

KONSTANTINOS TAKIRTAKOGLU*

DOI:10.57155/PXQO7766

**THE LEGITIMATION OF ARMENIAN RULE IN CILICIA IN
HET'UMID PROMOTIONAL NARRATIVE: THE CASE OF THE
COLOPHON OF HET'UM II'S LECTIONARY (1286)**

Keywords:

*Byzantine Empire, Armenian-Byzantine Relations, Het'um II's
Lectionary, Colophons, T'oros II, Het'umids, Rubenids, Komne-
nians, Cilicia.*

The period of T'oros II's rule was a significant milestone in the history of Cilician Armenia. He successfully reconstituted the Rubenid principality, which had temporarily ceased to exist as a result of John II Komnenos' campaign. Although T'oros himself had been taken captive and transferred to Constantinople, he managed to return to Cilicia in the mid-1140s and gradually began reclaiming his ancestral lands. Manuel I's initial response to T'oros' actions was to dispatch a Byzantine expeditionary force led by Andronikos Komnenos, tasked with suppressing T'oros' newly established dominion (1151/2). However, the Armenian *ishkhan* managed to defeat Andronikos and further expand his holdings in the Cilician Plain. Preoccupied with other fronts, Manuel sought alternative means to resolve the Rubenid issue, first by enlisting the help of the Sultan of Ikonion, Mas'ūd, and later by turning to Renaud of Châtillon, Prince of Antioch (1154-1156). Two Turkish assaults against T'oros failed to weaken him significantly, while the intervention of the Prince of Antioch backfired on the Byzantines, as it led T'oros and Raymond to launch a campaign against Cyprus. This event ultimately forced Manuel to take direct action. In 1158–1159, his grand campaign resulted in the submission, after the mediation of the King of Jerusalem, of both rulers to the Byzantine emperor. From that point forward, T'oros governed Cilicia as a client of Byzantium. Although tensions with Constantinople persisted, sources indicate that

* Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Assistant Professor, Department of History and Archaeology, ktakirta@hist.auth.gr, հոդվածը ստանալու օրը՝ 5 ապրիլի, 2025, հոդվածը գրախոսելու օրը՝ 14 մայիսի, 2025: I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Gohar Muradyan for her valuable comments.

T'oros remained committed until his death to the idea that an alliance with the Crusaders and maintaining good relations with Byzantium were essential for countering the threat posed by the Zengid ruler, Nūr al-Dīn.

For the above period, a significant proportion of our sources come from the Het'umid era. Besides the work attributed to Sparapet Smbat, which was completed, according to Thomson, "soon after 1272,"¹ there is also the work of Vahram Rabbun, Prince Het'um's teacher, who composed it at the request of King Levon II (1270–1289). Het'um himself was probably the author of a brief chronicle². It is also known that Het'um had close ties with the monastery of Skewra; Gēorg of Skewra was a member of the inner circle of the Het'umid court until 1290³, and it is believed that he played a direct role in the production of the Het'um's Lectionary, whose scribe was Step'anos the Priest⁴.

This last source has primarily attracted the interest of art historians, and justifiably so⁵, as it is rightly called. "one of the most brilliant masterpieces of

¹ **Robert W. Thomson**, "The Crusaders through Armenian Eyes", in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. **Angeliki E. Laiou** and **Roy Parviz Mottahedeh**, Washington, DC, p. 80.

² **Հերոս Բ**, «Տարեգրությունը» ["The Chronicle of Het'um II"], in *Մանր ժամանակագրություններ XIII-XVIII դդ.* [*Minor Chronicles, 13th-18th cc.*], ed. **V.A. Hakobyan**, vol. 1, Yerevan, 1951, էջ 65–87 [English Translation: *Chronicle Attributed to King Het'um II*, tr. **Robert Bedrosian**, Long Branch, 2005].

³ For Gēorg of Skewra and his relations with the royal court, see: **Vincent Mistrih**, "Trois Biographies de Georges de Skévra. Présentation, texte et traduction", *Studia orientalia christiana. Collectanea*, 14, 1970-1971, p. 266–267. **David D. Bundy**, "The Anonymous Life of Gēorg Skewrac'i in Erevan 8356. A Study in Medieval Armenian Hagiography and History", *REArm*, 18, 1984, p. 494–495. **Andrea Barbara Schmidt**, "Kloster Skevra (12.-14. Jahrhundert) im Schnittpunkt kirchlichen und kulturellen Wandels in Kilikien", in *Das Lemberger Evangeliar. Eine wiederentdeckte armenische Bilderhandschrift des 12. Jahrhunderts*, ed. **Günter Prinzing** and **Andrea Barbara Schmidt**, Wiesbaden, 1997, p. 139–141. **Artashes Matevosyan**, «Գևորգ Սկևրացին Հերոս թագավորի «ձաշոցի» հորինիչ և պննագարդող» ["Gēorg of Skewra – Compiler and Illuminator of King Het'um's Lectionary"], *Etchmiadzin*, 2007, 12, pp. 62f. For Skewra as a spiritual and cultural centre, see, for example: **Sirarpie Der Nersessian**, *Manuscripts Arméniens illustrés des XII^e, XIII^e et XIV^e siècles de la bibliothèque des pères Mekhitharistes de Venise*, Paris, 1936, p. 7-9. **Andrea Barbara Schmidt**, "Kloster Skevra". **Irina Drampian**, *Lectionary of King Hetum II (Armenian Illustrated Codex of 1286 A.D.)*, Yerevan, 2004, p. 90-91.

⁴ For Step'anos and his relationship with Gēorg see **Artashes Matevosyan**, «Գևորգ Սկևրացին Հերոս թագավորի «ձաշոցի» հորինիչ և պննագարդող», էջ 53-60. See also, **Andrea Barbara Schmidt**, "Kloster Skevra", p. 138-139, 141-142.

⁵ The relevant studies on the Lectionary are numerous. For example, see: **Irina Drampian**, *Lectionary of King Hetum II*. Of course, the conclusions of these works are directly related to the study of the period and aspects of the ideology of the Het'umids, as well as the personality of Het'um II himself. For example, see: **Ioanna Rapti**, "Featuring the King: Rituals of

medieval Armenian book art."⁶ Although Armenian historians have utilized the material of this colophon in their research, the lack of a translation into a Western language (at least to the best of my knowledge) has hindered access to it for scholars who are not familiar with the Armenian language⁷.

The document's brevity, combined with its purpose as a text intended for Prince Het'um, makes it an excellent case study to examine how members of the Het'umid dynasty themselves perceived and interpreted history. In simple terms, it offers an excellent opportunity to explore the "storyworld" of the royal historiography of Cilician Armenia⁸, an issue which has not been sufficiently studied.

What draws attention in this very brief text is that, while describing the conflict between Andronikos Komnenos and T'oros II during the reign of Manuel Komnenos, it clearly refers to how the Het'umids and some other noble families of Cilicia joined the Byzantines as allies against T'oros II.

And while he remained there confidently, the duke of the Greek nation, who had been appointed by the emperor, having gathered his army, along with the Armenians, the Nathanielians, the lords of Askouras, and Het'um, lord of

Coronation and Burial in the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia", *Court Ceremonies and Rituals of Power in Byzantium and the Medieval Mediterranean. Comparative Perspectives*, ed. **Alexander Beihammer**, **Stavroula Constantinou**, and **Maria Parani**, Leiden, 2013, p. 291-335. **Emma Chookaszian**, "Les quatre portraits de Het'um II: une nouvelle interprétation du portrait de la famille des Het'umides du ms. 979", *L'Arménie et les Arméniens, entre Byzance et le Levant : Mélanges offerts à Gérard Dédéyan*, ed. **Isabelle Augé** et al., vol. 1, Montpellier, 2023, p. 166-169.

⁶ **Irina Drampian**, *Lectionary of King Hetum II*, p. 67.

⁷ For the significance of studying colophons in historical research, see, for example: **Tim Greenwood**, "Armenian Sources", *Byzantines and Crusaders in Non-Greek Sources 1025-1204*, ed. **Mary Whitby**, Oxford, 2007, p. 235-236. **Gérard Dédéyan**, "Les colophons de manuscrits arméniens comme sources pour l'histoire des Croisades", *The Crusades and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, ed. **John France** and **William G. Zajac**, London, 2016, p. 89-110. For colophons in general, see, for example: **Avedis K. Sanjian**, *Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 1301-1480. A Source for Middle Eastern History*, Cambridge, 1969, p. 1-41. **Khachik Harutyunyan**, *Հայերեն Ձեռագրերի Հիշատակարանները* [*Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts*], Yerevan, 2019.

⁸ For a concise and accurate definition of "storyworld," see: **Anna Linden Weller**, "Ideological Storyworlds in Byzantium and Armenia: Historiography and Model Selves in Narratives of Insurrection", *Storytelling in Byzantium: Narratological Approaches to Byzantine Texts and Images*, ed. **Charis Messis**, **Margaret E. Mullet**, and **Ingela Nilsson**, Uppsala, 2018, p. 74-75: "A 'storyworld' ... is bigger than any one narrative. It is a sort of 'mental model' of a universe, containing all of the events, persons, places, and interactions that make up the narrative, plus all of the possible events, persons, places, and interactions which might exist in a world where the narrative-as-perceived also exists."

Lambron, who had also fled from the East, escaping the sword of the Ismaelites, came and took possession of the aforementioned regions and submitted under the sovereignty of the Emperor of the Greeks.⁹

The above narrative fully reflects reality, as we know that the Het'umids, "as loyal imperial vassals, defended Byzantine Cilician territory from Rubenid incursions."¹⁰ In the following decade, we also know that the Het'umids once again clashed with T'oros II when he temporarily turned against the Byzantines¹¹, demonstrating that the interests of the Het'umids were closely linked with those of the Byzantines.

One might wonder: if the author of the colophon records what happened, what is the issue? Initially, since the Het'umids succeeded the Rubenids and were proud

⁹ **Artashes Matevosyan**, *Colophon of 1286*, in *Հայերեն ձեռագրերի հիշատակարաններ ԺԳ դար* [*Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 13th c.*], Yerevan, 1984, p. 584: «Եւ մինչ կայր անդ յաննոգս, տունն յունական ազգին, որ էր ի կայսերէ կարգեալ, ժողովեալ զգաւսս իւր, եւս եւ զհայկազունսն, զնաթանիւեանն, զտեսն Ասկուտայ, եւ զՀերոս տէր Լամբրունին, որք եւ նոքա յարեւելից ի սոյն Իսմայէլացոց խոյս տունեալ, եկին եւ կալան զկողմանսդ նախասացեալ, եւ մտին ընդ հնազանդութեամբ կայսերն Յունաց».

¹⁰ **Ani Atamian Bournoutian**, "Cilician Armenia", in *Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times. Vol. 1 The Dynastic Periods: From Antiquity to the Fourteenth Century*, ed. **Richard G. Hovannisian**, New York, 1997, p. 276. For the close connection between the interests of the Het'umids and the Byzantine Empire during this period, see: **A. A. Bozoyan**, «Կիլիկյան Հայաստանի պատմությունը Միջերկրական ծովի պետությունների արխիվներում» ["The History of Cilician Armenia in the Archives of Mediterranean States"], in *Կիլիկյան Հայաստանը Մերձավոր Արեւելքի եկեղեցաքաղաքական փոխհարաբերությունների փաստաթղթերում: վավերագրատիկան խնդիրներ* [*Cilician Armenia in Documents of Political and Ecclesiastical Interrelations in the Near East*, ed. by **A. A. Bozoyan**, **G. G. Danielyan**, and **M.-A. Chevalier**, Yerevan, 2023, pp. 136-137. Indicative in this context is Dadoyan's description of the Het'umids as "vassals of Byzantium and border guards over the eastern frontiers", see **Seta B. Dadoyan**, *The Armenians in the Medieval Islamic World. Paradigms of Interaction Seventh to Fourteenth Centuries. Volume 2. Armenian Realpolitik in the Islamic World and Diverging Paradigms. Case of Cilicia: Eleventh to Fourteenth Centuries*, New Brunswick, 2013, p. 157, while Lilie describes Lambron as "the center of the Emperor's Armenian partisans", see **Ralph-Johannes Lilie**, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, tr. **J.C. Morris** and **Jean E. Ridings**, Oxford, 1993, p. 167. For a detailed study of the Het'umids, see: **Gérard Dédéyan**, *Les Arméniens entre Grecs, musulmans et croisés : Étude sur les pouvoirs arméniens dans le Proche-Orient méditerranéen (1068-1150)*, 2 vols., Lisbonne, 2003, p. 660-704.

¹¹ *Հնդհանրական Թուղթք Սրբոյն Ներսիսի Շնորհալոյ* [*Encyclical Letter of S. Nersēs Shnorhali*], Jerusalem, 1871, p. 86. **Charles A. Frazee**, "The Christian Church in Cilician Armenia: Its Relations with Rome and Constantinople to 1198", *Church History*, 45.2, 1976, p. 175. **Claude Mutafian**, *Le Royaume Arménien de Cilicie XII^e-XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1993, pp. 29-30. **A. A. Bozoyan**, «Կիլիկյան Հայաստանի պատմությունը Միջերկրական ծովի պետությունների արխիվներում» ["The History of Cilician Armenia in the Archives of Mediterranean States"], pp. 136-138.

of their Rubenid heritage¹², it seems strange that they would choose to highlight, in such a short document, that their ancestors had been allies of the Byzantines against the Rubenids¹³. This appears even more unusual when we consider that the colophon otherwise repeats the narrative of earlier Armenian sources¹⁴, according to which the Greeks were the primary enemies of the Armenians of Cilicia. For example, the murder of Gagik by the Mandale brothers and the notion that envy was the motive behind Byzantine attacks on Cilicia are both mentioned in the colophon. The same text frequently diverges, as we will see, from historical reality and often omits events that did not align with the author's agenda.

So, the reference to the Het'umid assistance to Andronikos serves a specific purpose. This article will attempt to examine the intended goal of this reference, following an analysis of the crucial question of how the Het'umids navigated the paradox of being the successors of the Rubenids while simultaneously remaining loyal supporters of Constantinople and acknowledging its *de jure* claim to the region.

As will be argued, in the *storyworld* of the Het'umids, as reflected in the 1286 colophon, Cilicia had legally come under Armenian control as early as the time of T'oros II. This transfer of ownership is described as having been carried out with the approval of both God and the Emperor of Constantinople, who was previously the rightful ruler of the region. The final recognition of Armenian sovereignty over the area was firmly established during the reign of Levon the Great.

¹² As evidenced by the adoption of Rubenid names by the Het'umid dynasty, see e.g. **Benjamin Bourgeois**, "La royauté : dynamiques et représentations. Royaumes de Jérusalem, Chypre et Arménie cilicienne. XII^e-XIV^e siècle", PhD Thesis, Montpellier, 2018, p. 440-441.

¹³ The collaboration of the Het'umids with the Byzantines in the context of Andronikos Komnenos' campaign is also confirmed by other Armenian sources. See, for example, **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, ed. **M. Melik-Adamian** and **N. Ter-Mik'ayelian**, Vagharshapat, 1898, p. 401 [English Translation: **Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", in *Armenia and the Crusades: Tenth to Twelfth Centuries: The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, tr. **A. Edmund Dostourian**, Lanham, p. 261]. **Smbat Sparapet**, *Տարեգիրք* [*Chronicle*], ed. **Serobē Agalean**, Venice, 1956, pp. 170-171 [English Translation: **Sparapet Smbat**, *Chronicle*, tr. **Robert Bedrosian**, Long Branch, 2005, p. 77]. **Vahram Rabuni**, *Ռոմանաւոր Պատմութիւն Ռուբենեաց* [*History of the Rubenids in Verse*], ed. **K.V. Shahnazarean**, Paris, 1859, էջ 206 [English Translation: **Vahram Raboun**, *Chronicle of the Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia during the Time of the Crusades*, tr. **Charles F. Newmann**, 1831, p. 37-38]. **Հէթում Բ**, *Տարեգրութիւնը* ["The Chronicle of Het'um II"], p. 102.

¹⁴ As Andrews has observed, the hostility between the emigrant Armenians and the Byzantines is the dominant theme of the second book of Matthew. See **Tara L. Andrews**, *Matt'ēos Urhayec'i and His Chronicle. History as Apocalypse in a Crossroads of Cultures*, Leiden, 2017, p. 88.

The Will of God

To begin with divine will, it was demonstrated in a vision T'oros had while he was a captive in Constantinople:

After spending a certain time in prison, his son Toros had a dream and recounted it to his father: "I saw in a vision that a man gave me a loaf of bread, and on it, a fish. I took it, but I did not give you any of it." And the father, pleased, interpreted his son's dream, saying: "You will regain the leadership of Cilicia, which our ancestors held with virtue and bravery, and moreover, you will expand your dominion to the sea, which is symbolized by the fish."¹⁵

This occurred after John II Comnenus' campaign, when T'oros, his father Levon I, and his brother Ruben were taken as prisoners to the Byzantine capital.¹⁶ According to the narrative, the bread and fish symbolized the vision's meaning, and as interpreted by Levon, it foretold the return of the young¹⁷ T'oros to Cilicia, where

¹⁵ *Colophon of 1286*, էջ 584: «Յետ ժամանակաց ինչ լինելոյ ի բանտի, ետես երագ որդի նորա թորոս եւ պատմեաց հաւր իւրում, թէ տեսի յանուշս, զի այր ոմն տայր յիս նկանակ մի հացի, եւ ձուկն ի վերայ, եւ ես առի եւ բեզ ոչ ետու ի նմանէ: Եւ հայրն խնդացեալ ելոյժ գտեսիլն որդոյ, թէ ոմնիս վերստին տիրել Կիլիկիոյ, զոր նախնիք մեր կալան քաջութեամբ, այլ եւ ընդարձակեցես գաւթութիւնն քո, մինչեւ ի ծով, զոր ձուկն նշանակեաց»: See also: **Vahram Rabuni**, pp. 199-200. **Հէթում Բ**, *Տարեգրութիւնը* "The Chronicle of Het'um II", p. 101.

¹⁶ For John II Komnenos' campaign in Cilicia, see **Azat A. Bozoyan**, *Բյուզանդիայի արեւելյան քաղաքականութիւնը եւ Կիլիկիան Հայաստանը ժԲ դարի 30-70-ական թվականներին* [*The Eastern Policy of Byzantium and Cilician Armenia in the fourth to eighth decades of the 12th Century*], Yerevan, 1988, pp. 99-123. **Gérard Dédéyan**, *Les Arméniens entre Grecs, musulmans et croisés*, p. 588-603. **Angeliki Papageorgiou**, *Ο Ιωάννης Β' Κομνηνός και η εποχή του (1118-1143)*, Athens, 2017, p. 327-336. **Konstantinos Takirtakoglou**, "John II Komnenos' Campaign in Cilician Armenia", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 114.3, 2021, p. 1329-1350. **Maximilian C.G. Lau**, *Emperor John II Komnenos: Rebuilding New Rome 1118-1143*, Oxford, 2023, p. 198-217. **Michael J. Decker**, "The Wars of John II Komnenos and the Decline of Byzantium in the East", *Victors and Vanquished in the Euro-Mediterranean: Dealing with Victory and Defeat in the Middle Ages*, ed. **Johannes Pahlitzsch** and **Jörg Rogge**, Göttingen, 2024, p. 164-166, 171.

¹⁷ Ter-Petrosian argued that T'oros was around 25 years old when he returned to Cilicia. See **Levon Ter-Petrosyan**, *Խաչակիրները եւ հայերը: Հատոր Բ: Պատմա-քաղաքագիտական հետազոտություն* [*The Crusaders and Armenians, vol. II, Historical-Politological Study*], Yerevan, 2007, pp. 118-119. Rüdts-Collenberg also estimates that T'oros was between 20 and 25 years old when he took power, see **W.H. Rüdts-Collenberg**, *The Rupenides, Hethumides and Lusignans: The Structure of the Armeno-Cilician Dynasties*, Paris, 1963, p. 22. For a comparison of the Armenian sources' accounts of T'oros' return to Cilicia, see, for example, **Ghewond Alishan**, *Sissouan, ou l'Arméno-Cilicie: description géographique et historique, avec cartes et illustrations*, Venice, 1899, p. 50. **Nicolas Adontz**, "Notes arméno-byzantines", *Byzantion*, 10.1, 1935, p. 192-193. **Azat A. Bozoyan**, *Բյուզանդիայի արեւելյան քաղաքականութիւնը* [*The Eastern Policy of Byzantium*], pp. 173-182. **Gérard Dédéyan**, *Les Arméniens*

he would not only reclaim his father's lands but also extend his conquests to the sea. This signified that he would conquer the Plain of Cilicia, accomplishing what his father had not.

To remove any doubt about the divine origin of the vision, T'oros' prophetic ability is explicitly highlighted later in the text.

For he was a pious and merciful man, profound in thought and magnanimous, living according to both the old and new laws of God, well-versed in all philosophical disciplines, from which every soul could attain the gift of prophecy. He also interpreted many difficult and obscure matters.¹⁸

Similarly, in Vahram, the conquest of Cilicia by T'oros after his return is similarly presented as fulfilling divine will.

It was disposed by God, / That coming out of prison / And finding himself lord of the land of his ancestors, / [He will] take the government from the Greeks / And repel their troops.¹⁹

It is important to remember that, according to Armenian historiography, T'oros had God's help on his side during his reign. This notion is not only emphasized in the colophon of 1286²⁰ but is also a recurring theme in the sources. In a colophon from 1164, which mentions the fateful battle of Ḥarim/Artāḥ against Nūr al-Dīn²¹, the author explicitly notes that the Armenian *ishkhan* was spared, writing: "But the

entre Grecs, musulmans et croisés, 618-619. **Grigor Mikayelyan**, *Կիլիկիայի Հայկական Պետության Պատմություն* [*History of the Armenian State of Cilicia*], Yerevan, 2007, p. 111-112. For some important observations on the symbolism in these narratives, see **Benjamin Bourgeois**, "La royauté : dynamiques et représentations", p. 141.

¹⁸ *Colophon of 1286*, 585: «զի էր այր բարեպաշտ եւ ողորմած, մեծախորհուրդ եւ առատամիտ, վարեալ ինն եւ նոր արիւնաւ Սատուծոյ, տեղեակ գոլով եւ ամենայն իմաստասիրական արհեստից, զորմէ ամեն հոգի մարգարէութեան ունել, որ եւ զբազում դժուարալոյծ բանս մեկնեալ». See also, e.g., **Vahram Rabuni**, p. 209.

¹⁹ **Vahram Rabuni**, p. 203: «Ի յՍատուծոյ՝ էր տնօրինեալ: / Որ ի բանտէ՝ անտի ելեալ, / եւ հայրենեաց՝ ըն տէր գտեալ. / Զիշխանութիւն՝ Յունաց առեալ, / եւ զնոցին՝ զօրսն վանեալ».

²⁰ See e.g. *Colophon of 1286*, p. 584: «եւ մեծն Թորոս գտեալ ազնութիւնն յՍատուծոյ... Բայց որպէս եւ է գրութեամբն Սատուծոյ եւ ազնականութեամբն».

²¹ For the joint campaign of 1164, see, indicatively **Nikita Elisséeff**, *Nūr ad-Dīn. Un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des Croisades (511-569 H./1118-1174)*, 3 vols., Damascus, 1967, 591-593. **Marshall W. Baldwin**, "The Latin States under Baldwin III and Amalric I, 1143-1174", *A History of the Crusades*, ed. **Marshall W. Baldwin**, vol. 1: The First Hundred Years, Madison, 1969, p. 551. **Vahan A. Ter-Ghevondian**, «Կիլիկիան Հայաստանն ու Սիրիան XII դարի 40-70-ական թվականներին» ["Cilician Armenia and Syria in the fifth to eighth decades of the 12th Century"], *PBH*, 2, 1986, pp. 124-125.

right hand of the protecting Father, protected the Armenian *ishkhan*, named T'oros".²²

Bourgeois posits it was during this period that the Rubenid dynasty was endowed with a sacred and prophetic role.²³ After Matthew of Edessa's Time of the Apocalypse, T'oros came to be regarded in the Het'umid Historiography as the prophet of the salvation of the Armenian nation, a salvation that would be delivered by Levon the Great.²⁴

As it stands, it seems reasonable to assume that it is no mere coincidence that T'oros received his divine vision in Constantinople. Indeed, under the pattern of royal historiography (on which see later) the Emperor of Constantinople would cede Cilicia to T'oros.

The Will of the Emperor

In both the colophon and Vahram's narrative, the account of Manuel's campaign against Cilician Armenia in 1158 is riddled with chronological

²² **Artashes Matevosyan**, Հայերեն ձեռագրերի հիշատակարաններ Ե-ԺԺ դդ. [*Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 5th-12th cc.*], Yerevan, 1988, p. 189: «Բայց աչքն Հաւր պահպանական պահեաց զիշխանն հայկական զԹորոս անուն». See also **Gérard Dédéyan**, "Les colophons de manuscrits", p. 102. The theme of divine assistance to the Rubenid ruler is a recurring motif in many sources; see, for example, **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, p. 400 [**Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", p. 261], where it is noted that the Armenians of Cilicia gathered around T'oros after his return to Cilicia "through God's foresight."

²³ **Benjamin Bourgeois**, "La royauté : dynamiques et représentations", p. 141, 607-608.

²⁴ **Benjamin Bourgeois**, "La royauté : dynamiques et représentations", p. 604-610. Regarding the development of the eschatological tradition in Armenian sources, see **Sergio La Porta**, "Conflicted Coexistence: Christian-Muslim Interaction and Its Representation in Medieval Armenia", *Contextualizing the Muslim Other in Medieval Christian Discourse*, **Jerold C. Frakes**, New York, 2011, p. 112: "during the latter half of the twelfth century, the focus of the eschatological perspective shifts from the punishing destruction of the Seljuk invasions...to hope in assistance from the West and, ultimately, to hope in the resurrection of the Armenian monarchy in Cilicia". For the eschatological portrayal of Levon in Armenian sources, see, e.g., **Sergio La Porta**, "King Lewon I: The Last Roman Emperor", *La Méditerranée des Arméniens: XII^e-XV^e siècle*, ed. **Claude Mutafian**, Paris, 2014, p. 85-100. **Sergio La Porta**, "Vardan Aygekc'i's Counsel and the Medieval Armenian Apocalyptic", *The Armenian Apocalyptic Tradition: A Comparative Perspective*, ed. **Kevork B. Bardakjian** and **Sergio La Porta**, Leiden, 2014, p. 504-537. **Zaroui Pogossian**, "The Last Emperor or the Last Armenian King? Some Considerations on Armenian Apocalyptic Literature from the Cilician Period", *The Armenian Apocalyptic Tradition: A Comparative Perspective*, ed. **Kevork B. Bardakjian** and **Sergio La Porta**, Leiden, 2014, 457-503. For Levon's own desire to be presented as the spiritual leader of the Armenians, see **David Linus Neagu**, "King of All the Armenians": Lewon I and the Armenian Church", *Revue des études sud-est européennes*, 58. 1-4, 2020, p. 39-49.

inaccuracies, which will not be examined here. It suffices to mention an indicative example: in the colophon, Manuel's campaign against Cilicia precedes his incitement of the Turkish Sultan (here identified as Kilij Arslan²⁵) against T'oros²⁶. However, we know that the Turkish campaigns must be chronologically placed between Andronikos' defeat at Mopsuestia and Manuel's own campaign in Cilicia²⁷. The narrative contains several significant omissions and factual distortions. For instance, it entirely omits T'oros' attack on Byzantine Cyprus in collaboration with the Prince of Antioch, an event that played a crucial role in prompting Manuel's subsequent campaign²⁸. Instead, the cause of the campaign is attributed solely to the Byzantine emperor's envy.²⁹

In the colophon, as in Vahram's Chronicle, an unidentified battle between T'oros and the Byzantine forces is described, occurring near Bardzrberd.

²⁵ The same in Vahram, see **Vahram Rabuni**, p. 207 [**Vahram Raboun**, *Chronicle*, p. 38]. Scholars, based on Gregory the Priest's testimony and the chronological period during which Manuel's rapprochement with the Turks occurred, suggest that the Sultan in this case was likely Masud, the father of Kilij Arslan see e.g. **Nikita Elisséeff**, *Nūr ad-Dīn*, p. 536-537. **Levon Ter-Petrosyan**, *Խաչակիրները եւ հայերը: Հատոր Բ* [*The Crusaders and Armenians*, vol. II], p. 123. **Marie-Anna Chevalier**, *Les ordres religieux-militaires en Arménie cilicienne : Templiers, hospitaliers, teutoniques & Arméniens à l'époque des croisades*, Paris, 2009, p. 93.

²⁶ *Colophon of 1286*, pp. 584-585.

²⁷ See e.g. **A. A. Bozoyan**, *Բյուզանդիայի արևելյան քաղաքականությունը* [*The Eastern Policy of Byzantium*], pp. 132-133, 202-203. **Georgios Charizanis**, "Η πολιτική του αυτοκράτορα Μανουήλ Α΄ Κομνηνού (1143-80) και των διαδόχων του έναντι της Μικράς Αρμενίας", *Byzantiaka*, 25, 2005-2006, 157. **Isabelle Augé**, *Byzantins, Arméniens & Francs au temps de la Croisade. Politique religieuse et reconquête en Orient sous la dynastie des Comnènes : 1081-1185*, Paris, 2007, 278. **Levon Ter-Petrosyan**, *Խաչակիրները եւ հայերը: Հատոր Բ* [*The Crusaders and Armenians*, vol. II], p. 123.

²⁸ For the attack by Reynald and T'oros on Cyprus, see e.g. **Adam M. Aaron**, "The Sons of Melisende: Baldwin III, Amalric, and Kingship in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1143-1174 CE", PhD Thesis, Knoxville, 2024, p. 122. For a detailed analysis of the matter, see **Gérard Dédéyan**, *Les Arméniens en Chypre (577-1211). De Justin II à Hugues Ier de Lusignan*, Nicosia, 2018, p. 143-149.

²⁹ *Colophon of 1286*, p. 585: «Եւ վերստին լուեալ զհամբաւ բարութեան եւ փառութեան մեծին Թորոսի կայսրն իմմանովի, եւ ոչ կարեցեալ տանել նախանձոս». It is worth noting that envy also appears as the motivation for Andronikos' actions against T'oros in Gregory the Priest, see **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, p. 400 [**Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", p. 260]. In contrast, in Vahram's account, envy is not mentioned as the motivation for Manuel's hostility, but instead the mistreatment of the Greeks by T'oros and his usurpation of the Cilician region, see **Vahram Rabuni**, pp. 203-204 [**Vahram Raboun**, *Chronicle*, p. 35-36]. The conquest of Cilicia by T'oros, along with the desire to punish Renaud for the Cyprus raid, are noted by William of Tyre as reasons for Manuel's 1158 campaign, see **William of Tyre**, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, tr. **Emily Atwater Babcock** and **August Charles Krey**, vol. 2, New York, 1943, p. 275-276.

And he besieged him in the fortress called Bardzrberd. Then, the brave T'oros attacked the assembly of the Greeks, killed many, and took numerous Sebastoi as captives to the fortress. He sold them for gold to Emperor Manuel and distributed the treasure among the infantry of his army.³⁰

The account mentions that T'oros captured Byzantine officers (referred to as Sevastoi) and sent them to Manuel. This suggests that the victory was probably over a small Byzantine detachment rather than the main imperial army. Alishan argues that this incident likely occurred during the conflicts that followed Step'anos' assassination, as Bardzrberd was not under T'oros II's control during Manuel's campaign.³¹

It is equally plausible, however, that this incident was fabricated solely to conceal T'oros' flight from the imperial army.³² In the same work, and evidently aiming to downplay the extent of the Rubenid defeat, Levon is portrayed as having been taken prisoner by the emperor only as part of a ruse, even though we know that T'oros' father, having been left without any possessions, had attempted to gain John II's pardon³³. This hypothesis is further supported by the narrative's portrayal of the

³⁰ *Colophon of 1286*, էջ 585: «Եւ պաշարեալ զնա ի դղեակն Բարձրբերդ կոչեցեալ: Յարձակեալ ապա Բաշն Թորոս ի վերայ ժողովոյն Յունաց, զբազումս եսպան, եւ զյոյով սեւաստիաւսս գերի տարեալ ի դղեակն, վաճառեաց ընդ ոսկոյն կայսերն Էմմանուիլի, եւ զգանձն բաշխեաց իւրոյ հետեակաց զարուն».

³¹ **Ghewond Alishan**, *Léon le magnifique, premier roi de Sissouan ou de l'Arméno-Cilicie*, Venice, 1888, 50. According to Armenian sources, Vasil was one of the Armenian *ishkhan* who fought alongside Andronikos Komnenos against T'oros, see e.g. **Smbat Sparapet**, *Տարեգիրք* [Chronicle], p. 171 [**Sparapet Smbat**, *Chronicle*, p. 77]. For the murder of Step'anos by the Byzantines, see indicatively **Kirakos Gandzakets'i**, *Պատմություն Հայոց* [History of Armenia], ed. **K. A. Melik'-Öhanjanyan**, Yerevan, 1961, p. 110 [English Translation: **Kirakos Ganjakes'i**, *History of the Armenians*, tr. **Robert Bedrosian**, New York, 1986, p. 100]. For the symbolic aspects of the Armenian narratives concerning Step'anos' execution, see **Benjamin Bourgeois**, «La royauté: dynamiques et représentations», 608. Regarding the *doux* allegedly responsible for organizing Step'anos' murder, Andronikos Komnenos Euphorbenos, see, e.g., **Konstantinos Varzos**, *Η γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών*, vol. 1, Thessaloniki, 1984, p. 335-336.

³² **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, p. 417 [**Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", p. 272]. **John Kinnamos**, *Epitome Rerum Ab Joanne et Alexio Comnenis Gestarum*, ed. **A. Meineke** (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae 13), Bonn, 1836, p. 180, 186 [English Translation: **John Kinnamos**, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, tr. **Charles M. Brand**, New York, 1976, p. 138, 142]. **William of Tyre**, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, p. 276. For the tactic of the Armenians to retreat to their mountain fortresses when facing superior forces, see for example **Mariya Romanova**, "La défense de l'État arménien de Cilicie (1073-1375)", PhD Thesis, Montpellier, 2014, p. 126.

³³ **Gérard Dédéyan**, *Les Arméniens entre Grecs, musulmans et croisés*, 606.

final compromise between the emperor and T'oros II as a direct result of T'oros' supposed victory on the battlefield and the impression it made on Manuel.

Astonished by his bravery and generosity, he adopted him as his own son and granted Cilicia to T'oros by written decree and a golden bull, along with many other treasures. Then, he himself departed for Constantinople.³⁴

In this way, not only is the mediation of the King of Jerusalem concealed³⁵ but also the vassalage of the Rubenid lord, which we know resulted from the meeting between the Armenian *ishkhan* and the emperor (1159), is transformed into a recognition of his independence and the Byzantine granting of all of Cilicia. It is precisely here that we encounter the fundamental aspect of the second mode of legitimizing the authority of the Rubenids, and by extension the Het'umids, in Cilicia. Since Manuel granted Cilicia upon T'oros with a gold bullet, Cilicia is now under the control of T'oros, with the approval of the emperor.

As Azat Bozoyan has noted, this narrative in reality implies T'oros' integration into the Byzantine administrative system³⁶. In short, T'oros became the governor of

³⁴ *Colophon of 1286*, էջ 585: «Ընդ որոյ քաջութիւնն եւ առատամտութիւնն զարմացեալ կոչեաց զնա իւր յորդեգրութիւնն, եւ ետ զԿիլիկեա ձեռնագրով եւ ոսկի վոյով Թորոսի եւ այլ զանձս բազումս, եւ ինքն զնաց ի Կոստանդինուպոլիս»». Similarly, in Vahram of Edessa, T'oros' victory at Bardzrberd and the magnanimity he showed towards the Byzantine prisoners were the reasons that led Manuel to decide to engage in talks with the Rubenid prince, see **Vahram Rabuni**, էջ 204-205 [**Vahram Raboun**, *Chronicle*, p. 36].

³⁵ For the mediation of King Baldwin, see e.g. **Martin Marko Vučetić**, *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern (395–1204): Vorbereitung, Gestaltung, Funktionen*, vol. 1, Münster, 2021, p. 219. The Armenian sources not only confirm the mediation of the King of Jerusalem but also testify that T'oros had hoped for this from the very beginning, see **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, էջ 417 (**Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", p. 272). According to John Kinnamos, T'oros had unsuccessfully attempted to contact the emperor before Baldwin's mediation, see **John Kinnamos**, *Epitome Rerum*, p. 181. For the role of the religious-military orders in this mediation, see **Marie-Anna Chevalier**, *Les ordres religieux-militaires en Arménie cilicienne*, p. 98-100. The meeting between the two occurred in the spring of 1159, see e.g. **Friedrich Hild** and **Hansgerd Hellenkemper**, *Kilikien und Isaurien*, vol. 1 (Tabula Imperii Byzantini 5), Wien, 1990, 72.

³⁶ **Azat A. Bozoyan**, «Կիլիկիայի բյուզանդական կառավարիչները և Ռուբինյան իշխանությունը XII դարի 40—70-ական թվականներին» ["The Byzantine Rulers of Cilicia and the Rubenid Principdom in the fifth to eighth decades of the 12th Century"], *PBH*, 3, 1984, pp. 80–81, 85. This view is also supported by other historians, see e.g. **Natasha Hodgson**, "Conflict and Cohabitation: Marriage and Diplomacy between Latins and Cilician Armenians, c.1097-1253", *The Crusades and the Near East*, ed. **Conor Kostick**, London, 2011, p. 92. Ter-Petrosyan accepts Bozoyan's position, although he considers it more accurate to see T'oros as the governor of only the mountainous part of Cilicia, rather than the entire region, see **Levon Ter-Petrosyan**, *Խաչակիրները եւ հայերը: Հատոր Բ* [*The Crusaders and Armenians*, vol. II],

the Byzantine province of Cilicia, or at least its mountainous part. This is further supported by the absence of a Byzantine Duke of Cilicia between 1159 and 1162.³⁷ Bozoyan's thesis is strengthened by evidence that T'oros had received the title of *sebastos*.³⁸ According to Gregory the Priest's account, T'oros aimed to be recognized as a vassal of the emperor even before his victory over Andronikos Komnenos.

The Armenians, in turn, because of their affection for and fear of the Greek emperor, did not dare battle against him, but rather ceaselessly pleaded with him to be allowed to maintain their allegiance to him [and to empire]...Now Toros beseeched him with many entreaties, saying: "I am a vassal of the emperor and of you...."³⁹

pp. 126-127. This view has also been proposed by other researchers, see e.g. **Ralph-Johannes Lilie**, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, p. 179. On the other hand, Stepanenko argues against Bozoyan's position, pointing out that T'oros, as a vassal of the emperor, could not have been integrated into the imperial administrative system. He believes that T'oros' relationship with the empire should be studied within the context of relations between the empire and client neighbouring states, "whose rulers recognize the suzerainty of the basileus," see **Valerij Stepanenko**, "Торос II Рубенид и византийская администрация равнинной Киликии (1158–1160)" ["Toros II Rubenid and the Byzantine Administration of the Cilicia Plain (1158–1160)"], *Vizantijskij vremennik*, 56, 1995, p. 132.

³⁷ **Azat A. Bozoyan**, *Բյուզանդիայի արևելյան քաղաքականությունը* [*The Eastern Policy of Byzantium*], pp. 203, 214. In contrast, see: **Valerij Stepanenko**, "Торос II Рубенид и византийская администрация равнинной Киликии (1158–1160)" ["Toros II Rubenid and the Byzantine Administration of the Cilicia Plain (1158–1160)"], p. 127-133.

³⁸ See **Smbat Sparapet**, *Տարեգիրք* [Chronicle], pp. 179, 186 [**Sparapet Smbat**, *Chronicle*, p. 81, 85]. In general, scholars associate the title received by T'oros with the recognition of Byzantine suzerainty, see e.g. **Sirarpie Der Nersessian**, "The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia", *A History of the Crusades. II. The Later Crusades 1189-1311*, ed. **R.L. Wolff** and **H.W. Hazard**, Madison, p. 640. Gregory the Priest mentions T'oros II once with the title *pansebastos* and twice with the title *sebastos*, see **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, էջ 409, 423, 428 [**Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", pp. 267, 276, 280]. For the title *sebastos* during the reign of Manuel I Komnenos, see **Stavros G. Georgiou**, «Οι τιμητικοί τίτλοι επί Κομνηνών (1081-1185)», PhD Thesis, Thessaloniki, 2005, 315-401.

³⁹ **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, p. 400 [**Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", p. 260-261]: «Եւ նո՞ւա առ սէր եւ անի մեծի թագաւորին Յունաց ոչ համարձակէին տալ ընդ նմա պատերազմ, այլ համապագ սիրոյ աղագաւ աղաչէին մնալ նմա ի հնազանդութիւն... Իսկ Թորոս բազում աղաղանօք աղաչէր զնա, թէ «նորս եմ թագաւորին եւ քն»». Jurewicz argues that Andronikos rejected T'oros' peace proposals because he was dissatisfied with the terms offered by the Armenian *ishkhan*, see **Oktawiusz Jurewicz**, *Andronik I. Komnenos*, Warszawa, 1962, 53. On the other hand, Bartikyan, in the context of his argument for the assumption of a royal title by Levon I, contends that here T'oros II was signaling to the Byzantines that he would not repeat his father's actions, see **Hrach M. Bartikyan**, «Միջակեկ Իտալիկոս Ներքողյանը և հայոց առաջին թագավորի խնդիրը» ["The Panegyric of Michael Italicus and the Issue of the First Armenian King"], *PBH*, 4, 1984, p. 220. Other scholars, more appropriately in my view,

This seems to have been exactly achieved after the meeting between Manuel and T'oros: the recognition by Constantinople of the Rubenid as a client of the empire⁴⁰. The description by Kinnamos of the outcome of the meeting, though concise, is indicative: "Welcoming him, the emperor enrolled him among the Romans' subjects and so terminated the war."⁴¹ In the same vein, Gregory the Priest presents T'oros after 1164 as governing Cilicia "by the authority and the friendship of the emperor" (հրամանաւ եւ սիրով թագաւորին)⁴², while William of Tyre refers to an "oath of fealty to the emperor."⁴³ There are other indications that confirm the view that in this meeting T'oros recognized Manuel's suzerainty: the provision of supplies for the Byzantine army by T'oros⁴⁴, and the granting of a "fortress which the emperor demanded" to Manuel, according to William of Tyre, or "Anazarbus," according to the Armenian sources⁴⁵, form a picture that consistently appears in the recognition of Byzantine suzerainty by Armenian leaders. As correctly noted, the

suggest that Gregory's account indicates T'oros wanted to be recognized as a vassal of the emperor, see **F. Chalandon**, *Les Comnène : études sur l'Empire byzantin au XI^e et au XII^e siècles. II, Jean II Comnène (1118-1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143-1180)*, New York, 1912, p. 427. **Azat A. Bozoyan**, «Կիլիկիայի բյուզանդական կառավարիչները», p. 79, idem, *Բյուզանդիայի արևելյան քաղաքականությունը* [*The Eastern Policy of Byzantium*], p. 201.

⁴⁰ See e.g. **Georgios Chatzelis**, "Byzantine Strategy (AD 630-1204)", *The Cambridge History of Strategy*, ed. **Isabelle Duyvesteyn** and **Beatrice Heuser**, vol. 1. From Antiquity to the American War of Independence, Cambridge, 2025, p. 246. As Magdalino notes, the evidence leads to the conclusion that from the outset of his 1158 campaign, Manuel aimed at "imperial restoration based on recognition, rather than abolition, of the status quo," see **Paul Magdalino**, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180*, Cambridge, 1993, p. 69.

⁴¹ **John Kinnamos**, *Epitome Rerum*, p. 186 (**John Kinnamos**, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, p. 142): «βασιλεὺς δὲ αὐτὸν προσηκάμενος δούλοις τε τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐνέγραψε καὶ τὸν πόλεμον λοιπὸν ἔλυσεν».

⁴² **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, p. 423 [**Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", p. 276]. For why the "Greek suzerainty proved beneficent for the Armenians, particularly for the Rubenids", see **Claude Mutafian**, "The Brilliant Diplomacy of Cilician Armenia", *Armenian Cilicia*, ed. **Richard G. Hovannisian** and **Simon Payaslian**, Costa Mesa, 2008, p. 96.

⁴³ **William of Tyre**, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, p. 278.

⁴⁴ **Grigor Erets'**, *Continuation*, pp. 418-419 [**Gregory the Priest**, "Continuation", p. 273].

⁴⁵ **William of Tyre**, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, p. 278. Barber correctly views the granting of this fortress "as a symbol of submission", see **Malcolm Barber**, *The Crusader States*, New Haven, 2012, p. 213. **Vahram Rabuni**, էջ 205 [**Vahram Raboun**, *Chronicle*, p. 37]. **Հեթում Բ**, *Տարեգրությունը* ["The Chronicle of Het'um II"], p. 102. As Bozoyan clarifies, the fact that T'oros is reported to have captured Anazarbus after the assassination of Step'anos leads us to conclude that he indeed granted some territory in 1158, see **Azat A. Bozoyan**, «Կիլիկիայի բյուզանդական կառավարիչները», p. 81, idem, *Բյուզանդիայի արևելյան քաղաքականությունը* [*The Eastern Policy of Byzantium*], p. 205.

fact that T'oros returned to his lands only after obtaining permission from Manuel reveals the asymmetry of power between the two men⁴⁶.

That some kind of agreement was reached between Manuel I and T'oros is also demonstrated by Choniates, who contrasts Manuel's policy with that of his father: "He did not emulate his own father in contesting for control of all of Armenia, nor did he attack those fortresses which he had subdued."⁴⁷ The historian continues, Manuel was "tricked by the duplicity of Thoros's words and taken in by wheedling treaties."⁴⁸

In contrast to the narrative of T'oros' subjugation, the author of the colophon describes Cilicia as fully ceded to T'oros with the granting of a golden bull. Some point rightly that T'oros' obligation to provide certain territories to the Byzantine emperor could not be reconciled with the cession of the entire Cilicia to T'oros⁴⁹.

Byzantine historical narratives and other Armenian sources do not mention a chrysobull granted to T'oros by Manuel. This absence strongly implies that the chrysobull might be a literary invention by the author of the colophon. Given that Byzantine chrysobulls significantly influenced diplomatic practices in Cilician Armenia⁵⁰, it is plausible that the Het'umid historiography found it natural to assert that an imperial chrysobull had sealed the agreement. However, a reference in the work of Manganeios Prodromos clarifies that such a chrysobull existed: "He [i.e., T'oros] is reinstated as a shepherd, not an owner, and receives the grazing rights of his tenure more securely than before, authorized by you [i.e., Manuel I] in red syllables."⁵¹ This reference, however, also compels us to reject the notion that the

⁴⁶ **Martin Marko Vučetić**, *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern (395–1204)*, p. 278.

⁴⁷ **Nicetas Choniates**, *Historia*, ed. **J. L. van Dieten** (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 11), Berlin, 1975, p. 102–103 [English Translation: **Nicetas Choniates**, *O City of Byzantium: Annals of Niketas Choniates*, tr. **Harry J. Magoulias**, Detroit, 1984, p. 59: «οὐδὲ περὶ τῆς ὅλης Ἀρμενίας διαγωνίζεται τὸν οἰκεῖον πατέρα ἐξηλωκῶς, ἢ γοῦν, ὅσα ἐκεῖνος ὑπηγάγετο φρούρια πολεμῶν».

⁴⁸ **Nicetas Choniates**, *Historia*, p. 103 (**Nicetas Choniates**, *O City of Byzantium*, p. 59): «ἀλλὰ τῇ διπλῇ τῶν λόγων τοῦ Τορούση φενακισθεὶς καὶ τῇ αἰμυλίᾳ τῶν συνθηκῶν ἀπαλυνθεὶς».

⁴⁹ **Levon Ter-Petrosyan**, *Խաչափրինքը եւ հաղորդ: Հատոր Բ [The Crusaders and Armenians, vol. II]*, p. 126.

⁵⁰ See e.g. **Jean Richard**, "La diplomatie royale dans les royaumes d'Arménie et de Chypre (XII^e-XV^e siècles)", *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 144, 1986, p. 76. **Marco Bais**, "Documents de la chancellerie du royaume d'Arménie en Cilicie : traductions et traducteurs", *La Méditerranée des Arméniens: XII^e-XV^e siècle*, ed. **Claude Mutaftian**, Paris, 2014, p. 246.

⁵¹ **Manganeios Prodromos**, no. 8, 711–25, cited in **Paul Magdalino**, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, p. 70. For the identification of the "red syllables" with a chrysobull "by

chrysobull transferred ownership of Cilicia to T'oros. Instead, it affirmed the terms of the Armenian *ishkhan*'s vassalage to the emperor. The document explicitly emphasized that T'oros was made *shepherd* of the region, not its owner.

Regardless of the historical reality, for the author of the colophon, after 1158, Cilicia was Armenian—by the will of both God and the Byzantine emperor, who had been its former legal owner.

Final Act

This transfer of ownership of Cilicia to the Armenians was definitively sealed by the Byzantine Emperor, sending a crown to the first king of Armenian Cilicia, Levon I.

Hearing of his benevolence, the kings of the world urged him to take the crown and among them the overlord of the Franks and the Emperor of the Greeks sent him a crown and many treasures.⁵²

The events surrounding the sending of the crowns to the Armenian king have been examined by scholars⁵³; however, what is most significant for our study is that after this mention, the colophon no longer refers to the Byzantines. This omission must undoubtedly be attributed to the rarity of Byzantine-Armenian relations after 1204 (though not entirely severed⁵⁴). Just as with Byzantium, where after the reign

which Manuel reinstated T'oros in this territory, and conferred (or reconferred) on him the imperial dignity of *sebastos*,” see *ibidem*, p. 70, note 159.

⁵² *Colophon of 1286*, էջ 586: «Զոր բարեգործութիւն նորա լուեալ թագաւոր երկրի՝ ստիպելին զնա թագ առնող, յորոց եւ ուրբորն Ֆռանգաց, կայսրն Ֆռնաց, առաքեցին նմա թագ եւ զանձ բազում».

⁵³ See, e.g., **Azat A. Bozoyan**, «Կիլիկիայի Հայկական Պետությունը. Իշխանապետությունից թագավորություն» [“The Armenian State of Cilicia. From Principedom to Kingdom”], *Etchmiadzin*, 62.12, 2006, էջ 95-96. **Christodoulos G. Ntavonis**, “Further Thoughts on the Byzantine Crown of Lewon I the Magnificent,” *Byzantiaka*, 37, 2022, p. 149-161.

⁵⁴ For Armenian-Byzantine relations in the 13th century, see, e.g., **Alexis G. C. Savvides**, «To μεσογειακό κράτος της Κιλικιακής ή Μικρής Αρμενίας (Αρμενοκιλικίας) κατά τον ύστερο Μεσαιώνα μεταξύ Βυζαντίου, σταυροφόρων και Ισλάμ», *Ο Ύστερος Μεσαιωνικός Κόσμος (11ος-16ος αιώνες). Βυζάντιο, μεσαιωνική Δύση, Ανατολή και Ισλάμ, Σλάβοι*, by **Alexis G. C. Savvides** and **Nikolaos G. Nikoloudis**, Athens, 2007, p. 180, 182. **Azat Bozoyan**, “Les relations arméno-byzantines au XIII^e siècle : nouvelles perspectives”, *L'église arménienne entre Grecs et Latins fin XI^e-milieu XV^e siècle*, ed. **Isabelle Augé** and **Gérard Dédéyan**, Paris, 2009, p. 39-47. On the significant position of Chalcedonian Orthodox Christians (both Greek and Armenian) in the Kingdom of Cilicia in the 13th century, see **Sergei P. Brun**, “Chalcedonian Orthodoxy in the Kingdom of Armenia. The Church Hierarchy, Aristocracy and Communities of the Byzantines and the Chalcedonian Armenians in the 12th-14th Century Cilicia”, *Բանբեր Հայագիտության*, 3, 2018, p. 5-31. In a relatively recent study, Grigoryan has

of Manuel Komnenos, “the official Byzantine historiography seems to gradually forget about Cilicia’s existence,”⁵⁵ so too in the colophon, the Byzantines fade into the background, having fulfilled their role in transferring Cilicia’s rights to the Rubenids. As with Matthew of Edessa, the Byzantines are disregarded once they “have served their prophetic purpose.”⁵⁶

Conclusions: On the Side of Legitimacy

As we have seen, according to the 1286 colophon, the Het‘umids were loyal to the Emperor, fighting the Rubenids, the usurpers who attempted to seize control of the province by force. Nerses Lambronats‘i in his collection of documents *Պատճառ խնդրոյ միաբանութեան. թագաւորին հոռոմոց Մանուէլի և սրբոց կաթողիկոսաց հայոց ներսիսի և Գրիգորիսի թուղթքն, զոր գրեցին առ միմեանս* (*Explanation of the Discussion of the Union: the Letters of the King of the Romeans Manuel and the Holy Armenian Catholicoi Nerses and Grigoris, which they Wrote to Each Other*) clearly demonstrates that the Het‘umids who were T‘oros II’s contemporaries regarded his actions as a “riot” (խռովութիւն)⁵⁷. T‘oros was viewed as a scoundrel “revolting against the Roman King for various reasons, forgetting what he swore in their treaty and his vassalage.”⁵⁸ Contemporary scholars have already indicated that in the conflicts between the two dynasties, the Rubenids were always the aggressors⁵⁹. Therefore, the Het‘umids had no reason to conceal the fact that, unlike

convincingly argued that one branch of the Het‘umid family, that of Halkam, uncle of King Levon I, adhered to the Chalcedonian doctrine, see **Samvel Grigoryan**, “The lineage of Adam (Siratan), regent for Zapēl, Queen of Armenia”, *Élites chrétiennes et formes du pouvoir en Méditerranée centrale et orientale. (XIII^e-XV^e siècle)*, ed. **Marie-Anna Chevalier** and **Isabelle Ortega**, Paris, 2017), p. 231, 238, 240.

⁵⁵ **Azat Bozoyan**, “Cilician Armenia as Perceived by the Byzantine Empire (Komnenoi Period)”, *Cilician Armenia in the Perceptions of Adjacent Political Entities (Historical-Philological Essays)*, ed. **Azat Bozoyan**, tr. **A. Martirosyan**, Yerevan, 2019, p. 42.

⁵⁶ **Tara L. Andrews**, *Matt‘ēos Urhayec‘i and His Chronicle*, Leiden, 2017, p. 75-76. **Eadem**, “Matthew of Edessa (Matt‘ēos Urhayec‘i)”, *Franks and Crusades in Medieval Eastern Christian Historiography*, ed. **Alex Mallett**, Turnhout, 2020, p. 171.

⁵⁷ *Ընդհանրական թուղթք Սրբոյն ներսիսի Շնորհաւոյ* [*Encyclical Letter of S. Nersēs Shnorhali*], p. 86. This collection is discussed in A.A. Bozoyan, «Կիլիկյան Հայաստանի պատմությունը Միջերկրական ծովի պետությունների արխիվներում» [“The History of Cilician Armenia in the Archives of Mediterranean States”], էջ 126ff.

⁵⁸ *Ընդհանրական թուղթք Սրբոյն ներսիսի Շնորհաւոյ* [*Encyclical Letter of S. Nersēs Shnorhali*], p. 86: «քէկն ածէր ընդդէմ թագաւորին Հոռոմոց պէսպէս պատճառաւ, մոռացեալ զերդմնակոտ դաշինսն՝ որ ի միջի, և զմնազանդութիւն մորա».

⁵⁹ See e.g. **Sirarpie Der Nersessian**, “The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia”, p. 634-635.

the Rubenids, they were faithful vassals of Byzantium, thus showing that the Het'umids were always on the side of legitimacy⁶⁰.

In the selective memory of the Het'umids, however, T'oros II had been the man to whom the Emperor ultimately transferred the ownership of Cilicia, legitimizing their own authority. It may not be a coincidence that it was during the time of T'oros II that the slow and difficult but steady normalization of relations between the Rubenids and Het'umids began⁶¹. What is certain is that since the region passed to T'oros II by the will of both God and the Emperor, and thus Cilicia rightfully belonged to the Rubenids, the Het'umids, as the successors of the Rubenids, had inherited the right to rule the region.

ԿՈՆՍՏԱՆՏԻՆՈՍ ՏԱԿԻՐՏԱԿՕԳԼՈՒ

ԿԻԼԻԿԻՈ ՀԱՅՈՑ ԻՇԽԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՕՐԻՆԱԿԱՆԱՑՈՒՄԸ ՀԵԹՈՒՄՅԱՆՆԵՐԻ ՔԱՐՈՉՉԱԿԱՆ ՊԱՏՈՒՄԻ ՄԵՉ. ՀԵԹՈՒՄ Բ-Ի ՃԱՇՈՑԻ ՀԻՇԱՏԱԿԱՐԱՆԻ ՕՐԻՆԱԿԸ (1286 թ.)

Բանալի բառեր՝ Բյուզանդական կայսրություն, հայ-բյուզանդական հարաբերություններ, Հեթում Բ-ի ճաշոցը, հիշատակարաններ, Թորոս Բ, Հեթումյաններ, Ռուբինյաններ, Կոմենեններ, Կիլիկիա:

Հոգվածում լուսաբանվում է այն խնդիրը, թե ի՞նչ կերպ է ներկայացվում հայ-բյուզանդական հարաբերությունների անցյալը Հեթում Բ-ի ճաշոցի հիշա-

⁶⁰ It is worth noting Evans' position that this "long loyalty" of the Het'umid dynasty likely underpinned the choice of the Cilician royal court in the 13th century to express its royal power through Byzantine symbols of power, despite the fact that, during this period when Byzantium was weakened, one would have expected "the Cilicians to choose Latin models for their portraits," see **Helen Carney Evans**, "Imperial Aspirations: Armenian Cilicia and Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century", *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, ed. **Antony Eastmond**, Aldershot, 2001, p. 248. The Cilician coins of the period also reflect "Armenia's continuing connection with Byzantine artistic tradition," see e.g. **Eurydice Georganteli**, "Transposed Images: Currencies and Legitimacy in the Late Medieval Eastern Mediterranean", *Byzantines, Latins, and Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean World after 1150*, ed. **Jonathan Harris**, **Catherine Holmes**, and **Eugenia Russell**, Oxford, 2012, p. 159-160.

⁶¹ With the marriage of Oshīn's son, Het'um, to a daughter of T'oros, see e.g. **Smbat Sparapet**, *Տարեգիրք* [Chronicle], p. 171 [**Sparapet Smbat**, *Chronicle*, p. 77]. Mutafian characteristically describes this marriage as "une première tentative d'alliance des deux grandes familles rivales," see **Claude Mutafian**, *Le Royaume Arménien de Cilicie*, 28.

տակարանի կարճ գրության մեջ, որը հստակորեն բացահայտում է Հեթումյանների՝ պատմագրության կիրառումը քարոզչական նպատակներով: Հետագոտության հիմնական հարցն այն է, թե ինչո՞ւ է քարոզչական այս պատումի մեջ ներառվել այն վկայությունը, թե Հեթումյանները բյուզանդացիների կողքին կռվել են Ռուբինյան իշխան Ռորոս Բ-ի դեմ: Սա իրապես տարօրինակ մի քայլ է, քանի որ Հեթումյանները Ռուբինյանների իրավահաջորդներն էին: Հոգվածում ցույց է տրվում, որ Ճաշոցի հիշատակարանի այդ տեղեկությունն ունի առաջնային մի նպատակ՝ ձևավորել այն պատկերը, ըստ որի՝ Հեթումյանները միշտ կանգնած են եղել օրինականության կողմում: Քանի դեռ Բյուզանդիան համարվում էր Կիլիկիո տարածքի օրինական տիրակալը, Հեթումյանները նրա հետ էին ընդդեմ նվազ օրինապաշտ Ռուբինյանների: Բայց արդյո՞ք այս ընկալումը չի հակասում այն փաստին, որ հենց Հեթումյաններն էին դարձել Ռուբինյանների իրավահաջորդները Կիլիկիայում: Արդյո՞ք սա չէր թուլացնում նրանց իշխանության օրինականությունը: Փաստերի հանգամանալից ուսումնասիրությունն այս կարևոր հարցին ժխտական պատասխան է տալիս. Հեթումյանների արքունիքում ձևավորված պատմագրական հարացույցի համաձայն՝ Ռորոս Բ-ն հետագայում դարձել էր Կիլիկիայի օրինական տերը, և դա տեղի էր ունեցել ոչ միայն Աստծո, այլև հենց Բյուզանդիո կայսեր կամոք, որը Ռորոս Բ-ին էր փոխանցել Կիլիկիայի տարածքը: Հետևաբար, Հեթումյանները դարձել էին Ռուբինյանների իրավահաջորդներն այն բանից հետո, երբ իրենց իշխանությունն օրինականացվել էր թե՛ Աստծո, թե՛ նախկին օրինական տիրոջ՝ կայսեր կողմից: Ռուբինյանների իշխանության ճանաչումը վերջնականապես ամրագրվեց ու հաստատվեց, երբ կայսրը Ռուբինյան առաջին թագավորին բյուզանդական թագ ուղարկեց:

КОНСТАНТИНОС ТАКИРТАКОГЛУ

ЛЕГИТИМАЦИЯ АРМЯНСКОЙ ВЛАСТИ В КИЛИКИИ В ПРОПАГАНДИСТСКОМ НАРРАТИВЕ ХЕТУМИДОВ НА ПРИМЕРЕ КОЛОФОНА ЛЕКЦИОНАРИЯ ХЕТУМА II (1286 Г.)

Ключевые слова: Византийская империя, армяно-византийские связи, Лекционарий Хетума II, колофоны, Торос II, Хетумиды, Рубениды, Комнины, Киликия.

Статья посвящена представлению прошлого армяно-византийских отношений в тексте колофона Лекционария Хетума II, в котором очевидно пропагандистское использование историографии династией Хетумидов. Почему в этот пропагандистский историографический нарратив было включено свиде-

тельство о том, что Хетумиды сражались на стороне византийцев против князя Тороса II из династии Рубенидов? Это действительно странный ход, если учесть, что именно Хетумиды стали преемниками Рубенидов. В статье показано, что данным пассажем Хетумиды стремились продемонстрировать, что они всегда находились на стороне законности. До тех пор, пока Византия оставалась законным владельцем региона, Хетумиды выступали на её стороне против менее законопослушных Рубенидов. Но как такое представление соотносится с тем фактом, что сами Хетумиды впоследствии стали преемниками Рубенидов в Киликии? Не подрывает ли это легитимность их собственной власти в регионе? Всестороннее исследование дает на этот важный вопрос отрицательный ответ. Ведь в историографической парадигме, разработанной при дворе Хетумидов, подчеркивалось, что Торос II впоследствии стал законным правителем региона. Эта эволюция произошла не только по воле Бога, но и самого императора, который передал Торосу II Киликию во владение. Таким образом, Хетумиды стали преемниками Рубенидов после того, как их власть была легитимирована как Богом, так и бывшим законным владельцем региона – василевсом, что и было окончательно утверждено отправкой византийской короны первому царю из рода Рубенидов.