

ous course of history. Fragments are compiled around the eminent actors of Armenian history by causative, typological and sympathetic modes of articulation – Atrashēs I and Artavazd II, Trdat the Great and Arshak II, Mashtots and Vramshapuh. They personified different aspects of social and ethnic, cultural and religious innovative projects of the society. The schematization and comparison of them promise to open new research perspectives. Perspectives, about not only what happened but also about what gave rise to the reflection of crucial happenings of the past and present. In other words, we are interested in the deductive aspect of consideration based on the importance of social ideas, perceptions and projects in the course of history³.

1. Reformation of Artashēs I

Scholars are unanimous that, after the battle of Gaugamela (331 B.C.), the satrap of Armenia Orontes (Eruand) declared his independence. His descendants, Eruandids, gave birth to several independent kingdoms with various historical destiny and duration: Greater Armenia, Armenia Minor, Sophene and Commagene⁴.

Greater Armenia was the most powerful of them. Eruandids reigned there a hundred and thirty years (331 – 201 B.C.) having Armavir as their capital⁵. The information of primary sources (both antique and early medieval Armenian) about the social structure of the kingdom is obscure. Therefore, our reconstruction is sketchy based on theoretical considerations and parallels with other social communities of antiquity. In this regard, the ideas M. Weber are of undoubted interest. They concern the concept of *patriarchal domination* the basic element of which was the traditional autonomous household (clan) with its land property (estate) and the strict hierarchy of members (from peasants to junior and senior members)⁶. It represented a social solidarity based on (real or imagined) agnatic ties. The patriarch had supreme military, administrative and judicial authority. His position was hereditary: the piety to tradition and to the patriarch were the basic elements of this system⁷.

This form of social solidarity reached back to the formative age of Armenia and again gained efficiency in the post-Urartian period under Eruandids – both the Achaemenid satraps and independent kings. The social terminology of the époque gives obvious testimony of the said. Primary sources bear evidence about sovereign clans (տոհմ, աղխ, տուն) of the Haykids, Artsrunids, Bagratids, Khorkhorunids, Siwnids etc⁸. They possessed collective land property (հայենիք) which was unalienable. It made a unity with the peasants (շիսակաւք) associated in villages (գւղ, շեն). The elder member of the ruling family became the hereditary head of the clan (տաւուտէր) with absolute authority over its population. His close entourage consisted of blood relatives (սէպուհք) who were at his disposal in running the household. The heads of clans made up the nucleus of the highest class of Armenian elite (ւէժամէժք)⁹. The integration of clans brought to the

³Antique intellectuals linked this with practical aspect of historiography, which was still present in the works of Herodotus and Thucydides. The approach reached its height in Histories by Polybius. See in detail **Walbank**, 15 – 23; **Hartog**, 2002, 26 – 29; **Breisach**, 2002, 46 – 52; **Herchenroeder**, 2010, 69 – 72.

⁴**Manandyan**, 1954, 36 – 39; **Toumanoff**, 1963, 278 - 285; **Tiratsyan**, 1971, 500 – 520; **Krkiasharyan**, 1973, 179 – 185; **Garsoïan**, 1999, 46 – 47.

⁵**Manandyan**, 1944, 86 – 98; **Tiratsyan**, 1958, 53 – 72; **Toumanoff**, 1963, 277 – 292.

⁶**Weber M.**, 1946, 79.

⁷**Weber**, 1963, 1013.

⁸**Adontz**, 1971, 398 – 426;

⁹Scholars trace the principal features of the Armenian feudalism in prehistoric society. However, they often obscure

formation of a patriarchal state, when “[...] one of master’s domination over other masters, who are not subject to his patriarchal power, implies an affiliation of authority relations which differ only in degree and content, not in statue”¹⁰. In this regard, the following is to be taken into consideration: in the mentality of the early Armenians, their homeland was formulated as a great household (տուն Հայոց)¹¹.

Certainly, along with the dominant patriarchal form, other forms of patrimony were also present in Eruandid Armenia. There is a reason to propose that they were based on charismatic and bureaucratic principles as well. The charismatic principle was organically linked with the patriarchy: during centuries, the dynastic authority was sacralized, and the renowned formula of Moses Khorenatsi seems to express this phenomenon most exactly: “[...] the princes, as the mistrals say, to be the kin and race and seed of the gods” [Khor., III, 65, 13]¹². As to the bureaucratic principle, it, on the contrary, came to shake the foundations of dynastism and establish rational relations in accordance with laws and strict (impersonal) regulations. However, under Eruandids, this principle was not developed entirely since social relations had predominately personal character. Just this loose power structure gave rise to the independent kingdoms mentioned above.

Scholars connect the change of the situation with the activity of Artashēs I. Most probably, he was an Eruandid prince of secondary branch who lived as a hostage in the court of Antiochus III (322 – 187 B.C.) As it is transparent in his further activity, he was well acquainted with principles of Hellenistic political theory and governing art. He and the other Armenian prince, Zariadris/Zareh of Sophene enjoyed the confidence of the Seleucid king.

Antiochus III bestowed the Armenian princes with extraordinary authority, gave military forces and sent Armenia to bring it under his sway. They arrived, broke the resistance of the last Eruandids in Greater Armenia and Sophene. It occurred in 201 B.C. About details of these events, unfortunately, we have no exact evidences. We can only affirm that the policy toward Armenia was a part of the king’s global plan to restore the power and influence of Seleucid Empire¹³.

During forthcoming ten years, the two Armenian princes would rule their domains as the *strategoï* of the king. Radical changes took place after the battle of Magnesia (190 B.C.) when Antiochus suffered a crushing defeat by the Romans. The peace treaty of Apamea lowered the status of Seleucids to the level of local governors. Their subject rulers hastened to declare their independence; many of them entered in friendship with Rome. Artashēs and Zareh, most probably, were among them¹⁴.

their borders and identify them. This approach has entailed an illusion of *eternal feudalism*. **Adontz**, 1908, 453 – 479; **Manandyan**, 1934, 46 – 56; **Toumanoff**, 1963, 108 – 129; **Zoryan**, 2015, 18 – 27.

¹⁰ **Weber**, 1963, 1018.

¹¹ The isomorphism of *household-clan-homeland* had steady tradition reaching back the formative period of the Armenians. Scholars see its best expression in the mythical tale of Hayk and Haykids. See respectively, the mythological, historical, theoretic aspects of the problem in **Abeghyan**, 1944, 19 – 25; **Petrosyan**, 2009, 161 – 163; **Hmayakyan** 125–132; **Sargsyan**, 2006, 53 – 70

¹² «[...] որպէս քերթողքն ասնն, մերձազուակք և մատասերք գոլ և նոյնասերմանք աստուածոց իշխանք»: In political ideology of the Sassanid age, the term “cihr az yazatān (divine seed)” was very effective. Cihr was held as the manifestation of *farr/xwarenah* – glory which communicated its bearer with deities. **Soudavar**, 2012, 31. However, most probably, Khorenatsi proceeds from the formula of Philo of Alexandria “σύγγενοι τῶν θεῶν” about the eminent personalities [Philo, Mos., I, 32]. **Runia**, 1997, 7. For the Armenian case see, **Toumanoff**, 1963, 108 – 109.

¹³ On this plan and history of its implementation, see in detail **Schmitt**, 1964, 51- 52, 62 – 64; **Kosmin**, 2014, 35 – 36; **Grainger**, 2015, 87 – 92.

¹⁴ On the institute of Roman friendship and its variations towards Greater Armenian see in detail, **Sherwin-White**, 1984,

From this time, the reign of Artashēs is well documented. Compiling the accounts of antique and early medieval Armenian sources with those of the Aramaic inscriptions, scholars have reached the following understanding of the king's activity: it represented a *revolution from above*¹⁵. According to Khorenatsi, the king acted relying on his close entourage and army.

However, we have no clear information about the members of this *creative minority*. Among them, Hannibal, the eminent Carthaginian general, is worthy of mention in the first place¹⁶. It is attested, that, after Magnesia, he left Syria and sought refuge in the court of Artashēs I [Plut., Luc., XXXI, 3, 12; cf. Khor., II, 49, 5]. At that time, the creative minority drafted a plan of reformation aimed to rebuild Greater Armenia as a rationally organized social system with its periphery and center.

a. Territorial integration (periphery). According to Strabo, Artashēs, in collaboration with Zareh, expanded the borders of the Greater Armenia at the expense of the neighboring lands:

[...] cutting off Caspianē and Phaunitis and Basoropeda from the country of the Medes; and the country along the side of Mt. Paryadres and Chorzenē and Gogarenē, which last is on the far side of Cyrus River, from that of Iberians; and Carenitis and Xorxenē, which border on Lesser Armenia or else are parts of it; from that of the Chalybians and Mosynoeci; and Aclisenē and the country round the Antitaurus from that of the Cataonians; and Tamoritis particularly, from that of the Syrians. Hence they all speak the same language [Strabo, XI, 14, 5].

The last statement (ὥστε πάντας ὁμογλώτους εἶναι) seems of particular significance, a fact that becomes obvious in the light of the early medieval Armenian historians Faustos Buzand and Moses Khorenatsi. They also formulated the borders of Greater Armenia through language characteristic – “[...] the limits of the regions where Armenian is spoken” [Buz., Khor., II, 3, 6; 8, 5; Khor., II, 3, 6; 8, 5]¹⁷. In other words, there was a steady tradition considering Greater Armenia (and the Armenian identity) as a united communicative space. It must be added that the antique intellectual tradition linked the latter with social peace and order (εὐταξία καὶ εὐνομία)¹⁸.

b. Foundation of the new capital (center). Plutarch gives trustworthy evidence about the new center of Armenia. He depicts the building of Artaxata/Artashat, by the initiative of Hannibal:

[...] observing that a section of the country which had the greatest natural advantages and attractions was lying idle and neglected, he drew up a plan for a city there, and then brought Artaxias to the place and showed him its possibilities, and urged him to undertake the building. He was delighted and begged Hannibal to superintend the work himself, whereupon a very great and beautiful city arose there, which was named after the king,

58 – 70. **Stepanyan**, 2012, 112 – 128; **Stepanyan, Minasyan**, 2013, 14 - 33.

15 **Sargsyan**, 1971, 522; **Stepanyan**, 2012, 31 – 35.

16 Moses Khorenatsi mentions also prince Smbat Bagratid as the closest companion of Artashēs I. One of Aramaic inscriptions of the king confirms this information. See in detail **Perikhanian**, 1971, 17 – 29.

17 More precisely: «ի ծայրս հայերէն խաւսից», «եզերք հայկալկան խաւսից». On the relationship of ethnic and state identities with the language borders see, **Stepanyan**, 1999, 144 – 153.

18 The concept, certainly, reached back to the Sophists, Socrates and Plato tracing in communication the most effective way of balancing the opposite principles of government - coercion (κράτος) and persuasion (ῥήθος). It was held to support the justice (δικαιοσύνη): “Injustice causes civil war, hatred, and fighting, while justice brings friendship and sense of common purpose” [Plato, Rep., I, 351d].

and proclaimed the capital of Armenia [Plut., Luc., XXXI, 3 – 4; cf. Khor., II, 49, 4]¹⁹.

The staff of citizens of Artashat was composed by the way of synoikismos (συνοικισμος) - the unification of inhabitants from different cities. It represented the renowned practice of Hellenistic age formulated as the integration of citizens into a new civil community. A special royal decree bestowed the body of citizens with a particular constitution (πολίτευμα) guaranteeing its autonomy. At the same time, Artashat was the royal residence: on one of its nine hills, the royal court (βασιλειον) was situated [Strabo, XI, 14, 6]²⁰. To support the process of urbanization of Greater Armenia, the king, besides Artashat, founded other cities as well – Zarehavan, Zarishat, Arshtat etc²¹.

c. *The figure of the king.* The Hellenistic theory worked out a concept about king's decisive role in establishing of social peace and balance. As a point of reference, the subjugation of the given country was considered. Its territory was thought as a land obtained by king's spear (χώρα δορίκτητος)²². In mythical-philosophical tradition (particularly, after Alexander the Great), the act of subjugation was interpreted as a great benevolence (εὐεργεσία) aimed at the salvation (σωτηρία) from chaos. It was comparable with the cosmic creation, and the king was considered as a personification of the supreme law and justice (νόμος ἔμφυχος)²³. On this base, the king was also ranked as the only real landowner of the country: all the others (grands, officials, cities, temples, rural communities) were eventually the holders of the royal land (γῆ βασιλική). Preserved by Moses Khorenatsi the unique formula, undoubtedly, expresses this idea: “For the frontiers of the brave are their weapons: as much as they cut, that much they hold” [Khor, I, 8, 4]²⁴.

d. *Rational administrative division of the country.* Scholars are inclined to interpret the following account of Pliny the Elder in the context of the reformation of Artashēs I: “This is well known, that it (Greater Armenia) is divided into prefectures, which they call strategiae; and some of them in old time were as large as kingdoms: the number of them being CXX with barbarous names” [Plin., Nat. Hist., VI, 9, 27]²⁵. The keyword of the fragment is the term *prefectures* capable to expand our information: The fact is that, in the Roman administrative system, it denoted a subject territory with limited autonomy. Appointed from Senate, its governor run local affairs in full accordance with Roman laws and constitution²⁶.

In Greater Armenia, such territories represented administrative units under *nakharars* (սախարարք) appointed by the king. They had their own staff to carry out local admin-

19 On comparability of the accounts of Strabo and Moses Khorenatsi about Hannibal's activity in Greater Armenia see, **Stepanyan**, 2013, 210 – 215.

20 **Krkiasharyan**, 1970, 37 – 45; **Krkiasharyan**, 2005, 205 – 216. On economic, religion, and legislative aspects of relations of Hellenistic kings and cities see, **Strootman**, 2011, 141 – 154.

21 **Eremyan S.T.**, 1953, 16 – 17; **Manandyan**, 1954, 118 – 120; **Tiratsyan**, 1979, 165 – 173; Among the Hellenistic settlements of Greater Armenia, G. H. Cohen mentions also Artemita, Epiphaneia-on-Tigris, Nicea Nialia, Nikopolis, Philadelphia. See, **Cohen**, 2013, 45 – 54.

22 **Goodenough**, 1928, 63 – 65; **Chaniotis**, 2005, 57 – 62; **O'Neil**, 2007, 128 – 130.

23 **Goodenough**, 1928, 66 – 68; **Dvornik**, 1966, 227 – 248.

24 «[...] զի սահմանք քաջաց զէնս իւրեանց, որքան հատանէ՛՝ այնքան ունի»: Cf. Cicero, De off., I, 3, 35. See, **Stepanyan**, 1991, 89– 91.

25 “Dividitur, quod certum est, in praefecturas, quos strategias vocant, quasdam ex his vel singula regna quodam, barbaris nominibus CXX”. Cf. **Sargsyan**, 1971, 678 – 679. This information is absent in Strabo: most probably, it was obtained by the Romans during Corbulo's campaign to Greater Armenia, when Artaxata and Tigrnakerk (and royal archives) were plundered (A.D. 58).

26 **Sherwin-White**, 1992, 871 - 872.

istrative, economic, judicial affairs and were fully responsible to the king and his court. With king's close entourage, they made up the nucleus of the newly emerging administrative nobility. Governing skills and knowledge were highly valued in its representatives. Their welfare mostly depended on the successes of the king and his governing system. In this respect, they differed from clan nobility²⁷. In the end, it should be highlighted that the administrative hierarchy reached up to the level of villages, and their heads (գեղջուաւազք) were state officials as well²⁸.

It seems relevant to come back to the Weberian theory and define the situation as *bu-reaucratic patrimony*. In other words, it was about the transition from one form of patrimony to the other. It entailed the formalization of social life after strict orders and laws and the reformation of the given community into a *political ethnîe* (πολιτήs)²⁹. This feature was inherent to Armenia across centuries and the renowned formula of Moses Khorenatsi seems to be about that. On the use of historical works, he states: “[...] we say, when we read their accounts, we become profound about the world course and learn the political order” [Khor., I, 3, 3]. In other words, two models of identity existed in Greater Armenia ready to gain prominence due to favorable social and political conditions³⁰.

e. Land registry. Primary sources give evidence about the two main forms of land property in Greater Armenia. The first represented the collective hereditary property (հայրենիք). As to the second, it consisted of private properties belonging to temples, cities, and representatives of administrative and military nobility (γή ἐνάφασι). Most of them were the royal gifts for service (սարգլաւաւնք). The other part made up the lands acquired through purchase (քսաւազիք). On them, intensive forms of farming were set up (դաստակերտք և ազարաւք) with the use of slave labor³¹. Artashēs I thought to balance these forms of property: “[...] ordered the boundaries of villages and estates to be established. [...] And he established markers for the borders in the following way: he ordered four-sided stones to be hewn, their corners to be hollowed out like plates, and that they to be buried in the earth. Over them, he had fitted four-sided obelisks, a little higher than the ground” [Khor., II, 56, 3; 77, 9].

This is the literal description of the king's border-stones found in various districts of modern Armenia with standard Aramaic inscriptions: “Artashēs, king Eruandakan, gracious, son of Zariat”³². Inscriptions emphasized the king's guarantee of the land registry based on his supreme land ownership right. Scholars believe that the king had also a pecu-

27 Stepanyan, 2009b, 29 – 46.

28 Eremyan, 1948, 68 – 71; Sargsyan, 1962, 53 – 57.

29 “Pillars of the distinguishing features of Armenian identity – the building blocks – were laid in ancient times: religion, language, territorial basis, myths and symbols” Panossian, 2006, 23.

Signing the so-called Artashat treaty with Tigran II, G. Pompey, seems, recognized the Armenians as **populus**. An approach, which was opposite to that of L. Lucullus, who saw in the Armenians (army) only a chaotic mob (ὄχλος). Stepanyan, 2012, 101 – 102.

30 «...] ի ձեռն որոց եւ մեք յնթերնուլն զար ի նոցանէ շարածս բանից՝ ըստ աշխարհաւրէն կարգաց իմաստնանալ աւիմք, եւ քաղաքականս ուսանել կարգա»։ Cf. Zekiyan, 1987, 472 – 473. The poly-dimensional ethnic situation was typical in Hellenistic monarchies: the Greeks and Macedonians (later the Romans as well) made up the *political ethnîe* with numerous privileges. Better it is studied on the material of Hellenistic Egypt. See, Mairs, 2013, 167 – 172.

31 Eremyan, 1948, 58 – 62; Sargsyan, 1962, 48 – 53. This system of land-holding acquired a new content during feudalization of the society in the 4th – 5th centuries. Cf. Adontz, 1908, 455 – 460; Garsoïan, 1999, 77 – 78.

32 “rth[sy] mlk rwnd [kn] t̄b br zryhr”. Perikhanian, 1966, 17 – 18. Most probably, Aramaic adjective *t̄b* (good, kind, benefactor) is to be interpreted as Greek εὐεργετής. In this light, the Hellenistic context of the inscription becomes transparent. Cf. Stepanyan, 1991, 92.

liar motivation for this: he protected land portions of rural communities from the claims of the nobility since they were his main taxpayers. Besides that, the commoners performed works for construction of roads, channels, and fortresses. They also formed the basis of the militia. In this way, the commoners were transferred from clan structures to the level of nationwide integrity.

f. Army reorganization. Military forces played important role in the governing system of king Artashēs. Except the border security functions, the army had to provide internal peace and stability of Greater Armenia. The king entrusted the command of the whole army to his elder son Artavazd but before long he changed his mind and: “[...] divided the command of the army into four: he left Artavazd in command of the eastern army, Tiran over the western, and he entrusted the southern to Smbat, and the northern to Zareh” [Khor., II, 53, 12]. At the same time, he left for himself the decision of most important strategic issues. However, on the lower level, he decentralized the army management with a purpose to improve its mobility and combat capability: every unit contained soldiers of different types of troops and staff of officers who under generals would fulfill their strategic objective³³.

g. Religion reformation. Supposedly, Artashēs introduced the sacralization of his royal ancestors. This was an accepted practice of the Hellenistic age, and there was a common formula denoting it – *king’s ancestors equal to gods* (πρόγονοι ἰσοθέοι)³⁴. In the following account, Khorenatsi relates just about that: “He erected in it (Artashat) a temple and transferred to it from Bagaran the statue of Artemis and all the ancestral idols (և զսաննայն կուռս հայննիս)” [Khor., II, 49, 5]. The meaning of the phrase is fully disclosed in another fragment of the author, where the idols are interpreted as the images of royal ancestors (պատկեր նախնեացն) [Khor., II, 77, 7]..

h. New arts and sciences. Relating about this aspect of king’s activity, Khorentsi first pays attention to the fact that he put into circulation a calendar – “the circles of weeks, months and years” [Khor., II, 59, 10]. Modern approach traces in it a step to establish synchronism in whole Greater Armenia to facilitate the management of political, economic and religious processes. In substantial sense, it supported the formation of the sense of national unity and identity³⁵.

In the context of this reformation, the introduction of new technologies is noticeable as well: navigation on the lakes and rivers and intensive fishing were initiated. Nevertheless, the changes in agriculture were most impressive: due to new inventions, it spread to all corners of Great Armenia and ceased to be “practiced in scattered land portions”.

33 Under the Arsacids, the military organization of Greater Armenia was systematized entailing a document known as *Military List* (Ջարթասմակ). **Adontz**, 1908 263 – 272.

34 The Hellenistic experience reached back to the Assyrian and Achemenian traditions. See, **Goodenough**, 1928, 69 – 71; **Sargsyan**, 1966, 23 – 33; **Chaniotis**, 2003, 436 – 437; **Briant**, 2009, 27 – 28. This practice was developed by the eminent descendants of Artashēs – Tigran the Great and Artavazd II – who introduced the divination of the ruling kings: “Tigranes cognomine deus [...]” [Trog. Pomp., Prol., XLII]. Numismatic data confirms this fact: in legends of some tetradrachms, the Armenian kings are named gods (θεός) or divine persons (θειός). See **Bedoukian**, 1978, 25, 32 – 33; **Sargsyan**, 1966, 23 – 78. Parallel steps of divination of the royal family were undertaken in Parthia. The process, seems, initiated Mithridat I Theopator (165 – 131 B.C.) and reached its completion under Mithridat II Epiphanes and Soter (121 – 91 B.C.). See, **Dąbrowa E.**, 2009, 41 – 49; **Dąbrowa E.**, 2014, 149 – 160; **Pastor L.B.**, 2014, 179 – 181.

35 This is to be discussed in the wide scope of cultural transfers of Hellenistic Age concentrated in the Greek cities across Asia. **Dan**, 2014, 252 – 274. Artashat composed an area of such cultural transfer in Greater Armenia. **Stepanyan**, 2013, 220 – 224.

Moreover: “[...] it is said that in the time of Artashēs there was no land unworked in Armenia, neither of mountain nor plain, on account of the prosperity of the country” [Khor., II, 56, 5]³⁶.

Generalizing the principal innovations of Artashēs I, the following is to be highlighted: the king saw his purpose in rationalization and systematization of Greater Armenia in the important areas of social commonality. He tried to reach this end through balancing the opposite poles of it – center and periphery, royal court and local administration, cities and rural communities, clan and bureaucratic aristocracies, collective and private forms of landholding, religion and new technologies. This flexible balance was estimated to have its sources in the charismatic figure of the king who secured the intercourse of his subjects with the divine sphere.

The king’s descendants, however, could not preserve this valuable balance. Due to the formation of Empire, the reign of Tigran the Great (95 – 55 B.C.) saw the growth of the military and bureaucratic elite. As to the reign of Artavazd II (55 - 34 B.C.), it suffered hardly from clan opposition, which entailed misbalance in different areas of life. The misbalance was tangible particularly in the decline of urban centers, markets, and finances. The efforts of royal authority to stop this system crisis failed. We think this must be assessed as one of the main causes of the fall of the Artaxiads³⁷.

2. Efforts for restoration of the balance: Trdat the Great

In Greater Armenia, the Arsacid dynasty came to replace the rule of Artaxiads (66 – 428 A.D.). It happened in accordance with Rhandea peace reached between Rome and Trans-Euphratian coalition after ten years of war. Parthian king of kings Vologaeses I (50 – 77 A.D.) initiated the coalition, where Armenia occupied the third rank, after Parthia and Atropatene³⁸. Undoubtedly, this meant the loss of some portion of state sovereignty of the Artaxiad age: Armenian throne now held young princes of Arsacid family who reigned in accordance with the mandate of Ctesiphon³⁹.

During this époque, Greater Armenia underwent a new wave of Iranization in political, social, and religious areas. We can appreciate the results of this shift proceeding from the accounts of the early medieval Armenian historians. The most obvious fact was that Hellenistic momentum weakened, and the traditional patrimony again gained the upper hand⁴⁰. The consequence of that appeared in the fact that traditional aristocracy began to control clan landholdings, ranks and insigia (բարձ և պատիւ).⁴¹ They occupied high offices of the royal court - seneschal (հազարապետ), supreme commander of the army (պարսապետ), coronant (թագադիր), commander of cavalry (սպարտապետ), keeper of

36 In other words, under Artashēs, Greater Armenia became an entirely cultivated land (ւճու). This utopic scene is in opposition to the renowned fragment of the *Lament*, where the country is depicted in overall chaos [Khor., III, 68, 39 - 41]. The two situations make up the two poles of Khorenatsi’s axiology and historical concept. See in detail, **Stepanyan**, 2016b, 69 – 77.

37 **Stepanyan**, 2012, 329 – 330.

38 **van Lint**, 2010, 266; **Stepanyan**, **Minasyan**, 2013, 14 – 18.

39 **Chaumont**, 1976, 129; **Garsoïan**, 1999a, 67; **Panosian**, 2006, 38; **van Lint**, 2010, 266. C. Toumanoff finds this system to be valid until the reign of Vologeses II (180 - 191), a king who fostered the autonomy of the Armenian branch of Arsacids. **Toumanoff**, 1969, 363 – 364.

40 **Stepanyan**, 2014a, 153 – 154.

41 **Adontz**, 1908, 273; **Manandyan**, 1934, 83 – 84.

cent to the Sassanid throne⁴⁹. As to the western regions of Greater Armenia, they were under the rule of Roman nominees of Arsacid origin⁵⁰.

The son of the late king Khosrov II, Trdat, who had found refuge in the Roman court, regained his ancestral dignity through the support of emperor Diocletian: “He crowned his head with a diadem, and decorated him with the purple and royal insignia. And he entrusted him a great army for his support and sent him to his own land of Armenia” [Agath., III, 46]. De iure (recognized by both Rome and Iran) his reign started allegedly after Nisibis treaty in 298⁵¹. Signed between the two super states, it lasted for forty years (298 - 338) securing a dominant position of Rome in the East⁵². It coincided with the reign of Tiridat III (298 - 330) and was marked with important achievements in the history of Greater Armenia⁵³. We decided to point out the two of them concerning the royal authority.

a. Restoration of Hellenistic ideal of royal authority.

It is worthy to pay attention to the fact that the establishment of absolute royal authority followed the restoration of the Arsacid rule. Our primary sources – particularly, Agathangelos and Khorenatsi - depict the return of the prince as an act of conquest Greater Armenia.

For the appropriate interpretation of this event, the following is to be kept in mind: a similar situation Trdat observed while living in the Roman court. The fact is that under Diocletian (284 - 305), the Hellenistic perception of royal authority was revived to advocate the absolute monarchy – Dominate, which came to replace the “soft monarchy” of Augustan Participate. Diocletian (and other members of the system of *tetrarchy*), in the official propaganda, showed himself a personification of divine potency (Jovus) determined to save Empire from decay and chaos engendered by so-called military emperors⁵⁴.

This gives grounds to assert that the first steps of Trdat III in Greater Armenia are suitable to explain in the terms of Hellenistic social experience whereof we spoke discussing the reformation of Artashēs I. Parallels give reason to believe that Trdat also considered his kingdom as *a land obtained by weapon*: “The king hasten to Armenia; when he arrived he found there a great army of Persians, because they had subdued the country for themselves. Many he slaughtered and many he threw back in flight to Persia. And he

49 **Chaumont**, 1968, 83 -91; **Daryae**, 2011, 182 – 183. Obviously, Sassanids intended to restore the order habitual for the Arsacid Age. Following Buzand and Khorenatsi, Eremyan defines the target of this policy as an attempt to turn the eastern portion of Armenia into a *Sassanid dastakert*. **Eremyan**, 1984, 49 – 54.

50 From them, a certain Tiridates is attested in Roman authors. He is also mentioned in the renowned Paikuli inscription among the sovereigns congratulating Narses on occasion of his ascension to the Sassanid throne in 293. Scholars traditionally identify him with Trdat III. **Asdourian**, 1911, 135; **Manandyan**, 1957, 115; **Eremyan**, 1984, 63. However, others see in Tiridates the uncle of Trdat the Great. **Toumanoff**, 1969, 274 – 275; **Garsoïan**, 1971, 271 - 276; **Redgate**, 1998, 94 – 95.

51 **Blockley**, 1984, 30 – 38; **Dignas, Winter**, 2007, 83 – 84. A.D. 298 is accepted as the starting date of Trdat’s reign as the Armenian king recognized by the two super states. Some scholars find that the reign of the king began in 287 in the western part of Greater Armenia under Roman leadership. **Eremyan**, 1984, 64 – 65; **Chaumont**, 1986, 424; **Traina**, 1990, 158 – 159. On the contradictions around the years of the reign of Trdat III see, **Hewsen**, 1986, 324 – 326.

52 It established the Roman control over Georgia and (most probably) Albania as well. **Hakobyan**, 2016, 469. The Roman policy in upper Euphrates region (as in all Eastern frontier) proceeded through periods of so-called *romantism* (expansion) and *realism* (toleration). Their periodical change made up the algorithm of the border policy from Pompey to Justinian. See, **Gray**, 1973, 33 – 35.

53 The chronology of the kings on the Armenian throne during the 50-s – 80-s of the 3d century is rather complicated: some scholars think that, among the Armenian rulers, there was Trdat III, the brother Khosrov II. On this grounds, they find it correct to see in Trdat the Great (298 - 338) Trdat IV. **Garsoïan**, 1999a, 74 – 75.

54 **William**, 2000, 61 – 70; **Southern**, 2001, 226 – 258.

brought under his own sway his ancestral kingdom and ruled over its borders” [Agath., III, 47; cf. Khor., II, 82, 9]⁵⁵.

It is quite relevant to suppose that the king also assessed himself as an embodiment of the supreme law and justice. His religious credo was marked with Hellenized Zoroastrianism based on the concept of trinity of supreme gods: “[...] abundant fertility from noble Aramazd, protection (and benevolence) from Lady Anahit, valor from valiant Vahagn [comes] to you and all the land of Armenia” [Agath., V, 127]⁵⁶. The king showed himself a mediator between divine and human spaces. It was believed that each member of the divine trinity denoted one of the three basic social estates – producers, warriors, and governors⁵⁷.

For gaining completion of his royal authority, every king would have to pass through three grades of initiation: those of Anahit, Vahagn and Aramazd⁵⁸. It is noticeable that Trdat III commenced his initiation first visiting the temple of Anahit: “In the first year of Trdat in Greater Armenia, they went to the province of Ekegheats to the village of Erēz to the temple of Anahit in order to sacrifice there”. [Agath., III, 48]⁵⁹. The ritual looked at the goal of re-establishing the king’s spiritual unity with his own country and people.

According to Agathangelos, the social ideal of Trdat III was patterned after the concept of isomorphism of family and state: “For as every householder cares for his house and family, so do we care for the prosperity of our land of Armenia” [Agath., V, 130]⁶⁰. Hereby, the king defined rights and responsibilities of each social class demonstrating his supreme justice: “So, all great princes and nobles and officials and beloved of our majesty, peasants and inhabitants and clients of our Arsacid family, whom we provided for, raised, took care of and promoted in order to care for our common advantage. [This is also done with a view] you to honor the gods” [Agath., V, 131]⁶¹. In other words, king Trdat re-established the Hellenistic tradition of royal person as the supreme landholder and the mediator of divine potency in Greater Armenia. In this regard, let us highlight again that there was a full accordance between the social stances of emperor Constantine and his Armenian partner Trdat III. Most probably, Armenian intellectuals were well acquainted with the concept of Christian Hellenism promoted by Eusebius of Caesarea.

55 On the unification of the Armenian periphery districts by Trdat see, **Garsoïan**, 1999, 75. According to the treatise of 298, Roman Empire acquired Ingilene, Sophene, Arzanene, Corduene and Zadicenae. Eremyan believes that, despite the last district, all of them made up the “undividable part of Greater Armenia”. **Eremyan**, 1984, 68. It seems, however, more acceptable the approach of Toumanoff: though under the aegis of the Roman Empire “[...] the four States continued to participate in the life of Greater Armenia”. **Toumanoff**, 1963, 170.

56 «[...] լիութիւն պարարտութեան յարոյն Արամազդայ, խնամակալութիւն յԱնահիտ տիկնոջէ, և քաջութիւն հասցէ՛ ձեզ ի քաջէն Վահագնէ, ամենայն Հայոց աշխարհիս»: Cf. **Alishan**, 1910, 274 – 298, 314 – 320; **Russell**, 1987, 189 – 289.

57 **Stepanyan**, 2012, 57 – 60. On the tripartite structure of the ancient Armenian society and the relevant ideology see in detail, **Petrosyan**, 2000, 160 – 176.

58 The first phase of initiation asserted king’s connection with his native land, the second - with the military social estate, the third demonstrated his (and his dynasty’s) heavenly mandate of supreme authority. See, **Stepanyan**, 2012, 312 – 318.

59 **Calzolari**, 2011, 49 – 60.

60 «[...] զի որպէս ամենայն տանուտէր ընդ տան իւրոյ եւ ընտանեաց հոգայ՝ տոյապես եւ մեք հոգամք ընդ մեր Հայոց աշխարհիս շինութեան»: In other words, in the case of Trdat III also, it is relevant to speak about the concept of *χώρα δορίκτητος*. It means that the other homogeneous qualities of Hellenistic rulers must also be traced in his person. Cf. Eusebius, Vita, II, 2 – 3.

61 «Արդ՝ ամենայն նախարարք մեմամեծք և ազատք և գործակալք և սիրելիք մեր թագաւորաց, և շինականք, բնակք և ձեռնատունք և ձեռնատունք մեր Արշակունեաց, զոր յանձնածեալսդ և սնուցեալսդ է, անխայեալսդ և յառաջեալսդ է, վասն մեր ազտի հասարակաց հոգացեալ, զի զդիսն պատուեցիք»:

b. Christianity and metamorphosis of royal authority

Now times, however, had been changed and the old royal ideal was not acceptable for a whole section of the Armenian society. We mean the section that comprised the followers of Christianity⁶². Their leader was the cleric Gregory, the son of Anak a Parthian nobleman who had treacherously murdered the king Khosrov II. In Caesarea, Gregory had been brought up and instructed in Christian doctrine. He returned Armenia to implement his spiritual mission to convert the land to Christianity. Officially, he entered the service of the king and conveyed him in important ritual actions⁶³.

The renowned fragment of Agathangelos relates about the dispute of the king and the future illuminator of Armenia at the temple of Lady Anahit. Gregory challenged the significance of pagan gods and kings' role in social peace and order of Greater Armenia. By his words: "But they (pagan gods) do not really exist; they can do neither harm nor good to anyone; they can neither honor their worshippers nor dishonor their opponents. Your mind is deranged if you worship them" [Agath., III, 59]. However, the dispute did not cause an open conflict since Gregory declared his double allegiance – fidelity to the king and dedication to heavenly omnipotent God: "I have served you loyally. I shall never render vain my service. [...] For I had no expectation that I would receive compensation from you but from God, whose creations are all creatures visible and invisible" [Agath., III, 54]⁶⁴. All this gives grounds for asserting that, in early years of Trdat's reign, his absolute authority stayed unchallengeable.

The situation began to change with the conversion to Christianity, which, according to the historical tradition, took place in 301. However, some scholars dispute the tradition, proceeding from the fact that around that time (303), Diocletian enforced the great persecution of Christians. They find the event could happen only after Milan Edict (313), which proclaimed toleration for Christianity within Empire⁶⁵.

At any event, the Armenian tradition traces a radical change in the status of the king after the conversion. It was carefully worked out into a narrative with the following standard elements: *a.* Trdat's severe persecution of Christians; *b.* the slaughter of Hripsimean Virgins; detainment of Gregory and his tortures in the jail of Khor Virap; *c.* Trdat's transformation into a wild boar as God's punishment; *d.* Gregory's release and his healing of the king; *e.* their collaboration where Trdat played the role of the *second important partner*; *f.* suppression of the resistance of the pagan priesthood, destruction of the famous temples and Conversion of all the country to Christianity⁶⁶.

Obviously, the breaking point of the narrative is the God's punishment of the king for persecution of Christians⁶⁷. For authentic interpretation of the narrative, a careful discussion of that seems necessary. According to our principal source Agathangelos, God turned

62According to the Armenian tradition, Christianity was present in Greater Armenia from the Apostolic age. Particularly, the apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew are reputed to introduce the new religion in this country. See in detail, **Ormanean**, 1999, 10 – 16; **van Esbroeck**, 1962, 425 – 429; **van Esbroeck**, 1972, 241 – 246; **Russel**, 1986a, 255 – 264; **Thomson**, 1994b, 29 – 30; **Gillman, Klimkeit**, 1999, 92 – 95.

63 See, **Ormanean**, 1999, 75; **Bournoutian**, 2006, 47.

64 **Calzolari**, 2011, 53 – 57.

65 **Manandyan**, 1957, 126 – 128; **Redgate**, 1998, 115 – 116; **Garsoïan**, 1999a, 82; **Seibt**, 2002, 125 – 133; **Stopka**, 2016, 29-30.

66 Together these elements make up a complicated hagiographic narrative based on various elements - from authentic acts, historic romance to legends of passions and spiritual resurrections. Cf. **Hippolyte, Delehayé**, 1907, 107 – 115.

67 A locus communis of martyrological narratives. See in detail, **PGL**, 1961, Martyr, 831 - 832; **Randorf, Solignac**, 1980, 726 – 729; **Frend**, 1965, 217 – 225.

the king into a wild boar, who: “[...] entering a reedy place, in senseless abandon pastured on grass, and wallowed naked in plain” [Agath., VI, 212]. The author explains the situation through a parallel with the case of Nabuchadnezzar, the king of Chaldean Babylon, who also lost his human nature and became a boar because of impious life [Dan., IV, 12 - 13].

However, the author strangely passes by silence the well-known practice of Armenian kings. The fact is that the second grade of their royal initiation demanded their dedication to Vahagn. Ritually, they identified themselves with a wild boar, the sacred animal of that god bestowed with supreme creative potency [Yašt, 14 – 15; cf. Yašt, 127]⁶⁸. In memory of that, kings wore a golden ring with boar image (վարազազիր մատանի) to sign important state decrees⁶⁹. As it is highlighted above, Armenian kings went through three grades of sacred initiations, which corresponded to the divine trinity and three social orders – commoners (Lady Anahit), warriors (Vahagn) and rulers (Aramazd)⁷⁰.

Undoubtedly, for the pagan Trdat III, the second interpretation is more acceptable. This makes implausible the idea that Gregory could gain prominence over the king by healing him from the strange disease. The king was healthy; therefore, another explanation of the problem is to be sought. From this point of view, the experience of Constantine the Great (306 - 337), with whom the king maintained close relationship, seems most relevant. Though a neophyte, the emperor showed himself a true champion of Christianity: by his active efforts, Ecumenical Council of Nicaea convened in 325⁷¹. His main intention was to combine the Hellenistic concept of royal authority with Christian doctrine⁷². Scholars trace manifestations of Hellenistic Christianity in *Vita Constantini* authored by Eusebius of Caesarea:

Thus, like a faithful and good servant, did he act and testify, openly declaring and confessing himself obedient minister of the supreme King. And God forthwith rewarded him, by making him ruler and sovereign, and victorious to such a degree that he alone of all rulers pursued a continual course of conquest, unsubdued and invincible [...]. So dear was he to God, and so blessed; so pious and so fortunate in all that undertook, that with the greatest facility he obtained the authority over more nations than any who had preceded him, and yet retained his power undisturbed to the very close of his life [Euseb., Vita, VI,1].

This agreement between heavenly omnipotent God and earthly emperor made up the peculiarity of Late Roman Empire and Early Byzantium. Emperor became the focus of both political and religious life of Empire. He was considered as God’s earthly personification (χριστέμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ), and the patriarch of Church had to occupy the second position next to him⁷³.

68 Stepanyan, 2012, 312 – 314. On the case of Trdat III see, Russell, 1987, 189 – 191.

69 It was a Zoroastrian custom to guarantee the basic obligations and responsibilities of men. From this point of view, the account of Buzand about the negotiations of Arshak II with Shapur is assessed as exemplary: “And in accordance with the usage for solemn oaths in the kingdom of Persia, [Shapur] had salt brought in, sealed it with his own seal ring bearing effigy of a wild boar, and sent it off, so that if he still did not come after this oath, he might then prepare for war between them” [Buz., IV, 53, 5 - 6]. As to the Armenian king, he had to swear by Holly Bible. However, the cult of the wild boar continued in Christian Armenia. The best proof of that are the data of onomastics: male names on varaz (boar) were popular among the Armenians – Varazdat, Varaz-Nerseh, Varaz-Shapuh, Varaz-Tirots, Varaz-Trdat, Varaz-Vahan etc. See, Acharyan, 1962, 62.

70 Russell, 1986b, 439 – 440; Russell, 1990, 2682 – 2688; Scholars even distinguish this trinity as *royal religion*. Traina, 1990, 158.

71 Baus, 1982, 415 – 425; MacMullen R., 1984, 48 – 51; MacMullen R., 2014, 511 – 517.

72 Hellemann, 2016, 32 – 42.

73 Aland, 1959, 493 – 513; Dvornik, 1966, 626 – 635; Bowersock, 1986, 299 – 300.

The situation of Armenia seems identical. From this point of view, the renowned account of Sozomen, the author of the first half of the 5th century is of particular importance: “The Armenians, I have understood, were the first to embrace Christianity. It is said that Tiridates, then sovereign of that nation, became a Christian by means of a marvelous Divine sign which was wrought in his house; and he issued commands to all the subjects, by a herald, to adopt the same religion” [Sozomen., Eccl. Hist., II, 8]⁷⁴. Obviously, this version depicts Trdat III the principal actor of the Armenian Conversion. And this must be recognized as the primary perception of the image of the king reformer.

Presumably, this accordance made the real momentum of the historical tradition telling about the visit of Trdat III to Emperor Constantine in the company of Gregory the Illuminator and numerous Armenian magnates [Agath., VI, 873 - 875]. The visit occurred around 315 and resulted in the *Treaty of Alliance*: “And furthermore he (Constantine) made an alliance with him (Trdat), holding their faith in the Lord Christ as an intermediary so that they might constantly and forever keep faithful love between their kingdoms” [Agath., VI, 877]⁷⁵. Let us underline that this format of relationship was possible only in the case of the unanimity of the two sovereigns in matters of both secular power and religion.

The tradition of the primacy of the first Armenian Christian king looks, however, rather vague on the background of the radical revision of the narrative implemented at the late date⁷⁶. Two patriarchs of Armenian church, Nerses the Great and (particularly) Sahak Partev, are assessed to play a decisive role in this revision aimed to highlight the figure of Gregory the Illuminator.

Such approach made up the nucleus of the new ideology that became uncontested as early as in the beginning of the 5th century. It considered Gregory as “the father of the renewal of the whole Armenian land due to his baptismal birth” [St. Sahak, Canons, XL, 32]⁷⁷. He was also recognized as the *land-founder* (աշխարհաճնունդ). As to Trdat, he was now represented as the *son of the land-founder father* (աշխարհաճնունդ հայրենեացն որդի) [St. Sahak, Canons, XL, 33]⁷⁸. The revision concerned also the renowned fragment of the mentioned visit to Roman: “[...] emperor Constantine was amazed, and humbled himself and fell before Gregory to be blessed by him” [Agath., VI, 876]⁷⁹.

74 The worship of Gregory the Illuminator was worked out during long time with traceable interruptions. It reached completion under the pen of Sahak Partev. But in 430-s, by the efforts of the catholicoi of Syrian origin (Brkisho and Samuēl), it was denied and restored only in the second half of the 5th century. See, **Musheghyan**, 2012, 42.

75 Most probably a nucleus of this document was compiled in the 4th century and cardinaly revised in the 5th century. In later centuries, it was reshaped into a document of “western orientation of the Armenians” and gained particular popularity in the Cilician époque. See in detail, **Bartikyan**, 2004, 65 – 116.

76 R.W. Thomson came up to this approach more cautiously: “It is therefore difficult to assess the actual role of the Armenian kings in the conversion, from the shadowy figure of Trdat (Tiridates) converted by St. Gregory the Illuminator in the early fourth century, to Vram-Shapuh who encouraged the monk Mashtots and patriarch Sahak nearly a hundred years later to invent a script and lay the foundation of a national literature”. **Thomson**, 1994a, 26.

77 «Քանզի սուրբ Լուսավորիչն Հայոց Մեծն Գրիգորինս ծնեալ վերստինս զՀայաստանեացս աշխարհ առազանին ծննդեամբ»: Cf. English translation, **Conybear**, 1898, 828 – 848.

78 Scholars find the *Canons* of St. Sahak to be compiled in the beginning of the 7th century, most probably, by John Mayragometsi. See, **Thomson**, 1962, 379; **Garsoïan**, 1989, 566.

79 This statement contradicts the image of the Emperor depicted by Eusebius of Caesarea – the intellectual who theorized his absolute authority: “But farther, when I raise my thoughts even to the arch of heaven, and there contemplate his thrice-blessed soul in communication with God himself, freed from every mortal and earthly vesture, and shining in a refulgent robe of light, and when I perceive that it is no more connected with the fleeting periods and occupations of mortal life, but honored with an ever-blooming crown, and immortality of endless and blessed existence, I stand as it were without power of speech [...]” [Euseb., Vita, II, 2].

However, in a lower social stratum, naxaradoms, the primacy of political (more precisely, clan) authority over church authority survived for a long time. It is noticeable that some canons of Second Duin Council (555) concern with this problem: "Laymen do not command instead of clerics, for they are your leaders and laity (brothers) is under their hand; not resist this order, since it is lawless, if a prince has consecrated or deconsecrated [them]"⁸⁰.

In the elaboration of the new ideology, the role of historians and especially Moses Khorenatsi is undeniable. At the same time, his approach is more balanced and sophisticated: "And I would assign the superiority to the king, the two were equal in the contemplation of God and the ascetic life, but the king's merit was greater in subjecting [people to the faith] by persuasive or forceful words, for he never interrupted his efforts on behalf of the faith. For this reason, I call him the leader on the road and the second father of our illumination" [Khor., II, 92, 3].

If our restoration of Trdat's reign is correct, we have reason to define it as one of the periods of Armenian history marked with a rare balance in the home and foreign policies. According to historical tradition, it resulted in two important events - the restoration of centralized state power and conversion to Christianity. In both enterprises, Greater Armenia kept step with Roman Empire and enjoyed the fruits of Nisibis peace: oppositional nobility was forced to come to terms with the royal authority; Sassanids were humiliated and could not support it.

However, this picture is too optimistic. For the sake of the whole truth, the other side of it needs to be taken into consideration as well. The side, which our sources prefer to pass by silence. The fact is that the pagan resistance was rather tangible in Christian Armenia; as it is attested, pagan fanatics murdered (or tried to murder) the successors of Gregory the Illuminator – Aristakēs, Vrtanēs and many other clergymen⁸¹. If we trust Khorenatsi, the same fate befell the king Trdat [Khor., II, 91; 92,]⁸². Only in this light, the forthcoming events of Armenian history can receive a reliable explanation.

3. Features of Political Retro-Hellenism: Arshak II and Pap

After Trdat III, the situation in Greater Armenia and around it changed radically. Under the two subsequent kings, Khosrov Kotak (330 - 338) and Tiran (338 - 350), the resources of balance exhausted. First of all, this became obvious in the extreme antagonism between the central state power and centrifugal nobility. Scholars have illuminated the process with sufficient efficiency and we decided to touch upon only its most important aspects⁸³.

Representatives of the centrifugal nobility intended to restore their traditional liberties. Gradually, the conflict gained momentum and turned into bloody clashes. By royal decrees, some principalities (Rshtunids and Artsrunids) were nearly cut off. Simultane-

80 **Kanonagirk hayoc**, 1964 (Corpus juris canonici armenorum), 489.

81 **Ormanean**, 1999, 61 – 69. Cf. **Scott**, 2016, 318 – 319.

82 Probably, this statement is a rhetorical embellishment to strengthen the emotional tension of the last chapter of the Second book of *History of the Armenians*. The chapter is compiled on the axiological dichotomy of the ideal Fathers of Conversion and the barbarity of the base people: "I am ashamed here to speak the truth, especially the lawlessness and impiety of our nation and their deeds worthy of great lamentation and tears" [Khor., II, 92, 9].

83 **Manandyan**, 1957, 137 – 156; **Eremyan**, 1984, 81 – 86; **Garsōian**, 1971, 341 – 343; **Hewsen**, 1978, 100 – 107; **Redgate**, 1998, 132 – 133; **Scott**, 2016, 315 – 323.

ously, the relations with the church were also strained. The patriarch Yusik began to accuse king Tiran in baser sins and even forbade him to enter church. He paid for that with his life. Some scholars even think that the patriarch's behavior was a reaction to the king's mitigation to the pagans⁸⁴.

The époque of Shapur II (309 - 379) started, during which Persia pursued a strategic objective to regain its dominant position on western borders⁸⁵. This plan attributed a principal role to Greater Armenia, and the Sassanid court followed the situation in the country very carefully. It saw in internal strifes an opportunity to intervene in affairs of Greater Armenia. The opposition was encouraged and began to intensify its actions. King Tiran fell victim of this collision: in the war between emperor Constantius and Shapur II (337 - 350), the king kept the side of the Romans but the Persians gained the upper hand, so he was captured, blinded and forced to abdicate⁸⁶. His young son Arshak ascended to the throne.

The ebbs and flows of the reign of Arshak II (350 - 367) are well documented in the sources of both Armenian and Roman origin⁸⁷. The Persian inscriptions and bas-reliefs provide additional information. They give sufficient grounds for sketching the first years of Arshak's rule as follows: the king restored the territorial integrity of Greater Armenia; regulated relations with the nobility and the church; kept due balance between Persia and Roman Empire; the country began to prosper⁸⁸. By the initiative of the patriarch Nersēs the Great, the council of Shahapivan was held in 354 to work out new social and moral regulations: “[...] to turn the entire population of the land of Armenia into the likeness of a universal order of solitary-communities” [Buz., IV, 4, 32 - 46].

However, the further history saw a new wave of polarization and strife. Magnates remembered about their traditional liberties and intended to enlist the support of the Church. Again, the legitimacy of royal absolutism was challenged. In response, the king and his entourage set a purpose to reinforce the state centralization. This brought to new violations and clashes focused on Arshakavan – the royal residence (դաստակերտ) designed to symbolize the fulfillment of the king's plan. According to our principal sources, Faustos Buzand and Moses Khorenatsi, Arshak II began to erect his new residence on the southern slopes of the Mt. Ararat, in the district Kogovit of Ayrarat province. Soon, it expanded and comprised more than 20 000 households:

And he ordered a royal edict proclaimed in every district of his dominion and announced on every public square in his realm, and he filled all the regions and districts with the royal proclamation [saying] that: “Should anyone be indebted to anyone, or should anyone anywhere have wronged anyone else, or should anyone have been summoned to judgement, let every one of them come and settle in this dastakert [Buz., IV, 12, 10; cf. Khor., II, 27, 2 - 4]”⁸⁹.

84 They think that this royal policy was designed to balance the rigors of Church leaders. See **Garsoïan**, 1999a, 85.

85 **Shahbazi A. Sh.**, 2001, 71-74; **Rubin**, 2008, 133.

86 **Asdourian**, 1911, 143 – 147; **Christensen**, 1944, 236 - 238; **Frye**, 1983a, 136 -137.

87 The date of ascension of Arshak II is obscure: S.T. Eremyan, for example, finds more probable it to happen in 445. Cf. **Eremyan**, 1984, 87.

88 **Asdourian**, 1911, 148 – 150; **Manandyan**, 1957, 158 – 159.

89 «Եւ ետ հրաման ընդ ամենայն գաւառս իշխանութեան իւրոյ, և հրամայեաց կարգել քարոզ ընդ ամենայն տեղիս աշխարհացն հրապարակին իւրոյ. և ամենայն կողմանս գաւառաց իւրոց լի առնէր հրամանաւն արքունի. զի եթէ որ ումէք ինչ պարտիցի, եթէ որ ուրոյ ուստէք ինչ վնասեալ իցէ, կամ ոք ումէք ինչ դատ պարտիցի, ամենեքեան եկեացն ի դաստակերտն շինեացն»:

*Apparently, this policy had its explanation in the **genetic code** of Armenian church as well: “When bishops are identified by see, it is not a town but a province is named, and many provinces are identified by the name of the family that controlled them. In the Greco-Roman world Christianity spread from city to city; and the more important the city the more important, the wider role played its bishop. In Armenia, Christianity spread through the social and political structure indigenous to that country”⁹⁶.*

The royal and opposition armies encountered under the city walls; the battle was bloody but the magnates took the upper hand and leveled the king’s residence to ground. Arshak II assembled a new army reinforced by Iberian troops and was ready to extirpate his enemies. However, the patriarch stopped him: through his mediation, the sides came to a fragile truce. The peace, however, did not last long: “[...] Arshak violated all the pacts that he had made with the nobles and sought vengeance for his city Arshakavan” [Khor., III, 31, 2]. The king almost completely exterminated Kamsarakan clan⁹⁷.

Nevertheless, the opposition did not lose hope. The fact is that the Persians launched a new military campaign against Greater Armenia (364 - 368). Led by Meruzhan Artsrunid, a part of the Armenian nobility openly sided with Shapur and even declared its readiness to extirpate Christianity in Armenia and restore the pagan religion (Zoroastrianism)⁹⁸. The other part backed the king; but the war was long and exhausting and, after some initial victories, the nobles began to abandon the king: “[...] for every one of them longed for his own house, his own place, in accordance with the inborn ways of Armenian men” [Buz., IV, 20, 36]⁹⁹.

Finally, the king remained alone with his close entourage. Shapur began to act cautiously: he invited the king to visit him for the resumption of friendship. He sent to Arshak a handful of salt “[...] sealed with his own seal ring bearing the effigy of a wild boar” [Buz., IV, 53, 4]. This sacred solemn oath of Zoroastrians convinced Arshak in the sincerity of Shapur. However it was a trap when the king arrived to the Persian court, he was arrested. King’s project of retro Hellenistic reformation of the social and political systems of Greater Armenia failed to cause his individual tragedy: detained in the jail Andəmiş (An-hush) he found the end of his unrest life [Buz., IV, 54, 38 - 39]¹⁰⁰.

In some senses, the destiny of Arshak II is comparable with that of Artavazd II (55 – 34 BC.). Abandoned by his “adversaries and supporters” this king gave up to Antony who had invaded Greater Armenia with great forces. Capturing and plundering cities and fortresses, the triumvir took the captive king to Alexandria in silver chains. Later, after the battle of Actium, he put him to death. Tacitus sees in this action a crime (scelus) [Tac., Hist., II, 3]¹⁰¹.

obvious unanimity in the policy of Roman Arian emperors and Armenian sovereigns. In their view, this accordance (despite temporal ebbs) lasted nearly fifty years, from Tiran to Arshak III (338 - 387). Cf. **Garsoïan**, 1967, 304 – 307; **Garsoïan**, 1999a, 86 – 87; 135; **Thomson, R.W.**, 1994, 30; **Terian**, 2005, 18.

⁹⁶ **Thomson**, 1994b, 34.

⁹⁷ On the activity of Armenian opposition see in detail, **Harutiunyan**, 2016, 62 – 78.

⁹⁸ Proceeding from the perception that *Armenian paganism* was in fact a local version of Zoroastrianism [**Russell**, 1986, 439 - 440], the following conclusion looks obvious: the Armenians were not unanimous in their conversion to Christianity; a part of them was ready to keep fidelity to “ancestral gods”. Cf. **Daryae**, 2011, 182 - 183. Most probably, the program of Meruzhan and his party is to be considered in this light. Cf. **Thomson**, 1994b, 43; **Redgate**, 1998, 135; **Garsoïan**, 1999a, 87; **Dignas, Winter**, 2007, 180; **Stopka**, 2016, 39 – 40.

⁹⁹ «[...] զի ամենայն ոք յանձնիր տուն յիրանքն չիր տեղի զաւրդն բարոց հայաստան մարդկան անձկացեալ էին»: Two opposite noble parties were distinguish in Armenia – that of Artsrunids which pursued a pro-Persian program and the second party of Mamikonids with pro-Roman orientation. **Manandyan**, 1934, 278.

¹⁰⁰ **Traina**, 2003b, 187 – 188.

¹⁰¹ **Stepanyan**, 2012, 204 – 205.

Shapur devastated Greater Armenia from west to east. Many regions were depopulated, the renowned cities – Artashat, Vagharshapat, Zarehavan, Zarishat, Van – lay in ruins. The Persians and rebel magnates controlled the country¹⁰². As a result, a part of grands abandoned their estates and looked for shelter in mountainous places, the other part left the country for Roman Empire. They began to understand the fatality of the situation and looked for ways to restore stability and order. Patriach Nersēs was unanimous with them. They stopped the choice on the young son of the late king, Pap, as the key figure of restoration. During the turmoil, he had found refuge in the Roman court; emperor Valens now recognized his rights on the Armenian throne and provided him with a solid military contingent to secure his comeback to the country [Amm., XXVII, 9 - 16]¹⁰³.

Leaving aside contradictions, many grands gathered around Pap: “And all those who had scattered, fled and hidden in the land of Armenia, returned and gathered together” [Buz., V, 1, 6]. The general battle took place in 370, near Mount Npat (in the field of Dzi-rav) in the district Bagravand, where usually popular assemblies were held¹⁰⁴. The joint Armenian and Roman army won a complete victory over the Persians. According to Khorenatsi, it mostly resulted from the consensus of the Armenian elite: “[...] all the princes, both those who willingly accepted the rule of Pap and those who did not” [Khor., III, 36,10].

In its turn, it engendered a series of victories, which brought to the restoration of the former borders of the kingdom¹⁰⁵. According to Buzand, by the efforts of the sparapet Mushegh Mamikonid, the Arsacid rule was re-established over the royal domain in Atropatene, Norshirakan, Gorduene, Tamoritis, Arjakh, Uti, Sakasene, Caspene, Gogarene, Arzanene. The sparapet annexed also three important regions from the Ro-mans – So-phanene, Anzitene and Ingilene [Buz., V, 8 - 19]¹⁰⁶.

Now, Pap became the legitimate ruler of his native realm (370 - 373). Sometimes, scholars name him the last significant figure among Armenian Arsacids. Despite clerical tradition, which accuses the king in all mortal sins, they scrutinize his activity tracing in it the continuation of the policy of Arshak II¹⁰⁷. Indeed, during his short reign, Pap implemented important projects to increase the level of sovereignty of Greater Armenia. *First*, he equipped a new army with high combat capability which comprised 90 000 soldiers of different weaponry. Despite the regular order, the king acknowledged the close relatives of clergymen reliable for military service. This reformation was to set up an effective basis for the royal authority tending to absolutism. *Second*, to alleviate the poverty of peasantry, increased during the turmoil, the king abolished the taxes “fruit and tithes” paid to the church. *Third*, tolerated some old funeral rates to mitigate the contradiction between paganism and Christianity and to secure the unity of the society. *Forth*, he confiscated the

102Asdourian, 1911, 156 – 157; Manandyan, 1957, 182 – 187; Garsoïan, 1999a, 89 – 90; Lenski, 2002, 169 – 172.

103 Manandyan, 1957, 201 – 209; Geatrex, 2000, 27 – 38; Lenski N., 2002, 172 – 173; Dignas, Winter, 2007, 183 – 184.

104 In narratives of our principal authors, Buzand and Khorenatsi, this battle has a metaphysic context as well. It depicts the victory as an act of reconstruction of cosmic order and harmony. See in detail, Stepanyan, 2014, 33 – 40.

105 At the same time, by the support of Valence, the Georgian throne was restored under Surmak who soon came to agreement with Varaz Bakur conceding him the northern and eastern regions of the kingdom [Amm., XXVII, 12, 16 - 17]. Cf. Manandyan, 1957, 204; Muradyan, 2016, 300.

106 If we trust Buzand, Pap claimed also Caesarea and Edessa, which, probably, caused tensions between the allies. [Buz., V, 32, 3 - 4]. Manandyan finds some toponyms of this list (particularly the last three) to be exaggerations. Manandyan, 1957, 208. Cf. Redgate, 1998, 135.

107 Ammianus characterizes the king as “a man of forethought and contrivance” and compares his treacherous murder with that of the eminent historical heroes Pyrrhus and Sertorius [Amm., XXX, 1, 5; 22 - 23].

most part of the land property of Church - starting from parish allotments ending with large estates – donations of Trdat III and his descendants. *Fifth*, the king radically limited the number of charity institutions – asylums of widows and orphans as well as dwellings for virgins [Buz., V, 31, 2 - 9]¹⁰⁸.

All these measures had an obvious anticlerical character. Nersēs the Great stood out as the leader of the opposition criticizing the king in the name of divine justice¹⁰⁹. In the deeper sense, however, it again marked the confrontation of the centripetal (retro-Hellenistic) and centrifugal (nakharar) projects. Soon, however, the patriarch died¹¹⁰. The king used this chance to implemented his next decisive innovation: he decided to install a new patriarch without the approval of the chief-bishop of Caesarea: “After the death of the patriarch Nersēs, King Pap installed Bishop Ysik, who was a descendant of Bishop Albianos of Manazkert. [The king] ordered him to assume the position of patriarch [...]” [Buz., V, 29, 2]. Scholars usually interpret this event as the starting point of the autocephalisation of the Armenian Church¹¹¹.

To demonstrate the other important innovation of Pap, scholars pay attention to the account of Ammianus Marcellinus about the secret correspondence of the commander of the Roman troops dislocated in Greater Armenia. The general Terentius informed the imperial court about the intention of the Armenian king to improve relations with Persia: “[...] his nation, which at present was friendly to us, should revolt to the Persians” [Amm., XXX, I, 4]. Certainly, he exaggerated the fact: the king Pap, most probably, only tried to establish identical relations with the two super states. The semiotic code of such situations, “both... and”, demonstrates the profound significance of it - to gain maneuverability between two (or more) empires. In other words, Pap looked for a complementary stability for his kingdom¹¹². As to the Romans, they assessed it as a policy directed against their interests, and soon the king fell victim to the conspiracy arranged by the general [Buz., V, 32, 10 - 17]. This marked the final collaps of the political retro-Hellenism in Greater Armenia.

In this regard, let us remind that a like project was introduced in Rome by Constantin the Great and developed by his descendants to give birth to the system of absolute monarchy in Eastern Roman Empire. Some scholars are inclined to trace the influence of that in the reformation of Sassanid king of kings Khosrow I Anushirvan (531 - 579). It concerned the areas of agriculture and trade, administration and army, taxation and jurisdiction. It had an aim to establish a rational system of government, breaking the power and influence of autonomous clan grands. The reformation succeeded and entailed the “golden era” of Sassanid Empire¹¹³.

108 The reformation of Pap, in the context of the 4th century and further history of Armenia, has raised opposite sentiments – from medieval clerical condemnation to modern intellectual admiration. Unfortunately, the époque of Arshak II and Pap has not yet become a subject of complex investigation.

109 At the same time, let us remind, that the king continued to pursue an Arianizing policy. Terian, 2005, 19.

110 According to the clerical tradition, Nersēs the Great was poisoned by the king tending to get rid of his severe reproaches and opposition [Buz., V, 29, 3]. However, modern scholars reject this opinion. Cf. Ormanean, 2001, 243 – 244;

111 The Gregorid archbishops were replaced by the Albianids, who, despite them, “[...] were from the old cast of pagan priests and were more flexible in doctrinal matters and more responsive to the needs of state”. Stopka, 2016, 49. Cf. Garsoïan, 1999b, 36 – 38. On the phenomenon of autocephaly of Oriental churches see in detail, Krikorian, 1981, 114 – 129.

112 Typologically this policy reached back to the last period of the reign of Tigran II (95 – 55 B.C.). Among the Armenian kings, he was the first who adopted the *position of political mean* [Dio Cass., XXXVII, 7, 4]. Artavazd II (55 – 34 B.C.) formulated it as the principal doctrine of the foreign policy of Greater Armenia See, Stepanyan, 2012, 138 -139.

113 Christensen, 1944, 363 – 367; Frye, 1983b, 257 – 260; Rubin, 1995, 279 – 284; Daryae, 2009, 29 – 30; Daryae,

4. Model of *Soft Power*: king Vramshapuh

In Armenia, this power model took shape in consequence of the collision between “royal absolutism” and “aristocratic liberty”. During the second half of the 4th century, the aristocratic opposition showed two parallel masks. *The first* personified Meruzhan Artsrunid whose clan was almost exterminated in the days of the king Tiran. As it has been noticed above, the prince abandoned Arshak II and took the side of the Persians with his party. He was particularly active during the four-year war, taking part in the devastation of Greater Armenia and extirpation Christianity:

After the death of Arshak, Sapur gathered a large army under Meruzhan and dispatched it to Armenia, entrusting the land to him. He gave him as a wife his own sister Ormizdukht and also edicts [bestowing on him] many villages and estates in Persia. He also promised to give him the throne of Armenia, provided that he subdued the princes and converted the land to the Mazdaean religion [Khor., III, 36, 2 – 3; cf. Buz., IV, 57 – 58; V, 43,2].

In other words, Meruzhan intended to implement a plan of the symmetric response to the Arsacid absolutism. It planned the replacement of Arsacids by Artsrunids and restoration of the old religion. Instead of Rome, it sought the support of Persia. However, the plan was thwarted by efforts of the king Pap and his supporters¹¹⁴.

The second mask of the opposition intended to gain a strong (and charismatic) authority of the Mamikonid clan behind a weak king. It represented prince Manuel, the regent in charge of the young son of the late Pap Arshak III (378 - 387). With a military support of Sassanids, he dethroned and exiled the Roman nominee Varazdat Arsacid (374 - 378). Within seven years, he concentrated a great power in his hands and established peace and order in the country¹¹⁵. So great were his power and influence, that he was dignified with royal honors:

The king of Persia also sent a crown, a robe-of honor, and the royal standard to Queen Zarmdukht through Surēn, as well as crowns for her sons, Arshak and Vagharshak. He likewise sent royal robes to the sparapet Manuēl, sables, and gargamak diadem of gold and silver for the head with the knot over the crest of the diadem behind the eagle tied in an ashkharawand knot, and an apizak chest ornament [pativ], as is the rule for kings [Buz., V, 38, 6 - 7].

In this regard, let us again assert the following fact: although the Armenian nobility was divided into pro-Roman and pro-Persian parties, it was unanimous against the powerful royal authority and intended to expand its *traditional rights* at the expense of the debasement of the latter. The both sides defaced the royal authority and attributed to kings (particularly Arshak II and Pap) low somatic passions. Similar descriptions are frequent especially in the text of Buzand [Buz., IV, 15, 47 – 51; IV, 44, 3 – 5; V, 22, 2 - 7]¹¹⁶.

2011, 188 – 189.

114 Khorenatsi informs that Meruzhan was killed at the Battle of Dzirav at the hands of the coronant and aspet Smbat Bagratid [Khor., III, 37, 23]. However, according to Buzand, he escaped the battle and was killed some years later by Babik Siwni, the companion-in-arms of the sparapet Manuel Mamikonid [Buz., V, 43, 36]. See, **Stepanyan**, 2014a, 41 – 42.

115 Of course, Greater Armenia was now under the suzerainty of Sassanids who controlled the country and conducted their policy through the marzpan Suren with 10 000 select cavalry [Buz., V, 38, 10]. **Manandyan**, 1957, 231 – 232; cf. **Daryae**, 2009, 18 – 19.

116 However, the case of the sparapet Manuel Mamikonid was asymmetric: on one hand, through his hypertrophic regency, he humiliated and desacralized the royal authority, on the other hand, he underlined his fidelity to the “royal blood” [Buz., V, 4, 61]. Cf. **Windengren**, 1959, 245.

The political project of the oppositional nobility began to prevail, and for reaching this aim, every party hoped to attract the support of one of the super states. At last, such tendencies paved a way to one of the most tragic event of the Armenian history – the partition of the kingdom between Rome and Persia, which happened in 387.¹¹⁷ The border passed along Euphrates. Although our principal sources – Buzand, Ghazar Parpetsi, and Procopius of Caesarea - do not give sufficient information about the details of the partition, modern scholars restore it with great probability¹¹⁸.

Then a joint consultation for union and agreement was held between the two kings of the Greeks and the Persians, and they determined that first, it would be good to divide the realm of Armenia in two between themselves “For”, they said, “this powerful and wealthy kingdom is set between us. It will be good if we are able to perturb and ruin this kingdom. First [let us] divide it in two with the Arsacid kings whom we have installed, then [let us] strive to impinge on and impoverish them and drive them into subjection so that they should not be able to raise their head between us [Buz., V, 1, 8]”¹¹⁹.

The western regions of Greater Armenia went to Rome, and Arshak III (and his brother and co-king) moved there to live and reign under the *patronage of the pious emperor*. However, he soon passed away under mysterious circumstances. The royal authority was abolished in the western regions; they were re-shaped into Roman provinces. As to the eastern regions (which made up a larger part of the country), they formed Persarmenia under the rule of the kings of Arsacid family¹²⁰. Among them, the figure of Vramshapuh (389 - 415) looks quite appropriate for the present discussion. His reign can be formulated as *a soft power* aimed at the transformation of *political retro-Hellenism* into *Christian (cultural) Hellenism*¹²¹.

Vramshapuh gave up the absolutist aspirations of the political retro-Hellenism and personified the aristocratic ideal of royal power – *primus inter pares*. He sought to settle contradictions between influential clans and was successful in many cases. As to grands, they saw in him a mediator between themselves and the Sassanid court. Indeed, he followed the orders of the king of kings and regularly paid tributes. At the same time, if we trust Khorenatsi, he entered into *friendship* with Roman Emperor as well: “Vramshapuh ruled our country and was subject to both kings, paying them tribute – to Vram for the Persian part and to Arcadius for the Greek part” [Khor., III, 51, 22]. It seemed, he restored the unity of Greater Armenia under his personal reign. However, it was not a system settlement of the problem: the new Roman emperor Theodosius the Younger: “Kept the same

117 More correctly, the talks began on the initiative of Shapur III in 384 and lasted until 389. See, **Doise**, 1945, 274 – 277; **Blockley**, 1987 229 – 234; **Geatrex**, 2000, 42 – 44.

118 We mean first of all **Adontz**, 1908, 222 – 226. Cf. **Asdourian**, 1911, 165 -168; **Redgate**, 1998, 137. Rome annexed Sophene, Anzitene, Ingilene, Saphanene, Persia - Arzanene, Gorduene, Tamoritiss up to Paytakaran. Georgia acquired Gogarene (except Kangar), Albania – Otana and Arjakh.

119 «Եւ այնուհետև անէլ խորհուրդ միաբանութեան հաւանութեան ընդ միմեանս թագաւորն Յունաց և թագաւորն Պարսից. եւ լաւ համարեցան զաշխարհն Հայոց նախ ընդ երկուս ի մէջ իւրեանց բաժանել. զի ասէին՝ թե ի միջի մերում բնակեալ է այս հզար և հարուստ թագաւորութիւն, լաւ է զի այսու եղծանել և խանկարել կարացուք զայս թագաւորութիւնս. նախ ընդ երկու բաժանել երկու թագաւորաւքս Արշակունսաք՝ զորս կացուցաք, սպա և ընդ նոսա կրծել ջանասցուք, աղքատացուցանել, ի մէջ արկանել ի ծառայութիւն զի մի կարացնն ի մէջ մեր ամբանալ գլուխս»:

120 Persarmenia comprised only six regions of Greater Armenia: Tayk, Turuberan, Vaspurakan, Siwnik, Moxene and Ayrarat. **Eremyan**, 1984, 112. However, this and other partitions did not distort the identity of the Armenians, since: “[...] the majority of the inhabitants possessed a common language (Armenian) and (from the fourth century) a common religion (Christianity) irrespective of whether a particular district fell under Roman or Persian rule”. **Lee**, 1993, 50.

121 **Stepanyan**, 2014a, 144 – 154.

friendship with our country and with our king Vramshapuh, but he did not entrust him with his own sector [of Armenia] but held it himself through governors” [Khor., III, 54, 2]¹²². Unfortunately, short-term political interests and ambitions again prevailed across the borders of upper Euphrates.

Despite these ebbs and flows, in Vramsharuh’s reign, an event took place destined to change radically the course of Armenian history. By the active support of the king and catholicos Sahak Parthev, a learned cleric Mesrop Mashtots invented the Armenian scribe system¹²³. It happened in North Mesopotamia with the active support of the Syrian clergy-men in 405:

And God the All-Bountiful finally granted him that good fortune: for with his holy hand he became the father of new wonderful offsprings – letters of the Armenian language, and then and there quickly designed, named, determined their order and devised the syl-labication [Koriun, VIII, 3].

After this crucial event, St. Mashtots and his disciples came back to Armenia and met an enthusiastic reception from the king, catholicos, noblemen and people. It was the start-ing point of the new époque of the national education, scholarship and mentality.

According to modern investigations, besides cultural and religious aspects, the prob-lem of the Armenian scribes had also political and civilization contexts. Our main source of this event, Koriwn, touches with them in a slip; nevertheless, the restoration of the whole picture is quite possible. In this regard, it is necessary to pay attention to the follow-ing fact: for implementing his mission, St. Mashtots visited the Syrian centers of north Mesopotamia, Amid and Edessa, and received the approval of the eminent leaders of the Christian communities, bishops Babilas and Akakios. The fact is that, in the days of Jaz-kert /Jazgird I (399 – 421), the Sassanid court adopted a policy of toleration to all reli-gious communities. It also concerned Christianity, represented in the Pesian empire by Syrian (Nestorian) Church as a counterweight to Roman orthodoxy¹²⁴.

The warm reception of St. Mesrop, attested about a new start in relations of the two churches of the East. The real background of this event, undoubtedly, was the authoceph-alisation of the Armenian church from Caesarea. The Armenian side hoped to enlist the support of the Syrian clergy in front the Sassanid Court since the effectuation of it prom-ised to enforce the process of authocephalisation¹²⁵. National script system and schools, theology and everyday religious practice were thought as effective means of reformation of the Armenian Christian identity. The Syrian church had already passed through this way and supporting this initiative, hoped to gain superiority over the Armenian church and

122 This account of Khorenatsi has no parallels in other primary sources, therefore, scholars usually reject it or pass by silence. **Manandyan**, 1957, 244 245; **Garsoïan**, 1999a, 91; However, it is quite reliable since it corresponds to the common context of Vramshapuh’s reign. Cf. **Eremyan**, 1984, 117.

123 This was preceded by another attempt to invent the Armenian scripts undertaken by Syrian intellectuals. According to Koriwn, the bishop Daniel played a key role in this experience. More probably, he acted in full accordance with Duin and Ctesiphon. However, Mashtots found these scripts not appropriate to express peculiarities of the phonetic system of Armenian [Koriwn, VI, 12].

124 The reign of Jazkert I could be defined in the term of *persianism*. With its antimony, *persianization*, it made up the two faces of the home and foreign policies of Persia beginning from Achemenid époque. Their competition kindled under Sassanids. See in detail, **Börm**, 2008, 429; **Strootman, Versluys**, 2017, 16 – 18; **Wiesehöfer**, 2017, 384 – 387. Cf. **Daryae**, 2009, 21 – 22; **Daryae**, 2011, 184 – 185.

125 Scholars pay attention to the fact that closing the (Greek) schools founded by Nerses the Great, Pap paved a way to the prevalence of Syrian church and scholarship in Armenia. See, **Ter-Minassiantz**, 1904, 12 – 15; **Peeters**, 1929, 207- 208.

spread its influence in the country¹²⁶.

Most probably, the Armenian court also parleyed with Ctesiphon on the same problem and achieved an approval. Jazkert I met the demand of the Armenians proceeding nearly from the following consideration: although they denied Zoroastrianism, they declined from the Roman path as well. However, it was not only about Armenia, but also the cultural area from North Mesopotamia to the Caucasus Mountains since the Armenian, Iberian and Albanian churches were in union with the center in Duin, the new capital of Armenia¹²⁷.

From a semiotic point of view, the situation could be formulated as “neither ... nor”. In a profound sense, this was a religious and cultural variation of the renowned policy adopted still by Gn. Pompey towards the region in 66 – 65 B.C. It was recognized an area of amical relations centered in Artashat. In the light of modern scholarship, the situation could be formulated through the phrase: “a local civilization gesigned to amortize turbulent tensions between super states”¹²⁸.

It is not surprising that the Roman side, by the initiative of the emperor Theodosius the Younger and Constantinopolitan church prelate Atticus, adopted this approach as well; St. Mashtots was invited to start national schools in the western portion of Armenia as well. According to Koriwn: “He received at the outset of his journey a very sincere and amicable reception” and was honored with a high title akoumit [Koriwn, XVII, 3]¹²⁹.

As a result, there appeared a neutral religious and cultural area between the two empires comprising the three countries. Armenian, Georgian and Albanian script systems symbolized the semiotic codes of neutrality of the space. With temporal retreats, this situation continued until the beginning of the seventh century (706) when the schism between the Armenian and Iberian churches occurred¹³⁰.

However, the system metamorphosis implemented by Vramshapuh could not secure the stability for the Arsacid monarchy for a long time. Both the Armenian opposition nobility and the Sassanid court began to challenge its validity¹³¹. Vramshapuh still maintained a balance between the two poles; the crisis came on the reign of his “young and unexperienced” son Artashēs/Artashir (422 - 428) when the confrontation reached its apo-

126 The role of Vramshapuh in this crucial event is, unfortunately, shadowed. Our principal sources, Koriwn, Parpetsi, Khorenatsi, give no precise information about the talks of the king with the Sassanid court. Sufficient to say that in this important enterprise, the Armenian clergy could not act on its own. This tradition is still alive in works of modern scholars. See, **Ormanean**, 2001, 300 – 310; **Panossian**, 2006, 45 – 46; **Mahé**, 2012, 887 – 889; **Rapp Jr.**, 2012, 29 – 30; **Stopka**, 2016, 55 – 56. However, some contemporary scholars are inclined to trace the impulse of Vramshapuh in this enterprise. The impulse reached its end through king’s collaboration with Mashtots. They believe that catholicos Sahak Partev joined the project after Mashtots’ experience in Goghtn district. See, **Martirosyan**, 1982, 131 – 132; **Melik-Shahnazaryan**, 2007, 208 – 214.

127 **Akinean**, 1910, 9 – 20; **Ormanean**, 2001, 685 – 705; **Fortescue A.**, 1913, 413 – 414; **Ter-Minaseants**, 2009, 49 – 50; **Beledian**, 1994, 12 – 13; **Rapp Jr.**, 2012, 32 – 33.

128 On this assumption, see in detail, **Stepanyan**, 2012, 252 – 257; **Stepanyan**, 2014, 154 – 166. From this point of view, the following account of Tacitus about the Armenians looks very appropriate: “This had been of old an unsettled country from the character of its people and from its geographical position, bordering, as it does, to a great extent on our provinces and stretching far away to Media. It lies between two most mighty empires, and is very often at strife with them, *hating Rome and jealous of Parthia*”. [Tac., Ann., II, 56, 4].

129 **Acharyan H.**, 1968, 190 – 207. In Greek spiritual tradition, this title (ἀκοίμητος = sleepless) was usually bestowed upon devoted clergies. In some senses, it was comparable to the spiritual name Gregory (Γρηγόριος) denoting “vigilant, alert and watchful” man. Cf. **Stepanyan**, 2016b, 45.

130 On the details of the schism of the Armenian and Georgian churches see, **Akinean**, 1910, 62 – 71.

131 In last years of his reign, Jazkert I decided, however, to restore the Armenian policy of Parthian Arsacids and raised to its throne his son, the crown-prince Shapur. But his expectations failed because of unfriendly reception of the Armenian nobility (Parp., I, 12, 3; Khor., III, 55, 6 - 23). Cf. **Asdourian**, 1911, 168; **Manandyan**, 1957, 278 – 280.

5. Cultural Retro-Hellenism

The second wave or the cultural retro-Hellenism was characteristic for the Christian societies of the East beginning from the 4th century. It implied the reasoning of biblical subjects, plots and truths from point of view of ancient Greek and Hellenistic philosophy and theology: “Central doctrines of Christianity prompted and sustained attractive, liberating, and effective social relations and organizations”¹³⁷. Among the precursors of this approach, the eminent intellectuals of Christian Church are mentioned - Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Euagrius Ponticus et al¹³⁸. On them, the influence of the spiritual experience of Philo of Alexandria was especially effective. Scholars assess this synthesis as the beginning of a new civilization typology, which, unlike the previous one, was focused on narratives and texts. Moreover, it radically changed the mode of behavior of the educated elite “from induction to deduction”. The long-term social ideas and projects gained prominence in social actions based on the Christian paradigms of life and death, justice and moral responsibility, sin and retribution, divine judge and salvation¹³⁹.

a. Features of the new cultural paradigm

The intellectual elite of Armenia acted in the mainstream of this essential shift. After the invention of the national scripts, it engendered a powerful intellectual movement known as the *Hellenizing School* (Յունաբան դպրոց). In its turn, the latter gave birth to numerous areas of national culture: theology and philosophy, linguistics and hermeneutics, poetry and hagiography, rhetoric and history, geography and cosmology¹⁴⁰.

In time, there appeared a new creative minority, the nucleus of which made up the generations of Mashtots’ pupils. Starting their education in Armenian primary schools (equal to progymnasmata), many of them continued the curriculum in the eminent centers of Alexandria, Antiochia, Athens, and Constantinople. Albeit they dedicated their energy to different areas of spiritual activity, in a deep sense, they all were involved in a common cause: to expand the limits of Armenian intellectual discourse in order to encompass the principal meanings of the new spiritual cosmos¹⁴¹. The results of this activity were so impressive that this period of Armenian history is defined as the Golden Age (5 th – 7 th cc.).

On this way, the members of the Hellenizing School first implemented significant innovations in Armenian language. After the Greek grammatical models, they corrected and standardized the morphological structure of the language; coined correct Armenian equivalents of the complicated Greek theological, philosophical and grammatical terms and concepts; introduced a system of prepositions and prefixes due to which Armenian language gained flexibility; on Greek patterns, the syntactic rules of Armenian were diversified for composing complex texts and contexts¹⁴².

137 Stark, 1996, 211.

138 They indicated a whole époque during which Christianity derived (through Jewish Christianity) from Rabbinism and adopted Greek philosophy. Alexander, 1992, 23 – 25; Cf. Kelly, 1968, 9 – 14, 41 – 47; Gonzáles, 2010, 86 – 92, 199 – 205, 209.

139 They formed the two significant genres of early Christian literature, apologetics and martyrology, which supplied the subsequent generations with stereotypes of heroic deed and ascetism, chestity and piety, devotion and noble death. See in detail, Clark, 2004, 78 – 81; Rhee, 2005, 50 – 70, 88 – 101; Heather, 2006, 65.

140 Arevshatyan, 1973a, 23 – 37; Terian, 1982, 177 – 184; Thomson, 1999, 205 – 226.

141 For the best reference on this problem see, Shirinian, 2005, 112 – 131.

142 H. Acharyan finds that different groups of intellectuals worked on this project in parallel and coined sometimes

the translation activity, the Armenian intellectuals began to compile original works in the areas mentioned above. Soon, there appeared a cohort of outstanding authors that formed the glory of the Golden Age: Sahak Partev, Mesrop Mashtots, Koriwn, Eznik Koghbatsi, Faustos Buzand, Eghishē, Ghazar Parpetsi, Moses Khorenatsi, John Mandakuni, Mambre Interpreter, David Invincible, Anania Shirakatsi and many others¹⁵².

However, between the invention of the scripts and this intellectual blossom, scholars trace a missing link, personified by Mesrop Mashtots. Proceeding from the analysis of primary sources (first of all Agathangelos and Koriwn), they have come to a conclusion that the two notorious works of the early Armenian literature, *Faithful Speeches* (Յաճախապատում ճառք) and *Doctrine of St. Gregory* (Վարդապետութիւն սր. Գրիգորի), traditionally attributed to Gregory the Illuminator, are composed in 420-s and most probably belong to the pen of Mashtots. The great cleric, following the intellectual experience of Philo of Alexandria, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, Ephrem the Syrian, John Chrysostom, laid the foundations of Armenian patristic philosophy and apologetic, theological ontology and anthropology, hermeneutic and moral theory¹⁵³.

b. Historiography in the context of the new cultural paradigm

The experience of Mashtots influenced different areas of Armenian culture, and scholars have studied it with more or less efficiency. Nevertheless, there is an area that stays almost untouched: the historiography, although it occupied the central position in the cultural context of the Age¹⁵⁴. We decided not to enter into the descriptive details of this complicated process but to compile a new perception of its typology, applying materials of the two waves of cultural Hellenism. The two waves, that contained projects of westernization of social experience and culture. Instead of myth and epic tales, it introduced new technologies of memory and history writing. In this transformation, an effective way of constructing of a new paradigm of the national identity came afore¹⁵⁵.

According to the common approach, the principal task of history is to bring back the image of the past shared by the given ethnic community, country, region or whole dwelt world through important events and actions, ideas and plans, illusions and utopias of elite groups and eminent individuals. This marks an intellectual activity based on of the mnemotechnics (μνημοτεχνή) - the craft of re-remembering and re-shaping its results in linear narratives (stories) with exact semantic and semiotic codes¹⁵⁶. As a result, the given collective acquires an instrument of auto-reflection and construction of its identity in the per-

in diversity (ἐν-πολλῷ). Cf. **Rist**, 1967, 412 – 413; **Hadot**, 1993, 25 – 27; **Hadot**, 1995, 131.

152 From numerous investigations on this problem, the works of the following contemporary authors seem more comprehensive. See, **Arevshatyan**, 1973b, 250 - 256; **Thomson**, 1999, 218 – 220; **Calzolari**, 2014, 352 – 366.

153 **Sargisyan**, 1890, 401 – 408; **Abeghyan**, 1944, 119 – 122. **Arevshatyan**, 1996, 91 – 96. N. Marr has even hypothesized that the initial Armenian recension of Agathangelos' *History* (disappeared in the 5th century) had been composed by Mashtots. **Marr**, 1905, 157.

154 **Calzolari**, 2014, 366. The keen relationship between theology and historiography made one of principal features of the Christian cultural context in the West and East. Cf. **Heather**, 2006, 65.

155 In this light, the formula proposed by A.E. Redgate seems very relevant: "A common theme in Armenian historiography has been a connection not only between national identity and Christianity but also between national identity and Christology" **Redgate**, 1998, 250.

156 Memory of oral narratives was associated with a power of influence (δύναμις) on illiterate mass through speech and declamation. Sometimes it is defined as rhapsodic memory linked with particular (divine) abilities of artists. With writing (especially alphabetic) systems new methods of memory were invented – more easy and available. Reading and writing expanded an influence over people. Cf. **Enos**, 2012, 4 – 5.

spective of the past and present. The opposite situation is featured by the absence of memory. The ancients usually defined it as a state of barbarity devoid of the capacity of auto-reflection. It does not look for historicization of time and reasoning of its principal results in precise historical perceptions. Consequently, the barbarity is thought to be bereft of ability to apply the results of historical reflection in formalization, rationalistic interpretation, and reasoning of the problems of modernity as well¹⁵⁷.

The memory of the past makes up a kind of treasury that comprises archetypes of moral virtue and wisdom, martial valiance and heroism¹⁵⁸. In Armenia, the first index of the similar treasury comprised subjects of the epical past starting from the ethnarch Hayk and his descendants. With the conversion to Christianity, Holy Script began to play the same role. In biblical themes and lives of eminent patriarchs, a global narrative of the origin and development of mankind was traced. In this way, universal Christian wisdom (stored in numerous apologetical and exegetical, theological and historical works) gained an exceptional value¹⁵⁹. Emotionally emulating or rationally adopting them, the intellectuals intended to set up the Armenian national homeostasis to give relevant responses to the challenges of history. And it is no accident that *Universal History (Chronicon)* by Eusebius of Caesarea was very popular in early medieval Armenia¹⁶⁰.

In this regard, it is pertinent to point out that starting from Herodotus, the intention to secure continuous duration of historical memory was the principal task of historians: “[...] in hope of thereby preserving from decay the remembrance of what men have done, and of preventing the great wonderful actions of the Greeks and of the Barbarians from losing their due meed of glory” [Herod., I, 1,1]¹⁶¹. Undoubtedly, Moses Khorenatsi proceeded from this old tradition, stating: “If in truth those kings are worthy of praise who in written accounts fixed and ordered their annals and wise acts and inscribed each one’s valor in narratives and histories, then like them the compilers of books of archives who were occupied with similar efforts are worthy of our eulogies” [Khor., I, 3, 3]¹⁶².

Historians discussed the problem of memory a propos of different genres of historical narrative – epic history, chronology, pragmatic history, tragic history, clerical history, local

157This followed from the Hellenistic assumption of the term “barbarity” purified from genetic prejudice and composed exclusively on cultural values. Moser, Boletsi, 2015, 19 – 20; Hartog, 2015, 30 – 32. Such approach, in many senses, was prepared by Stoics who shook the foundations of traditional concept of slavery. Colish, 1985, 36 – 41; Schofield, 1999, 760 - 768. Christianity adopted this approach seeing in barbarity (pagans, polytheists), first of all, *natural inclinations and impiety*. According to the Fathers of Church, the newly converted Christians (children) preserved some features of that. According to St. Paul: “I fed you with milk and not solid food, for you were not yet able to take it – and even now you are still not able to for you are still living by your natural inclinations” [I Corinthians, 3: 1 – 2.]. Cf. Antonova, 2005, 69 – 71. 158 “Memory (memoria) referred in medieval culture to a trained and disciplined memory, educated according to a well-established pedagogical system. As in the classical authors, the material to be remembered was broken down into smaller elements that were short enough to be recalled. These were then arranged into a rigid and local order, so that one could easily and quickly locate a piece of information that had been stored”. Whitehead, 2009, 41.

159 “Historical accounts, interpretations and explanations are verifiable or refutable only within particular paradigms”. Fulbrock, 2002, 68. On the biblical paradigms of Armenian historiography see in detail, Thomson, 1994, 329 – 341; Thomson, 2005a, 47 – 61; Thomson, 2005b, 34 – 44.

160 Zarbhanalean, 1889, 54, 434 – 442.

161 Dovatur, 1957, 13 – 17; Bakker, 2006, 92 – 102. Herodotus reached this objective through five kinds of explanation: divine jealousy, fate and the cycle, divinities, act and retribution, historical analysis. See, Lateiner, 1989, 162 – 167.

162 «Ջի թէ արդարև արժանի գովութեան այնք ի թագաւորաց իցեն, որք գրով և պատմութեամբ զիրեանցն հաստատեալ կարգեցին զժամանակս, և զգործս իմաստութեան և զքաջութիւն իւրաքանչիւր արձանացուցին ի վէպս և ի պատմութիւնս՝ ըստ սոցանէ և պարապեալքն այսպիսում ճգութեան ղիւանագիրք մատենից՝ ներբողականաց ի մէնջ արժանի եղեն ասից»։ This was thought as a common approach to Hellenistic historiography. See in detail, Briant, 2003, 173 – 186.

history, regional history, global history etc¹⁶³. They applied various methods of description, interpretation, reasoning and, naturally, their results differed by content, structure, and axiology. This gives grounds to state that the polyphony was one of the significant characteristics of the craft of history writing. The fact is that the terms “the past” and “history” are not equivalent; the main objective of historians is to master (through their professional skills) *history* from the *ambiguous past*¹⁶⁴.

The mentioned diversities of genres were transparent in ancient and early Medieval Armenian historiography as well. In time, they were classified in a number of lists of eminent authors and their works. The most typical is recognized that of Stepanos Taronetsi, the historian of the 10th – 11th centuries: “First and foremost the valiant Agathangelos, the historian of the amazing wonders and torments of St. Gregory and of our coming to know God; then Moses, the equal of Eusebius, who is called the rhetor; then Eghishē vardapet, who [wrote] about the Vardanank and tortures and martyrdom of the holy priests; then the history of the eloquent Ghazat Parpetsi [...]”¹⁶⁵.

Usually, this classification has been discussed in contradiction with that of Ghazar Parpetsi, who recognizes three historians of the 5th century – Agathangelos, Faustos Buzand and himself [Parp., I, 1 - 6]. We find the contradiction to be constrained: perhaps Parpetsi speaks only about the three authors, bearing in mind the fact that they continued each other in relating the history of Armenia from Conversion to Christianity (301) to the second great anti-Persian rebellion (481 - 484).

Three more diversities of the genres are noticeable in Armenian historiography of the time. They concern the temporal coverage of historical narrative. The first genre represents contemporary history, based predominantly on eyewitnesses of the author (հի ծփւտս). Still, Herodotus believed that the facts obtained in this way were more reliable since they resulted from immediate perception [Herod., II, 99; 147]¹⁶⁶. In Armenia, this form of information had been gathered in state archives of Tigranakert, Ani Kamakh, Artashat, and Duin. The following account of Ghazar Parpetsi seems quite ad hoc: “[...] the royal scribes treated the affairs of kings of Armenia in Syriac and Greek, as well as their decisions and decrees” [Parp., I, 10,1]¹⁶⁷.

Certainly, this practice looked first of all to the needs of the effective government of the kingdom, but it had an undoubted cultural context as well – it stored the *immediate memory* about the events of different époques¹⁶⁸. In time, this information made up the background of the so-called *previous present* available to historians¹⁶⁹. Besides that, histo-

163 In all these variations, the basic is the fact that history is a meta-text away from immediate imprint of the events of the past. This makes important its relationship with narrative, text, poetry, logics, hermeneutics, rhetoric, and semiotics etc. See, **Atkinson**, 1978, 8 – 14; **White**, 1984, 31 – 33; **Ricoeur**, 1985, 264 – 266.

164 **Marwick**, 2001, 28 – 33.

165 «Իսկ ըստ հայրմն՝ նախ և առաջին քաջն Ագաթանգեղոս, որ նորասբանչ հրաշից և չարչարանաց սրբոյն Գրիգորի աստուածածանաւթութեանս մերոյ է պատմիչ: Եւ զկնի մեծն Մովսէս, հանգոյն Եւսեբեայ, որ քերթողացն անուանի հայր: Եւ ապա Եղիշէ վարդապետ, որ վասն Վարդանանց և սուրբ քահանայիցն չարչարանաց և կատարման: Եւ զկնի՝ Դազարոս Փարբեցոյ ճարտասանի պատմութիւն [...]»:

166 **Lurje**, 1947, 106 – 111. **Dovatur**, 1957, 27 – 29.

167 We possess a clear information that still in the Achemenid period existed *Royal Chronicles*: “[...] in which the Persians in accordance with a certain law of theirs kept an account of their ancient affair” [Diod., II, 33, 4]. Usually, they were applied to settle current affairs. **Momigliano**, 1990, 5 – 7; cf. **Daryaee**, 2009, 53 – 55.

168 The objective of such presentism is formulated as “[...] to focus not on the past, but on the present, not on history as what is irremediably gone, but on history as ongoing process”. **Runia**, 2006, 8.

169 Recording about Achemenid king of kings Xerxes I, Old Testament highlights: “At that night could not the king sleep,

rians applied this genre to compile narratives about current events relying on their own observation, interpretation and reasoning. On these ground, they sought to reshape the modernity into textual duration¹⁷⁰.

This practice is transparent in the two waves of the cultural Hellenism - beginning from Artavazd II and ending with Eghishē. The king tried to historicize the events of Crassus' Parthian campaign (54 - 53 B.C.), whereas Eghishē's objective was to cover the events of the great anti-Sassanian revolt of the Armenians (450 – 451). Both of them were the contemporaries of the crucial of their narratives.

In comparison with the other forms of perception, historians (following Herodotus' tradition) preferred the eyewitness. Some of them, although they lived in later times, sought to show themselves contemporaries of the events described in their works¹⁷¹. This feature is traceable in Armenian historiography as well. Agathangelos, the author of the 5th century, demonstrates a remarkable example of that: in the Introduction to his *History of Armenia*, he represents himself a Greek scribe of the king Trdat III, who was commissioned to compose the history of his reign focused on the conversion of the kingdom to Christianity [Agath., Intr., 30]. Whereas modern scholarship has proved him to be an author of the second half of 5th century¹⁷².

As to the *second genre*, it marked narratives focused exclusively on events of the (distant or near) past. Ancient historians traced its origin in the mediated information of sources. They believed that the perception of hearing (τὸ ἀκουσθέν) prevailed in this case. It is defined as a verbal information. [Thuc., III, 38, 5; VIII, 147, 10]¹⁷³. In other words, these authors proceeded from the senses and descriptions, ideas and concepts of *many others*. In compiling their own narratives, they had to practice professional crafts and efforts to pass over the differences, discrepancies and contradictions of primary sources – myths and epic tales, ruins and inscriptions, archive materials and chronicles, rhetorical compendiums and philosophical treaties, literal fictions and historical narratives. The problem of a historian was to balance this polyphony to achieve the objective of his narrative¹⁷⁴.

In ancient historiography, the works of Herodotus, Ephorus and Diodorus Siculus were estimated as the best examples of this genre¹⁷⁵. As to the Armenian historiography, the most typical representative of this genre is Moses Khorenatsi, whose *History of the Armenians*, as it was noticed, sought to cover events of the past - from Flood, formative period of Haykids to the fall of the Arsacid dynasty. The author was not the contemporary of the events described in his work; his principal sources of information were the *voices of*

and he commanded to bring the book of records of the chronicles; and they were read before the king" [Esther, VI:1]. The same Xerxes, watching the Salamis battle (480 B.C.), kept nearby scribes (οἱ γραμματισταί) to set down the important events and heroes [Herod., VIII, 90, 4].

170 Irrelevant to its genres, - epic, chronicle, romance, inquiry - history is called to implement this essential function. See, **Hay**, 1977, 34 – 38; **Hartog**, 2002, 22 - 25; **Borrow**, 2009, 229 – 238.

171 In this connection, the phrase of a modern theorist on historians' work grows into a definition: "gate keepers and tour guides to the past". **Fulbrook**, 2002, 175.

172 **Anasyan**, 1959, 161 – 213. On the theoretical principles of historical presentism, see in detail, **Runia**, 2006, 210 – 229.

173 On the opposition of the visual and verbal accounts in the narrative of a historian see, **Immerwahr**, **Connor**, 1985, 428 – 429. The modern psychological and cognitive aspects of these forms (and their combinations) see, **Loftus E.F.**, **Miller D.G.**, **Burns H.J.**, 1978, 1 – 19.

174 **Evans**, 1997, 142 – 148. **Marwick**, 2001, 39 - 40. At the same time, the personality of historian plays an indisputable role in the composing of the perspective of the past and present. This adds a share of relativism to historical reconstruction in the spirit of R.G. Collingwood. **Collingwood**, 1994, 282 – 301.

175 **Luce**, 1997, 70 – 86; **Harrison**, 2010, 377 – 383; **Dillery**, 2011, 179 -186.

others. He mentions historians Herodotus, Berossus, Alexander Polyhistor, Joseph Flavius, Phlegon, Evagrius Ponticus, Eusebius of Caesarea et al. Alongside with them, authors are singled out who lived and worked in Armenia, Mar Aba Katina (of Mtsurn), Priest Olympus, Bardetsan, Agathangelos¹⁷⁶. Dialogues with them makes up the semantic and semiotic backgrounds of Khorenatsi's narrative. It represents three pairs of communicative situations: *ego – opposite other*, *ego – neutral other*, *ego – alter ego*.

In the *History* of Khorenatsi, the last semiotic pair occurs more often, since he has chosen the authors whose accounts correspond to his approaches. From this point of view, the archetypical heroes and situations of Bible are appreciated very highly. The same is also true about the Armenian mythical and epical tales.

The dialogue of Khorenatsi with his sponsor prince Sahak Bagratid (which passes through all his History) is revealing. Sometimes it takes a form of consent, sometimes misunderstanding and disputation. At a close discussion, it becomes obvious that the prince was an adept of the epic history and represented the “epic mask” of Khorenatsi. As to the misunderstandings and disputations, they, as a rule, fall on the critical points of the narrative marking its transition to the rationalistic and metaphysic layers¹⁷⁷.

The *third genre* exemplifies a hybrid situation aimed at the combination of the presentism and retrospection. This was the most popular mode of history writing; the authors looked for the causes of the contemporary events in the past. In ancient historiography, the best representatives of the genre were Thucydides and Polybius. In the second wave of Armenian Hellenism, the *History* of Ghazar Parpetsi corresponded to this genre most of all. Although his focus is the second great anti-Persian revolt (481 - 484), he covers also the previous historical events beginning from the conversion of Greater Armenia to Christianity. Later, this genre would become most popular being represented by the eminent historians Sebeos, John Draskhanakerttsi and Stepanos Taronetsi.

Despite their temporal coverage, the genres differed by the mode of describing, interpreting and reasoning of historical information. We have already touched the epic and rationalistic ways of composing the perspectives of the past and present. The most typical expression of this was transparent in the Greek logography which influenced the narratives of Herodotus, Xenophon and Ephorus¹⁷⁸. As to the Armenian historiography, it comprised two epic circles covering the history from the patriarch Hayk and his descendants to the 4th century AD. Anonymous authors elaborated the raw narratives of minstrels (զուսանք) applying devices and tools of the Hellenistic grammar, rhetoric and history writing [cf. Khor., I, 19, 5; 20, 12 - 15]¹⁷⁹.

176 **Sarkisyan**, 1969, 115 – 126. Most probably, Mar Aba Katina was the source of Procopius of Caesarea in his sketch on the early history of Armenia. In general features, it reminds the fragments of Anonym and Moses Khorenatsi: “The Armenians of ancient times used to have a king of their own race, as is recorded by those who have written the history of the earliest period (ἤπερ τοῖς ἀναγραψαμένοις τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἀρχαιότατα δεδιήγηται). And when Alexander of Macedon overthrew the King of the Persians, the Persians remained quietly in subjection, but the Parthians rose against the Macedonians and overcoming them in the struggle, drove them out of the country and gained the territory as far as the Tigris River, and the Persian state remained subject to them after that for five hundred years, until Alexander, son of Mamaea, became Emperor of the Romans. At one time, one of the kings of the Parthians appointed his brother, Arsaces by name, King of the Armenians, as the history of the Armenians declares (ὥσπερ ἡ τῶν Ἀρμενίων ἱστορία φησί). I say this lest anyone think the descendants of Arsaces are Armenians. At least peace continued between them for these five hundred years because of the kinship” [Procop., De aedificiis, III, 1, 4 - 7]. However, scholars usually find that Procopius refers to *Epic History* by Buzand. See, **Traina**, 2001, 405 – 413; **Traina**, 2015, 157 – 158.

177 **Stepanyan**, 1991, 167 – 171.

178 **Immerwahr, Connor**, 1985, 456 – 458; 461 – 465.

179 See in detail, **Abeghyan**, 1966, 98 – 100.

Combined with the historical rationalism, it gave birth to a new method of the interpretation history through metaphysic perception. Scholars see the most complete expression of that in the *History* of Thucydides. Sometimes, they define it as *transcendental pragmatic narrative* emphasizing its capacity to find out the deep (sometimes, intangible) causes of historical events. In such experience, the role of the historian was assessed very highly¹⁸⁰. Proceeding from contemporary understandings, scholars also formulate this approach as poetry of history. We find it transparent in the narratives by Eghishē, Ghazar Parpetsi and (especially) Moses Khorenatsi¹⁸¹.

For the sake of the truth, it should also be paid attention to the fact that the metaphysic aspect was immmanent to the Armenian historiography since the times of adoption of western canon in the 1st century B.C. The pioneers of this experience were the eminent orator and philosopher Metrodorus of Scepsis and king Artavazd II. According to our reconstruction, Metrodorus had compiled his historical narrative on *transcendental pragmatism*, whereas Artavazd followed the method of *tragic history*. Despite that, the both authors looked for the profound essence of the historical past and present¹⁸².

As it was pointed out, the present investigation looks for the generalization of the results of historical thinking along the two waves of Hellenism in Armenia. We discuss the rationalization through the introduction of the western (Greek and Hellenistic) canon of the reflection over the past and present. Among the numerous historians participating in this experience, the four are in the focus of our discussion: Metrodorus of Scepsis and Artavazd II (1st c. B.C.), on one hand, Eghishē and Moses Khorenatsi (5th c. A.D.), on the other hand. They marked the process of transformation of ancient storyteller bards into professional history writers.

However, the two groups were not identic. The historians of the first wave intended to manufacture Armenian history by using the classical intellectual stereotypes – philosophical, historical, rhetorical, theatrical etc. Whereas the narratives of the historians of the second wave were polydimensional aimed at the harmonization of epical, western and biblical perceptions¹⁸³. The biblical perception of history was a new element in the westernization of Armenian culture. Introduced in Armenia with Hellenistic Christianity, it made up a counterpoint of the former model of historicism. In other words, the Hellenistic and Biblical perceptions made up the two significant poles of the westernization of historical thought in Armenia.

In an essential sense, this polyphony showed two opposite poles representing the classical and biblical paradigms of historical perception. In the classical perception, historical narratives and texts depended on the axiological choice of events and the reliability of primary sources – immediate observation, eyewitness accounts, archives, authentic works of previous authors etc. The historian played a key role in compiling and reasoning of basic results of the past.

As to the biblical perception, it was focused on the chain of significant events directed by God's Will. The historian related stories about the past proceeding from the sacred texts

180 In this regard, the creative activity of a historian becomes very important: “Chaque mot, chaque tour, chaque silence, chaque remarque contribue à dégager une signification qui a été distinguée par lui et imposée par lui”. Romilly, 1956, 12. 181 Stepanyan, 2016b, 74 – 77.

182 On this aspect of discussion see in detail, Stepanyan, 2017, 38 – 65.

183 G. Khalatyants did not trace any polyphony in the text of Khorenatsi. Therefore, he exaggerated the role of the epic narrative stratum and found that text of the *History* would be discussed only from this point of view. Despite this failure, his analysis of the epical data is impressive. Khalatyants, 1896, 273 – 301.

(tradition). His work was a ritual rather than an investigation: he did not feel a private responsibility for his narration. Respectively, whereas the classical tradition juxtaposed the figure of the historian with that of the philosopher, the biblical tradition correlated the figures of the historian and prophet.¹⁸⁴

The problem was to balance the oppositions and establish a polyphony within historical perception. Hellenistic Christianity settled the problem proceeding from the concept of *God's image* (ἰνδαλμα τοῦ θεοῦ), which personified a human being who reached completion. His training (ἀσκησις) combined elements of Greek philosophy and Biblical wisdom. Philo of Alexandria was the illustrious theorist of this approach further developed by the Christian intellectuals [Philo, *De somn.*, VIII, 46 – 47, 59 – 60; *De fuga*, XXX, 166; cf. *Greg. Nyss., Mos.*, II, 96]. This concerned particularly the Cappadocian fathers who were very popular in early medieval Armenia¹⁸⁵.

According to Khorenatsi, such training was suitable for a true historian as well¹⁸⁶. The substantial aspect of his work was to uncover the metaphysics of the past and present. A layer that sought to represent the lesson formulated in the *poetry of history*. It promised to give answer not only about “what happened”, but also “what could happen”. Such narratives were addressed to *advanced readers* (ընթերցասէրք, ուսումնասէրք) able to cooperate with an author in attaining the hidden (and profound) truths of history. In this approach, the collaboration of a writer and reader played a principal role. The *reverse perspective* prevailed in the text perception, and *author – reader* poles were principally interchangeable¹⁸⁷.

In spite of the Greeks, writers and readers made up a limited circle in Armenia. Their intellectual circle was composed of a common system of curriculum and axiology¹⁸⁸. The slip of ideas and concepts was a dominant feature of that. At the same time, it must be kept in mind that: “[...] medieval writing does not produce variants, it is variance”¹⁸⁹. Therefore, it would be no exaggeration to highlight that numerous (and often anonymous) allusions, citations and interpolations were rather regular than accidental traits of the texts of the age. Moreover, in some sense, their authors made up a *collective intellectual identity*.

Modern text criticism has reached to this idea through theoretical constructs and assumption. In allusions, citations and interpolations, it traces an editorial work (apparatus) purposed to validate a past text in accordance with demands of the present day. And the apparatus: “[...] is an indication less of the nature of the text than of the type of audience for which the edition is intended”¹⁹⁰.

Afterwards, even the representatives of other generations of intellectuals felt their in-

184 On this problem see in detail **Momigliano**, 1966, 14 – 21.

185 Theologization and philosophization are to be recognized the main features of the early medieval historiography. It provided history with the image of omnipotent God and divine Eternity, on one hand, and a creative human being purposed to translate the will of God into the duration of material world, on the other hand. Cf. **Breisach**, 2002, 50 – 51; **Stepanyan**, 2016a, 40 – 45.

186 Described by Khorenatsi the journey of the young students from Armenia to Alexandria [Khor., III, 62, 2 - 8] was compiled in accordance with the spiritual initiation - from a profane (earthly) life to the divine heights. See in detail, **Stepanyan**, 2009a, 182 – 193.

187 **Barthes**, 1991, 109 – 112.

188 In some senses, the situation reminded that of Alexandria in early Hellenistic time: a limited group of historians was isolated from his audience. See, **Breisach**, 1983, 78 – 79.

189 **Cerquiglini**, 1989, 111.

190 **Tanselle**, 1972, 43; cf. **Shillingburg**, 1989, 59 – 62.

volvement in that identity. Moreover, they even felt their participation in a new virtual generation with a wider range of information exchange. This was the other aspect of the collective intellectual identity. Such approach indicates that the definition of the time of this or that historical text based on the explicit or implicit interpolations contains tangible error risks. This perception concerns equally the principal authors of the second wave of the westernization of the Armenian historical mind - Eghishē and Moses Khorenatsi.

Modern scholar criticism has proposed a great deal of innovative interpretations of their texts. However, it failed to measure precisely the influence of these traits on the semantic and semiotic structure of the authors' works as monolith narrative systems. Such work, unfortunately, has yet not been brought about. From 70 – 80-s of the 19th century a number of eminent scholars tried to fill this lack by shifting the time of these authors to the further centuries¹⁹¹. However, this does not remove the problem from the agenda. The gates are still open and expectations are still vivid.

For now, however, we have what we have... Therefore, we decided to follow the traditional approach and recognize that the texts under consideration (or the nucleus sections of them) belong to the 5th century¹⁹². On the other hand, the exact time of these authors is not the main concern of our investigation, since it is focused on the problems of typology and global concepts of the Armenian historical thinking acquired under the impact of the Hellenistic and early Medieval social and intellectual experience. Historical thinking which, through its reverse effect, was capable to influence the course of history.

Conclusion

The following sequence of the evolution of historiography is accepted in modern Armenian studies: epic history of ancient bards worked out by anonymous authors according to the western canons of grammar and rhetoric; introduction of western canons of history writing by Metrodorus of Scepsis and Artavazd II (1st c. BC.); chronologies compiled by the authors of the 2d - 3d centuries AD. - Mar Aba Katina (Mtsurnatsi), Priest Olymp and Bardetsan; new historiography of the 5th – 7th centuries – Agathangelos, Faustus Buzand, Ghazar Parpetsi, Eghishē, Moses Khorenatsi and Sebeos.

This process took place against the background of the introduction and development of Hellenistic culture in ancient and early medieval Armenia. It made up the two waves of Hellenization during which the identity of the Armenians underwent significant metamorphoses. Particularly, the three of them are transparent in the insight of modern scholarship: *first*, the traditional (patrimonial) ethnē based on the clan system of integration; *second*, the political nation (populus) based on the bureaucratic patrimony initiated by the centralized state, *third*, God's covenant based on the Christian community and axiology. They

¹⁹¹ Eghishē was “moved” from the 5th century to the first or second half of the 6th century and lost his stature of the witness of the Great Revolt. N. Adontz, B. Kiuleserean, G. Khalatyants, N. Akinean, R. W. Thomson and the others were active in this experience. See in detail, **Ter-Minasyan**, 1971, 129 – 198.

The strongest criticism befell Moses Khorenatsi and his *History of the Armenians*. Some of critics (A. Gutschmidt, H. Hübschmann, L. Melikset-Bek) saw the date of his life and creativity in the 7th century; others (O. Carrier, H. Tashyan, G. Ter-Mkrtychyan, N. Adontz, C. Toumanoff, R.W. Thomson, N.G. Garsoïan) stopped their choice on the 8th century; thirds (J. Marquart, K. Maclaure, N. Akinian, H. Manadyan) went further and preferred the 9th century. See in detail, **Musheghyan**, 2007, 5 – 18.

¹⁹² We mean the group of such scholars who intended to protect the traditional perception of the early medieval Armenian historiography within the 5th century – O. Carrier, S. Malkhasyants, M. Abeghyan, E. Ter-Minaseants, G. Sar-gsyant, B.-L. Zekiyant, A. Stepanyant, G. Traina, A. Musheghyan, A. Topchyan.

were expected to be considered in a diachronic sequence but it would be only a half of truth. The identity models might also exist synchronically in accordance with the principle of complementarity. The said is true especially for the *Golden Age* of the Armenian cultural revival.

In other words, the Armenian identity was polyvalent. A characteristic that engendered the polyvalence of culture and mentality in the whole. This concerned with the historiography as well. In the first wave of Hellenism, historiography saw its mission in the interpretation and reasoning of important data of the Armenian history from point of view of classical Greek and Hellenistic axiology and rhetoric, moral philosophy and history writing craft. On this interdisciplinary foundation, Metrodorus of Scepsis and Artavazd II compiled their historical works in the 1st century B.C. They pursued different objectives and chose different genres of history writing. Metrodorus wrote a world history to explain the typology and role of Tigris's empire in the sequence of world empires. He proceeded from Classical Greek and Hellenistic social philosophy to explain and legitimize Tigris's empire. As to Artavazd II, he applied these intellectual models to reveal the essential (metaphysical) aspect of modernity.

Despite diversities, the two historians, it seems most probable, proceeded from Aristotelian concept of four causes of *being* - passive matter, active form, actor and purpose. Respectively, Armenian historical data were considered as a passive matter which would have to be elaborated under western intellectual forms to reveal their real significance.

In parallel, a group of unknown intellectuals applied the same approach to the ancient Armenian epic tales mastering them through the crafts and skills of Classical and Hellenistic rhetoric and historiography. They set up a tradition that revived in the 3rd and 4th centuries paving a way to the historiography of the Golden Age. The other way of this transmission concerned with the professional activity of the eminent chronographers and historians of the same period – Priest Olymp, Mar Aba Katina and Bardesan.

The basic element of the historiography of the Golden Age was the new wave of Westernization designed to combine Hellenistic and Christian intellectual values in Armenia. In the narratives of the eminent historians of the époque, Agathangelos, Faustus Buzand, Eghishē, Ghazar Parpetsi, Moses Khorenatsi and Sebeos, Westernization is traceable in inadequate extent and intensity.

Admittedly, this is more transparent in the texts of Eghishē and Moses Khorenatsi. These authors differ in their intellectual experience. Eghishē has been focused on the *point history* of the antisassanid Revolt of the Armenians in 450 – 451. As to Khorenatsi, his task is to grasp the *long duration* of history from World's Creation and Flood to the Fall of the Armenian Arsacids in 428. However, the narrative perspectives of both *point history* and *long duration* are constructed by the same principle of combining the passive Armenian historical *material* with the active intellectual *form* of ideas, concepts and values of Hellenistic Christianity. Such approach gave opportunity to consider the models of Armenian identity in various historical conditions, temporal durations and axiological systems. Due to this, their texts, more than the texts of other authors, reflect the poetics of history. In other words, the texts under consideration are designed to uncover the essential layers of the Armenian past and present. This fact indicates a rather rare match of historical texts with the lesson of history.

Bibliography

Sources

Agathangelos, 1976, History of the Armenians, translation and commentary by R.W. Thomson (Albany (N.Y.), State Univ. of New York Press).

Ammianus Marcellinus, 1939 – 1950, History, v. 1 – 3, With an English translation by J.C. Rolfe (Cambridge (Ma), UP).

Aristotle, 1991, The Complete Works, ed. by J. Barnes (Princeton UP).

Elishe (Eghishē), 1982, History of Vardan and the Armenian War, translation and commentary by R.W. Thomson (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard UP).

The History of **Herodotus**, 1890, Parallel English and Greek Texts, English translation by C.C. Macaulay (London, New York, Macmillan Press).

Koriwn, 2012, The Life of Mashtots, translated by B. Norehad, 2d ed. (Yerevan, YSU Publ.).

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

Ղազարայ Փարպեցույ Պատմություն հայոց, 2003, Մատենագիրք հայոց, հ. Բ (Անթրիլիաս-Լիբանան, Մեծի տանն Կիլիկիոյ կաթողիկոսութիւն), 2201 – 2375.

Philo of Alexandria, 1993, The Works. Complete and Unbridged, New Version, translated by C.D. Young, foreword by D.M. Scholée (New York, 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), Harvard UP).

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

Procopius of Caesarea, Works, v. 7, On Buildings, 1940, with an English translation by H.B. Dewing (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard Univ. Press, Macmillan Co).

Սահակ Պարթև, Կանոնք սրբոյն Սահակայ հայոց հայրապետի, Մատենագիրք հայոց, հ. Ա (Անթրիլիաս-Լիբանան, Մեծի տանն Կիլիկիոյ կաթողիկոսութիւն), 163 – 217:

Conybear F., 1898, The Armenian Canons of St. Sahak Catholicos (390 – 439 A.D.), The American Journal of Theology, 2, 828 – 848.

Sozomenus, 1890, Ecclesiastical History, v. 1 – 2, translated by Ch. D. Hartranft (Buffalo (N.Y.), Christian Literature Publ.).

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

C. Tacitus, 2004, The Annals, translated with introduction and notes by A.J. Woodman (Indianapolis, Cambridge, Hackett Publ.).

Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism: Edited and Translated by M. Boyce (Chicago, Chicago UP), 1990.

Thucydides, 1956, History of the Peloponnesian War, v. 1- 2, With an English translation by Ch. Foster Smith (London, Heinemann LTD, Cambridge (Ma) Harvard UP).

Monographs and articles

Abeghyan M., 1944, History of Ancient Armenian Literature (Yerevan AS Arm.SSR Publ.)
Աբրեղյան Մ., Հայոց հին գրականության պատմություն, հ.1 (Եր., ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ.)].

Acharyan H., 1951, History of Armenian Language, pt. II (Yerevan, Haypethrat) **Աճառյան Հ.**, Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն, մ. II (Եր., Հայպետհրատ)].

Acharyan H., 1962, Dictionary of Armenian Onomastics, v. 5 (Yerevan, YSU Publ.)
Աճառյան Հ., Հայոց անձնանունների բառարան, հ.Ե (Եր., ԵՊՀ հրատ.)].

Adontz N., 1970, Armenia in the Period of Justinian. The Political Conditions Based on the Naxarar System. Thranslated with partial revisions, a bibliographic note and appendix by N.G. Gorsoïan (Lisbon, G.Gulbekian Foundation) **Адонц Н.**, 1908, Армения в эпоху Юстиниана. Политическое состояние на основе нахарарского строя (СПб., Типография Императорской Акаде-

мии Наука)].

Adontz N. G., 1915, *Dionusius Thrax and Armenian Interpreters* (St. Petersburg, Imperial AS Publ.) [Адонц Н.Г., Дионисий Фракийский и армянские толкователи (СПб, Типография Императорской Академии Наука)].

Akinean N., 1910, *Kiwrión, the Georgian Catholicos. A History of Armenian and Georgian relations in the VII century. Historical Investigation* (Vienna, Mekhitarist Publ.) [Ակինեան Ն., Կիրիոն կաթողիկոս վրաց (Պատմություն հայ-վրական յարաբերությանց եօթներորդ դարու մեջ. Պատմական ուսումնասիրություն (Վիեննա Մխիթարեան տպ.)].

Akinean N., 1935, *Translation of Holy Bible into Armenian, Handes Amsorya* [Ակինեան Ն., Սուրբ Գրքի հայերեն թարգմանությունը, Հանդէս ամսօրեայ], 10-12, 550 – 563.

Akinean N., 1938, *On Rhetoric Trainings of Theon: A Propos a Newly Discovered Armenian Translation*, in: *Bibliographic Studies: Inquest and Manuscript*, v. 4 (Vienna, Mkhitarist Publ.) [Ակինեան Ն., Թեոնայ Յաղագս ճարտասանական կրթությանց: Առթիւ նորագիտ հայերեն թարգմանության (Վիեննա, Մխիթարեան տպ.)], 91 – 116.

Aland K., 1959, *Der Abbau des Herrscherkultus im Zeitalter Konstantins*, in: *The Sacral Kingship. Studies in the History of Religions* (Leiden, Brill), 493 – 513.

Alexander Ph. S., 1992, “The Parting of the Ways” from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism, in: *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. by J.D.C. Dann (Michigan, UP), 1 – 27.

Alishan Gh., 1910, *The Ancient Faith or Pagan Religion of the Armenians* (Venice – St. Lazaro, Mkhitarist Publ.) [Ալիշան Գ., Հին հուստոք կամ հեթանոսական կրօնք հայոց (Վենետիկ – Ս. Ղազար, Մխիթարեան հրատ.)].

Anasyan H. S., 1959, *Armenian Bibliography*, v.1 (Yerevan, AS Arm SSR Publ.) [Անասյան Հ. Ս., Հայկական սատենագիտություն (Եր., ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ) հրատ.]:

Antonova S. E., 2005, *Barbarians and the Empire-Wide Spread of Christianity*, in: *Christianity in the First Four Centuries: Essays in Explanation*, ed. by W.V. Harris (Leiden, Boston, Brill), 69 – 86.

Arevshatyan S., 1973a, *The Oldest Armenian Translations and their Historical Significance*, *Historical-Philological Journal of AS Arm. SSR* [Արևշատյան Ս., Հնագույն հայկական թարգմանությունները և նրանց Պատմական նշանակությունը, ՊԲՀ], 1, 23 – 37.

Arevshatyan S., 1973b, *Formation of Science of Philosophy in Ancient Armenia (V – VI cc.)* (Yerevan, AS Arm. SSR Publ.) [Արևշատյան Ս., Մեթոդական Մաշտոցի փիլիսոփայական հայացքները, ՊԲՀ], 2, 91 – 109.

Arevshatyan S., 1996, *Philosophical Outlook of Mesrop Mashtots*, *Historical-Philological Journal of AS Arm. SSR* [Արևշատյան Ս., Մեթոդական Մաշտոցի փիլիսոփայական հայացքները, ՊԲՀ], 2, 91 – 109.

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

Atkinson R.F., 1978, *Knowledge and Explanation in History* (Ithaca, London, Cornell Univ. Press).

Auerbach E., 1953, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, transl. by W.R. Trask (Princeton, UP).

Bakker E., 2006, *The Syntax of historiē: How Herodotus Writes*, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, ed. by C. Dewald and J. Marincola (Cambridge, UP), 92 – 102.

Ball W., 2000, *Rome in the East. The Transformation of an Empire* (London, New York, Routledge).

Bartikyan H., 2004, “Charter of Friendship”. *Conception, Time and Goal of Its Composition*, *Historical-Philological Journal of AS of the RA* [Բարթիկյան Հ., «Ռաշանց Թուղթ» կազմը, ստեղծման ժամանակը ու նպատակը, ՊԲՀ], 2, 65 – 116.

Baus K., 1982, *From the Apostolic Community to Constantine*, Translation with General Introduction to Church History by H. Jadin (New York, Crossroad).

Baynes N.H., 1910, *Rome and Armenia in the Fourth Century*, *The English Historical Review*,

100, 625 – 643.

- Beledian K.**, 1994, *Fils d'Abraham, Les Arméniens* (Lille, Éditions Brepols).
- Bevir M.**, 1999, *The Logic of the History of Ideas* (Cambridge, CUP).
- Blockley R.C.**, 1984, *The Roman-Persian Peace-Treaties of A.D. 299 and 363*, *Florilegium* (Carleton University Annual Papers on Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages) 6, 28 – 49.
- Blockley R.C.**, 1987, *The Division of Armenia between the Romans and Persians at the End of the Fourth Century A.D.*, *Historia (Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte)*, Bd. 36/ 2, 222 – 234.
- Börm H.**, 2008, *Das Königtum der Sasaniden – Strukturen und Probleme. Bemerkungen aus althistorische Sicht*, *Klio*, 2, 423 – 443.
- Borrow J.**, 2009, *History and Histories. Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus to the Twentieth Century* (London, New York, Penguin).
- Bournoutian G.**, 2006, *A Concise History of the Armenian People*, 5th ed. (Costa Mesa (Ca), Mazda Publ.).
- Bowersock G.W.**, 1986, *From Emperor to Bishop: The Self-Conscious Transformation of Political Power in the Fourth Century A.D.*, *Classical Philology*, 84/4, 298 – 307.
- Breisach E.**, 1983, *Historiography. Ancient, Medieval, and Modern* (Chicago, London, Chicago Univ. Press).
- Breisach E.**, 2002, *From Ancient to Medieval Historical Thinking*, in: *Turning Points in Historiography. A Cross-Cultural Perspective (TPH)*, ed. by Q.E. Wang, G.G. Iggers (Rochester (N.Y.), UP), 45 – 58.
- Briant P.**, 2003, *Quand les rois écrivent l'histoire. La domination achéménide vue à travers les inscriptions officielle lagides*, dans: *Événement, récit, histoire officielle. L'écriture de l'histoire dans les monarchies antique*, ed. par M. Baud et N. Grimal (Paris, Cybèle) 173 - 186.
- Brown V.**, 2002, *On Some Problems with Weak Intentionalism for Intellectual History*, *History and Theory*, 41, 198 – 208.
- Brown V.**, 2007, *Historical Interpretation, Intentionalism and Philosophy of Mind*, *Journal of Philosophy of History*, 1, 26 – 62.
- Calzolari V.**, 2011, *Une page d'histoire religieuse arménienne. L'affrontement entre le roi mazdéen Tiridate et Gregoire l'Illuminateur près du temple de la déesse Anahite en Aklisène*, dans: *Dans la laboratoire de l'historien des rélogions. Mélange offerts à Philippe Borgeaud* ed. par F. Prescendi & Y. Volokhin (*Réligions et perspectives* 24) (Genève, Labor et Fides), 45 – 60.
- Calzolari V.**, 2014, *Philosophical Literature in Ancient and Medieval Armenia*, in: *Armenian Philology in the Modern Era. From Manuscript to Digital Text (APhME)*, ed. by V. Calzolari with the collaboration of M. Stone (Leiden/Boston, Brill), 349 – 376.
- Catford J. C.**, 1965, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics* (Oxford, UP).
- Cerquiglini B.**, 1989, *Éloge de la variante. Histoire critique de la philology* (Paris, Seuil).
- Chaniotis A.**, 2003, *Divinity and Hellenistic Rulers*, in *Companion to Hellenistic World*, ed. by A. Erskine (Oxford, Blackwell), 431 – 446.
- Chaniotis A.**, 2005, *War in Hellenistic World. A Social and Cultural History* (Oxford, Blackwell).
- Chaumont M.-L.**, 1968, *Les grand rois sassanides d'Arménie*, *Iranica Antiqua*, t.8, 81 – 93.
- Chaumont M.-L.**, 1976, *L'Arménie entre Rome et l'Iran. I. De l'avènement d'Auguste à l'avènement de Diocletian*, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW)*, Bd. II, 9/1, hrsg von H. Temporini und W. Haase (Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter), 71 – 194.
- Chaumont M.-L.**, 1986, *Armenia and Iran II. Pre-Islamic Period*, in: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, v. II/4, ed. by E. Yarshater (New York, Columbia UP), 418 - 438.
- Clark G.**, 2004, *Christianity and Roman Society* (Cambridge, UP).
- Christensen A.**, 1944, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides* (Copenhagen, Ejnar Munksgaard).
- Cohen G. H.**, 2013, *The Hellenistic Settlements in the East from Armenia and Mesopotamia to Bactria and India* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, California Univ. Press).

- Colish M.L.**, 1985, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, Brill).
- Collingwood R. G.**, 1994, *The Idea of History*, Revised edition: introduction and editorial material by J. van der Dussen (Oxford, UP).
- Cox C.**, 2014, *The Armenian Bible: Status Questionis*, in: *APhME*, 236 – 246.
- Dan A.**, 2014, *La cité greque et les transferts culturels, Les concepts en sciences de l'Antiquité: monde d'emploi (Chronique 2014 – Les transferts culturels), Dialogue d'histoire ancienne*, 40/1, 239 – 305.
- Danielyan N.**, 2001, *On the Phases of Translation of Holy Bible in Armenian*, *Historical-Philological Journal, of NAS of the RA [Գանժեղյան Ն., Աստվածաշնչի հայերեն թարգմանության փուլերի մասին, ՊԲՀ]*, 1, 3 – 16.
- Daryaee T.**, 2009, *Sasanian Persia. The Rise and Fall of an Empire* (New York, T.B. Tauris & Co Ltd).
- Daryaee T.**, 2011, *The Sasanian Empire, (224 651 C.E.)*, in: *The Handbook of Iranian History*, ed. by T. Daryaee (Oxford, UP), 177 – 197.
- Debié M.**, 2009, *Syriac Historiography and Identity Formation*, in: *Religious Origins of Nation? The Christian Communities in the Middle East*, ed. by B ter Haar Romeny (Leiden, Brill), 93 – 114.
- Dignas B., Winter E.**, 2007, *Rome and Persia in Late Antiquity. Neighbors and Rivals* (Cambridge, New York, Cambridge Univ. Press).
- Dillery J.**, 2011, *Hellenistic Historiography*, in: *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, v.1. *Beginning to A.D. 600* (Oxford, UP), 171 – 218.
- Doise J.**, 1945, *La partage de l'Arménie sous Théodose I-er*, *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 47, 3, 274 -277.
- Dovatur A. I.**, 1957, *Research and Narrative Style of Herodotus* (Leningrad, UP) [Доватур А. И., Научный и повествовательный стиль Геродота (Ленинград, Изд. ЛГУ)].
- Drost-Abgaryan A.**, 2016, *The Reception of Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 264 - 339) in Armenia*, in: *Greek texts and Armenian Traditions. An Interdisciplinary Approach*, ed. by F. Gazzano, L. Pagani, G. Traina (Berlin, Boston, de Gruyter), 215 – 230.
- Dvornik F.**, 1966, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy*, v.1 (Washington, The Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies).
- Enos R. L.**, 2012, *Ancient Greek Writing Instruction and Its Oral Antecedents*, in: *A Short History of Writing Instruction. From Ancient Greece to Contemporary America*, ed. by J.J. Murphy (New York, Oxford, Routledge), 1 – 35.
- Eremyan S.T.**, 1948, *Principal Features of Social Structure of Armenia in Hellenistic Age*, *Bulletin of AS Arm. SSR (Humanitarian Sciences) [Еремян С. Т., Основные черты общественного строя Армении в эллинистическую эпоху, Известия АН Арм. ССР, Общественные науки]* 11, 33 – 73.
- Eremyan S.T.**, 1953, *Development of Cities and City Life in Ancient Armenia*. *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii, AS of the USSR [Еремян С. Т., Развитие городов и городской жизни в Древней Армении, Вестник древней истории, АН СССР]* 3, 11 – 31.
- Eremyan S.T.**, 1976, *Partition of Greater Armenia between Sassanian Iran and Roman Empire (244 - 253)* *Historical-Philological Journal [Երևնյան Ս.Տ., Մեծ Հայքի թագավորության բաժանումը Սասանյան Իրանի և Հռոմեական կայսրության միջև (244 - 253), ՊԲՀ]*, 1, 67 – 88.
- Evans R. J.**, 1997, *In Defense of History* (New York, London, W.W. Norton & Company).
- Fortescue A.**, 1913, *The Lesser Eastern Churches* (London, Catholic Truth Society).
- Frend, W.H.**, 1965, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, (Oxford, Basil Blackwell).
- Frye R.N.**, 1983a, *The Political History of Iran under The Sasanians*, in: *The Cambridge History of Iran*, v. 3/1, ed. by E. Yarshater, H. Kevorkian (Cambridge, CUP), 116 – 180.
- Frye R.N.**, 1983b, *The History of Ancient Iran* (München, C.H. Back'sche Vrlg.).

- Fulbrock M.**, 2002, *Historical Theory* (New York, Routledge).
- Garragham G.J.**, 1957, *A Guide to Historical Method*, 3d ed. (New York, Fordham Univ. Press).
- Garsoïan N. G.**, 1967, *Politique ou orthodoxie? L'Arménie au quatrième siècle*, *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, t. 4, 297 – 320.
- Garsoïan N.G.**, 1971, *Armenia in the Fourth Century*, *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, t.8, 341 – 352.
- Garsoïan N.G.**, 1989, *The Epic Histories Attributed to P'awstos Buzand (Buzandaran P'atmutiwnk)*, Translation and Commentary (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard Univ. Press).
- Garsoïan N.G.**, 1999, *Arsacids in 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. Hovannisian (New York, St. Martin's Press), 64 – 94.
- Geatrex G.**, 2000, *The Background and Aftermath of the Partition of Armenia in A.D. 387*, *The Ancient History Bulletin*, 14, 35 – 48.
- Gillman I., Klimkeit H.-J.**, 1999, *Christians in Asia Before 1500* (London, New York, Routledge).
- González J. L.**, 2010, *The History of Christianity*, v.1, *The Early Church to the Dawn of Reformation*, Revised and updated (New York, HarperCollins Publ.).
- Grainger J.D.**, 2015, *The Seleucid Empire of Antiochus III (223 – 187 BC.)*, (Barnsley, Pen and Sword).
- Gray E. W.**, 1973, *The Roman Eastern Limes from Constantine to Justinian - Perspectives and Problems*, *Proceedings of the African Classical Associations*, 12, 21 – 40.
- Hadot P.**, 1993, *Plotinus or the Simplicity of Vision*, trans. by M. Chase with an introduction by A. Davidson (Chicago, UP).
- Hadot P.**, 1995, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, edited with an introduction by A. Davidson (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Blackwell Publ.).
- Hakobyan A.**, 2016, *Albania (Eastern Transcaucasia) in IV – XVIII centuries*, in: *History of Neighboring Countries of Armenia*, v. II, ed. by P. Chobanyan (Yerevan, Zangak Publ.) [**Հակոբյան Ա.**, 2016, Աղուանքը (Արևելյան Այսրկովկասը) IV – XVIII դարերում, Հայաստանի հարակից երկրների պատմություն, հ. II, խմբ. Պ. Չոբանյան (Եր., Ջանգակ հրատ.)], 468 – 530.
- Harrison Th.**, 2010, *Greek Historiography*, in: *The Edinburgh Companion to Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. by Ed. Bispham et al. (Edinburgh, UP), 377 – 383.
- Hartog F.**, 2002, *The Invention of History: From Homer to Herodotus*, in: *Turning Points in Historiography. A Cross-Cultural Perspective (TPH)*, ed. by Q.E. Wang, G.G. Iggers (Rochester (N.Y), UP), 19 – 30.
- Hartog F.**, 2015, *Barbarians. From the Ancient to the New World*, in: *Barbarism Revised: New Perspectives on an Old Concept*, ed. by M. Boletsi and Ch. Moser (Leiden, Brill Rodopi),
- Harutiunyan B.**, 2016, *Artsrunid Princely House in Armenian History* (Yerevan, Meknark Publ.) [**Հարությունյան Բ.**, Արծրունյաց իշխանական տունը հայոց պատմության մեջ (Եր., Մեկնարկ հրատ)].
- Hay D.**, 1977, *Annalists and Historians* (London Methuen).
- Heather P.**, 2006, *The Late Antiquity and the Early West*, in: *Companion to Historiography*, ed. by M. Bentley (London, New York, Routledge), 65 – 82.
- Helleman W. E.**, 2016, *The “Triumph” of Hellenization in Early Christianity*, in: *The Willey-Blackwell Companion to World Christianity*, ed. by L. Sanneh, M.J. McClymond (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Willey Blackwell Press).
- Herchenroeder L.**, 2010, *Hellenistic Historiography and the Sciences Practices and Concepts in Polybius' Histories*, A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the USG Graduate School, University of South California.
- Hewsen R.**, 1986, *Aspects of the Reign of Tiridates the Great*, in: *Armenian Studies in Memoriam Haig Berberian*, ed. by D. Kouyujjian (Lisbon, Calouste Gulbenkian & Livraria

Bertrand), 323 – 332.

Hippolyte P., Delehaye S.L., 1907, *The Legends of the Saints: An Introduction to Hagiography*, Trans. by V.M. Crawford, Introduction by R.J. Schoeck (Paris, Univ. of Notre Dame Press).

Hmayakyan S. G., 1992, The Myth of Patriarch Hayk and the City of Kibša in the Nibur Mountains, *Historic-Philological Journal of AS RA*, [Հմայակյան Ս. Գ., 1992, Հայկ նահապետի մասին առասպելն ու Կիբշա քաղաքը Նիբուրի լեռներում, ՊԲՀ], 1, 125–132.

Immerwahr H. R., Connor W.R., 1985, *Historiography*, in: *The Cambridge Classical Literature*, v.1, Greek Literature, ed. by P.E. Easterling, B.M. Knox (Cambridge, UP), 426 – 471.

James, 1959, The Sacred Kingship and Priesthood, in: *The Sacral Kingship. Studies in the History of Religions* – 4 (Leiden, Brill), 63 -70.

Jahukyan G., 1954, *Grammatical and Orthographical Works in Ancient and Medieval Armenia (V – XV cc.)* (Yerevan, YSU Publ.) [Զահուկյան Գ., Քերականական և ուղղագրական աշխատությունները հին և միջնադարյան Հայաստանում (Եր., ԵՊՀ հրատ.)].

Kanonagirk hayoc, 1964 (*Corpus juris canonici armenorum*), v. 1, ed. V. Hakobyan (Yerevan, AS Arm. SSR Publ.) [Կանոնագիրք Հայոց, հ.Ա, աշխատ. Վ. Հակոբյանի (Եր., ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ.)], 475 – 490.

Kelly J.N.D., 1968, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 4d ed. (London, Adam & Charles Black).

Khalatyants G., 1896, Armenian Epic Tale in *History of Armenia* by Moses Khorenatsi (Moscow, Publ. V. Gatsuk) [Халатьянц Г., Армянский эпос в *Истории Армении* Моисея Хоренского, ч.1, Москва, Типография В. Гатцук].

Kosmin P.J., 2014, *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory and Ideology in Seleucid Empire* (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard Univ. Press).

Krikorian M., 1981, Autonomy and Autocephaly in the Theory and Practice of the Ancient Oriental Churches, in: *Kanon, V = Kirche und die Kirchen Autonomie und Autokephalie*, Bd.2 (Vienna, Vrlg. des Verbandes der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreiches), 114 – 129.

Arkiasharyan S.M., 1970, *Essays on History of Cities of Ancient Armenia and Asia Minor* (Yerevan, AS of the Arm. SSR Publ.) [Կրկյաշարյան Ս.Մ., Հին Հայաստանի և Փոքր Ասիայի քաղաքների պատմության դրվագներ (Եր., ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ.)].

Arkiasharyan S.M., 2005, *State Structure of Ancient Armenia (VI B.C. – A.D. IV cc.)* (Yerevan, Lusakn Publ.) [Կրկյաշարյան Ս.Մ., Հին Հայաստանի պետական կառուցվածքը (մ.թ.ա.VI – մ.թ. IV դդ.) (Եր., Լուսակն հրատ.)].

Lateiner D., 1989, *The Historical Method of Herodotus*, Phoenix Suppl., v.23 (Toronto, UP).

Lee A.D., 1993, *Information and Frontiers. Roman Foreign Relations in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, UP).

Lee A. D., 2013, *From Rome to Byzantium A.D. 363 to 565. The Transformation of Ancient Rome* (Edinburg, UP).

Lenski N., 2002, *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, California UP).

Loftus E.F., Miller D.G., Burns H.J., 1978, Semantic Integration of Verbal Information into Visual Memory, *Journal of Experimental Psychology, Human Learning and Memory*, 4/1, 1 – 19.

Luce T.J., 1997, *The Greek Historians* (London, New York, Routledge).

MacMullen R., 1984, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (New Haven, Yale UP).

MacMullen R., 2014, Religious Toleration Around the Year 313, *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, v. 22/4, 511 – 517.

Mairs R., 2013, Intersecting Identities in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt, in: *Egypt. Ancient Histories, Modern Archeologies* (New York, Cambria Press), 163 – 192.

Maksymiuk K., 2015, *Geography of Roman – Iranian Wars. Military Operations of Rome and Sasanian Iran* (Siedlce, Uniwersytet Przyrodniczo - Humanistyczny).

Manandyan H., 1928, *The Hellenizing School and the Phases of its Development* (Vienna, Mkhitari Publ.) [Մանանդեան Յ., Յունաբան դպրեցր և նրա զարգացման շրջանները (Վիեննա, Մխիթարեան տպարան)].

Manandyan H., 1941, Mesrop Mashtots and the Struggle of the Armenians for Cultural Identity (Yerevan, Publ. ArmFAN) [**Манандян Я.**, Месроп Маштоц и борьба армянского народа за культурную самобытность (Ереван, Изд. АрмФАН)].

Manandyan H.H., 1954, On Trade and Cities of Armenia in Relation with World Trade of Ancient Ages (V c. BC. – AD. XIV c.), 2^d ed. (Yerevan, YSU Press), 2d ed. [**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.), 2-е изд. (Ер., изд. ЕГУ)].

Manandyan H. H., 1957, Critical Survey of History of Armenia People, v. 2. pt.1 (Yerevan, Naupethart) [**Մանանդյան Հ.Հ.**, Քննական տեսություն հայ ժողովրդի պատմության, հ. Բ, մաս Ա (Եր., Հայպետհրատ)].

Marciak M., 2017, Sophene, Gorduene, and Adiabene: Three Regna Minora of Northern Mesopotamia between East and West, (Leiden, Brill).

Marr N. J., 1905, Baptism of the Armenians, Georgians, Abkhazians and Albanians by St. Gregory, Proceedings of Oriental Department of Imperial Russian Archeological Society [Март Н.Я., Крещение армян, грузин, абхазов, албанов св. Григорием, Записки Восточного отделения Императорского русского археологического общества], т. XV, 63 – 211.

Martirosyan A., 1982, Mashtots (A historic-analytic insight) (Yerevan, AS Arm. SSR, Publ.) [**Մարտիրոսյան Ա.**, Մաշտոց (Պատմատեսություն) (Եր., ՀԽՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ.)].

Marwick A., 2001, The New Nature of History: Knowledge, Evidence, Language. 3d ed. (London, Palgrave).

Melik-Shahnazaryan H.L., 2007, Role of Mashtots in Politics of the V century Armenia, in: Armenian Theologian (proceedings), v.1, ed. by A. bish. A. Zhamkochyan et al. (Yerevan, YSU Publ.) [**Մելիք-Շահնազարյան Հ. Լ.**, Մաշտոցի դերը Հայաստանի V դարի քաղաքականության մեջ, Հայ Աստվածաբան, հ.1, խմբ. Ա. եպ. Ժամկոչյան և այլք (Եր., ԵՊՀ հրատ.)].

Momigliano A., 1966, Time in Ancient Historiography, History and Theory, v.6, 1 – 23.

Momigliano A., 1990, Persian Historiography, Greek Historiography, and Jewish Historiography, in: A. Momigliano, The Classical Foundation of Modern Historiography, with Foreword by R. di Donato (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, California UP), 5 – 28.

Mommsen Th., 1992, A History of Rome under Emperors, Transl. by C. Kroyzl, ed. by Th. Wiedemann (London, New York, Routledge).

Morony M. G., 2005, History and Identity in Syrian Churches. Redefining Christian Identity: Cultural Interaction in the Middle East since the Rise of Islam, ed by J.J. van Ginkel et al. (Leuven, Paris, Dudley (Ma), Brill), 1 – 34.

Moser Ch., Boletsi M., 2015, Introduction, in: Barbarism Revised: New Perspectives on an Old Concept, ed. by M. Boletsi and Ch. Moser (Leiden, Brill Rodopi), 11 – 28.

Movsisyan A., 2003, Script Systems of Pre-Mashtots Armenia (Yerevan YSU Publ.) [**Մովսիսյան Ա.**, Նախամաշտոցյան Հայաստանի գրային համակարգերը (Եր., ԵՊՀ հրատ.)].

Muradyan G., 1994, The Initial Complete Collection of Progymnasmata by Aphtonius and Ancient Armenian “Art of Grammar”, Vizantijsky vremennik, v. 55/3[**Մուրադյան Գ.**, Первоначальный полный сборник прогимнасм Афтония и древнеармянская книга “Книга хрий”, Византийский временник, т. 55/3], 141 – 145.

Muradyan G., 2014, The Hellenizing School, in: APhME, 321 – 348.

Muradyan P., 2013, Georgia in IV – VI Centuries, in: History of Neighboring Countries of Armenia (HNCA), v.2 (Yerevan, Zangak Press) [**Մուրադյան Պ.**, Վրաստանը IV – VI դարերում, Հայաստանի հարակից երկրների պատմություն, հատ. 2 (Եր., Զանգակ հրատ.)], 298 – 306.

Musheghyan A., 2012, Symbolic Prohibition of the Name and Worship of Gregory the Illuminator under the Syrian Catholicoses in 430-s, Banber Marenadarani [**Մուշեղյան Ա.**, Գրիգոր Լուսավորչի անվան և պաշտամունքի խորհրդապաշտական արգելքը 430-ական

թթ. ասորի կաթողիկոսների օրոք, Բանբեր մատենադարանի], 19, 21 – 44.

O'Neil J. L., 2007, The Creation of New Dynasties after the Death of Alexander the Great, *Prudentia*, 32/2, 118 – 137.

Nida E. A., 1972, Linguistic Theories and Translation, *The Bible Translator*, 23/3, 301 – 308.

Nyberg H.S., 1974, A Manual of Pahlavi, pt. II. Ideograms, glossary, abbreviations, index, grammatical survey, corrigenda to part I. (Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz).

Ormanean M., 1912, Armenian Church and Her History (Constantinople, V. and H. Ter-Nersean Publ.) [**Օրմանեան Մ.**, Հայոց եկեղեցին և իւր պատնութիւնը (Կ. Պոլիս, Վ. և Հ. Ներսեսեան տպ.)].

Ormanean M., 2001, National History, v.1 (Echmiadzin, Mother See S. Echmiadzin) [**Օրմանեան Մ.**, Ազգապատում, հատ. Ա (Էջմիածին, Մայրաթոռ Ս. Էջմիածին)].

Panossian R., 2006, The Armenians. From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars (London, Hurst & Company).

Peeters P., 1929, Pour l'histoire de l'alphabet arménien, *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, t.9/1, 203 – 237.

Perikhanyan A.G., 1959, Temple Associations of Asia Minor and Armenia (IV c. B.C. – A.D. III c.) (Moscow, Vostochnaya Litteratura Publ) [**Периханян А.Г.**, Храмовые Объединения Малой Азии и Армении (IV в. до н.э. – III н.э.) (Москва, Изд. Восточной литературы)].

Perikhanyan A.G., 1966, Une inscription arméniéene du roi Artashes truvée dans le Zaquezur (Siwnik), *Revue des Études Arméniennes (REA)*, t. III, 17 - 29.

Petrosyan A., 2003, Problems of Armenian Ethnogenesis in the Light Traditional Data, *Historical-Philological Journal RA* [**Պետրոսյան Ա.**, Հայոց ազգածագման հարցեր ավանդական լույսի ներքո, ՊԲՀ], 2, 189 – 224.

Petrosyan A., 2009, The Forefather Hayk in the Light of Comparative Mythology, *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 37/1-2, 155 – 163.

Petrosyan S., 2000, Manifestation of the Principle of Tripartite Social Model in Armenia under the Ervandid Dynasty (An attempt of correlation of the data of primary sources), *Historical-Philological Journal AS RA* [**Պետրոսյան Ս.**, Հասարակության եռադասության սկզբունքի դրսևորումը Երվանդունյաց Հայաստանում (Մատենագրական տվյալների համադրման փորձ), ՊԲՀ] 2, 160 – 176.

PGL - A Patristic Greek Lexicon, ed. by C.W.H. Lampe (Oxford, Clarendon Press), 1961, Martyr, 831 – 833.

Randorf W., Solignac A., 1980, Martyr, in: *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité: Ascétique et mystique doctrine et histoire, fondé par M. Villar et al.* (Paris, Beauchesne), t.10, 718 – 737.

Rapp Jr., S. H., 2012, *Caucasia and the First Byzantine Commonwealth: Christianization in the Context of Regional Coherence* (Washington (Ge), NCEEER).

Redgate A. E., 1998, *The Armenians* (Oxford, Blackwell Publ.).

Rhee H., 2005, *Early Christian Literature. Christ and Culture in the Second and Third Centuries. The Apologies, Apocryphal Acts and Martyr Acts.* (London, New York, Routledge Taylor & Francis Group).

Ricoeur R., 1985, Narrated Time, *Philosophy Today*, v. 29/4, 259 – 272.

Rist J. M., 1967, Integration and Descendant Soul in Plotinus, *American Journal of Philology*, 88/4, 410 – 422.

Rosenthal F., 1986, Aramaic (General), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, v. II/1, 250 – 261.

Rubin Z., 1995, The Reforms of Khosrov Anushirwān, in: *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East. III, States Resources and Armies*, ed. by A. Cameron (Princeton UP), 225 – 297.

Rubin Z., 2008, Eastern Neighbors: Persia and the Sassanian Monarchy, in: *The Cambridge History of Byzantine Empire c. 500 – 1492*, ed. by J. Shepard (Cambridge, UP), 130 – 155.

Runia D.T., 1997, The Reward for Goodness: Philo, *De Vita Contemplativa* 90, *The Studia Philonica Annual*, 9, 3 – 18.

Runia E., 2006, Presence, History and Theory, *45/1*, 1 – 29.

Russell J., 1986a, *Bad Day at Burzēn Mihr: Notes on an Armenian Legend of St. Bartholomew*, *Bazmavep* (Révue d'Études Arméniennes) v. cxliv, 1-4, 255 – 267.

Russell J., 1986b, *Armenia and Iran III: Armenian Religion*, in: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, v. II/4, ed. by E. Yarshater (New York, Columbia), 438 – 444.

Russell J., 1987, *Zoroastrianism in Armenia*, Harvard Iranian Series (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard Univ. Press).

Russell J., 1990, *Pre-Christian Armenian Religion*, in: ANRW, Teil II, Bd. 18.4, herausgegeben von W. Haase und H. Temporini (Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter), 2679 – 2692.

Sargisean B., 1890, *Agathangelos and his Old Secrete* (Venice, Mkhitarist Publ.) [**Սարգիսեան Բ.**, Ագաթանգեղոս և իր բազմադարեան գաղտնիքը (Վենետիկ, Մխիթարեան տպ.)].

Sarkisyan G. Kh., 1960, *Tigranakert. On History of City Communities of Ancient Armenia* (Moscow, Vostochnaya Litteratura Publ.) [**Саркисян Г.Х.**, Тигранакерт. Из истории древнеармянских городских общин (Москва, Изд. Восточная литература)].

Sargsyan G. Kh., 1962, *On the Ways of Social and Economic Development of Ancient Armenia* (Yerevan, AS of Arm. SSR Publ.) [**Սարգսյան Գ.Խ.**, Հին Հայաստանի սոցիալ-տնտեսական զարգացման ուղիների մասին (Եր., ՀՍՄԻ ԳԱ հրատ.)].

Sarkisyan G. Kh., 1966, *Armenia of Hellenistic Age and Moses Khorenatsi* (Yerevan, AS Arm SSR Publ.) [**Սարգսյան Գ.Խ.**, Հելենիստական դարաշրջանի Հայաստանը և Մովսես Խորենացին (Եր., ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ.)].

Sarkisyan G. Kh., 1969, *Historiography of Pre-Mashtots Age*, *Historical-Philological Journal of AS of Arm. SSR* [**Սարգսյան Գ.Խ.**, Նախամաշտոցյան շրջանի պատմագրությունը, ՊԲՀ], 1, 107 – 126.

Sargsyan G. Kh., 1971, *State Organization of Armenia in Hellenistic Age*, in: *History of Armenian People*, v. 1, ed. by S.T. Eremyan et al. (Yerevan, AS Arm SSR Publ.) [**Սարգսյան Գ.Խ.**, 1971, Հայաստանի պետական կարգը հելենիստական դարաշրջանում, Հայ Ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ.1, խմբ. Մ.Ս. Երեմյան և այլք (Եր., ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ.)], 667 – 689.

Sargsyan G. Kh., 2006a, *Moses Khorenatsi's "History of Armenia" and the Cuneiform Sources* (The Problem of Historicity and Phases of Development of the Legend of Hayk and Haykids), in: G. Kh. Sargsyan, *Historical Studies*, ed. by P. M. Muradyan (HS) (Yerevan, AS of RA, "Gitwutium" Publ.) [**Սարգսյան Գ.Խ.**, Մովսես Խորենացու «Հայոց պատմությունը» և սեպագրական աղբյուրները (Հայկի և Հայկյանների առասպելի պատմականության և զարգացման փուլերի խնդիրները) «Պատմական հետազոտություններ» (ՊՀ), խմբ. Պ. Մ. Մուրադյան (Եր., ՀՀ ԳԱ «Գիտություն» հրատ.)], 46 – 70.

Sargsyan G. Kh., 2006b, *On Prehistory of the Armenian Script System*, in: HS [**Саргсян Г. Х.**, К предыстории армянской письменности, (ՊՀ)], 224 – 229.

Sargsyan G. Kh., 2006c, *Lament of Moses Khorenatsi in a New Interpretation*, in: HS, [**Սարգսյան Գ.Խ.**, Մովսես Խորենացու «Ողբը» նոր մեկնաբանությամբ, ՊՀ], 127 – 138.

Schmitt H.H., 1964, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antioch's des Grossen und seiner Zeit*, *Historia, Einzelschriften*, 6 (Wiesbaden, F. Steiner Vrlg.).

Scott M., 2016, *Ancient Worlds. An Epic History of East and West* (London, Penguin Random House UK).

Seager R., 1996, *Ammianus and the Status of Armenia in the Peace of 363*, *Chiron*, 26, 275 – 284.

Seibt W., 2002, *Der historische Hintergrund und die Chronologie der Christianisierung Armeniens bzw. der Taufe König Trdats (ca. 315)*, in: *Die Christianisierung der Kaukasus: The Christianization of Caucasus (Armenia, Georgia, Albania)*, Hrsg. W. Seibt (Wienn, Vrlg. der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften), 125 – 133.

Shahbazi A. Sh., 2001, *Early Sasanians' Claim to Achaemenid Heritage*, *The International Journal of Ancient Iranian Studies*, 1/1, 61 -74.

- Sharma U., Sharma S.K.**, 2000, *Principles and Theory of Political Science*, v.1 (New Delhi, Atlanta).
- Sherwin-White A.N.**, 1984, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 B.C. to A.D. 1* (London, Duckworth).
- Sherwin-White A.N.**, 1992, *Praefectura*, in: *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. by N.G.L. Hammond, H.H. Scullard, 2d edition (Oxford, Clarendon Press), 871 – 872.
- Shirinian M. E.**, 2005, *Antique and Hellenistic Elements of Christian Teaching (In the comparison of Armenian, Greek-Classical and Byzantine sources)*, (Yerevan, Gold Print and Design) [Շիրինյան Մ. Է., Քրիստոնեական վարդապետության անտիկ և հելլենիստական տարրերը (հայկական և հունական դասական ու բյուզանդական աղբյուրների բաղդատությամբ) (Եր., Գուլդ փրինթ ընդ դիզայն)].
- Schofield M.**, 1999, [Stoic] *Social and Political Thought*, in: *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, ed. by K. Algra, J. Barnes, M. Schofield (Cambridge, UP), 739 – 77.
- Shillingburg P.L.**, 1989, *An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism*, *Studies in Bibliography*, 42, 55 – 78.
- Soudavar**, 2012, *The Two Eyes of the Earth. A Reassessment of Sassanian Rock Reliefs*, *Iranian Studies*, 45/1, 29 – 58.
- Stark R.**, 1996, *The Rise of Christianity. A Sociologist Considers History* (Princeton, UP).
- Stepanyan**, 2006, *On Interpretation of a Fragment of Lament by Moses Khorenatsi*, in: *International Conference Dedicated to the 1600th Anniversary of the Armenian Letters Creation. (Proceedings)* (Yerevan, Publ, Gitutiun of the NAS RA) [Ստեփանյան Ա., Խորենացու «Ողբի» մի հատվածի մեկնաբանության շուրջ, Միջազգային գիտաժողով նվիրված հայոց գրերի ստեղծման 1600-ամյակին. Զեկույցների ժողովածու (Եր., ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Գիտություն հրատ)], 248 – 254.
- Stepanyan A.**, 2009a, *On the Basic Idea of the History of the Armenians by Moses Khorenatsi*, in: *L'Œuvre de David l'Invincible. Commentaria in Aristotelem Armeniaca – Davidis Opera*, v.1, ed. by V. Calzolari & J. Barnes (Leiden, Boston, Brill), 181 – 196.
- Stepanyan A.**, 2009b, *Social Homeostasis in Artaxiad Greater Armenia (Civilization retrospection)*, in: *Problems of Political Science [Ստեփանյան Ա., Ընկերային հոմեոստաս-սիսը Արտաշիսյան Մեծ Հայքում (Քաղաքակրթական հետհայաց), Քաղաքագիտության հարցեր]*, 1, 29 – 46.
- Stepanyan A.**, 2013, *On the Interpretation of a Fragment by Moses Khorenatsi (History of the Armenians, II, 49, 2 - 5)*, *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies*, 22, 209 – 225.
- Stepanyan A., Minasyan L.**, 2013, *Greater Armenia and Euphrates Frontier in 60-s A.D. (Conflict, ideas, settlement)*, *Journal of Armenian Studies, NAS RA*, 14 – 33.
- Stepanyan A.**, 2014a, *The Trace of History. Deeds, Writings, Essence* (Yerevan, Printinfo) [Ստեփանյան Ա., Պատմության հետագիծը. Գործք, գրույթ, իմաստ (Եր., Փրինթինֆո)].
- Stepanyan A.**, 2014b, *On the Interpretation of a Fragment by Moses Khorenatsi (History of the Armenians, III, 34, 2 - 24)*, *Journal of Armenian Studies of NAS of RA*, 2/3, 28 – 51.
- Stepanyan A.**, 2016a, *On Semantic Index of Greater Armenia in Moses Khorenatsi (In light of moral theory of Philo of Alexandria)*, *Journal of Armenian Studies of NAS RA*, 1, 34 – 63.
- Stepanyan A.**, 2016b, *Sapientia Illustris Historiae: An Attempt of Revising the Texts by Eghishē and Moses Khorenatsi*, *VEM, Armenian Journal of Humanities*, 4, 45 – 90.
- Stepanyan A.**, 2017, *Western Canon of Historiography in Hellenistic Armenia. Pragmatic and tragic histories*, *Vem. Armenian Journal of Humanities*, 2, 38 – 65.
- Stern R.**, 2002, *History, Meaning and Interpretation: A Critical Response to Bevir*, *History of European Ideas*, 28, 1 – 12.
- Stopka K.**, 2016, *Armenia Christiana. Armenian Religious Identity and the Churches of Constantinople and Rome (4th – 15th century)* (Kraków, Jagiellonian Univ. Press).
- Strootman R.**, 2011, *Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age*, in: *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, eds. R. Alson, O. van Nijf, C. Williamson (Leuven, Brill), 141 – 153.

свете археологических исследований, Вестник древней истории], 2, 160 – 175.

Traina G., 1990, Les arméniennes entre l'Iran et le monde gréco-romain (V^e siècle av.J.-C vers 300 ap J.-C.), Histoire du peuple arménien. Histoire d'une chrétienté, ed. par G. Dédeyan (Toulouse, Privat), 101 – 162.

Traina G., 2001, Faustus “of Byzantium”, Procopius, and Armenian History (Jacobi, FGRIHst, 679, 3 - 4), in: Novum Millenium. Studies in Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to P. Speck, ed. by C. Sode and S. Takács (Aldershot, Burlington (USA), Ashgate), 405 – 413.

Traina G., 2002, La Forteresse de l'Oubli, Le Muséon. Revue d'Études Orientales, t.115, fasc., 3 - 4, 399 – 422. [Տրայնա Զ., Բանտարկության վայր Սասանյան Իրանում, Պատմա-Բանասիրական հանդես, 1, 186 – 202].

Traina G., 2003a, L'Armenia nel III secolo: note di lettura, Electrum, 7, 131 – 143.

Traina G., 2004, La Fine del Regno d'Armenia, in: La Persia e Bizanzio. Convegno Internazionale (Roma, 14 – 18 ottobre 2002) (Roma, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), 353 – 372.

Traina G., 2015, Tradition et innovation dans la première historiographie arménienne, in: L'historiographie tardo-antique et la transmission des savoir, eds. Ph. Blandeau, P. van der Nuffelen (Berlin, New York, de Gruyter), 153 – 164.

Toumanoff C., 1969, The Third-Century Armenian Arsacids. A Chronological and Genealogical Commentary, Revue des Études Arméniennes, t.6, 233 – 282.

van Esbroeck M., 1962, Chronique arménienne, Analecta Bollandiana, 80, 423 – 445.

van Esbroeck M., 1972, Le roi Sanatrouk et l'apôtre Thaddée, Revue des Études Arméniennes, t. 9, 241 – 283.

van Lint T. M., 2010, The Formation of Armenian Identity in the First Millennium, in: Religious Origins of Nations? The Christian Communities of the Middle East, ed. by Bas ter Haar Romeny (Leiden, Boston, Brill), 251 – 278.

Walbank F. W., 1993, Polybius and the Past, in: Tria Lustra: Essays and notes presented to J. Prinsent, Liverpool Classical Papers, 3, 15 – 23.

Weber M., 1946, Politics as a Vocation, in: M. Weber, Essays in Sociology, translated and edited by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York, Oxford UP), 77 – 128.

White H., 1984, The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory, History and Theory, 23/1, 1 – 33.

Whitehead A., 2009, Memory. The New Critical Idiom (London, New York, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group).

Wieshöfer J., 2017, Ērān und Anērān: Sasanian Patterns of Worldview, in: FCC, 381 – 393.

Windengren G., 1959, The Sacral Kingship of Iran, in: The Sacral Kingship. Studies in the History of Religions (Leiden, Brill), 242 – 258.

Zarbhanalean G., 1889, Catalogue of Ancient Armenian Translations (IV – XIII cc.) (Venice, Mkhitarist Publ.) [Զարբհանալեան Գ., Մատենադարան հայկական թարգմանութեանց նախնեաց (դար Դ – ԺԳ) (Վենետիկ, Մխիթարեան տպարան)].

Zekiyan B.L., 1987, L “idéologie” nationale de Movsēs Xorenac'i et sa conception de l'histoire, Handes Amsorya, 101, 171 – 185.

Zekiyan B.L., 2006, Invention of Armenian Scripts and the Problem of National Identity in the General Context of Christ's Salvation, in: 1600. Armenian Letters, ed. by V. Barkhudaryan et al (Yerevan, NAS of RA, “Gitutium” Publ.) [Զեքիեան Գ.Լ., Հայ գրերու գիտըր և ազգային ինքնութեան հարցը Քրիստոսի փրկագործութեան ընդհանուր համագրին մէջ, 1600. Հայոց գրեր, խմբ. Վ. Բարխուդարյան և այլք (Եր, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ, Գիտություն հրատ.), 408 – 427.

Zoryan H., 2015, Social and Economic Problems of Historical Armenia: Class Stratification of the Armenians, ed. by P. Hovhannisyanyan, in: Historical Studies (Yerevan, YSU Publ.) [Զորյան Հ., Սոցիալ-տնտեսական հարցեր պատմական Հայաստանէն. հայ ժողովրդի դասակարգային շերտավորումը, Պատմագիտական ուսումնասիրություններ, խմբ. Պ. Հովհաննիսյան (Եր., ԵՊՀ հրատ)], 5 – 29.

Ալբերտ Ա. Ստեփանյան – գիտական հետաքրքրությունների շրջանակն ընդգրկում է հայ անտիկ և հելլենիստական շրջանի մշակույթի, քաղաքակրթության և պատմության տեսության հիմնախնդիրները: Հիմնական աշխատություններն են՝ Развитие исторической мысли в древней Армении, Ер., 1991, Պլուտինոս, Էննեադներ (թարգմանությունը, ուսումնասիրությունը և մեկնությունները Ա. Ստեփանյանի), Եր., 1999, Պատմության կերպափոխությունները Մեծ Հայքում, Գիրք Ա, Արտաշիսյան դարաշրջան, Եր., 2012:

Ամփոփում

ԱՐԵՎՄՏԱԿԱՆ ԱՅՈՒՄԸ ՀԻՆ ԵՎ ՎԱՂ ՄԻՋՆԱԳԱՐՅԱՆ ՀԱՅ-ՔՈՒՄ

Պատմություն և պատմական գրույթ

Ալբերտ Ա. Ստեփանյան

Բանալի բառեր – հելլենիզմ (հունականություն), քրիստոնեական հելլենիզմ, ռետրո-հելլենիզմ, մշակութային հելլենիզմ, սոցիալական բարեփոխում, Արտաշես I, Տրդատ III, Արշակ II, Պապ, Վռամշապուհ, պատմագիտություն, Եղիշե, Մովսես Խորենացի:

Հողվածը խնդիր ունի հարադրելու հելլենիզմի հիմնարար արդյունքները հայոց միջավայրում: Ընդամին, կարևորվում է հիմնախանդրի դիտարկման երկու հարթություն՝ քաղաքական և մշակութային: *Առաջին հարթությունը* խնդիր ունի բացահայտելու հելլենիզմի կերպափոխություններն իր բնօրինակի և երկու տարակերպերի հաջորդականությամբ՝ քրիստոնեական հելլենիզմ և հետհայաց (ռետրո) հելլենիզմ: Դրանք ներկայացնում են հելլենիզմի երկու ալիքները հայոց միջավայրում՝ Ք.ա. III-I և Ք.հ. IV-V դարեր:

Բնօրինակը դիտարկված է Արտաշես Ա-ի, քրիստոնեականը՝ Տրդատ Գ-ի, հետհայացը Արշակ Բ-ի և Պապի բարենորոգումների լույսի ներքո: Դրանց հիմնարար ընդհանրությունը ենթադրում էր գորեղ և կենտրոնաձիգ իշխանական կառույց՝ ագուցված քարիզմատիկ արքայական իշխանությամբ: Արդի ընկերաբանության դիտանկյունից (Մ. Վերեր)՝ դա *վարչական պատրիմոնիա* էր՝ միտված վերածվելու ավատատիրության: Ի հակադրություն վերջինիս, հայոց միջավայրում առկա է նաև *ալիանդական պատրիմոնիան*՝ հիմնված տոհմական (կլանային) կառույցների վրա: Զորեղ արքայական իշխանության պարագայում վերջինս կրավորական էր, մինչդեռ թուլացման պարագայում՝ դառնում էր հույժ ներունակ: Այս երկու միտումների բախումը հողվածում քննարկվում են Արշակ Բ-ի և Պապի կառավարման տարիների փորձառությամբ:

Նախարարական ընդդիմությունը մշակել էր իր քաղաքական ծրա-

գիրը, որը բացառում էր գորեղ արքայական իշխանությունը: Լավագույն դեպքում արքան կարող էր լինել «առաջինը ի թիվս հավասարների»: Կար նաև վատթար տարբերակ, որն ընդհանրապես բացառում էր նրա իշխանությունը: Այս լույսով՝ Վռամշապուհ արքայի կառավարումը ներկայանում է իբրև լավատեսական տարբերակի մարմնավորում, որը խնդիր էր դրել լրացնել իշխանական բացարձակության կորուստը մշակութային արարմամբ: Ի վերջո, սակայն, հաղթանակեց վատթար տարբերակը. հայ նախարարների նախաձեռնությամբ 428 թվականին Տիգրանում դատ կազմակերպվեց արքա Արտաշես/Արտաշիրի նկատմամբ: Եվ անկեց հայոց Արշակունյաց պետությունը:

Առավել ընդհանրական բնութագրմամբ՝ 4-րդ դարի վերջը – 5-րդ դարի սկիզբը հայոց միջավայրում ներկայանում է նաև իբրև անցում իշխանակենտրոն քաղաքակրթական կառույցից դեպի մշակութակենտրոնություն: Այն մշակութային հելլենիզմի տարակերպն էր և կազմում է հիմնախնդրի մեր լուսաբանման *երկրորդ հարթությունը*: Տրդատ Գ-ի և Գրիգոր Լուսավորչի անդուլ ջանքերով կյանքի կոչված հայոց Դարձը դարձավ այն խթանը, որը միավորեց Քրիստոնեական վարդապետությունը, հելլենիստական իմաստությունը և հայոց ավանդական մշակույթը: Իսկ Մաշտոցի և Սահակ Պարթևի շնորհիվ գիրը, տեքստը և գիրքը դարձան հայոց համակեցության կարևորագույն բաղադրիչներ:

Հողվածում քննարկվում է հայոց միջավայրում հելլենիզմի երկու ալիքների ժառանգականության հիմնախնդիրը մշակույթի ամենատարբեր ապարեզներում՝ քերականություն և ճարտասանություն, իմաստասիրություն և աստվածախոսություն, գրականություն և պատմագրություն: Հատկապես շեշտադրված է պատմագրությունը՝ նկատի առնելով դրա կարևորագույն դերակատարությունը ազգային ինքնության կայացման և կերպավորության գործում: Այն դիտարկված է ժանրային-սեմիոտիկ և իմաստային բազմազանությունների տեսքով՝ պարառելով պատմական պատումն իր կարճ և տևական, տեղական և համընդգրկուն, էպիկական և բանական, բնագանցական և թատերային ըմբռնումների համաձիգում: Իբրև ասվածի թանձրացումներ ներկայացված են հայոց հելլենիզմի երկու ալիքների խոշորագույն պատմագրական տեքստերը՝ հեղինակված, մի կողմից, Մեսրոպոս Սկեպացու և Արտավազդ Բ-ի, մյուս կողմից, Եղիշեի և Մովսես Խորենացու կողմից:

ВЕСТЕРНИЗАЦИЯ В ДРЕВНЕЙ И РАННЕСРЕДНЕВЕКОВОЙ АРМЕНИИ

История и исторический текст

Альберт А. Степанян

Ключевые слова – эллинизм, христианский эллинизм, ретро-эллинизм, культурный эллинизм, социальное реформирование, Арташас I, Трдат III, Аршак II, Пап, Врамшапук, Историография, Эгише, Мовсес Хоренаци.

Статья имеет целью сопоставить основные результаты эллинизма в армянской среде. Выделяются два аспекта трактовки проблемы – политический и культурный. *Первый аспект* нацелен на освещение метаморфоз эллинизма в виде трех парадигм социального эксперимента – исконный эллинизм, христианский эллинизм и ретро-эллинизм. Они представляют две волны эллинизма на армянской почве, охватывая соответственно III – I вв. до н.э. и IV – V вв. н.э.

Исконный эллинизм в статье интерпретирован в контексте реформ Арташеса I (189 – 160 гг.), христианский эллинизм – Трдата III (298 – 330 гг.), а ретро-эллинизм – Аршака II (350 – 368 гг.) и его приемника Папа (370 – 374 гг.). Они предполагали сильную политическую власть, основанную на харизме правителя. С точки зрения современной теории (М. Вебер), это - *бюрократическая патримония* с перспективой на феодализацию общества. Помимо последней, существовала также *традиционная патримония*, основой которой были патриархальные (клановые) структуры. При сильной царской власти, последние были пассивны, в условиях же ее ослабления, становились весьма деятельными. Столкновения этих двух тенденций в статье рассмотрены на фоне трагических событий периода правления Аршака II и Папа.

Аристократическая оппозиция выработала свою политическую программу, которая исключала наличие сильной царской власти. В лучшем случае царь мог претендовать на роль “первого среди равных”. Однако существовал и худший сценарий, который исключал царскую власть вообще. В этом свете правление царя Врамшапуха (289 - 315) выглядит как воплощение оптимистического сценария, нацеленного на компенсацию потери абсолютной царской власти “культурной революцией”. Победил, однако, худший сценарий: по инициативе армянской аристократии в 428 году в Ктесифонте состоялся суд над царем Арташесом/Арташиром. И пало государство армянских Аршакидов.

В цивилизационном восприятии конец IV и начало V вв. в Армении представляется как переход от властоцентрической модели социального устройства к культуроцентрической. Это была разновидностью “культурного эллинизма”, и она составляет *второй уровень* данного исследования. Неустанными трудами Трдата III и Григория Просветителя было осуществлено Обращение армян к христианству (301 г.), которое объединило христианскую теологию, эллинистическую философию и ар-

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ԳԻՏՄԱՆԱԿԱՆ ԳԵՂԱՐԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԳԵՂԱԿԱՆ ԳՐԱԴԱՐԱՆ, 2017 ՊՄՏՄՄԻԹԵՅԸՆ ՏԵՄԻԹԵՅՈՒՆ

мянскую традиционную культуру. Усилиями же Месропа Маштоца и Саака Партева письмо, текст и книга стали важнейшими составными армянского социального бытия.

В статье рассматривается проблема преемственности двух волн эллинизма в самых разных сферах культурного творчества – грамматики и ретирики, теологии и философии, литературы и историографии. Особо подчеркивается роль историографии в становлении национального идентитета армян. Она освещена в разных пространственно-временных и смысловых форматах - локальном и всеобщем, эпическом и рационалистическом, театральном и метафизическом. В подтверждение сказанного рассмотрены тексты выдающихся историографов двух волн эллинизма в Армении - с одной стороны, Метродора Скепсийского и Артавазда II, с другой стороны, Егишэ и Мовсеса Хоренаци.