

Albert A. Stepanian

WESTERN CANON OF HISTORIOGRAPHY IN HELLENISTIC ARMENIA

Pragmatic and tragic histories*

Keywords: Hellenism, Historiography, Pragmatic History, Tragic History, Armavir Inscriptions, King Artavazd II, Metrodorus of Scepsis.

Introduction

The western canon implied rational perception of history with a purpose formulated still by Herodotus as follows - to find out **how, when and why** (πῶς, ποτέ, διὰ τί) happened important events of history [Herod., I, 1, 1].¹ Efforts of Herodotus and his close contemporaries reformed the logographic genre of storytelling in an area of rationalistic study and explanation of the past. In accordance with this approach, the term ἱστορία was coined for denoting investigation in its proper sense.² From this time, the image of historians gained a particular social significance since the investigation of the past (despite pure curiosity) pursued practical interests.

During centuries, rationalistic approach gave birth to numerous genres of historical writing, from chronicles and annals to ethno-geographic descriptions and biographic sketches, from local and global histories to moral and philosophical reflections on events of the past.³ Such transmissions were particularly effective within cultural context of Hellenistic age. It affected different historical traditions in different ethnic, social and cultural circumstances.

As it is established, Hellenistic elite culture was effectively introduced in Greater Armenia by around the middle of the third century BC.⁴ It represented a combination of Greek, Zoroastrian and native Armenian traditions⁵ in various areas of intellectuality and

*The article is given for publication on 22.05.2017.

1 **Ankersmit**, 1983, 211 – 214; **Grant**, 1995, 58 – 59; **Stadner**, 2002, 39 – 43; **Munslow**, 2007, 38.

2 See in detail **Taho-Godi**, 1969, 107 – 126.

3 The outstanding historians of the Hellenistic age, and particularly Polybius and Posidonius, emphasized their adherence to the philosophic tradition of the time. Cf. **Bringmann**, 1997, 159 – 174; **Sreedharan**, 2004, 18 – 23; **Herchenroeder**, 2010, 8 – 15.

4 **Eremyan**, 1948, 34; **Tiratsyan**, 1971, 501; **Sargsyan**, 1969, 108.

5 The imaginative formula of A. Dan expresses the significance of such cultural interchanges very exactly: “L’idée d’envisager la culture grecque comme une palimpseste sous lequel on retrouverait les traces des

practice - religion beliefs and rituals, administration system and court etiquette, literature and rhetoric, theater and philosophy. Scholars on the base of literature and archeological material have studied the process.⁶ My task is to trace this syncretism in historiography. Aspects of this approach have already been discussed⁷ and now it seems necessary to enrich and systematize them in the light of modern approaches.

In Greater Armenia, the two genres of Hellenistic historical writing seem to deserve peculiar attention – **pragmatic history and tragic history**. They marked the process of introduction of western tradition in Armenian intellectual environment and make up the focus of the present investigation of the problem.⁸

1. Pragmatic History: Metrodorus of Scepsis

Initiated by Thucydides this genre (πραγματική ιστορία) greatly influenced the subsequent development of historiography.⁹ It saw its inborn character in tracing profound meanings and results of history through concrete events and deeds¹⁰. For this purpose, it applied ideas, concepts and research methods of philosophy and astronomy, geography and mathematics, rhetoric and poetry. From this point of view, the reflection of Thucydides on his own work seems exponential: “But he that desires to look into the truth of things done and which (according to the condition of humanity) may be done again, or at least their like, shall find enough herein to make him think it profitable. And it is compiled rather for an everlasting possession than to be rehearsed for a prize” [Thucid., I, 22, 4]. This new perception was against the everyday sense of storytelling in the frame of which “Most people, in fact, will take the trouble in finding out the truth, but are much inclined to accept the first history they hear” [Thucid., I, 20, 3].

Such inheritance was particularly current in the Hellenistic age.¹¹ The most prominent of its representatives was Polybius (II century BC.) who raised the genre to its unprecedented highs. It comprised two various perceptions of history – theoretical and practical. The author explained the significance of the first perception as follows: “The subject I have undertaken to treat, the how, who and wherefore of the subjection of the known parts of the world to the dominion of Rome, should be viewed as a single whole, with a recognized beginning, a fixed duration, and an end which is not a matter of dispute [...]” [Polyb., III, 1, 4 - 5]. As to the practical perception, it emphasized the influence of outstanding personalities on the course of history: “A physician cannot help the sick, if he is ignorant of the causes of certain conditions of the body, nor a statesman help his fellow citizen if he cannot follow how, why or by what process every event has developed” [Polyb., III, 7, 5].

Pragmatic history was thought as effective only in the case of a balanced combination of these opposite approaches. Many intellectuals of the II - I centuries BC. – particularly

civilisations plus anciennes [...]”. Dan, 2014, 52.

6 From numerous studies of this problem, We should like to put out those of the three eminent scholars: Eremyan, 1948, 33 – 46; Sargsyan, 1966, 12 – 14; Tiratsyan, 1988, 116 – 121.

7 Sargsyan, 1969, 107-126; Stepanyan, 1991, 121-139.

8 Stepanyan, 1991, 116.

9 Malitz, 1982, 257 – 259.

10 The two eminent representatives of the pragmatic history (πραγματική ιστορία) were Thucydides and Polybius. It was believed that the term denoted: “[...] a formal approach to study of the past based on current methods in the practical sciences”. Herchenroeder., 2010, 72.

11 Walbank, 1972, 40 – 43.

Posidonius, Diodorus Siculus, Timagenes, and Strabo – adopted this assumption of history.¹² Eminent Metrodorus of Scepsis was among them: “[...] a man of agreeable speech and wide learning” [Plut., Luc., 22, 2]. It is attested that he graduated from the Athenian Academy and soon became celebrated in political philosophy and logic, rhetoric and law theory, geography and history.¹³ However, evidences about his concrete ideas and concepts are very scarce and fragmentary wherefore we found it reasonable to juxtapose three important *texts* concerning him – life-course, semantic code of works (corpus), and some global ideas of the treaty “On Tigranes”.

The first text implies a common sight to the biography of the philosopher in the light of the renowned concept that the life of a creative individuality is a more or less exact embodiment of his beliefs and ideas, perceptions and concepts.¹⁴ In other words, despite simple people, he lives within his own *reverse perspective*.

In 75 BC., Metrodorus graduated from Academy, the scholarch of which (from about 79 BC.) was the outstanding philosopher Antiochus of Ascalon who crucially changed the content of academic curriculum and research strategy. Particularly, he denied the Skepticism paving a path for compiling important values of Old Academy with those of Peripatetic and Stoic Schools. Due to that, the rationalistic assumption of world and human being was recognized as a guiding principle of contemplative and practical modes of life.¹⁵ We are going to demonstrate the adherence of Metrodorus to this assumption. An adherence, which continued to lead his mind, will and social activity throughout all his creative life.

Through prestigious marriage, the philosopher acquired citizenship of Chalcedon, the most prosperous city of Troas. Here, during the Third Mithridatic War (73 – 71 BC.), he met Mithridat VI Eupator, the king of Pontus. He took the side of the king with great enthusiasm and began to pursue a public career in the royal court. In other words, he abandoned pure philosophy to practice political life (ἐκ τοῦ φιλόσοφου μεταβεβλήκως ἐπὶ τῶν βίου πρακτικόν) [Strabo, XIII,1, 55]¹⁶. Soon, he gained an exceptional honor and influence being appointed to supervise all the affairs of state justice (τὰ περὶ δικαιοδοσίας). In addition, he was granted with the title of *king's father* and his authority and power reached to an incontestable height so that nobody could appeal against his decisions [Ibid.].

It is also important to outline the essential perspective of this phase of Motrodorus' life. For this purpose, the Stoic ethic theory seems most appropriate. It prompted that a genuine philosopher (σόφος) had to *step down* from his pure contemplations to the level of appropriate actions (τὰ καθήκοντα) becoming a practitioner (ἀσκητής).¹⁷ The principal care

12 **Stepanyan**, 2014, 196.

13 **Fuchs**, 1938, 34 – 36. Sometimes, scholars confuse him with another intellectual of the same name, Metrodorus of Scepsis, a pupil of the Carneades. They neglect the account of Cicero: “[...] aequilem fere meum ex Academia rhetorem nactus Metrodorum illum.” [Cic., De orat., III, 20, 75]. See **Scullard**, 1992, 685.

14 **Foucault**, 1969, 181 – 182. J. Barnes applies the same approach in his interpretation of the speculative system of Antiochus of Ascalon. **Barnes**, 1989, 52 – 55.

15 On the new start of Academy under leadership of Antiochus see in detail **Merlan**, 1967, 53 – 57; **Barnes**, 1989, 67 – 78; **Polito**, 2012, 31 – 54.

16 The problem of transition from speculative wisdom (σοφία) to practical wisdom (φρόνησις) is formulated by Aristotle as follows: “The end of theoretical knowledge is the truth (ἀληθεία), while that of practical knowledge is action (τὸ ἐργόν) [...] practical men study not eternal principle but the relative and immediate application” [Arist., Met., II, 993b, 20]. The Stoics adopted this concept. Rist, 1977, 108 – 111. Philo of Alexandria proceeded from the same concept speaking about his endeavor to abandon the contemplative life for a political life [Philo, De spec. leg., III, 1 – 6]. Cf. **Runia**, 2000, 362.

17 Stoic philosophy was introduced in Rome in the 2d century BC., and the central figure of this adoption

of the latter was to bridge the social order with universal Order. This task seemed to be vital for the kingdom of Pontus consisting of numerous social and ethnic unities - from nomadic tribes and agricultural communities to industrious Greek cities - different languages, cultures and customs. Royal authority intended to bring them together through rational justice, law and administration. In Metrodorus, Mithridat Eupator (and his *enlightened proximi*) saw an adequate figure to carry out this paramount program.¹⁸

Soon, however, this idyll came to end. Relations between the king and philosopher soured sharply. The king secretly even planned to put him to death. According to Strabo, the philosopher “[...] incurred the enmity of men less just than himself” [Strabo, XIII, 1, 55]. Supposedly, they represented the conservative local (tribal) nobility longing to enlarge its traditional autonomy. This faction gained the upper hand in the second phase of the Third Mithridatic War when the king began to suffer defeats from Lucius Licinius Lucullus and lose control over his kingdom.¹⁹ In his turn, the king, probably, tried to depict the philosopher as a scapegoat of all his failures.

For averting the catastrophe, the Pontiac king strived to involve Greater Armenia into the war on his side. He sent Metrodorus to Tigran II, knowing about his sympathy to the philosopher. On his embassy, Metrodorus deserted the Pontian king and offered his service to the Armenian king.²⁰ Moreover, he advised him to deny Mithridat’s proposal and keep a middle position of neutrality between the two enemies – *beyond victory and defeat*. Metrodorus went for it, in spite of his personal hatred to Rome.²¹ As to Tigran II, he still had an illusion that, creating his empire, he did not contradict to the Roman perspectives in the East.²²

Metrodorus stayed in the Armenian court, but did not occupy any official position. Most probably, he was Tigran’s friend and private adviser (*φίλος και σύντροφος*).²³ It seemed that the philosopher had at last reached the calm haven of his instable life. However, these hops did not come true. In 69 BC., without declaring war, Lucullus, invaded Greater Armenia presenting himself as a liberator of peoples enslaved by Tigran [Plut., Luc., 29, 5]. The strategy of balanced neutrality thwarted. In the general battle, Tigran suffered a hard crash, and his capital Tigranocerta was sacked, captured and looted by the Roman soldiers. Under this ultimate condition, the king decided to come to terms with Mithridat, who had lost Pontus and lived in Armenia as a refugee.²⁴ The king of Pontus met the proposal of collaboration with enthusiasm but advanced his own condition demanding to send back Metrodorus at his disposition. Tigran agreed but did not realize that it was a death sentence of the philosopher. Indeed, at his comeback, Mithridat immediately put him to death [Plut., Luc., 22, 3 - 4]. Metrodorus was about forty years old.

Parallels with Plato are obvious. Like the great philosopher, Metrodorus tried to pat-

was Panaetius. The Stoic moral terms were transformed into the essential Roman values – *gravitas, decorum, officium*. See **Morford**, 2002, 22 – 32; **Schofield**, 2003, 242 – 246.

18 **Stepanyan**, 2014, 197 – 198; The subject “philosopher in the court” has a principal significance in studying of elitism and governing ideology in the Hellenistic age. **Erksine**, 2011, 181.

19 **Olshausen**, 1974, 160 – 166. The dichotomy of Hellenized and Conservative (local) branches of the elite was typical for Greater Armenia as well. Cf. **Stepanyan**, 2012, 142 – 157.

20 In other words, Tigran and his entourage, like the eminent Hellenistic courts, were ready to learn from philosophers. **Erksine**, 2011, 179.

21 “Metrodorus Scepsius qui cognomen Romani nominis odio inditum est [...]” [Plin. Nat. hist., XVIII, 3].

22 **Stepanyan**, 2012, 98.

23 On the category of *intellectual royal friends* in the Hellenistic courts, see **Strootman**, 2011, 74 – 76.

24 **Reinach**, 1890, 362 – 363; **Olshausen**, 1972, 812– 813.

tern his life-way in accordance with his social ideal. It is well attested, during all his long life, Plato did his best to incorporate his project of the ideal state in Syracuse.²⁵ However, he failed and at last gave up. Nearly the same is traceable in Metrodorus' life: he tried to bring about his theory of social order and justice in Pontus and Greater Armenia. However, in both cases, he failed and (in spite of Plato) paid for that with his life.

The second text concerns the semantic code of Metrodorus' works. For such analysis, we decided to proceed from the titles of his treatises, which are unfortunately lost. At first sight, they represent an unbound series – “On Gymnastic Training”, “On Herds”, “A Contour [of World]”, “On Customs” “On History”, “On Rhetoric”, “On Tigranes” etc.²⁶ Nonetheless, an experienced glance is able to trace some important common features uniting them.

Stoic theory attributes a support to speak about these features more exactly. The latter was based on a concept stating that an overwhelming sympathy integrated all elements of the universe making them to live in accordance with the *Order of Nature*.²⁷ The Stoics denoted this creative principle by different terms – reason, fire, breath, governing principle, god, logos etc. (νοῦς, πῦρ, πνεῦμα, τὸ ἡγεμονικόν, θεός, λόγος). They considered its emanations (ἐκπύροσις) to be aimed at the global cosmic determinism covering stars and planets, animals and men.²⁸ Order, justice and harmony of this imagined universe gave grounds to compare it with an ideal Commonwealth (City) securing welfare and happiness for its *partisan-citizens*.²⁹

Human being was depicted as the mediator of the cosmic justice and harmony in earthly circumstances. His body was thought to function due to the association of its different parts. It was believed that the most important function of men was to reproduce the cosmic balance in themselves through skillful gymnastic instruction.³⁰ The same was true about the partner relationship between creatures living with communal life (κοινωνία) - from families, tribes to various forms of city communities, political associations and empires. It was held that laws (expressions of the overwhelming Universal Law) would guide various forms of social partnership. This was estimated as the principal condition for earthly communities to imitate their heavenly pattern consisting of stars, planets and pure spirits.³¹ In this regard, fatalism was considered as the most important feature of the Universe.

Besides this fatalism, the Stoics, however, recognized also the personal responsibility of men to learn the cosmic Order and to act in accordance with it.³² For this purpose, they

25 It is well attested, the philosopher undertook three voyages to Syracuse (389 – 388, 367 – 361, 361 – 357 BC.) to educate and turn the tyrants into beneficent philosopher-kings. **Huard**, 1976, 109 – 110.

26 This presumptive list of the titles is extracted from the primary sources on the life and intellectual activity of the philosopher [FGrH, 184, 204, 205; **Apoll. Rhod., Scholl.**, IV, 133; **Athen.**, XIII,14; **Strabo**, XVI, 3, 6; 4, 7].

27 Cicero defined this isomorphism very exactly: “Just as there is no part of our body which is not of less value than we ourselves are, so the cosmos as a whole must be of more value than any part of it” [Cic., De nat. deorum, II, 32].

28 **Zeller**, 1886, 243 – 244; **Hankinson**, 1999, 531 – 534; **White**, 2003, 136 – 138.

29 **Stanton**, 1968, 183 – 195; **Tsolis**, 2000, 336 – 343; **Brown**, 2009, 357 – 364.

30 **Schofield**, 1999, 760 – 768; **Evans**, 2008, 108 – 109. On the cosmic character of human nature, see **Inwood**, 1999, 682 – 683.

31 **Mitsis**, 1999, 155 – 177.

32 The maxim of the Middle Stoa displayed this assumption entirely: volentem fata ducunt, nolentem tra-

were obliged to commit appropriate actions (τὰ καθήκοντα) which made up the focus of the intellectual and spiritual development of the *advanced and selected* men.³³ In this light, it is worth to remind that the Greek mentality and practice traced parallels between the body training and rhetoric instruction believing that the both were built on the same crucial values – proportion (κάρος) and craft-wisdom (μῆτις).³⁴

With the extension of these principles, the dwelled world (οἰκουμένη) would pass over all kinds of diversities. It would have a real chance to incorporate the cosmic Commonwealth building harmony of its ethnic and religious, cultural and moral, social and political aspects. The Stoics worked out a theory of global citizenship.³⁵

Perhaps, the close attention of Metrodorus to various tribes and peoples dwelling in the area from India to Caucasus, Asia Minor and Greece, Italy and (even) Germany must be discussed in the context of this approach [Plin. Hist. Nat., III, 20; VIII, 14; XXVIII, 23; XXXIV, 16; XXXVII, 15].³⁶ Though logical, this assumption stays still hypothetical and cannot pretend to unquestionable trustworthiness. Nevertheless, it draws a path in world-view system of Metrodorus.

The third text represents the treatise “*On Tigranes*”. Living in the Armenian court, the philosopher participated in activities of Tigran’s *brain center*: Presumably, he received suggestion to represent and vindicate the empire created by the king’s stable efforts. The treatise under consideration seems to be the result of this activity and most probably had an apologetic character.³⁷

Supposedly, the author proceeded from the Hellenistic political theory worked out under Platonic, Peripatetic and (particularly) Stoic ideas. Its central figure was the king estimated as an *incorporated law* (νόμος ἐμψυχος).³⁸ The objective of this function was to overcome real (or possible) disasters and connect the kingdom with cosmic Order. It was believed that the king would master this task through the military subjugation of his own realm.³⁹ The next important step of legalization endowed king’s authority with religious features representing him as a savior (σωτήρ), benefactor (εὐεργέτης) and even revealed god (ἐπιφανής) of his people.⁴⁰

Do the ancient sources witness like ideas about Tigran II? The positive answer would enhance the probability of our proposition about the treatise under consideration. In this regard, three fragments of ancient authors seem to be of undoubted interest.

hunt. Cf. Zeller, 1886, 242.

33 On the Stoic appropriate action based on moral choice (αἵρεσις) see in detail Rist, 1977, 97 – 111; White, 2010, 114 – 116.

34 On the discussions of this problem, see Hawhee, 2004, 86 – 93.

35 On the unity of mankind in the Stoic moral theory see Zeller, 1892, 327 – 328; Baldry, 1965, 162 – 167; Sellars J., 2007. The pure philosophical concept was adopted and implemented by Alexander the Great. Tarn, 1948, 137 – 148; Badian, 1958, 425 – 444; Bosworth, 1980, 1 – 21.

36 In this sense, the nearest predecessor of Metrodorus was perhaps Posidinius a master of regional descriptions (χωρογραφία). Cf. Nock, 1959, 7 – 12; Thümmel, 1984, 58 – 61; Clarke, 1999, 77 – 185; Yarrow, 2006, 163 – 166.

37 Stepanyan, 1991, 131 – 132.

38 Besides its religious and charismatic meaning, the term also had concrete judicial content denoting the exceptional role of Hellenistic kings in their kingdoms. The both aspects proceeded from the political philosophy worked out by the Stoics. See Goodenough, 1928, 63 – 65; Dvornik, 1966, 248.

39 Yates, 1966, 38 42; Dvornik, 1966, 249 – 251.

40 In fact, the kingdom was estimated as the affaires (τὰ πράγματα) of a king. The concept stressed the creative attitude of a king to his own realm. Goodenough, 1928, 67 – 68; Bringmann, 1993, 7 – 9. On the identic Parthian political ideology, see Dąbrowa, 2008, 29 – 30.

The first fragment belongs to Gn. Pompeius Trogus, an author of the 1st century B.C., whose narrative of world history - *Historiae Philippicae* – is credited to be composed on trustworthy primary sources. Telling about subduing of Seleucid Syria by the army of Tigran II, he records:

After the kings and kingdom of Syria had been exhausted by continual wars, occasioned by the mutual animosities of brothers, and by sons succeeding to the quarrels of their fathers, the people began look for relief from foreign parts, and to think of choosing a king from among the sovereigns of other nations. Some therefore advised that they should take Mithridates of Pontus, others Ptolemaeus of Egypt, but it being considered that Mithridates was engaged in war with the Romans, and Ptolemaeus had always been an enemy to Syria, the thoughts of all were directed to Tigranes king of Armenia, who, in addition to the strength of his own kingdom, was supported by an alliance with Parthia, and by matrimonial connection with Mithridates. Tigranes accordingly, being invited to the throne of Syria, enjoyed a most tranquil reign over it for seventeen years (per XVII annos tranquilissimo regno potitus est), without having occasion to go to war either to attack others or to defend himself [Just., Epit., XL, 1, 1 - 4]⁴¹.

This seems to be a description of a popular assembly with a well-elaborated scenario to vindicate Tigran's *peaceful conquest* of Syria as a great benefaction. As the main achievements of the king, order and peace (*pax*) have been pointed out which, however, continued only seventeen years (83 – 66 BC.). This idealistic vision of the events, of course, was far from the historical truth because other sources relate about resistance of the Syrians to Tigran's invasion [Strabo, XI, 14, 15; App., Syr., 48; Plut., Luc., 14, 5, 10]⁴². Some scholars are inclined to trace in this fragment a citation from *On Tigranes* by Metrodorus of Scepsis. A treatise targeted at the legitimation and propaganda of the king's empire.⁴³ Without tangible risk of error, one can even state that the fragment contains information about the concept of *pax Armenica*.⁴⁴

The second fragment, which belongs to Plutarch, seems to continue the same concept on the new ideas and considerations. At first sight, it contains Tigran's boastful self-estimation:

Above all else, the spirit of the king himself had become pompous and haughty in the midst of great prosperity. All the things which men most covet and admire, he not only had in his possession, but actually thought that they existed for his sake (ὃι αὐτόν γεγονυγέννοι) [Plut., Luc., 33,3].

However, a close concern leads to the conclusion that the Armenian sovereign spoke in accordance with his hypostasis of a *savior*. We have noticed, according to the common

41 The key term of the fragment *pax* (peace), according to the Hellenistic and (particularly) Roman political theory, made up the essence of every genuine government. **Parchmani**, 2009, 31 – 58;

42 **Mommsen**, 1867, 46 – 47; **Bevan**, 1902, 261 – 263; **Errington**, 2008, 277. For balanced assessment of the situation, some scholars find that the two approaches must be combined. Cf. **Asdourian**, 1911, 34, **Manandyan**, 1943, 49 – 50; **Garsoïan**, 1997, 65.

43 **Castiglioni**, 1928, 629; **Liebman-Frankfort**, 1969, 896 – 898.

44 **Stepanyan**, 2012,

Hellenistic assumption, an eminent king accomplished this function through a (real or ritual) act of conquest and occupation of his own land. Therefore, in official documents, his realm often was named a *land obtained by spear* (χώρα δορίκτητος).⁴⁵ Such concept emphasized his absolute authority over his subjects.⁴⁶ In other words, the *grotesque gesture*, ascribed by the author to the king, was nothing else than a norm of the Hellenistic political theory and practice. In this case also, without significant risk of error, one can accept this text as a cornerstone of Metrodorus' assumption of Tigran's Empire.⁴⁷

The third fragment again belongs to Plutach and seems to contain elements of the Roman counter-propaganda based on nearly the same ideas and values as in the case of Tigran II. It states: “Lucullus, after filling Asia *full of law and order, and full of peace* (πολῆς μὲν εὐνομίας, πολῆς δ' εἰρήνης), did not neglect the things which minister to pleasure and favour [...]” [Plut., Luc., 23, 1]. Strictly speaking, the Roman general ascribed himself the same function of the savor of Asia. Was the target of his ideological attack Metrodorus the *hater of Rome*? It is hard to assert because we have no direct account about that, and the answer may only be sought in logical constructs and probabilities.

The fourth fragment belongs to G. Pompeius Trogus. The appropriate interpretation of it promises to illuminate the important aspect of the legitimation of the empire of Tigran. A task, which remains untouched by modern scholars. It is about the place that the empire occupied in general world history according to its official propaganda.

For this approach, one must proceed from the following consideration: within centuries, in the East, a theory functioned about super-states succeeding one other in world history. Initially, it comprised the three renowned super-states - Assyria, Media and Achaemenid Iran. The latter was considered as the crown of history because of its largest extent and high degree of administrative, social, religion and cultural achievements. Afterwards, however, the Seleucid royal propaganda decided to add the new empire to this string, and the triad of the super-states was soon reshaped in a quadrat - Assyria, Media, Achaemenid Iran and Seleucid Empire.⁴⁸

At the end of the Seleucid age, the idea of a new super-state revived. First of all, it found expression in religious expectations and professes of the époque [Dan., II, 7; Lact., Div. inst., VII, 15–18; Just., Apol., I, 44, 12].⁴⁹ Among the states pretending to this role were Parthia, Pontus and (most probably) Greater Armenia. They intended to occupy the fifth position in the list of the super-states. Political propaganda each of them came to work out ideas and concepts to prove its pretensions on this role.

Despite Parthia and Pontus, the claim of Greater Armenia has never been discussed in modern scholarship⁵⁰, whereas there is a direct testimony of Trogus on this account. Relat-

45 This concept had two various aspects. The first denoted the king's mythological creative function. As to the second aspect, it represented the same concept reshaped, however, into a legal norm aimed at the regulation of real social relations. See **Goodenough**, 1928, 68 – 72; **Mehl**, 1980/1981, 174 – 190; **Hahn**, 2010, 458 – 464.

46 Cf. **Dvornik**, 1966, 262 – 263.

47 This Hellenistic concept is still traceable in the text of Moses Khorenatsi: “For the frontiers of the brave [...] are their weapons; as much they act, that much they hold” [Khor., I, 8, 4].

48 On this concept of world history, see in detail, **Swain**, 1940, 4 – 9.

49 On Hellenistic prophesies see in detail **Cumont**, 1931, 79 – 88. Two oracles also aroused spiritual enthusiasm in this transitive age – Oracula Sibyllina and Oracula Hystaspis. See, **Parke**, 1988, 125 – 135; **Suderman**, 2012, 606 – 609.

50 The Parthian claim was based on the ideology tracing blood relations between the Arsacids and Achaemenids. **Neusner**, 1963, 45 – 48; **Dąbrowa**, 2010, 130 – 131. As to Mithridates VI Eupator, he set up his claim

ing about subjugation of Syria by Gn. Pompey's in 64 BC., he records that one of the last Seleucids, Antiochus XIII, visited the general and raised a claim to regain his ancestral throne. But he was sharply denied: "[...] he (Pompey) would not give Antiochus what he himself had yielded to Tigranes (ita quo cesserit Tigrani) and what he would not know how to defend" [Just., Epit., XL, 4]. In this way, the Roman general underlined the fact that he had taken over the *Eastern legacy* from the hands of Tigran II signing the Artaxata treatise in 66 BC. On these grounds, he began to reorganize Syria into a Roman province.⁵¹

In other words, the right interpretation of the Artaxata treatise has a principal significance for the claim of Greater Armenia on world dominance. It is a renowned fact that, after ebbs and flows of wars and internal strives, the Armenian king of kings gave up and decided to come to terms with the Romans.⁵² The sides elected to settle the problems at the meeting of the two leaders. Receiving Tigran II at the Roman camp, Pompey solemnly "[...] spoke words of encouragement, telling him among other things that he had not lost the kingdom of Armenia, but had gained the friendship of the Romans" [Dio Cass., XXXVI, 52, 4].⁵³ In other words, Greater Armenia abandoned the occupied territories and the status of the great empire. By the next step, it was recognized as a Roman partner of high rank - *amicus populi Romani*, which meant its acknowledgement the Roman suzerainty in the East.⁵⁴

However, soon the Roman propaganda *forgot* about the Tigran's empire. Usually, Rome was more tolerant and flexible in the similar situations.⁵⁵ But the case under consideration was extraordinary because Roman intellectuals intended to solve an important ideological problem convincing the world that only their empire was the rightful heir of the Seleucid super-state. This perception found its full expression in the narrative of Velleius Paterculus:

The Assyrians were the first of all races to hold world power; then the Medes, after them the Persians, and then the Macedonians. Then through the defeat of Kings Philip and Antiochus, of Macedon origin [...] the world power passed to the Roman people (summa imperii ad populum Romanum pervenit)[Vel. Pat., I,6,6]⁵⁶.

Coming back to the quest of Greater Armenia to the status of super-state, the following becomes clear: the impulse proceeded from the *brain center* of the court of Tigran II.

on blood relations with both the Achaemenids and Seleucids. **Rubinsohn**, 1993, 7 – 8.

⁵¹ **Jones, Syrig**, 1992, 1030.

⁵² The last test of the lot was the rebellion of the crone-prince Tigran the Young who tried to usurp the throne with the Parthian support but failed. He decided to offer his services to Pompey but the general preferred to build relationship with Tigran II. On these grounds, his relations with Pompey were spoiled and he ended life in Roman captivity. See **Gray**, 1992, 1073.

⁵³ **Minasyan**, 2009, 94 – 101; **Stepanyan, Minasyan**, 2013, 26 – 27.

⁵⁴ Gn. Pompey settled Roman East as a rather complicated system of relations beginning from provinces and ending with allies and friends. It supplied the Romans with facility to govern this great territory (full of ethnic, social and cultural diversities) with appropriate flexibility. See **Downey**, 1951, 149 – 163; **Gruen**, 1984, 668 – 670; **Sherwin-White**, 1984, 209 – 226; **Ball**, 2002, 33 – 34.

⁵⁵ **Braund**, 1984, 81– 82.

⁵⁶ Later, however, the Romans began to consider the Parthians as their equals. Relating about the meeting of the August's heir Gaius Caesar with the Parthian king Fraataces, Velleius states: "[...] while two eminent leaders not only of the empires they represented but also of mankind (hominum) thus met in conference – truly a notable and memorable sight" [Vel. Pat., II, 51, 2].

In this regard, its concern with Metrodorus of Scepsis seems most probable.

On these grounds, bringing together the results of our discussion, we can tentatively point out the crucial concepts of the treatise “*On Tigranes*” as follows: a. Tigran’s empire was based on the principle of persuasion (ῥήσος) but not on bare coercion (κράτος) and it was aimed at peace, order and justice; b. the empire was a result of the king’s creative efforts: he had built it as a savior and benefactor of all his subjects; c. the empire occupied a honorable place in the string of super-states representing glory and destiny of the East, beginning from Assyria; d. the treatise “*On Tigranes*”, probably, was composed as an essay of world history focused, however, on the deeds of the king of kings and his ancestors⁵⁷.

Certainly, this narrative axis was complemented with numerous historical events and facts (τὰ πράγματα) but their consideration is beyond the limits our reach. We can only guess about them.

2. Features of Tragic History in Hellenistic Armenia

Theatricality was an obvious feature of everyday life in Hellenistic cities and (especially) royal courts. Respectively, scenic gesture began to prevail in ideology and decision making procedure.⁵⁸ Current events were interpreted after the archetypes of old myths and tragedies. Immortal gods and Tyche were held as the essential authors of the plot of history.⁵⁹ In this regard, the work of historian was believed to have a target to reveal the divine will through appropriate facilities and skills. Even Polybius, the most rationalistic historian of Hellenistic époque, could not remain indifferent to the ideas of tragic history and viewed in world history the greatest performance of Tyche (θέαμα) [Polyb., X,9,3, 11, 7 etc.]⁶⁰.

It is appropriate to look for a similar stimulus of adopting tragic history in Greater Armenia as well. In the court of Artaxiads (Artashēs I, Tigran II, Artavazd II), functioned a group Hellenistic intellectuals who could introduce this genre in the country.

a. *Armavir Inscription (Arm., II, 4)*

With a purpose to illuminate the genre of tragic history in Armenia, we decided to proceed from two different kinds of primary sources. On one hand, epigraphic data, on the other hand, the renowned fragment of Plutarch’s ‘Life of Crassus’ about theatrical performance in the court of the king Artavazd II (55 – 34 BC.).

Epigraphic data comes from archeological site of Armavir, the capital of Eruandid Armenia (6th – 3d centuries BC). Two basalt boulders (I, II) were discovered with Greek letters in 1911 and 1927. Scholars trace on them seven inscriptions – three on the first boulder and four on the second. They are fragmentary and sometimes poorly preserved, which makes their transcription, translation and interpretation extremely difficult. Despite

57 It is well known that compiling the recent period of Armenian history, Strabo had on hand an extend work and tried to sketch it in main features (ἐν κεφαλαίῳ) [Strabo, XI, 14, 15]. Departing from this fact, some scholars found it possible to trace in this primary source the treatise of Metrodorus or Artavazd II. Cf. **Sargsyan**, 1969, 119 – 120.

58 In spite of ritualized rural life, in the Hellenistic cities (and especially in the courts), life was apparently theatricalized. See **Chaniotis**, 1997, 219 – 221.

59 **Sreedharan**, 2004, 33.

60 **Walbank**, 1985, 68 – 69.

the efforts of scholars - J. Smirnov, A. Boltunova, H. Manandyan, C. Trever and J.-P. Mahé - our knowledge about their content is still ambiguous. Nevertheless, scholars are still unanimous about the character and (even) the content of some inscriptions [Arm., I, 1 – 3; II, 1, 4].⁶¹

However, it is not the purpose of the present investigation to discuss the epigraphic, orthographic, stylistic or literary peculiarities of the Armavir inscriptions. Our focus is the semantic cod of the fourth inscription of the second boulder [Arm., II, 4] in A. Boltunova's restoration and H. Manandyan's interpretation.⁶² It seems more trustworthy and supposedly contains a fragment of an unknown tragedy:

“What (message) Numenius passes to Philadelphus,
belongs to the murderer.
I deny it to contain anything disgraceful.
Indeed, he yielded up the ghost
with a weapon in his hand...
... [the adversary] has captured Armenian land with a new city ...”⁶³.

In its information, H. Manandyan traced the events of 201 BC., when the last king of Eruandid dynasty, Eruand the Last, challenged by Young Artashēs, was murdered in a battle. As to Philadelphus, supposedly, she was the priestess of the temple of Artemis/Anahit connected with the late king with sacred marriage ties (ιερογαμία), a religious experience and ritual reflecting the unity of basic cosmic and social elements in a sacred commonality.⁶⁴

The starting point of this interpretation is the fragment of Moses Khorenatsi recording in detail about the conflict of Eruand with Young Artashēs.⁶⁵ The king is depicted as an evil tyrant who has usurped the royal throne and dignity massacring the house of his predecessor, the king Sanatruk. As to Artashēs, he is the only offspring of the late king who has escaped the destiny of his brothers and sisters. His tutor prince Smbat Bagratid saves him and brings up in the Parthian court.

Artashēs' pretention to his paternal throne is quite legitimate, wherefore he is depicted as a personification justice and law. In a cruel battle, Eruand is defeated; abandoned by his soldiers and close entourage, he tries to find refuge in the palace of the royal capital Eruandashat: “However, one of soldiers entered and struck off Eruand's head with a saber, scattering his brains over the floor. From such blow he died, having held the throne for

61 On the details of discovery, transcription, translation and study of Armavir inscriptions see Trever, 1953, 104 – 148; Movsisyan, 2003, 124 – 137.

62 Manandyan, 1946, 9 – 17. This interpretation was accepted by Robert, 1952, 181 – 185; Habicht, 1953, 251 – 156; Mahé, 1994, 571 – 573.

63 Τῆι Φιλαδέλφωι Νουμήμιος [εἰ]πε [φο]νέοει
τουτ' ἔπος, ἀμείβω δ' οὐδὲν ἔχων ἀκλεές.
'Ἄλλὰ μιν ὄπλοφοροῦντα λίπεν θ[υ]μός ...
... καινάπολιν χώρον Ἀρμενίην κατ[ί]χεν ...

64 H. Manandyan even found her to be the sister of Eruand the Last. Manandyan, 1946, 16. On the sacred marriage, see Frazer, 1914, 70 – 72; Koester, 1995, 171 – 177; Avagianou, 2008, 150 – 156.

65 Ruling sometimes as Achaemenid satraps, sometimes as independent sovereigns of Armenia, the Eruandids linked the Post-Urartian period with that of the Artaxiads (6th – 3d centuries). See Tiratsyan, 1958, 53 – 72; Toumanoff, 1963, 277 – 285.

twenty years” [Khor., II, 46].⁶⁶

Classic sources (especially Strabo and Plutarch) provide records, which come to complete the lifecourse of Artashēs as the founder of Artaxiad dynasty (180 BC. – 52 AD.)⁶⁷. As it was demonstrated before, the new king first of all restored the territorial integrity of Greater Armenia establishing social peace and consensus. After that, he built a splendid new capital, Artaxata, the embodiment of the new social order. Let us underline again, scholars trace in his reformation the crucial event of history of Hellenistic Armenia.⁶⁸

The legitimation of the authority of the new dynasty was one of the most important problems of Artashēs I. Its echo is clearly traceable in the inscription under consideration: despite Khorenatsi, it portrays the last Eruandid king as a valiant and brave warrior who died “with a weapon in his hand”. This approach seems quite explainable: the political propaganda of the new dynasty tried to show the *blue blood* of its predecessor. It was well attested by the fact, that the Eruandids traced their origin from Achaemenids, the dynasty whose heritage continued to be desirable for centuries.⁶⁹ Subsequently, the next step of legitimation was to connect the Artaxiads with the Eruandids through ties of consanguinity. Scholars believe that this aspect is transparent in numerous Aramaic inscriptions found in contemporary Armenia. In them, Artashēs apparently names himself Eruandid - *RWND-KN*.⁷⁰

To define exactly the genre of the inscription under consideration, it seems necessary to point out the role of Numenius, a personage, who tells about the event, which has taken place beyond the visual scope. In other words, he tries to *present* the past event to the audience or readers. It makes possible to identify his figure with that of the *messenger*, a well-known mask of ancient theater.

As it is well attested, messengers (μήνυμα) were introduced in Greek drama to relate about offstage events: “[...] thought is required wherever a statement is proved, or a general truth (γνώμην) enunciated” [Arist., Poet., 1450a, 7]. Observations and comments, remarks and stories of messengers were usually based on accounts heard or seen *by others*. Scholars trace in their activity an effort to overcome the *innate failure* of Greek drama motivated by its threefold unity of action, time and place. In rational and transparent forms, messengers supported the motion of a dramatic plot to its logical and emotional end.⁷¹ Their information contained a secret designed to be uncovered during the performance. The focus of their words was the audience – real or imagined – who gained emotional and rational satisfaction.⁷²

66 In various religious systems, the sacred marriage personified the cause of cosmic and social harmony. **Kramer**, 1969, 22 – 26. The concept was adopted by the Christianity in the form of the marriage of Christ with the Church. **Klein J.**, 1992, 868–869.

67 We proceed from the idea that all the holders of the Armenian throne of the 1st half of the 1st century AD. – Tigran V, Zenon–Artashēs, Iberian princes (Mithridat and Rhadamist) Tigran VI, based their claims on the fact that they were Artaxiads by maternal line. Cf. **Toumanoff**, 1963, 81; **Stepanyan**, 2012, 28 – 68.

68 **Bargyan**, 1976, 521 – 553; **Adonts**, 2009, 445 – 455. About the metaphysical aspects of Artaxata see **Stepanyan**, 2014, 209 – 225.

69 **Boyce**, 1983, 427; **Daryaee T.**, 2006, 494 – 497.

70 More than twenty Aramaic inscriptions are found in modern Armenia, in which the king names himself Eruandakan. **Perikhanian**, 1966, 17 – 29; **Perikhanian**, 1971, 5 – 11.

71 **Barret**, 2002, 38 – 55.

72 The intellectual stance was characteristic for the Greek theater spectators: “In the Greek theater the spectators had to do much of the work themselves, to imagine places and settings, important information and relationships from the mythical tradition visualise in their minds the events occurring off-stage and narrated by others”. **Storey, Allan**, 2005, 52.

In this light, summing up the results of the discussion, the following assumption appears more appropriate: the inscription under consideration displays a fragment of an unknown tragedy. Scholars have come to the same conclusion, proceeding from semantic, stylistic and metric peculiarities of the text. Some of them even find (of course, tentatively) that its author is the king Artavazd II (55 – 34 BC.) renowned by his literary, rhetoric and historical works.⁷³

Combining this interpretation with that of H. Manandyan, we come up to a proposition that the fall Eruandid dynasty made up the content of a tragic plot which has not come down to us in its initial form. Continuing this logic, one could conclude that, in Hellenistic Armenia, historical past was staged in accordance with the canons of theatrical theory.

To what extent this proposition is true. For answer, we must explain another important question: are there more distinct evidences about the genre of tragic history in Hellenistic Greater Armenia? In other words, were there intellectuals enough acquainted with Aristotelian poetry which states particularly: “Poetry, therefore, is more philosophical and higher than history: for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular” [Arist., *Poet.*, 1451b, 4-5].

b. Tragic History of Artavazd II

The specified fragment of Plutarch (*Plut.*, *Crass.*, 19 - 33) is an important chain in the context of his narrative about the Parthian campaign of Marcus Licinius Crassus (54 – 53 BC.). He was one of the most influential politicians of the last generation of the Roman Republic. With G. J. Caesar and Gn. Pompey, he set up the so-called First Triumvirate in 60 BC.⁷⁴ Endowed with extraordinary authority and power, he arrived in Syria, and initiated preparations of the great military campaign against the Parthian Empire. He counted on the Roman friends and allies (*amici et socii*) of the East and particularly distinguished the king of Greater Armenia Artavazd II.⁷⁵

In 54 BC., the Armenian sovereign visited Crassus in Syria and promised a solid military support under his own conditions: “And he tried to persuade Crassus to invade Parthia by way of Armenia, for thus he would not only lead his forces along in the midst of plenty, which the king himself would provide, but would also proceed with safety [...]”. Crassus, however, denied the proposal responding that “[...] he should march through Mesopotamia, where had left many brave Romans” [Plut., *Crass.*, 19, 2]⁷⁶. Upon this, the Armenian king left the Roman Camp.

In 53 BC., the Parthian king Orodes II invaded Greater Armenia: “[...] in order that Artavazdes, the son of Tigranes, the king of the land at that time, should send no assistance to the Romans through fear for his own land” [Dio Cass., 40, 16, 2]. On this occasion, Artavazd II turned with a letter to Crassus to come and route the Parthians with joint forces. This proposal was also denied. Moreover, the Roman general began charging the king of treachery threatening that “[...] another time he would come and punish Artavas-

73 In his attempt to interpret the second inscription of the first boulder (I, 2), J. I. Smirnov came up to this conclusion. A.I. Boltunova and C.V. Trever supported his supposition. See **Trever**, 1953, 124 – 126.

74 For the analysis of the problem see, **Scullard**, 1963, 112 – 113 **Gruen**, 1974, 83 – 120; **Syme**, 2002, 35 – 37.

75 On the details of the campaign see, **Badian**, 1992, 295; **Shahbazi**, 1991, 9-13; **Debevoise**, 1968, 70 – 89; **Bivar**, 2006, 48 – 56.

76 **Arnaud**, 1985, 31 – 35; **Belikov**, 2001, 107 – 108; **Sampson**, 2008, 87 – 93.

des for treachery” [Plut., Crass., 19,3].⁷⁷ The Roman general was unable to appreciate the situation and make adequate decisions. On the contrary, he led his legions through waterless steppes and deserts of the North Mesopotamia heading to Seleucia-on-Tigris.

To meet Crassus, the Parthian king equipped a new army under the eminent nobleman Surena. The latter pursued the traditional Parthian war tactics which demanded to come up to a general battle after exhausting the enemy forces through a series local scrambles. Implementing this tactics, Surena surrounded the Roman army at Carrhae and forced it to surrender. More than 20 000 Roman legionaries were killed. Many were captivated and lived in slavery during long years. As to Crassus, he was captured and beheaded: “And the Parthians, as some say, poured molten gold into his mouth in mockery [...]” [Dio Cass., 40, 27, 3]. His head and right hand were sent to Artaxata, the capital of Greater Armenia, to Orodes II and Artavazd II, who had already stopped military actions and come to terms [Plut., Crass., 33, 2].⁷⁸

This unprecedented military crash left indelible mark in the memory of generations. The principal opponents estimated it from opposite points of view. The Romans saw in it the innate cruelty of the Parthians who, despite their promises, acted with an ultimate inhuman way - “war without truce and without treaty” [Plut., Crass., 18, 1]. The Parthians, in the contrary, saw in it a proof of their heroism and military prominence. They even staged a grandiose mockery procession (πομπήν γελοίαυ) moving through cities and villages of North Mesopotamia to humiliate and disgrace the Romans [Plut., Crass., 32, 2]⁷⁹.

As to the Armenians, they tried to escape the white-and-black axiology and compose a balanced approach to the situation. The focus of it became the renowned theatrical performance set up at the Armenian court. In it, we believe, a scene of encounter of the opposite approaches is traceable.

As it is pinpointed above, the Parthian and Armenian kings had reconciled and, in honor of the event, the Armenian princess (the daughter of Tigranes II and the sister of Artavazd II) married the Parthian crone-prince Pacorus. On this occasion, the highest military and administrative elite of both Parthia and Greater Armenia came together for the wedding party. Besides delicious dishes, music, dances and other entertainments, they desired to watch a performance uncovering *the profound meaning* of the great victory. Certainly, the audience (following the old religious practice) first traced in the party a sacred marriage ritual purposed at the restoration of overwhelming peace, justice and order.

However, Plutarch’s narrative shows also the other side of the issue. It makes clear that the party was directed in accordance with a well-elaborated theatrical plot.⁸⁰ Its author proceeded from the fact that his addressee was well acquainted with Greek language, lit-

77 Following “the letter and spirit” of Artaxata treaty, signed by Gn. Pompey and Tigran II (66 BC.), the king Artavazd II counted himself an amicus populi Romani whereas Crassus demanded from him duties of a socius populi Romani obliged to support Rome with all his resources. About similar situations, see **Braud**, 1984, 72 – 76. The fact is that, in the last period of The Republic, the Roman generals began to treat the partner states: “[...]in a traditional and almost feudal form of clientship”. Konstan, 1997, 3, 128 – 131.

78 **Asdourian**, 1911, 60 – 61; **Ziegler**, 1964, 34 – 35. Among the main causes of the disaster, modern scholars often point out the low level of the awareness of the Romans about the Parthians. Cf. **Campbell**, 1993, 216.

79 The procession represented a set of pictorial fragments to express the low passions and avarice of the enemy. Its plot was patterned on the Old Iranian world-view system well attested by numerous bas-reliefs of the Achaemenid and Sasanid ages – Behistun, Naqgh-i Rostam, Bishpur, Taq-i Bostan etc. See in detail, **MacDermot**, 1954, 76 – 80; **Herman**, 2000, 35 – 40; **Canepa**, 2010, 582 – 584.

80 **Stepanyan**, 2015, 114.

erature, rhetoric and everyday mode of life.⁸¹ According to Plutarch, it was true particularly about the two kings. This fact makes to think that the *reverse perspective* of the audience was active and ready to play an important role in the forthcoming performance.⁸²

The wedding party was held in the banquet-hall (τῷ ἀνδρῶνι) of the Artaxata court and comprised two phases. The first phase represented the traditional banquet (ἑστιάσεις τε καὶ πότοι) [Plut., Crass., 33, 1]. The kings and their close entourage (φίλοι καὶ σύντροφοι) took a separate seat. From time to time, they invited an eminent guest to honor him with a drink or gift. In its profound essence, these (and similar) actions were designed to reestablish the elite hierarchy and re-consolidate it around the royal authority.⁸³

The first phase ended, and the servants removed the tables. The second phase of the party started which, like old Greek symposia, contained a literary component as well.⁸⁴ According to tradition, the choice and interpretation of the piece depended on the artistic and philosophical taste of the head of the banquet (συμποσιάρχος) [cf. Plato, Symp., 176a].⁸⁵ In this regard, it must be added that such banquets were considered as private enterprises, and were most popular in the Hellenistic age. For example, Alexander the Great's symposia as a rule included dramatic and literary performances with the objective of illustrating the essence of contemporary events. Theatricality emerged as a prevailing mode of public behavior within decision-making procedure; and current events were interpreted in accordance with the archetypes of old myths and tragedies.⁸⁶

In our case, the head of the banquet also preferred to uncover the meaning of current events by means of tragedy⁸⁷. Presumably, he adhered to a *tragic* understanding of history which appeared among members of the Peripatetic school in response to the Aristotelian concept of the strict opposition between history and tragedy (poetry) [Arist., Poet., 1451b, 4 - 5].⁸⁸ They believed in the possibility of a genre of historical writing aimed at expressing universal meanings through concrete events and characters.⁸⁹

Following this perception, the director of the Artaxata performance stopped his choice on the *Bacchae* of Euripides as a model of his interpretation of the *event of the day*. Supposedly, he departed from the idea that “[...] tragedy is an imitation of an action that is serious, complete, and of certain magnitude” [Arist., Poet., 1449b, 12]. As it is obvious from ensuing text, it was first of all implemented with an intention to define an action which is complete and whole. In its turn, “A whole is that which has a beginning, a middle, and an end” [Arist., Poet., 1450b, 27].⁹⁰ For tracing this, we must restore the plot of the

81 Hellenism was an elite cultural phenomenon having its specific particularities in each concrete country. See, **Traina**, 2002, 22 – 23.

82 The eminent theologian and philosopher P. Florensky as a specific method of perception work out the theory of the reverse perspective when the inner space of an audience actively implements the content and meaning of a piece of art. See **Florensky**, 2006, 218 – 221.

83 **Cohen**, 2001, 115 – 118. The tradition of the like banquets was vivid at the Achaemenid court. As to the Seleucid court, it combined the Greek and Iranian traditions. Cf. **Brosius**, 2011, 41 – 44; **Murray**, 1996, 22 – 24.

84 **Wecowski**, 2014, 28 – 33.

85 **Murray**, 1990, 5.

86 **Borza**, 1983, 47 – 48; **Chanotis**, 1997, 224 – 226.

87 On the problem of the Hellenistic theater in Hellenistic Greater Armenia see, **Goyan**, 1952, 79 – 103; **Traina**, 2010, 95 – 102; **Stepanyan**, 2015, 115 – 118.

88 **Vernant**, 1990a, 245 – 246. The following fact is very indicative: Polybius the greatest critic of tragic history could not remain indifferent to its principal perception, and viewed the performance (θέαμα) Tyche in world history. Cf. **Walbank**, 1985, 225.

89 **Marincola**, 2013, 78 – 80.

90 **Butcher**, 1920, 334 – 336; **Ackrill J.**, 1977, 595 – 601; It must be underlined that modern narrative

tragedy in brief:

It begins with the comeback of Dionysus from the East to Thebes to take revenge on the royal house refusing to recognize and worship him. He also desires to vindicate his late mother, Semele, disgraced by the Thebans. God drives the Theban women into ecstatic madness and sends them on the top of Mount Cithaeron to commit orgies. They are turned into maenads and are led by Agave - the sister of Semele and mother of the young Theban king Pentheus. Dionysus meets with Pentheus disguised as a Stranger and enchants him as well. He convinces him to put on woman's clothing and go to Cithaeron to watch the orgies. But maenads catch him and in wild rush tear to pieces. In their mad imagination, Pentheus looks like a young lion. More active is Agave who holds the lion's head above her head solemnly leading the maenads to Thebes. She is in ritual delight but the trance soon wears off. She comes back to reality understanding that she has killed her beloved son. The mother's grief is limitless, and nobody can condole with her. The vengeance of Dionysus also concerns his earthly grandparents, Cadmus and his wife, and turns them into serpents. In the last action, Dionysus appears on the scene in all his glory. His triumph is complete since he has demonstrated divine power and established his worship in Thebes⁹¹.

This plot and its general idea (γνώριμα) were most probably present in the reverse perspective of the participants of the Artaxata performance, and the director was prepared to model his own vision of the day's event after it. More exactly, he planned to demonstrate in what way Crassus' Parthian expedition ended as a tragedy (ὡςπερ τραγωδίαν τελευτήσαι) [Plut., Crass., 33, 4].⁹² We believe, Plutarch's narrative contains sufficient information for outlining this *new plot*.

Tragic actors and a chorus were invited for this purpose. Made up they an itinerant artistic association (τεχνῖται Διονυσικοί) or lived permanently in the Armenian court?⁹³ This question remains ambiguous. In any event, the group played the roles prescribed it by the director, and the leading position belonged to Jason of Tralles who played the roles of both Agave and her son Pentheus.

Most probably, the performance was not designed to demonstrate the *Bacchae* in its entity, but only some fragments appropriate to the day's event.⁹⁴ In accordance with this approach, Jason first played the role of Pentheus presenting, evidently, his refusal to recognize Dionysus' divinity. The second fragment began with the song preparing the entrance of Agave. The participants likely had to restore the connection of the two fragments by memory proceeding from the text of Euripides.

theory proceeds just from this Aristotelian idea. See **White**, 1984, 3- 5.

91 The two persons make up the main opposition of tragic plot - Dionysus and Pentheus (anti-Dionysus). The first embodies the polarities of vitality: life and death, joy and sorrow, wisdom and violence. As to the second, he is tyrannous, lawless and selfish. See **Vernant**, 1990b, 403.

92 In other words, the director of the performance was an adherent of the genre of the tragic history. About the problems of the genre see, **Walbank**, 1985, 227 - 229; **Marincola**, 2013, 82. It is well traceable in the works of Plutarch. **De Lacy**, 1952, 159 - 171; **Zadorojny**, 1997, 169 - 182; **Mossman**, 1998, 83 - 93.

93 On the structure and functions of these associations (τεχνῖται Διονυσιακοί) see **Sifakis**, 1967, 99 - 103; **Evans**, 2008, 114 - 116.

94 The similar practice was well known at Hellenistic courts. See **Borza**, 1983, 171; **Chaniotis**, 1997, 232.

The deviation from Euripides plot began in the third fragment. A *messenger* of the general Surenra came up to the door of the banqueting-hall: “[...] and after a law obeisance cast the head of Crassus into the center of the company” [Plut., Crass., 33, 2]. He brought information about *offstage events*. From this point on, a *new tragedy plot* began on the conventional scene of the hall. With applause and shouts of joy, the audience accepted the main idea of the director about the identity of Pentheus and Crassus.⁹⁵ In this light, the Roman general looked as tyrannous, lawless and selfish antihero whose evil destiny was inevitable.

Meanwhile, Jason of Tralles continued in this vein, discarded the costume of Pentheus: “and assuming the role of the frenzied Agave, sang these verses as if inspired”:

*We bring from the mountain
A tendril fresh-cut to the palace,
A wonderful prey*” [Eur., Bacch., 1170 – 1172, Plut., Crass., 33, 3].

Following Euripides’ plot, the audience would come back to the image of the unhappy mother who had killed her son. In the case of Crassus, Mother-Rome would have been imagined in the role of Agave. According to this logic, the ideology of the tragic performance would have coincided with that of the ritual procession in which Rome represented the pole of evil. As it is shown above, the procession reflected the Parthian official interpretation formulated in the ideological center of the king of kings.⁹⁶ However, such expectations did not come to pass. The deviation from the standard plot continued, and Agave came up to her renowned dialogue with the chorus:

*“Who slew him? (Chorus)
Mine is the honour”.* (Agave) [Ibid.].

Suddenly, one of the Parthian grandees, Pomaxathres⁹⁷: “[...] sprang up and laid hold of the head, feeling that it was more appropriate for him to say this than for Jason” [Plut., Crass., 33,3]. On this occasion, the new interpretation of the plot became apparent: Mother-Rome had no part in the murder of Crassus. The author of this tragic incident was a Parthian grandee. In Plutarch’s words, the Parthian king was delighted and endowed both Pomaxathres and Jason with rich gifts. Supposedly, this interpretation was a *surprise* for him.

The author of the *new plot* had a task to legitimize the *alteration* through the previous course of actions of the antihero. He would have to make it in accordance with the canon of tragic plays, looking particularly for the point when *the change of fortune* occurred.⁹⁸ Keeping in mind the fact that tragedy represented a complete action, he would have to come back to the beginning of the Parthian expedition of Crassus.⁹⁹

The beginning of Crassus’ expedition, according to Plutarch’s narrative, was marked with dramatic events. In 54 BC, Crassus held consulship with Pompey, and Syria fell to him for the forthcoming five years by lot.¹⁰⁰ He accepted this with great exaltation and

⁹⁵ Stepanyan, 2015, 121.

⁹⁶ On this center and its activity see in detail: Neusner, 1963, 58; Dąbrowa, 2008, 25 – 31;

⁹⁷ Most probably the name derived from Nomoxavqrhš (= Av. Nāmōxšathra). Cf. Justi, 1895, 254.

⁹⁸ According to the canon of the classical tragedy, this point (τὸ μεταβολεῖν) was designed to reveal the essential motives and movements of the plot. de Romilly, 1970, 17; Wiles, 1997, 134 – 135.

⁹⁹ Cf. Smith, 1968, 10 – 14.

¹⁰⁰ It was an imitation of the common practice of the sortation of provinces between consuls (sortiri provincias). Cf. Badian, 1992, 891 –892.

began thinking: “[...] he would not consider Syria nor even Parthia as the boundaries of his success, but thought to make the campaigns of Lucullus against Tigranes and those of Pompey against Mithridates seem mere child’s play, and flew on the wings of his hopes as far as Bactria and India and the Outer Sea” [Plut., Crass., 16, 2].

Crassus boasted in this manner among the intimate circle of his friends but the rumor was soon spread in Rome, and the enemies initiated attacks against him. The plebeian tribunes¹⁰¹ were more active: invested with sacred power of veto in the borders of the City, they did their best to stop the expedition. They motivated their denial by divine and human justice: “[...] and a large party arose which was displeased that anyone should go out to wage war on men who had done the state no wrong (οὐδὲν ἀδικούσιν), but were in treaty relations with it (ἀλλ’ ἐνσπόνδοις)” [Crass., 16, 3]¹⁰². They particularly pointed out the fact that: “[...] in the decree which was passed regarding his mission there was no mention of a Parthian war” [Ibid.]. Caesar and Pompey, on the contrary, supported and encouraged Crassus.

On the day of the departure, the multitude was summoned by the plebeian tribunes to block Crassus’ passage out of the City. Nevertheless, the latter had foreseen such a possibility and had sought the support of Pompey who had great influence in Rome. Pompey joined Crassus’ procession and when the people saw his presence: “[...] they were mollified and gave way before them in silence” [Ibid.].¹⁰³ One of the plebeian tribunes, Ateius: “[...] on meeting Crassus, at first tried to stop him with words, and protested against his advance; then he bade his attendant to seize the person of Crassus and detain him” [Crass., 16, 4]. However, the other tribunes did not support him, and Crassus trod to the gate of the City¹⁰⁴. But Ateius did not give up:

He ran on ahead to the city gate, he placed there blazing brazier, and when Crassus came up, cast incense and libations upon it, and invoked curses which were dreadful and terrifying in themselves, and were reinforced by sundry and dreadful gods whom he summoned and called by name [Plut., Crass., 16,5].

The populace found fault with Ateius for casting these curses since, although he tried to obstruct Crassus for the sake the City (δὲ πῶλιν), the curses were believed to harm Rome as well. Indeed, it was an impressive change of fortune: Mother-Rome tried unsuccessfully to stop the plans of Crassus, her insane son, but he had already set up a triumvirate with Caesar and Pompey with the end: “[...] to make themselves sole masters of the

101 The collegium of plebeian tribunes was probably established in 494 BC. It contained ten members who were charged with the defense of the lives and property of the Roman citizens (ius auxilii). The person of the tribunes was sacrosanct, and nobody could insult them without severe punishment. If unanimous, they could excise a veto (ius intercessionis) against the acts of magistrates, laws, election and senatus consulta. They could also hold comitia tributata and pass decrees. The authority of the tribunes was valid in the borders of the City. See **Abbott**, 1901, 195 – 198; **Momigliano**, 1992, 1092; **Lintott**, 1999, 30 – 32; **North**, 2011, 264 – 266.

102 The procedure of the allotment of provinces usually resulted with a Senate decree designating the main tasks of the governor’s future mission. Cf. **Lintott**, 1999, 102.

103 Pompey understood that the campaign was fraught with great dangers that could cause it to end in disaster. However, he supported Crassus since such an outcome would not contradict his own plans. Supposedly, the same was true about Caesar’s support.

104 The walls and gates of the City spatially limited the power of the plebeian tribunes. At the same time, it was valid if all the member of the collegium (ten tribunes) were unanimous. **Momigliano**, 1992, 1092.

state” [Plut., Crass., 14, 5].¹⁰⁵In other words, the Mother herself was in great danger and was not responsible for the evil actions of her son.¹⁰⁶ From this perspective, the beginning and the end of Crassus’ life-tragedy seemed to be equivalent narrative units¹⁰⁷.

According to such interpretation, Rome was no longer assessed as the pole of evil, and the Parthian expedition of Crassus appeared as an unfortunate accident implemented by his personal avarice and vainglory. Consequently, with the catastrophe and murder of the antihero, the restoration of peace and harmony could now be quite possible. This message to Rome was uttered in the Armenian court through the deviation from the plot of the *Bacchae* of Euripides.¹⁰⁸

The correspondence of this message with the policy of Tigran II in last years of his reign was obvious. It implied friendly relations (amicitia) of Greater Armenia with both Rome and Parthia.¹⁰⁹ In other words, the strategy demanded from the country to support none of the conflicting super-state against the other. In this light, we can tentatively reconstruct Artavazd’s argumentation as well: he had supported neither Crassus against Parthia nor Orodes II against Rome. His strategy implied a neutral position - beyond alienation and hatred, victory and defeat - to endorse a compromise, the equivalent of the existential and moral mean (to; mevson).¹¹⁰ In semiotic perception, the situation could be defined through the formula “neither... nor”.¹¹¹

The symmetric correspondence of the beginning of Crassus’ Parthian campaign with his tragic end performed in the Armenian court suggested that they may have composed the crucial elements of a tragic history which may have made up one of important primary sources of Plutarch’s narrative about Crassus’ eastern campaign.

We now come up to the last point of the present investigation concerning the authorship of the performance in the Artaxata court. Indeed, who directed the semantic development of the historical play and skillful deviation from the plot of the *Bacchae*? The answer to his question can only be tentative and based on common logic of the situation, which, as demonstrated above, was that the palace performance and the artistic representation of the exoneration of Rome sought the restoration of the policy of friendship of Greater Armenia with both super-states. The text of Plutarch may help point us in the right direction as it contains a rather transparent allusion to the authorship of the performance.

Embellishing the portrait of Artavazd II, the author pinpoints the fact that he “actually composed tragedies, and wrote orations and histories” [Plut., Crass., 33, 2]. It is well

¹⁰⁵ Some could even have interpreted this approach as an indication of the sympathy of the director to the old Roman Republic. However, I find it too bold in view of the fact that we have no direct accounts of it in our primary sources.

¹⁰⁶ Usually, the Romans vindicated their military setback by the will of omnipotent Destiny. However, the case of Crassus was an exception: in time, the Roman public opinion formed a steady belief that his disaster resulted from his avarice and vainglory. See **Traina**, 2010, 209 – 212.

¹⁰⁷ This equivalence makes up the narrative mainstream of numerous literary genres. Cf. **Smith**, 1968, 10 – 14.

¹⁰⁸ **Stepanyan**, 2012, 183 – 186.

¹⁰⁹ It was after Artaxata treatise of friendship with the Romans (66 BC.), Tigran II came to terms with the Parthian king Phraates II: “For they both well understood that whichever of them should conquer the other would simply help along matters for the Romans and would himself become easier for them to subdue. For these reasons they were reconciled” [Dio Cass., 37, 7, 4]. Cf. **Stepanyan**, 2012, 138 – 139.

¹¹⁰ According to Aristotle, the mean marked the desirable middle of two extremes of the same quality. It corresponded to virtue excellence and beauty [Arist., Nic. Eth., 1106b, 19 – 29].

¹¹¹ **Stepanian**, 2013, 32.

known that the king had been tutored under the supervision of the Greek intellectuals who had found refuge in the court of Tigran II.¹¹² Among them the philosopher Methodorus of Scepis and the orator Amphicrates of Athens were most renowned [Plut., Luc., 22, 10].

Moreover, Plutarch states that some of the works of Artavazd II were still preserved (ὡς εἶναι διασώζονται) [Plut., Crass., 33, 2]. The eminent biographer and moral philosopher was writing his *Parallel Lives* in Greece more than a hundred years after the events under consideration, and it would not be exaggeration to state that the works of the Armenian king continued to hold the interest of Greek intellectuals. Does Plutarch's statement indicate that he had actually used Artavazd's works? An absolute answer again remains tentative; nevertheless, there is a high degree of probability that he did that.¹¹³

In this regard, a synopsis of the lost historical work attributed to the king Artavazd could presumably have looked as follows:

The three most influential politicians of Rome, Caesar, Pompey and Crassus, set up triumvirate to subdue the Republic. They occupied all the power and divided the empire between themselves. By lot, Crassus obtained Syria and fostered plans to overpower Parthia, Bactria, and India reaching the Outer Sea. Through plebeian tribunes, Rome tried to frustrate this insane plan but in vain. The Parthian campaign of Crassus ended in an unprecedented catastrophe at Charrae. Many Roman soldiers fell victims. The Parthians celebrated their victory with a great pomp. As to Greater Armenia, it adopted a middle position, which implied friendly relations with the both opposing sides. The Armenian king Artavazd II was well acquainted with the Hellenistic and Roman political theories according to which a friendly country (or a person) was obliged first of all not to harm the interests his partner. With this starting choice, the Armenian king decided to keep a neutral position between powerful neighbors. Consequently, he came to terms with the Parthians and hoped reach to the adequate relations with the Romans.¹¹⁴ He considered the Artaxata wedding party and theatrical performance as the focus for harmonizing the two approaches.

Summing up the discussion of the genre of tragic history, we have come to endorse the fact of undoubted presence of it in elite culture of Hellenistic Armenia. In both expressions of the latter – Armavir inscription and Plutarch's text – Artavazd II (with different grade of certainty) is recognized as the author of this intellectual experience.¹¹⁵ The target of his narrative was to transform the crucial events of the past and present into historical narrative.¹¹⁶ This experience is to be viewed in the context of the first attempts of introducing the western canon of historiography in Armenia.

112 They made up an intellectual center operating under the patronage of the queen of queens Cleopatra. **Stepanyan**, 2012, 320 – 322.

113 It is fair to underline that G. Goyan had already come to the belief that the Artaxata performance was directed by Artavazd II. See **Goyan**, 135– 148.

114 The director, obviously, departed from the idea that the form and context of the performance of a tragedy made the audience: “[...] to view the same characters and circumstances in a consciously constructed drama that pointed to a world beyond the theater”. **Rehm**, 1994, 46.

115 A similar arrtoach is opted by **Merkelbach**, 1995, 71 – 72.

116 According to P. Ricoeur, this transformation passes through two important phases. First, it shapes events into a novel (plot), after that reshapes it into history. **Ricoeur**, 1985, 214.

Conclusion

Summing up the sketch of the process of introducing the western historical canon in ancient Armenia, two genres of it must be pointed out, the pragmatic and the tragic histories. They varied by research approaches and methods but pursued the same purpose to reshape the past and present as a comprehensible narrative able to give answers to the essential questions of historical investigation – *how*, *when*, and *why* happened this or that crucial event. This approach, however, did not entirely replace traditional epic history, and within time, a synthetic genre emerged aimed at the synthesis of the two genres.

The western canon of historiography was introduced as a branch of Hellenistic elite culture concentrated in the two capitals of Greater Armenia, Artaxata and Tigranocerta. In the royal court, lived and created a group of intellectuals - rhetors, philosophers, writers, who set up the brain center called to perform the Greek intellectual achievements in this *remote land*. Some of them even tried to interpret history of the country in accordance with the Hellenistic perceptions. By their efforts, the mentioned genres of historiography became prominent in Greater Armenia.

Primary sources give clear evidence about the genre of pragmatic history, associating it with the name of Metrodorus of Scepsis, the eminent rhetor and philosopher. The main concern his work *On Tigranes* was world history focused on the deeds of Tigran II. It interpreted them in the light of the political theory of Hellenistic age and had a purpose to legitimate Tigran's empire as the personification of creative intentions of the East – both earthly and heavenly. Supposedly, it depicted the empire as a space of absolute peace and order led by the king to the prosperity of all ethnic and social units. The political propaganda of Tigran II considered the empire in the train of the great empires of the East - Assyria, Media, Achaemenid Iran and Seleucid Empire. It is no accident that Pompey justified the Roman dominance in Syria proceeding from the results of Artaxata treaty.

As to the second genre, the tragic history, it was associated with the name of Artavazd II. There is reason to believe that the king used the plots of eminent Greek tragedians to pattern the historical events of the past and present in order to uncover their profound metaphysic essence. Tragic history concerned the *poetry of history* and was ready to answer the question “what might happen” in this or that concrete situations. Applying the tools of tragic history, Artavazd II gave his interpretation of the Parthian campaign of Crassus, the *insane son* who caused a great trouble, against the will of his mother (Rome). In this light, Artavazd's authorship of the renowned Armavir inscription receives a new share of probability.

Of course, all these constructions are of assumptive character. However, in every case, this quality was formed in accordance with numerous (though indirect) accounts and conjectures. A fact that bestows our restorations with a higher degree of probability.

Bibliography

Sources

- Aristotle**, 1902, *The Poetics*. Translation by S.H. Butcher (London, Macmillan & Co.).
Aristotle, 1926, *Nicomachean Ethics*. With an English translation by H. Rackham (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard Univ. Press).
Cassius Dio Cocceianus, 1961, *Roman History*, v.3 – 4, With an English translation by E. Cary

(Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard Univ. Press).

Cicero M.T., 1942, *De oratore*, book III. With an English translation by H. Rackham (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard Univ. Press).

Cicero M.T., 1967, *De natura deorum*, books I – II. With an English translation by H. Rackham (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard Univ. Press).

FHGr, 1848, *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*, ed. C. et Th. Mülleri, t. II – III (Parisis, Ambrosio Firmin Didot).

Iustinus, 1976, *Trogi Pompei Historiarum Philippicarum Epitoma* (Lipsiae, ed. Teubner).

Moses Khorenatsi, 1978, *History of the Armenians*. Translation and commentary on the literary sources by R. W. Thomson (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard Univ. Press).

Paterculus Velleius, 1955, *Roman History*, v. 1 – 2, With an English translation by F.W. Shipley, in: *Compendium Historiae Romae* (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard Univ. Press).

Philo of Alexandria, 1993, *The Works of Philo*. Complete and Unbridged. New Updated Version. Trans. by C.D. Yonge (Peabod (Ma), Hendrickson Publ.).

Pliny, 1949 – 1954, *Natural History*, in 10 v. With an English translation by H. Rackham, W.H. Jones, D.E. Eichholtz (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard Univ. Press).

Plutarch, 1914 – 1916, *Parallel Lives*, v.2 -3. With an English translation by B. Perrin (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard Univ. Press).

Polybius, 1967 - 1968, *The Histories*, v. 1 – 2, 4. With an English translation by W.R. Paton, Revised by F.W. Walbank and Ch. Habicht (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard Univ. Press).

Strabo, 1954 – 1961, *Geographica*, v.3 – 5. With an English translation by B. Perrin (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard Univ. Press).

Thucidides, 1928, *The History of the Peloponnesian War*. With an English translation by Ch.F. Smith, v.2 (London, Heinemann Ltd, Cambridge (Ma), Harvard Univ. Press).

Monographs and Articles

Abbott F.F., 1901, *A History and Description of Roman Republic Institutions* (Boston & London, Ginn & Co Publ.).

Ackrill J., 1977, Aristotle on Action, Mind (*A Quarterly Review of Philosophy*), 87, 595 – 601.

Adonts N., 2009, Artashēs I and Unification of Armenian Lands: Critical hHistory o Armenia, in: *Works*, v. IV (Yerevan, YSU Publ.) [Աղոնց Ն., Արտաշես I-ը և հայկական հողերի միավորումը. Քննական պատմություն հայոց, Երկեր, հ. Դ (Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ.)], 445 – 455.

Ankersmit F.R., 1983, *Narrative Logic. A Semantic Analysis of the Historian’s Language* (The Hague and Boston, London, Matrin Nijhoff Publ.).

Arnaud P., 1985, Les relations de Rome et de l’empire arsacide de Sylla aux lendemains de Carthes: diplomatoque et idéologue politique, 95 – 53 av. J.C. (Rome, Ecole française de Rome).

Arnold E.V., 1911, *Roman Stoics* (Cambridge, UP).

Asdourian P., 1911, Die politischen Beziehungen zwischen Armenien und Rom von 190 v.Chr. bis 428 n. Chr. (Venedig, Mechiteristenbuchdruckerei).

Avagianou A., 2008, Hieros Gamos in Ancient Greek Religion: The Human Aspect of a Sacralised Ritual, in: *Sacred Marriages: The Divine-Human Sexual Metaphor from Sumer to Early Christianity*, ed. by M. Nissinen & R. Uro (Winona Lake (In), Eisenbraus), 145 – 172.

Badian E., 1958, Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind, *Historia*, 7, 425 – 444.

Badian E., 1992, Crassus Marcus Licinius, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 295.

Baldry H. C., 1965, *Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought* (Cambridge, UP).

Ball W., 2002, *Rome in the East. The Transformation of an Empire* (London, New York, Routledge).

Barnes J., 1989, Antiochus of Ascalon, in: *Philosophia Togata. Essays on Philosophy and Roman*

- Society, ed. by M. Griffin and J. Barnes (Oxford, Clarendon Press), 51 - 96.
- Barret J.**, 2002, *Staged Narrative. Poetics and Messenger in Greek Tragedy* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, Univ. of California Press).
- Belikov, A.P.**, 2001, Parthian Campany of Crassus, *Para Bellum* (Military-Historical Journal), 12, [Беликов А.П., Парфянский поход Красса, *Para Bellum* (Военно-исторический журнал), 12], 103 - 119.
- Bivar A.D.H.**, 2006, Political History of Iran under the Arsacids, in: *Cambridge History of Iran*, v.3/1, ed. By E.Yarshater (London, New York, Cambridge Univ Press), 21 – 99.
- Borza E.N.**, 1983, The Symposium at Alexander’s Court Text (1983), *Ancient Macedonia*, 3, (Thessaloniki), 45-55.
- Bosworth A.B.**, 1980, Alexander and the Iranians, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 100, 1 – 21.
- Botsford G.W.**, 1922, *Hellenic History* (New York, Macmillan Co.).
- Boyce M.**, 1983, Achaemenid Religion, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. by E. Yarshater (New York, Mazda) v.1/4, 426 – 429.
- Braund D.**, 1984, *Rome and the Friendly King. The Character of the Client Kingship* (London, New York, St. Martin’s Press).
- Bringmann K.**, 1993, The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism, in: *Images and Ideologies. Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. by E. Gruen et al. (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, California Univ.Press), 7 - 24
- Bringmann K.**, 1997, Posidonius and Athenion: A Study in Historiography, in: *Hellenistic Constructs. Essays on Culture, History and Historiography*, eds. P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey, E. Gruen (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, Univ. of California Press), 159 – 174.
- Brosius M.**, 2011, New out Old? Court and Court Ceremonies in Achaemenid Persia, in: *Court and Court Societies in Ancient Monarchies*, ed. by T.J.S. Spawforth (Cambridge, New York, CUP).
- Brown E.**, 2009, The Emergence of Natural Law and the Cosmopolis, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Political Thought*, ed. by S. Salkever (Cambridge, UP), 331 – 364.
- Brubaker R.**, 2004, *Ethnicity without Groups* (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard Univ. Press).
- Bundy D.**, 2007, Early Asian and East African Christianities, in: *The Cambridge History of Christianity* (CHCh), ed by A. Casiday and F. W. Norris (Cambridge UP), 118 – 148.
- Bury J.B.**, 1909, *The Ancient Greek Historians* (Harvard Lectures) (London, Macmillan & Co.).
- Butcher S. H.**, 1920, *Aristotle’s Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (London, Macmillan & Co., 4th ed.).
- Campbell B.**, 1993, War and Diplomacy: Rome and Parthia, 31 BC. – AD. 235, in: *War and Society in Roman World*, ed. by J. Rich and G. Shipley (London, New York, Routledge).
- Canepa M.**, 2010, Technology of Memory in Early Sasanian Iran: Achaemenid Sites and Sasanian Identity, *American Journal of Archeology*, 114/4, 582 – 584.
- Cartledge L.**, 2006, Historiography and Ancient Greek Self-Definition, in: *Companion to Historiography* (London, New York, Routledge, 2d. ed.), 20 – 37.
- Castiglioni L.**, 1928, Motivi antiromani nella tradizione storica antica, in: *Recordi dell’instituto Lombardo*, 61, 625 – 639.
- Chaniotis A.**, 1997, Theatricality beyond the Theater. Staging Politic Life in the Hellenistic World, *Pallas*, 47, 219 – 259.
- Clarke K.**, 1999, *Between Geography and history. Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford, Clarendon).
- Cumont F.**, 1931, La fin du monde selon les mages occidentaux, *Revue de l’histoire des religions*, 103, 29 – 96.
- Dąbrowa Ed.**, 2008, The Political Propaganda of the First Arsacids and Its Targets (From Arsaces I to Mithradates II), in: *Parthica 10* (Incontri di culture nel mondo antico), ed. A. Invernizzi (Pisa, Roma, Fabrizio Serra), 25 – 31.
- Dąbrowa Ed.**, 2010, The Parthian Kingship, in: *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity, Proceedings of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop: Padova, Nov. 28 – Dec. 1, 2007* (Padova, S.A.R.G.O.N. Editrice e Libreria), 123 – 134.

- Dan A.**, 2014, Les concepts en sciences de l'Antiquité: monde d'emploi (Chronique 2014 – Les transferts culturels) Dialogue d'histoire ancienne, 40/1, 239 – 305.
- Daryae T.**, 2006, The Construction of the Past in the Late Antique Persia, *Historia* (Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte), 55/4, 493 – 503.
- de Lacy Ph.**, 1952, Biography and Tragedy in Plutarch, *American Journal of Philology*, 73/2, 159 – 174.
- de Romilly J.**, 1970, La tragédie grecque (Paris, PUF).
- Debevoise N.C.**, 1968, A Political History of Parthia, 2d ed. (New York, Greenwood Press).
- Downey G.**, 1951, The Occupation of Syria by the Romans, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 82, 149 – 163.
- Dumézil G.**, 1938, Vahagn, *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 117/2, 152 – 170.
- Dvornik F.**, 1966, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Thought: Origins and Background (Locus Valley, New York, Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies).
- Eremyan S. T.**, 1948, Principal Features of Social Order of Armenia in Hellenistic Age (Bulletin of AS of Arm. SSR, 11) [Еремян С.Т., Основные черты общественного строя Армении в эллинистическую эпоху (Известия АН Арм. ССР, 11)], 33 – 73.
- Errington R. M.**, 2008, A History of Hellenistic World, 323 – 30 BC. (Oxford, Blackwell Publ.).
- Erskine A.**, 2011, Between Philosophy and the Court: The Life of Persaios of Kition, in: *Creating a Hellenistic World*, ed. by A. Erskine and L. L. Jones (Swansea, Classical Press of Wales), 177 – 194.
- Evans J. A.**, 2008, Daily Life in the Hellenistic Age. From Alexander to Cleopatra (Westport (Co), London, Greenwood Press.).
- Florensky Pavel**, 2006, Reverse Perspective, in *Beyond Vision: Essays on the Perception of Art*, ed. by Misler N., trans. by W. Salmond (London, Reaction Books Ltd).
- Foucault M.**, 1969, The Archeology of Knowledge, trans. by A.M. Sheridan Smith (New York, Pantheon).
- Frazer J.G.**, 1914, Adonis, Attis, Osiris. *Studies in History of Oriental Religion*, v.2 (London, Macmillan & Co Ltd).
- Fuchs A.**, 1938, Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt (Berlin, de Gruyter Vrlg.).
- Garsoïan N.**, 1967, Politique ou orthodoxie? L'Arménie au IVe siècle, *Revue des Études Arméniennes* (REA). 4, 297 – 320.
- Garsoïan N.**, 1989, Introduction, in: *The Epic Histories Attributed to Pawstos Buzand*, translation and commentary by N. Garsoïan (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP), 1 – 58.
- Garsoïan N.**, 1997a, The Emergence of Armenia, in: *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times*, v.1, The Dynastic Periods: From Antiquity to the Fourteenth Century, ed. by R.G. Hovhannisian (New York, St. Martin's Press) (APAMT), 52 -62.
- Garsoïan N.**, 1997b, Aršakuni Dynasty (AD. 12 – [180?] - 428), in: APAMT, 63 – 94.
- Goodenough E. R.**, 1928, The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship, *Yale Classical Studies*, 2, 55 – 102.
- Goyan G.**, 1952, Theater of Ancient Armenia (Moscow, Iskusstvo Publ.) [Гоян Г., Театр древней Армении (Москва, изд. Искусство)].
- Grant M.**, 1995, Greek and Roman Historians. Information and Misinformation (London, New York, Routledge).
- Gray E.W.**, 1992, Carrahae, in: *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 207.
- Gruen E.S.**, 1984, The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome, v.2 (Berkeley, Univ. of California Press).
- Habicht Ch.**, 1953, Über eine armenische Inschrift mit Versen des Euripides, *Hermes*, 81, 251 - 256.
- Hahn D. E.**, 2010, Kings and Constitutions: Hellenistic Theories, in: *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, ed. by Ch. Row et al (Cambridge, UP), 457 – 476.
- Hankinson R.J.**, 1999, Determinism and Indeterminism, in: *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, ed. by K. Algra, J Barnes et al. (Cambridge, UP) (CHHPh), 513 – 541.
- Hawhee D.**, 2004, Bodily Arts. Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece (Austin, Univ. of Texas Press).

- Heidegger M.**, 2009, *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*, trans. by R.D. Metcalf, M.B. Tanzer (Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Press).
- Herchenroeder L.**, 2010, *Hellenistic Historiography and Sciences Practices and Concepts by Polybius' Histories*. (A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the USG Graduate School Univ. of Southern California).
- Herman G.**, 2000, *The Rock Reliefs of Sassanian Iran*, in: *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Parthian and Sassanian Periods: Rejection and Revival, 238 B.C. – A.D. 642*, ed. by V.S. Curtis (London, British Museum Press), 35-45.
- Huard R.L.**, 1976, *Plato's Political Philosophy. The Cave* (New York, Algora Publ.).
- Inwood B.**, 1999, *Stoic Ethics*, in: *CHHP*, 675 – 738.
- Jones A. H. M., Syrig H.**, 1992, *Syria*, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 1030 - 1031.
- Justi F.**, 1895, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg, N.G. Elwert'sche Vrlg.).
- Klein J.**, 1992, *Sacred Marriage*, in: *The Anchor Dictionary*, v.5, ed. D.N. Freeman (New York, Doubleday), 866 – 870.
- Koester H.**, 1995, *Ephesos in Early Christian Literature: Ephesos, Metropolis of Asia. An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archeology, Religion and Culture* (Valley Forge, Trinity Press International), 119 – 140.
- Konstan D.**, 1997, *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge, UP).
- Kramer S. N.**, 1969, *The Sacred Marriage Rite* (Blomington, Indiana Univ. Press).
- Liebman-Frankfort Th.**, 1969, *L'histoire des parthes dans le livre XLI de Trogue Pompée. Essai d'identification de ses sources*, *Latomus*, 28, 894 – 922.
- Lintott A.**, 1999, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic* (Oxford, UP).
- MacDermot B.C.**, 1954, *Roman Emperors in the Sassanian Reliefs*, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 44, 76 -80.
- Mahé J.-P.**, 1994, *Moïse de Khoréne et les inscriptions grèques d'Armavir*, *TOPOI, Orient - Occident*, 4/2, 567 - 586.
- Malitz J.**, 1982, *Thukidides' Weg zur Geschichtsschreibung*, *Historia*, 31, 257 – 289.
- Manandyan H. H.**, 1943, *Tigran II and Rome: A New Interpretation Based on Primary Sources* (Yerevan, Armfan Publ.) [Манандян Я.А., Тигран II и Рим, В новом освещении по первоисточникам (Ереван, изд. Армфан)].
- Manandyan H. H.**, 1946, *Armavir Greek Inscriptions in a New Interpretation* (Yerevan, YSU Press) [Манандян Я.А., Армавирские греческие надписи в новом освещении (Ереван, изд. ЕГУ).]
- Manandyan H. H.**, 1954, *On the Trade and Cities of Ancient Armenia in Connection with World Trade of Remote Times (V c. BC. – AD. XIV c.)*, 2d ed. (Yerevan, ESU Press) [Манандян Я.А., О торговле и городах древней Армении в связи с мировой торговлей древних времен (V в. До н. э. – XIV в. н.э.) (Ереван, изд. ЕГУ)].
- Marincola J.**, 1997, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (New York, Cambridge UP).
- Marincola J.**, 2013, *Polybius, Plutarchus and Tragic History: A Reconstruction*, in: *Polybius and his World, In Memory of F.W. Walbank*, ed. by B.Gibson and Th. Harrison (Oxford, OUP), 73 – 90.
- Marwick A.**, 2001, *The New Nature of History. Knowledge, Evidence, Language* (London, Palgrave).
- Mauskopf Deliyanis D.**, 2003, *Introduction*, in: *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. by D. Mauskopf Deliyanis (Leiden, Boston, Brill).
- Mehl A.**, 1980/1981, *ΔΟΡΙΚΤΗΤΟΣ ΧΩΡΑ. Kritische Bemerkungen zum 'Speererwerb' in Politik und Völkerrecht der hellenistische Epoche*, *Ancient Society*, 11/12, 173 – 212.
- Merkelbach R.**, 1995, *Die Trimeter von Armavir - Inschrift eines armenischen Königs?*, *Epigraphica Anatolica*, 25, 71 - 72.
- Merlan P.**, 1967, *Greek Philosophy from Plato to Plotinus*, in: *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by A.H. Armstrong (Cambridge, UP), 14 – 136.

- Mintz A.**, 1996, *Hurban: Responses to Catastrophe in Hebrew Literature* (Syracuse, UP).
- Mitsis Ph.**, 1999, *The Stoic Natural Rights*, in: *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*, ed. by K. Ierodiakonou (Oxford, UP), 153 – 177.
- Momigliano A.**, 1966, *Time in Ancient Historiography*, *History and Theory*, 6/6, 1 – 23.
- Momigliano A.**, 1992, *Tribuni Plebis*, in: *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 1092.
- Morford M.**, 2002, *The Roman Philosophers, From Time of Cato the Censor to the Death of Marcus Aurelius* (London, New York, Routledge).
- Mossman J.M.**, 1998, *Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's Alexabder*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 108, 83 – 93.
- Movsisyan A.**, 2003, *Writing Systems in Pre-Mashtots Armenia* (Yerevan, YSU Publ.) [Մովսիսյան Ա., Նախաամաշտոցյան Հայաստանի գրային համակարգերը (Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ.)].
- Munslow M.**, 2007, *Narrative and History* (New York, Palgrave Mac Millan).
- Murray O.**, 1990, *Symptotic History*, in: *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*, ed. by O.Murray (Oxford, UP), 3 – 13.
- Murray O.**, 1996, *Hellenistic Royal Symposia*, in: *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*, ed. by P. Bidle et al. (Aarhus, UP), 15- 27.
- Neusner J.**, 1963, *Parthian Political Ideology*, *Iranica Antica*, 3, 40 – 58.
- Nock A.D.**, 1959, *Posidonius*, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 49, 1 – 15.
- North J.A.**, 2011, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*, in: *A Companion of the Roman Republic*, ed. by N. Rosenstein and Morstein-Marx (Malden, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell), 256 – 277.
- Olshausen E.**, 1972, *Mithridates VI und Rom*, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (ANRW), Bd, I/1 (Berlin, New York, de Gruyter & Co.), 806 – 815.
- Olshausen E.**, 1974, *Zum hellenisierungsprozess am Pontischen Königshof*, *Ancient Society*, 5, 153 – 170.
- Parchmani A.**, 2009, *Hegemony, Peace and Empire. The Pax Romana, Britannica and Americana* (London, New York, Routledge).
- Parke H.W.**, 1988, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, ed. by B.C. McGing (London, New York, Routledge).
- Perikhanian A.**, 1966, *Une inscription araméenne du roi Artashes trouvée à Zanguézour* (Siwnik), *REA*, 3, 17 – 29.
- Perikhanian A.**, 1971, *Inscription araméenne gravée sur une coupe d'argent trouvée à Sissian* (Arménie), *REA*, 8, 5 – 11.
- Petrosyan S.**, 1981, *An Attempt to Reconstruct the Acrostics of "Vahagn's Song"*, *Bulletin of Humanitarian Sciences of AS of the Arm. SSR* [Պետրոսյան Ս., «Վահագնի երգի» արքունիքաների վերականգնման փորձ, ՀԽՍՀ ԳԱ, Տեղեկագիր հասարակական գիտությունների], 4, 78 – 87.
- Polito R.**, 2012, *Antiochus and the Academy*, in: *The Philosophy of Antiochus*, ed. by D. Sedley (Cambridge, New York, Cambridge Univ. Press), 31 – 54.
- Rehm R.**, 1994, *Greek Tragic Theatre* (London, New York, Routledge).
- Reinach Th.**, 1890, *Mithridate Eupator, Roi de Pont* (Paris, Librairie de Firmin-Didot et Co.).
- Ricoeur P.**, 1985, *History as Narrative and Practice*, *Philosophy Today*, 23/3, 213 – 221.
- Rist J. M.**, 1977, *Plotinus: The Road to Reality* (Cambridge, UP).
- Robert J. et L.**, 1952, *Bulletin épigraphique, Revue des Études Grecques*, 65, 181 - 185.
- Rubinson W. Z.**, 1993, *Mithridates VI Dionysos and Rome's Conquest of the Hellenistic East*, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 8/1, 5 – 54.
- Runia D.**, 2000, *The Idea and Reality of the City in the Thought of Philo of Alexandria*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61/3, 361 – 379.
- Sampson G.C.** (2008), *The Defeat of Rome. Crassus, Carrhae and the Invasion of the East* (New York, Barnsey).
- Sargsyan G. Kh.**, 1966, *Armenia of Hellenistic Age and Moses Khorenarsi* (Yerevan, AS of the

- Arm.SSR Publ.) [Սարգսյան Գ.Խ., Հելլենիստական դարաշրջանի Հայաստանը և Սոլվես Խորենացին (Երևան, ՀԽՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ)]:
- Sargsyan G. Kh.**, 1969, *Historiography of Pre-Mashtots Period, Historical-Philological Journal of AS of the Arm.SSR*, 1 [Սարգսյան Գ.Խ., 1969, Նախամաշտոցյան շրջանի պատմագրությունը, ՊԲՀ, 1], 107 – 126.
- Sargsyan G. Kh.**, 1976, *Unification and Reinforcement of Armenia under Artashēs I*, in: *History of Armenian People*, v.1, ed. by S.T. Yeremyan et al. (Yerevan, AS of the Arm SSR) [Սարգսյան Գ.Խ., Հայաստանի միավորումը և հզորացումը Արտաշես Ա-ի օրոք, ՀԺՊ, հատ. I, խմբ. **Ս.Տ. Երեմյան** և այլք (Երևան, ՀԽՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ)], 521 – 553.
- Schofield M.**, 2003, *Stoic Ethics*, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Hellenistic World*, ed. by G.R. Bugh (CCS) (Cambridge, New York, CUP), 233- 256.
- Scullard H.H.**, 1963, *From Gracchi to Nero. A History of Rome from 133 BC. to 68 AD.* (London Methuen and Co. Ltd, 2d ed.,).
- Scullard H.H.**, 1992, *Metrodorus of Scrcpsis in Mysia*, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* , 685.
- Sellars J.**, 2007, *Stoic Cosmopolitanism and Zeno’s Republic*, *History of Political Thought*, 27/1, 1 – 29.
- Shahbazi A. Sh.**, 1991, *Carrhae*, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, v.5/9 – 13.
- Sherwin-White A.N.**, 1984, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East: 168 BC. – AD.1* (Norman, Univ. of Oklahoma Press).
- Sifakis G.M.**, 1967, *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama* (London, Athlon Press).
- Smith B.H.**, 1968, *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End* (Chicago, UP).
- Sreedharen**, 2004, *A Textbook of Historiography, 500 BC. to AD.2000* (New Delhi, Orient Longman).
- Stadter Ph. A.**, 2002, *Historical Thought in Ancient Greece*, in: *A Companion to Western Historical Thought*, ed. by L. Kramer, S. Maza (Malden, Oxford, Blackwell Publ.), 35 – 59.
- Stanton**, 1968, *The Cosmopolitan Ideas of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius*, *Phronesis*, 13, 183 – 195.
- Stepanyan A.A.** 1991, *Development of Historical Thinking in Ancient Armenia. Myth, Rationalism, Historiography* (Yerevan, AS of the Arm. SSR Press) [Степанян А.А., Развитие исторической мысли в древней Армении. Миф, рационализм, историописание (Ереван, изд. АН Арм ССР)].
- Stepanyan A.A.**, 2012, *Metamorphoses of History in Greater Armenia*, v.1 *The Age of the Artaxiads* (Yerevan, S. Khachents • Printinfo) [Ստեփանյան Ա.Ա., Պատմության կերպափոխությունները Մեծ Հայքում. հ.Ա Արտաշիսյան դարաշրջան, Ս.Խաչենց • Փրինթինֆո].
- Stepanyan A. A., Minasyan L. R.**, 2013, *Greater Armenia and Euphrates Frontier in 60-s AD* (Conflict, ideas, settlement), *The Journal of Armenian Studies*, of NAS of the RA, 1, 14 – 33.
- Stepanyan A.A.**, 2014, *Metrodorus of Scepsis: An Attempt of Reconstruction of Historical Concept*, in: *The Trace of History: Deeds, Writings, Essence* (Yerevan, Printinfo) [Ստեփանյան Ա. Մեթրոդորոս Սկեփսացի. պատմասիրական համակարգի վերականգնման փորձ, Պատմության հետազիծը. Գործք, Գրույթ, Իմաստ (ՊՀ) (Երևան, Փրինթինֆո)], 194 – 211.
- Stepanyan A. A.**, 2015, *Relations between Tragedy and Historical Experience in Plutarch* (Crassus, 33), *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies*, 24, 112 – 123.
- Storey I.C., Allan A.A.**, 2005, *A Guide to Ancient Greek Drama* (Oxford, Blackwell).
- Strootman R.**, 2011, *Hellenistic Court Society: The Seleukid Imperial Court under Antiochos the Great*, in: *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires: Global Perspectives*, ed. by J. Duindam, M. Kunt, T. Artan (Leiden, Brill), 63 – 89.
- Suderman W.**, 2012, *Oracles of Hystaspes*, in: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, v.XII, fasc. 6, 606 – 609.
- Swain J.W.**, 1940, *The Theory of Four Monarchies: Opposition History under Roman Empire*, *Classical Quarterly*, 35, 1 – 21.

- Syme R.**, 2002, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, UP, 5th ed.).
- Taho-Godi A. E.**, 1969, Hellenistic Perception of the Term “History” and Those Related to It, *Problems of Classical Philology*, 2 [Тахо-Годи А.Э., Эллинистическое поминание термина “история” и подственных с ним, *Вопросы Классической филологии*, 2], 127 – 137.
- Tarn W.W.**, 1948, *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, UP).
- Thümmel H. G.**, 1984, Posidonius und die Geschichte, *Klio*, 66, 558 - 561.
- Tiratsyan G.A.**, 1958, Orontids in Armenia, *Bulletin of Humanitarian Sciences of AS of the Arm. SSR* [Տիրացյան Գ.Ա., Երվանդունիները Հայաստանում, ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ Տեղեկագիր հասարակական գիտությունների] 6, 53 - 72.
- Tiratsyan G.A.**, 1971, Armenian in Early Hellenistic Age, in: *History of Armenian People*, v.1, ed. By S.T. Eremyam, (Yerevan, AS of Arm SSR Publ.) [Տիրացյան Գ.Ա., Հայաստանը վաղ հելլենիզմի դարաշրջանում, ՀԺՊ, հ.1, խմբ. Ս.Տ. Երեմյան և այլք, (ՀԱՀ ԳԱ հրատ.)], 500- 520.
- Tiratsyan G.A.**, 1988, *Culture of Ancient Armenia*, VI c. B.C.–A.D. III c.: According to Archeologic Data (Yerevan AS of Arm. SSR Press) [Тирация Г.А., *Культура древней Армении*, VI в. до н.э. – III в. н.э., Ереван, изд. АН Арм. ССР].
- Traina G.**, 2002, Hellenism in the East: Some Historiographical Remarks, *Electrum*, 6, 16 – 23.
- Traina G.**, 2010, Imperial Views on the Battle of Carrhae, in: *War in Words. Transformation of War from Antiquity to Clausewitz*, eds. M. Formisano, H. Böhm (Berlin, New York, De Gruyer), 209 – 217.
- Traina G.**, 2010, Teatro Greco nell’ Armenia Antica, in: *Società indigene e cultura grecoromana*, ed. E. Migliano et al. (Roma, L’ «Erma» di Bretschneider), 95 – 103.
- Treuer C.V.**, 1953, *Essays on History of Culture of Ancient Armenia* (Moscow, Leningrad, AS of USSR Publ.) [Тревер К.В., *Очерки по истории культуры древней Армении* (Москва, Ленинград, изд. АН СССР)].
- Tsolis T.L.**, 2000, The Stoic Cosmopolis: A Vision of Justice and Virtue in a Multicultural Society, *Phronimon*, 2, 336- 345.
- Vernant J.-P.**, 1990a, The Tragic Subject: Historiciry and Transhistoricity, in: J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (New York, Zone Books), 237 – 249.
- Vernant, J.-P.** 1990b, The Masked Dionysus of Euripides’ Bacchae, in: Vernant J.-P., Vidal-Naquet P., *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece* (New York, Zone Books), 381-414.
- Walbank F. W.**, 1972, Polybius. Sather Classical Lectures, v.42 (Berkeley, Univ. of California Press).
- Walbank F. W.**, 1985, *Selected Papers. Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography* (London, New York, Cambridge UP).
- Wecowski M.**, 2014, *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet* (Oxford, OUP).
- White H.**, 1984, The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory, *History and Theory*, 23/1, 1 – 33.
- White M.**, 2003, Stoic Natural Philosophy, in: *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, ed. by B. Inwood (Cambridge, UP), 124 – 152.
- White S.**, 2010, Stoic Selection: Objects, Actions, and Agents, in: *Ancient Models of Mind. Studies in Human and Divine Rationality*, ed. by A. Nightingale and D. Sedley (Cambridge, UP).
- Wiles D.**, 1997, *Tragedy in Action* (Cambridge CUP).
- Yarrow L. M.**, 2006, *Historiography at the End of the Republic. Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule* (Oxford, UP).
- Yates F.A.**, 1966, *Selected Works*, v.3, *Art of Memory* (London, New York, Routledge).
- Zadorojni A.V.**, 1997, Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch’s Crassus, *Hermes*, 125/2, 169 – 182.
- Zeller Ed.**, 1886, *Outline of the History of Greek Philosophy* (London, Longmann).
- Zeller Ed.**, 1892, *The Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics* (London, Longmann).

Ամփոփում

ԱՐԵՎՄՏՅԱՆ ՊԱՏՄԱԳՐԱԿԱՆ ԿԱՆՈՆԸ ՀԵԼԼԵՆԻՍՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՅ-ՔՈՒՄ

Պրագմատիկ և ողբերգական պատմությունք

Ալբերտ Ա. Ստեփանյան

Բանալի բառեր – հելլենիզմ, պատմագիտություն, պրագմատիկ պատմություն, ողբերգական պատմության, Արմավիրի արձանագրություններ, Արտավազդ Երկրորդ, Մետրոդորոս Սկեպագի:

Հոդվածը խնդիր ունի լուսաբանելու բանական անցյալահայեցողության երկու կարևորագույն ժանրերի ձևավորումը և զարգացումը հայոց միջավայրում: Դրանցից առաջինի՝ պրագմատիկ պատմության հետևորդը Մեթրոդորոս Սկեպագին էր՝ հելլենիստական նշանավոր իմաստասերն ու ձարտասանը: Նրա «Գործք Տիգրանի» երկասիրության իմաստային ատաղձը հոդվածում վերականգնված է իր կյանքի և այլ երկերի հատ ու կտոր հատվածների համադրության ճանապարհով: Ստեղծված պատկերը, հարկավ, հիպոթետիկ է, սակայն՝ արժանահավատության աներկբա պաշարով: Համաձայն դրա՝ ա. հեղինակը հայոց տերությունը դիտարկում էր համաշխարհային պատմության հետնախորքում, բ. օրինականացնում էր այն հելլենիստական քաղաքական իմաստասիրության արժեքանությամբ՝ ներկայացնելով իբրև խաղաղության, արդարության և ազգերի հանուր բարօրության միջավայր, գ. դիտարկում էր այն համաշխարհային տերությունների հերթագայության համաձիքում՝ Ատրեստանի, Մարաստանի, Աքեմենյան Իրանի և Մելևկյան տերության շարքում: Մեթրոդորոսը չտեսավ հայոց տերության անկումը և Հռոմի բարձրացումը Արևելքում: Չտեսավ նաև այն, որ վերջինս սկսեց իրեն վերագրել այս հերթագայության վերջին կարևոր քաղաքիչի դերակատարությունը:

Ողբերգական պատմության հետևորդը Արտավազդ Բ-ն էր (55 - 34 թթ.), որ ստացել էր հիմնավոր կրթություն և ծանոթ էր հելլենիստական իմաստասիրության, ճարտասանության և գեղագիտության կարևորագույն նվաճումներին:

Հակառակ Արիստոտելի՝ Պերիպատետիկների դպրոցում կային մտածողներ, որոնք դեմ էին պատմության դերի թերագնահատմանը՝ համոզված, որ այն ի գորու է բացահայտելու իրականության բնագանցական խորքերը: Պատմության թատերայնացումը նրանք դիտարկում էին հենց այս տեսանկյունից: Արտաշատի արքունիքում կազմակերպված հանրահայտ թատերական ներկայացումը հիմք է տալիս մտածելու, որ Հայոց արքան համամիտ էր այս ուղղության կողմնակիցների հետ: Ավելին, մանրակրկիտ քննությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ Կրասսոսի պարթևական արշավանքի մասին պատմող Պլուտարքոսի տեքստը կազմված է ըստ ողբերգության կանոնի, և որ դրա հեղինակն ամենայն հավանականությամբ արքան էր: Ի մասնավորի դրանով կարելի է բացատրել այն առանձնահատուկ վերա-

բերմունքը, որն ուներ պատմագիրը նրա անձի և երկերի վերաբերյալ:
Պատմության ողբերգական և պրագմատիկ ըմբռնումները միայն դարեր անց, 5-րդ դարում, վերընձյուղվեցին հայոց քրիստոնեական հելլենիզմի մշակութային միջավայրում: Եվ ասվածի լավագույն դրսևորումը Եղիշեի և Մովսես Խորենացու պատմական երկերն են:

Резюме

**ЗАПАДНЫЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ КАНОН В
ЭЛЛИНИСТИЧЕСКОЙ АРМЕНИИ**
Прагматическая и трагическая истории

Альберт А. Степанян

Ключевые слова – эллинизм, историография, прагматическая история, трагическая история, надписи Армавира, король Артавазд II, Метродор Скепсийский

Статья имеет целью осветить процесс становления рационалистической рефлексии истории в Армении в II – I вв. до Р.Х. Последователем жанра прагматической истории стал Метродор Скепсийский, знаменитый эллинистический философ и ритор. Смысловая канва его трактата “О Тигране” в статье восстановлена по логике его жизненного пути и фрагментов разных произведений. Картина, конечно, гипотетическая, однако с большой долей вероятности. Согласно последней: а. империю Тиграна автор изображал на фоне всемирной истории, б. легитимизировал ее согласно аксиологии эллинистической философии, изображая ее как социальную среду мира, справедливости и всеобщего благоденствия, в. рассматривал ее в чередe мировых империй - Ассирия, Мидия, Ахеменидский Иран, держава Селевкидов.

Метродор не увидел падение империи Тиграна и возвышение Рима на Востоке. Не увидел также как римляне стали приписывать себе роль последней (и вечной) империи в мировой истории.

Последователем жанра трагической истории был царь Артавазд (55 - 34 до Р.Х.), получивший основательное эллинистическое образование и знакомый с философией, ораторским искусством и эстетикой эпохи.

Вопреки Аристотелю, в школе перипатетиков были мыслители, настроенные против упрощенного восприятия истории, полагая, что она способна раскрывать метафизические глубины прошлого и настоящего. Театрализацию истории они рассматривали как эффективный путь достижения подобной цели. Известное представление, организованное в царском дворе Арташата (53 г. до Р.Х.) дает основание думать, что Артавазд II был преемником этого направления. Из детального анализ текста Плутарха, рассказывающего об этом, можно полагать, что его автором, вероятнее всего, был сам царь. Именно этим объясняется внимание историографа к его произведениям.

Прагматический и трагический жанры историографии вновь появились в армянской среде спустя лишь столетия, в 5-м веке, в контексте культуры христианского эллинизма. Лучшими проявлениями этого стали произведения Егишэ и Мовсеса Хоренаци.