionem” (Petrus 456).

9. Ցուցականք են, որ ցուցանեն զժամանակ, զդէմս և զթիւ (177), “The indicative [verbs] are those which indicate tense, person and number” – “Modi, primus quorum dicitur indicativus, quo, scilicet, indicamus temporum varietatem... vel ab aliis quod fit voces secunde et tercie persone” (Petrus 523–524).

10. Ըղձական կերպ... մակար թէ կու սիրէի (177–8), “Optative mood... would that I loved!” – “Optativus... utinam...” (Pr. VIII.407). The interjection *makar* in Middle Armenian was borrowed from the late Greek *μακάρι*.⁹⁸

11. Տեսակ բայից են երկու՝ նախազադափար և ածանցական⁹⁹: Նախազադափար, հիզան կարդամ, և ածանցական, որպէս կարդացնեմ, վազեմ-վազեցնեմ, դատեմ-ենթադատեմ (178), “There are two species of the

97 Cf. a different translation in Cowe, “The Role of Priscian’s *Institutiones Grammaticae*,” 101: “Eight [factors] are associated with the verb.”

98 Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon*, 727, translates “utinam! would that !” whereas Cowe (“The Role of Priscian’s *Institutiones Grammaticae*,” 104) follows the different interpretation of this word as a borrowing from Persian, see Ghazaryan, Avetisyan, *Dictionary of Middle Armenian*, 485.

99 The same terms are in Dion. 23.5–6 = *πρωτότυπον... παράγωγον* (50.1).

verb: primitive and derivative; primitive, as ‘I read,’ and derivative, as ‘I cause to read,’ ‘I run – I cause to run, I judge – I express’¹⁰⁰” – “Species sunt verborum duae, primitiva et derivativa... est igitur primitiva, quae primam positionem ab ipsa natura accepit, ut lego, ferveo...; derivativa, quae a positivis derivantur, ut lecturio, fervesco...” (Pr. VIII.427).

12. Ձևք բային են երեք՝ պարզ, բարդ, յարաբարդ: Պարզ՝ որկեն են, բարդ հիկեն գրեն, յարաբարդ որբար սրբագրեն (178), “There are three forms of the verb: simple, compound and super-compound. Simple, as ‘I am,’ compound, as ‘I write,’ super-compound, as ‘I correct (lit. write clean)’¹⁰¹” – “Figura quoque accidit verbo, quomodo nomini. Alia enim verborum sunt simplicia, ut cupio, taceo, alia composita, ut concupio, conticeo, alia decomposita, id est a compositis derivata, ut concupisco, conticesco” (Pr. VIII.434).

13. Առաջին [դէմք] որ խօսի, երկրորդ է, ընդ որում խօսի, երրորդ է, յորմէ խօսի (179), “The first person is the one who speaks, the second is to whom one speaks, the third is of whom one speaks” – “Prima persona praeponitur aliis, quia ipsa loquitur et per eam ostenditur et secunda, ad quam loquitur, et tertia, de qua loquitur” (Pr. VIII.423).

14. Բայք ոմանք անկանոնք (179), “Some verbs are irregular.” An example of a suppletive verb is offered: կու ուտեն, “I eat” (Middle Armenian present form), կերա “I ate” – “Irregularium vel inequalium declinatio” (Petrus 514, with the example “fero... tuli”).

15. Ընդունելութիւն է մասն բանի հոլովական, որ լինի առեալ փոխանակ բայի, ուստի և ածանցի իսկ, ունելով սերք և անգումն ըստ օրինակի անուան, գժամանակս և զնշանակութիւնս ի բայէն (183), “Participle is a declinable part of speech, which is taken instead of the verb, from which it derives, having gender and case like the noun, tense and significance¹⁰² from the verb” – “Participium est igitur pars orationis, quae pro verbo accipitur, ex quo et derivatur naturaliter, genus et casum habens ad similitudinem nominis et accidentia verbo absque discretionem personarum et modorum... accidunt autem participio sex: genus, casus, significatio, tempus, numerus, figura” (Pr. XI.552).

100 The first two verbs are causative (in Middle Armenian form), whereas the verb ենթադասուն (the prefix ենթ- is added to its “primitive counterpart”) is absent from the dictionaries; it is related to Dion. 2.9–10 ըստ ենթադասութեան = καθ’ ὑπόκρίσιν.

101 In fact, in the examples են-գրեն-սրբագրեն, են is the present first-person singular of the verb of being, which coincides with the ending of գրեն, so this one is labeled “compound,” whereas the “super-compound” սրբագրեն is a compound proper, the second component of which coincides with գրեն.

102 This means voice, cf. “significatio sive genus” (Pr. VIII.369).

16. Ասէ Պրիսիանոս, թէ ոչինչ բան է կատարեալ թարց բայի (191), “Priscianus says that no utterance is complete without a verb” – “Primo loco nomen, secundo verbum posuerunt, quippe cum nulla oratio sine iis completur” (Pr. XVII.116).

17. Գոյացականքն և մակադրականքն պարտին համաձայնի¹⁰³ ի յերիս պատահմունս, այսինքն ի սերս, ի թիւս և ի յանկմունս (192), “Substantives and adjectives must agree in three accidents, that is in gender, in number and in case” – “Dicuntur accidentia nomini casus et numerus” (Petrus 211).

18. Ճարամանութիւն է յարմար շարակարգութիւն ասութեանց (198), “Construction is the fitting arrangement of phrases” – “Constructio itaque est congrua dictionum ordinatio” (Petrus 832).

19. Ի կատարեալ շարամանութեանց ոմն է անցողական և ոմն ոչ անցողական, և ոմն անդրայշրջական (199), “Of complete constructions, one is transitive, one intransitive, and one reciprocal” – “Constructionum autem alia transitiva, alia intransitiva, alia reciproca” (Petrus 897).

20. Արդ անցողական շարամանութիւն է, ի յոր առնումն և կրումն բանին անցանէ ի մի դիմէն ի միւսն, հիպէս «Պետրոս ընթեռնու զԵսային» (199), “Now transitive construction is [that] in which the activity and passivity of the utterance passes from one person to another, as ‘Peter reads Isaiah’ ” – “Transitiva vero constructio est quando fit transitus de una persona in aliam, ut ‘Socrates legit Vergilium’ ” (Petrus 898).

21. Ոչ անցողական շարամանութիւն է, որ առնումն և կրումն ոչ անցանի ի մի դիմէն ի միւսն, որզան «Սոկրատէս ընթեռնու» (199), “Intransitive construction is [that] in which the activity and passivity does not pass from one person to another, as ‘Socrates reads’ ” – “Intransitiva constructio est in qua non fit transitus de una persona in aliam, ut ‘Priscianus legit’ (Petrus 898).

22. Իսկ անդրանցական շարամանութիւն է այն, ի յոր նոյն անձն ցուցանէ առնել և կրել, հիզան «Ես կու սիրեմ զիս, դու կու սիրես զքեզ, նա կու սիրէ զինքն» (199), “While reciprocal construction is in which the same person shows activity and passivity, as ‘I love myself, you love yourself, he loves himself’ ” – “Reciproca vero constructio est in qua ostenditur aliqua res in se ipsam agere, ut ‘Socrates diligit se’ ” (Petrus 899).

103 This word (without terminological connotation) and the related abstract noun (համաձայնութիւն), adjective (համաձայն) and adverb (համաձայնապէս) are attested in early texts as calques of the Greek ὁμοφωνέω and the related words. Here, it is an important syntactic term, for which I have not managed to find a Latin equivalent in the available sources.

23. Բաղադրեալ բանիցն մին մասն կոչի նախընթաց, և միւսն հետևեալ (199, “One part of compound utterances is called antecedent, the other consequent”) – “Relatio quandoque fit ad antecedens, quandoque ad consequens” (Petrus 910).

24. Բայք կոչնականք... ես կու կոչիմ արդար (200), “Vocative verbs... I am called just” – “Vocativa, ut Priscianus: vocor, nominor, nuncupor, appellor” (Pr. VIII.144).

25. Սիլեմսիս է զանազան ասութեանց միով բայի համագոյգ յղութիւն (207), “The *sylllepsis* is a collecting of different phrases united with one verb” – “Silemsis vero est diversarum clausularum per unum verbum conglutinata conceptio” (Petrus 1004). Here յղութիւն, “conception, pregnancy,” is used as a semantic calque of “conceptio” in the sense of “grasp, collecting.”

26. Առաջին դէմն յղանա զառաջին և զերկրորդ դէմն, հիպէս «ես և դու և նա ընթեռնումք»... երկրորդ դէմն յղանա զերրորդ դէմն ներքո բայի երկրորդ դիմացն, որ այսպէս. «դու և նա ընթեռնոյք» (207), “The first person collects (lit. conceives) the first and the second and the third person, as ‘I and you and he [we] read’... the second person collects (lit. conceives) the third person under the verb in second person, as ‘you and he [you] read’ ” – “Concipit autem prima persona secundam et terciam... Prima concipit secundam ut ‘Ego et tu legimus’... prima persona concipit terciam ut ‘Ego et ille legimus’... ‘Tu et ille legitis’. Potest enim secunda persona concipere terciam” (Petrus 998).

These passages listed above are the moments in K’rnets’i’s grammatical work that I could trace to Priscianus’ and Petrus Helias’ grammatical works. Based on these passages, I can make the following observations:

a) All the 24 grammatical terms (2.3.1) calqued by Yovhannēs from Priscianus are also found in Petrus Helias’ text. As far as the phrases translated from Latin are concerned, the origins of twelve of them are found in Priscianus and 14 in Petrus Helias. So K’rnets’i’s dependence on Petrus Helias is stronger than had been previously noticed, but this does not mean that he used Priscianus through the mediation of Petrus, as Levon Khachikyan has argued.¹⁰⁴

Taking into consideration the parallels with Sponcius Provincialis (section 2.2), one can assume that Yovhannēs drew information from various sources, as he himself writes in his colophon cited above: “from Armenians and Latins, [small] bits from many authors and grammarians.”¹⁰⁵ Bartholomew of Podio

104 Khachikyan, Introduction to Yovhannēs K’rnets’i, *On Grammar*, 48.

105 By “Armenians” he means the Armenian version of Dionysius and the Armenian commentaries on that text.

could have brought a book from Italy containing excerpts from Priscianus and other grammarians, and Yovhannēs could have used it as a source.

b) K'ṙnets'ī's dependence on Latin sources is more extensive than noted by previous scholarship. The influence of Latin grammarians promoted Armenian grammatical theory to a more advanced stage in comparison to the Dionysian tradition. K'ṙnets'ī covered more aspects of the language and drew a more realistic picture of Classical Armenian, while also reflecting some elements of Middle Armenian. K'ṙnets'ī singled out substantives and adjectives from the general notion of “noun” (2.3.1.1–2), introduced the categories of transitive and intransitive verbs (2.3.1.12–13), irregular verbs (2.3.3.14), case government (2.3.1.19–20) and agreement (2.3.3.17), of complex sentences (2.3.3.23), the notion that the participle shares features both with the noun and the verb (2.3.3.15), and the explanation of the three persons of the verb (2.3.3.13).

c) Some grammatical terms used by K'ṙnets'ī are still in use today and are common in the modern Armenian grammatical works.¹⁰⁶ To give examples, the terms for “verbal nouns”¹⁰⁷ (2.3.1.8), “past imperfect” and “past perfect” (2.3.1.9), verbal “modes” (2.3.11.10) and “voices” (2.3.1.11), the “neutral voice” (2.3.3.6–7), “derivative verbs” (containing prefixes and suffixes – 2.3.3.11), “irregular verbs” (2.3.3.14) go back to K'ṙnets'ī's grammar book.

106 In addition to all the terms listed above in section 1 (“Terms Created...”) (except those for “genus epichenum et dubium” and the infinitive) and in footnote 69.

107 With some semantic shift, today it means “verbal adjectives.”