Cyrill TOUMANOFF

ON THE DATE OF PSEUDO-MOSES OF CHORENE

For over half a century the true date of the composition of the great work on the Armenian antiquities, which goes under the name of Moses of Chorene's (Movsēs Xorenac'i's) *History of Armenia*, has taxed the ingenuity of scholars. The author of this work actually supplies his readers with broad hints which make it possible to place his *floruit* in the second half of the fifth century [1] and which were once accepted at their face value by traditional historiography; but this has been found unacceptable by the overwhelming majority of modern specialists. Accordingly, the author, who thus appears to have been something of a deliberate mystifier, has come to be known as Pseudo-Moses. As to the true date of his activity, scholarly opinions vary. Broadly speaking there are three groups of theories on this subject: some ascribe this History to the seventh century [2], others to the eighth [3], and still others to the ninth [4]. These divergent views, and their mutual exclusion, were recently held up to irony by a Soviet Armenian savant, who reverted to the traditional date [5]; and he has been seconded in this by another authority [6]. While pointing out, quite justly, the mutually cancelling divergencies of modern scholars when dealing with the question of when Pseudo-Moses wrote, the two Soviet Armenian authorities seem to overlook the fact of the solid agreement of all of them as to when Pseudo-Moses could *not* have been writing, that is, in the fifth century. The best among the arguments against the traditional dating of Pseudo-Moses appear to me to be the following. (1) In 1. 14, Pseudo-Moses projects into a remote past the division of western Armenia and some neighbouring lands into First, Second, Third, and Fourth

---

[1] Ps. Moses, 3. 61, 62, 68. — Cf. M. Abelyan, *Istorija drevnearmjanskoj literatury*, I (Erevan, 1948), 198—199, 207.

[2] E. g., A. Zaminean, *Hay grakan patmut'iwn* (Nakhichevan, 1914), p. 110; F. C. Conybeare, s. v. "Moses of Chorene" (signed also by A. v. Gutschmid [† 1887], *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. (1911) [between 634 and 642: this appears to be the author's definitive opinion]; L. Melikset-Bek, "Xazary po drevnearmjanskim istočnikam v svjazi s problemoj Moiseja Xorenskogo", *Issledovanija po istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka: Sbornik v čest' Akademika I. A. Orbeli* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1960), pp. 112—118 [this author's latest; cf. *infra*, n. 10].

[3] E. g., Carrière, *Nouvelles sources de Moïse de Khoren: Etudes critiques* (Vienna, 1893); *idem*, *Nouvelles sources de Moïse de Khoren: Supplément* (Vienna, 1894); G. Xalat'eanc', *Armjanskij ėpos v "Istorii Armenii" Moiseja Xorenskago* (Moscow, 1903); G. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean, "Xorenac'woy žamanakĕ orošelu nor p'orj", *Ararat* (1897) [after the end of the seventh century]; N. Akinean, *Ļewond Erec' ew Movses Xorenac'i* (Vienna, 1930); *idem*, s. v. "Moses Chorenaçi", *Real-Encycl. d. cl. Alt.*, Suppl.-bd. 6 (1935), col. 534—541 [Pseudo-Moses is identical with Ļewond, c. 800]; N. Adontz, "Sur la date de l'Histoire de l'Arménie de Moïse de Chorène: A propos de l'article de M. Hans Lewy", *Byzantion*, 11 (1936), 97—100; *idem*, "A propos de la note de M. Lewy sur Moïse de Chorène", *Byzantion*, 11, 597—599 [between the last quarter of the eigth century and 826]; S. J̌anašia, "K kritike Moiseja Xorenskogo", *Masalebi Sak'art'velos da Kavkasiis istoriisat'vis*, 6 (1937) 473—503 [not before the eighth century].

[4] E. g., K. Mlaker, "Zur Geschichte des Ps. Moses Chorenatsi", *Armeniaca*, 2 (1927); *idem*, "Die Datierung der Geschichte des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i", *Wiener Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes*, 42 (1935), 267—286 [second half of the ninth century]; J. Markwart, "Die Genealogie der Bagratiden und das Zeitalter des Mar Abas und Ps. Moses Xorenac'i", *Caucasica*, 6 (1930) [second half of the ninth century]; H. Manandyan, *Xorenac'u aṙeļcvaci lucumē* (Erevan, 1934 [second half of the ninth century]; H. Lewy, "The date and Purpose of Moses of Chorene's History", *Byzantion*, 11, 87—96; *idem*, "Additional Note on the Date of Moses of Chorene", *Byzantion*, 11, 593—596 [between 876 and 885].

[5] S. Malxasyanc', *Xorenac'u aṙeļcvaci šurǰe* (Erevan, 1940).

[6] Abelyan, *Istorija*, p. 198—209.

Armenia, which division was instituted by the Emperor Justinian I in 536 [7]. — (2) In 3. 18, he speaks of the Iranians' penetrating as far as Bithynia in the course of a war on the Empire. This occured, for the first time in history, in the war of 604—629 [8]. — (3) In 3.46, allusion is made to the institution, following the death of Arsaces III (c. 390), of the office of presiding prince (*aṙaǰnordēr naxararac'n*), along with that of *comes Armeniae (komēss išxans)* in the provinces fallen under Imperial control. This can only be a reminiscence of the situation which resulted from Heraclius I's victory over Iran in 629. — (4) In 2.65, he refers to the Khazars (as at the time of the mythical King Valarsaces), which no Armenian source does prior to the Geography of Ananias of Siracene, of the end of the seventh century, once ascribed to the same Pseudo-Moses [9]. At the beginning of that century, Sebēos does not mention the Khazars by name [10]. — (5) He makes use, in 2.62, of "Vaspurakan", to designate the territory east of lake Van; this territory, however, came to be so designated only after the partition of Armenia in 591 [11]. Sebēos, in the early seventh century, does not yet know this term as a toponym, but uses *vaspurakan* adjectivally as an "elevated" equivalent of "Iranian", and, thus, also to designate the territory in question, which in 591 remained in the Iranian sphere [12]. It is only in the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*, compiled c. 700 and reaching us in a Greek rendering, that Vaspurakan first appears as Pseudo-Moses uses it [13]. — (6) He uses the term "Sisakan" to designate the province of Siunia (Siwnik'), in 1.12. Now this term makes its earliest appearance in the Syriac chronicle of Zacharias Rhetor (554) [14]; but the earliest Armenian use of it is found in the Geography of Ananias of Siracene. What is important, however, is that in this source Sisakan is not yet treated as synonymous with Siunia, but as the name of a canton in the neighbouring province of Arc'ax. It is only n the tenth-century History of the Katholikos John VI that this term has the same sense as in Pseudo-Moses [16]. — (7) For him, his dislike of the Mamikonids is a corollary of his devotion to the Bagratids. This can only have been an outcome of the dynastic policies of the two houses as they were shaped after the mid-eighth century [17]. — (8) The work of Pseudo-Moses is, as has been noted, an antiquarian's production — one is tempted to suspect him of emulating the *Antiquities* of Josephus on which he often draws — and his attention is focussed on the creative minority of Great Armenia, especially of the Arsacid and post-Arsacid phase, — its class of dynastic princes. His treatment of the Armenian princely nobility, however, is strikingly anachronistic. It is marked by an obvious archaeologism as well as by an *étatiste* misapprehen-

---

[7] Adontz, *Armenija v ėpoxu Justiniana* (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 203; Conybeare, *Moses of Chorene*, col. 898, n. l.

[8] Conybeare, *loc. cit.*

[9] For this work, see, e. g., Abelyan, *Istorija*, p. 232. For Manandyan's divergent view, see "Kogda i kem byla sostavlena 'Armjanskaja Geografija' pripisyvaemaja Moiseju Xorenskomu", *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 1/26 (1947), 127—143.

[10] Melikset-Bek, *Xazary* (*supra*, n. 2). The author's intention seems to be less to prove Ps. Moses's belonging to the seventh century than to show that no Armenian source of unquestioned dating prior to Ananias knows the Khazars. He does not altogether exclude the possibility of an interpolation; but the presence of the other anachronisms makes this possibility extremely unlikely. — Sebēos, who does not use the term "Khazar", nevertheless refers to the "great Xak'an of the North": *History of Heraclius*, 18 (ed. Tiflis, 1913, pp. 104, 106), 19 (pp. 108, 109). The recent theory of G. Abgaryan (in *Banber Matendarani*, 4 [1958], 61—72) that the author of this History is not Sebēos, but Xosrovik, likewise of the seventh century, has no bearing on the problem at hand.

[11] Adontz, *Armenija*, pp. 230—234.

[12] *Hist. Heracl.*, 3 (p. 40); in 6 (pp. 76, 77), *vaspurakan* is an unmistakable synonym of "Iranian". Cf. Adontz, p. 232; G. Garitte, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae: Edition critique et commentaire (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, 132; Subsidia, 4, Louvain, 1952), p. 244.

[13] *Narratio*, 103 (ed. Garitte [*supra*, n. 12], p. 40): *τῆς Ἀσπουρακὰν χώρας*. For the date of this source, see Garitte, *La Narratio*, pp. 382—400.

[14] Adontz, *Armenija*, p. 421, n. 3.

[15] *Ašxarhac'oyc' Movsesi Xorenac'woy* (ed. Venice, 1881), p. 33.

[16] *History of Armenia* (ed. Tiflis, 1912), pp. 135, 230, 245, 303, 307.

[17] Adontz, *Sur la date*, p. 99; Akinean, *Moses Chorenaçi*, col. 536.

© National Library of Armenia

sion of the dynasticist nature of that social group [18]. This suggests that the Armenian Antiquities of Pseudo-Moses could hardly have been written before that group began losing its vigour and, what is more, its actuality, and so could attract antiquarian interest: before, that is, the ushering in, in the mid-eighth century, of the Abbasid-Bagratid phase [19].

The cumulative effect of the above arguments points to the mid-eighth century as the *terminus a quo* of Pseudo-Moses. In accepting it we must part company with those who would assign him to the seventh century; what follows now will contradict the advocates of the ninth century as well [20]. It is well known that he wrote with a view to extolling one particular princely dynasty, among all the others, of Armenia: that of the Bagratids; and in so doing he devised for his patrons a new version of their origin, their Hebrew descent. And it is in connexion with this genealogical theory that the *terminus ad quem* of Pseudo-Moses can I think, be determined.

It has been shown that the Bagratids, an Orontid branch, along with some other Orontids, abandoned, following the conversion of Armenia to Christianity, the ancient Orontid claim to a divine origin, retaining the vaguer and milder claim, evolved from it but less objectionable in a Christian society, of a descent from the mythic primogenitor of the Armenians, Hayk. Hayk, though originally, too, a divine hero of Armenian paganism, had meantime been transformed into a legendary giant-hero whose filiation was attached to the biblical genealogies [21]. But with Pseudo-Moses an entirely new version of the Bagratid origin makes its appearance: the version of their Hebrew descent. Markwart has shown, to my mind convincingly, how, in correlating a name found in Josephus with the historical memory of the Armenians about Bagadates, Tigranes the Great's general and viceroy in Syria, Pseudo-Moses evolved this new theory [22]. Even if Markwart's explanation be deemed unconvincing, the fact must nevertheless be recognized that no earlier Armenian source knows anything about the Hebrew claims of the Bagratids. So, if not *by* Pseudo-Moses, this theory must have developed *at the time* of Pseudo-Moses and he at least must have put it in its earliest known literary form. Early on, this theory underwent an important modification. It was transformed into a tradition of such magnificence as outshone the genealogical *chimères* of other houses, — the pretension of the Mamikonids to the imperial Chinese, or of the Arcrunis to the royal Assyrian, descent. This latest Bagratid claim was one to be descended from King David the Prophet of Israel, the ancestor of Our Lord and of Our Lady, the descendant in an unbroken line from Adam, and the archetype of kings. This implied that the Bagratids were not only the most ancient and, as it were, the most authentic dynasty in the world, but, moreover, kinsmen of Our Lord and His Mother. This new version arose and developed, however, not among the Armenian Bagratids, but among their Iberian cusins. The Iberian (East Georgian) line of

[18] For this class, see, e. g., Toumanoff, "Introduction to Christian Caucasian History: The Formative Centuries (IVth—VIIIth)", *Traditio*, 15 (1959); "Introduction, etc., II: States and Dynasties of the Formative Period", *Traditio*, 17 (1961).

[19] Adontz, *Armenija*, pp. 237—238, 489; Toumanoff, *Introduction*, pp. 56—58. — If Markwart's identification (in *Genealogie* [*supra*, n. 4]) of one of Ps. Moses's alleged sources, Marabas Katina, with 'Abbās Mār Ya'qob, Bishop of Edessa († 708) be accepted — and there seems to be no reason for not accepting it — then this prelate's death-date must also be regarded as anterior to the *floruit* of Ps. Moses. In establishing the *terminus a quo* in question, all reference to Ps. Moses's connexion with the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates, the Life of St. Sylvester, and the chronicle of Malalas has been deliberately avoided. This connexion has been used by both the old antagonists and the modern proponents of the fifth century: cf. Abełyan, *Istorija*, p. 203—209. As can be seen, it is not essential to our problem. Nor is it proposed to enter here into the problem of the identity of Ps. Moses with Łewond, posed by Fr. Akinean (*supra*, n. 3).

[20] This has already been touched upon in passing in the present writer's "A Note on the Orontids" II, *Le Muséon*, 73 (1960), 101—102.

[21] Toumanoff, "A Note on the Orontids" I, *Le Muséon* 72 (1959), 1—36; — II, 13—106; *idem*, *Introduction*, pp. 55—56.

[22] *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 428—430; Toumanoff, *Orontids* II, p. 99.

the dynasty stemmed from Atrnerseh, or in Georgian Adarnase, son of Vasak and grandson of Ašot III the Blind († 761), Presiding Prince of Armenia. Following the defeat of the Armenian insurrection against the Caliphate in 772 Adarnase removed to Iberia thus founding this line [23]. The Georgian sources, at any rate, are the first to mention the Davidic descent of the Bagratids. The earliest reference is in J̌uanšer's *History of King Vaxtang Gorgasal*, written between c. 790 and c. 800 [24], where is related the arrival in Iberia of the above Adarnase, "who was of the House of David the Prophet" [25]. Next comes the stone effigy in low relief of Adarnase's son, the Curopalate Ašot I the Great († 830) [26], from the church of Opiza, in Šavšet'i, which represents him in an act of offering a model of that church to Our Lord, seated upon a throne, blessing Ašot, and accompanied by the King-Prophet, represented in an attitude of prayer and identifiable by the ecclesiastical majuscules CDVT' *(Cinascarmetqueli Da-ViT'* = "the Prophet David") [27]. Here the allusion to the donor's descent from Our Lord's ancestor and to the latter's intercession is unmistakable. The Life of St. Gregory of Xanjt'a, written in 950/951 by George Merč'ule [28], is next to refer, in Chapter 11, to the tradition of the Davidic origin as extant at the time of the Curopalate Ašot the Great. Finally, the *Chronicle of Iberia*, compiled in the eleventh century, mentions this tradition as existing at the time of Ašot's father Adarnase [29]. From the latter source and from J̌uanšer, it appears that the claim was not, in the days of Adarnase, as yet widely known [30]: this would suggest that it had just then come into being. Among the Armenian writers, the Davidic theory is first found in the History of the Katholikos John († 931) [31]; soon thereafter, it was referred to in the *De administrando imperio* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus († 959) [32]. The latter's reference definitely betrays its Iberian provenance [33]. The complete and most elaborate shape was given to this theory by the Georgian historian Sumbat (c. 1030) in his *History of the Bagratids* [34].

The two lines of the Bagratid dynasty, Armenian and Iberian, were, as is well known, long united by close ties of dynastic and political co-operation: Christian Caucasia thus

[23] Cf. Toumanoff, "The Early Bagratids: Remarks in Connexion with Some Recent Publications", *Le Muséon*, 62 (1949), 21—54; *idem*, "Iberia on the Eve of Bagratid Rule: An Enquiry into the Political History of Eastern Georgia between the VIth and the IXth Century", *Le Muséon*, 65 (1952), 17—49, 199—258; *idem*, *Orontids* I, II; *idem*, "The Bagratids of Iberia from the Eighth to the Eleventh Century", *Le Muséon*, 74 (1961), 5, 10.

[24] This work is often ascribed to the eleventh century; for the date here adopted, see Toumanoff, *Bagratids of Iberia*, II, n. 113.

[25] J̌uanšer (ed. S. Qauxč'išvili, *K'art'lis C'xovreba*, I, Tiflis, 1955), p. 243; cf. Toumanoff, *Early Bagratids*, p. 44, and *Iberia*, p. 224.

[26] For the date of his death, see Toumanoff, "Chronology of the Kings of Abasgia and Other Problems", *Le Muséon*, 69 (1956), 83—85.

[27] Š. Amiranašvili, *Istorija gruzinskogo iskusstva*, I (Moscow, 1950), 212—213 and Table 111. Ašot is here identifiable by an inscription. In another inscription from the same church, he is qualified as "the second builder" of it: N. Marr, *Dnevnik pojezdki v Šavšetiju i Klardžetiju (Teksty i Razyskanija po armjano-gruzinskoj filologii*, 7, St. Petersburg, 1911), p. 163. He must be so called because, according to J̌uanšer, p. 178, the original builder of the monastery of Opiza was Artavaz, Duke of Cholarzene, *temp.* Vaxtang I Gorgasal (late fifth century). In the *Chronicle of Iberia* (infra, n. 29), p. 260, it is Ašot's youngest son Guaram who is called "the second builder" of Opiza: doubtless as the second among the Bagratids, after his father.

[28] M. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur (Studi e Testi*, 185, Vatican City, 1955), p. 105; P. Ingoroqva, *Giorgi Merč'ule, k'art'veli mcerali meat'e saukunisa* (Tiflis, 1954), pp. 7—10.

[29] *Chron. Iber.* (ed. Qauxč'išvili, *K'art'lis C'xovreba*, I), p. 243; cf. Toumanoff, *Iberia*, pp. 224—225.

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 227—228; *Early Bagratids*, p. 44, n. 37 (erroneously: 38).

[31] *Hist. Arm.*, 8 (p. 25).

[32] Cap. 45.

[33] In its avoidance of all mention of the Armenian past of the Iberian Bagratids; this tendency reached its complete expression in Sumbat (*infra*, n. 34).

[34] Toumanoff, "Medieval Georgian Historical Literature", *Traditio*, 1 (1943), 154—156; *idem*, *Iberia*, Excursus B, esp. 244—252. (The line omitted at the bottom of p. 251 is found in the *corrigenda*, in "More on Iberia", *Le Muséon*, 66 [1953], 104).

© National Library of Armenia

becoming largely a sort of pan-Bagratid empire [35]. In view of these ties between them, it would have been hardly possible for the new genealogical theory of the Iberian Bagratids to remain unknown to their Armenian cousins, or to the latter's historiographer; and Markwart is undoubtedly right in observing that, had Pseudo-Moses been aware of the Iberian transformation of the Hebrew version, he would not have missed the opportunity of further glorifying his patrons by ascribing to them the Davidic ancestry [36]. Markwart has been able to square this observation with his belief that Pseudo-Moses wrote in the latter part of the ninth century, only because of his confidence that the Iberian Davidic version was formulated, under the influence of Pseudo-Moses, in the ninth-tenth century [37]. But as we now know, the beginnings of the Iberian version, of necessity a derivative of the Hebrew theory set forth by Pseudo-Moses, can be traced back to the eighth century.

The arguments used by Markwart to demonstrate Pseudo-Moses's belonging to the ninth century need not detain us long. They combine conclusions drawn from certain toponymical data with a search for hidden allusions in Pseudo-Moses's historical account to be revealed in the historical context of ninth-century Armenia; and they purport to leave no doubt that our author was writing on behalf of Ašot V Bagratuni († 890), Prince of Princes (from *c.* 862) and later, in 885, King (Ašot I) of Armenia [38]. With the toponymical argument, I have had occasion to deal elsewhere, and I trust to have shown that it is quite inconclusive, not to say groundless [39]. It would take us too far afield to go into this matter here. But, so far as chronology is concerned, even if one were to persist in the old view which placed J̌uanšer in the eleventh century and to reject, accordingly, his testimony, as well as that of the *Chronicle of Iberia* and of George Merč'ule, as not being contemporary accounts of eighth-century events, there would nevertheless still remain the fact of the Opiza relief made under the Curopalate Ašot I of Iberia (813—830), in other words, a witness of the beginning of the ninth century. It is interesting to note, too, that Ašot of Iberia died more than thirty years before the accession of Ašot of Armenia. There can, however, be no valid reason for discounting the above several mutually corroborating data of the Georgian sources. With this, the rise of the Davidic theory — and this is the *terminus ad quem* of Pseudo-Moses — appears to date from the end of the eighth century, or, at the very latest, the beginning of the ninth. The latter part of the eighth century must, accordingly, be regarded as the epoch of the mysterious author of the Armenian Antiquities.

[35] The genealogical aspect of this dynastic collaboration is treated in Toumanoff, *Bagratids of Iberia*, I; the historical aspect in M. Brosset, *Histoire des Bagratides géorgiens, d'après les auteurs arméniens et grecs, jusqu'au commencement du XIe siècle*, in the 9th of the *Additions et éclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Géorgie* (St. Petersburg, 1851), and, with some errors, in Sir S. Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign* (Cambridge, 1929), cap. 8.

[36] *Genealogie*, p. 67.

[37] *Streifzüge*, pp. 402—403 (not before the end of the ninth century), 428—430.

[38] *Genealogie*, pp. 47—59.

[39] *Orontids* II.

M. A. v. d. OUDENRIJN O. P.

TEXTE ZUR GESCHICHTE DER VEREHRUNG DES HL. GREGOR DES ERLEUCHTERS

und der hl. Hrip'simeank' bei den ostarmenischen Unitoren, bei den latinisierten Kilikiern und in Süditalien

Verzeichnis der wichtigsten Handschriften

A. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Ms Armén. 105. Unitorenbrevier des 14. Jh.
B. London, Brit. Museum „Add. 16, 408". Unitorenbrevier des 14./15. Jh.
C. Venedig, Bibl. Marciana Cod. Orient. 50. Armenisches Dominikanerbrevier des 18. Jh.
D. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Ms Armén. 108. Diurnum der Unitoren, Anfang des 15. Jh.
E. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Ms Armén. 106 Meßbuch der Unitoren. 14./15. Jh.
F. Florenz, Bibl. Laurentiana „Plut. I Cod. 13". Missale des Franziskaners Fr. Pontius zum Gebrauch der Kilikier und der Armenischen Diaspora in Italien, geschrieben 1353. Es existiert davon auch eine Replica aus dem Jahre 1358 in der Bibl. Ambrosiana von Mailand, „T 58 P I Sup".
P. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Ms Armén. 107, Missale des Fr. Pontius, geschrieben im Jahre 1381.
R. Rimini, Bibl. Gambalunghiana. „D IV 207". Missale des Fr. Pontius, erste Hälfte des 15. Jh.
Y. Sankt Florian „Cod XI 464", Meßbuch des Priesters Jakob Sargis, geschrieben 1391.

I

Seinerzeit haben wir[1] hingewiesen auf gewisse einheimisch-armenische Elemente in den liturgischen Büchern der Unitoren und namentlich in ihrem Brevieroffizium des hl. Erleuchters. Hier geben wir deshalb zunächst den Wortlaut dieses Offiziums, mit den bereits damals angedeuteten Entlehnungen aus dem Agathangelosbuch, dem Hymnus „*Ա՛յսօր գուարճա-ցեա՛լ*" usw.

A, fol. 521*a*:

ԿԱՆՈՆ ԵՐԱՆԵԼԻՈՅՆ(1) ԳՐԻԳՈՐԻ(2)
ՀԱՅՈՑ(3) ԼՈՒՍԱՒՈՐՉԻՆ

Յառաջիկ յերեկոյին(4)

Սաղմոս. *Աւրհնեցէ՛ք մ[անկուն]ք*(5)

Ի վերա սաղմոսացն(6) կցուրդ·

Ի փշաբեր (7) *արմատոյ*(8) *վարդ*(9) *կամբրիփեան*(10) *ծաղկեալ առաքելաչէնորհ ակր Գրի*[fol. 521*b*]*գորիոս անուշահոտ բուրմամբ եւից*(11) *պՀատատան*(12) *աչխարհս:*

Գլուխ·

Սիրեցեալ(13) *յԱստուծոյ, եւն:*

Պատասխանի·

Հայատատանեաց հայր հաւատոց(14), *եւն:*

(1) B. *երանելոյն*, D. *սուրբ*, (2) BD. *Գրիգորի*, (3) B. *Հայոց*, D. *om*, (4) A. *առաջին վէսպրն*, (5) B. *մանկունք*, (6) D. *om*, *յառաջին... սաղմոսացն*, (7) B. *փշաբար*, (8) A. *արմատոյ*, (9) B. *վարդի*, (10) B. *կամբրիբրիեան*, (11) B. *հւից*, (12) B. *պՀայաստան*, (13) B. *սիրեցեալն*, (14) A. *հոգեւոր?*, B. *om*, *հայր հաւատոց*, C. *in magine. Հայատատանեաց հայր հաւատոց հըղնկ* (sic) *ընտրեալ ճգն[ոպական]:*

երգ·

[Ա]յսօր(1) *գուարճացեալ*(2) *ցնծա՛ եկեղեցի պրախա*(3) *աստուածատունկ ծաղկեալ յորմէ աուտաւ*(4) *մեղ*(5) *տունկն*(6) *անմահ Հուքեան ակր Գրիգորիոս*(7) *եւ պաղովն*(8) *իւրով եւից*(9) *զաիեզերս*(10) *ամենայն:*

[1] *Handes Amsorya* 62, 1948, 381—387.

© National Library of Armenia