

ALBERT STEPANYAN

*Prof., Doctor of History
Head of the Department of World History
Yerevan State University,
bertstepanyan48@gmail.com*

ON INTERPRETATION OF A FRAGMENT

BY MOSES KHORENATSI

(History of the Armenians, III, 34, 2-24)

Abstract

The article deals with the events of **Pap's ascendance** to the throne related by **Moses Khorenatsi**. The description of the **Dzirav combat** (370), which paved his way to royal dignity, makes the main focus of the investigation. In my interpretation, the combat was patterned after the **Panarmenian Assembly** (**Ašxar-hažoxov**) which used to be held in the same site – Bagrewand district, Bagawan village, Npat Mount – where the memory of the old Zoroastrian gods was still vivid. The **mythological perspective** of Navasard Assembly gives reason for assessing Pap's first steps as efforts to establish **social unanimity and peace** after the turmoil of the reign of his father, Arshak II.

Introduction

This is an attempt of hypertextual interpretation of the text by Moses Khorenatsi concerning the events of the prince Pap's ascendance to his ancestral throne. His reign and reforms (370-374) have yet not found authentic estimation in primary sources. The estimations are polar making his image as enigmatic as attractive. On the one hand, he is depicted as the personification of evil since he oppressed the Church. On the other hand, he is represented as an active and brave ruler whose reforms were the last effective efforts to prevent the decline and downfall of the Armenian Arsacids. The first approach goes back to the Armenian historical tradition – P'awstos Buzand, Moses Khorenatsi [Buz., IV, 44, 162-163, V, 22, 219; Khor., III, 38, 5]¹. As to the second approach, it proceeds from the records of Ammianus Marcellinus [Amm. Marc., XXX, 7, 12]².

¹ Քարապաշեան, 122-124.

² By the words of the author, the young prince was "et doli iam prudens". And on occasion of his treacherous assassination by the Romans, compares him with Pyrrhus and Sertorius, the heroes of *old time justice*. [Amm. Marc. XXX, 20-23]. Cf. **Asdourian**, 161.

In its absolute expression, the negative approach puts under suspicion the legitimacy of Pap's reign from the point of view of divine and human justice: "His mother gave birth to him. And since she was a lawless creation and did not know God's fear, devoted him to *dēvas*. Many of them dwelt in the child and led him according to their [evil] will" [Buz., IV, 44, 3]. In response to this, an official concept was worked out the main features of which are traceable in the text of Moses Khorenatsi. The said concerns first of all the fragment of the combat against the Iranian army which took place in 371, in the Valley of Dsirav, near the sacred Npat Mount. The historical and esoteric interpretation of this event makes up the matter of my present investigation. For this purpose, besides the Armenian sources, I have used the data of the comparative mythology and the works of ancient authors as well. For the last case, I mean the accounts of C. Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus.

Historical Background.

Pap was the only offspring of the king Arshak II and queen P'arandzem. Arshak's reign was marked with both glorious and tragic events.

The social model of Great Armenia, based on the predominance of royal authority and central state administration, was en route of losing its resources. It was introduced centuries ago by the reforms of Artaxias I (189-160 B.C.) and went back to the Hellenistic state theory and experience³. Tiridates III (298-330) tried to empower this model with new vital impulses using the authority of the Christian Church⁴. However, neither the king nor his successors succeeded reaching this end. Separatism of the Armenian dynasts (*nacarars*) gradually took the upper hand. Their power was based on hereditary domains and offices, subject peasantry and military contingent⁵. They competed for privileges, high ranks, and wealth and looked frequently to Rome or Sasanian Iran for support. As to the super-states, they took this opportunity for interfering in the domestic affairs of Great Armenia⁶.

This process came to its heights in the days of Arshak II (350-368). The scholars agree that the first years of his reign were marked with social order and peace. The king ruled intending to keep balance of forces both in domestic and foreign policy. He acted in accordance with Saint Nerses, the archbishop of the Armenian Church. By their efforts, in 354, in Ashtishat village of Taron province, a council of *bishops in concert with the laity* was held to establish new modes of communal relations. By canonical regulation, it "[...] established mercy extirpating the root of inhumanity, which was natural custom of our land" [Khor., III, 20,4]. It institutionalized the care for the sick, the aged and

³ See in detail Stepanyan, 2012, 41-48.

⁴ Garsoïan, 1997, 80-86; Mahé, 79-81.

⁵ Adoniz, 165-182, Manandyan, 68 -75, 311- 315; Toumanoff, 114 -119.

⁶ Dignas, Winter, 179-188.

the poor, strangers and orphans. For this purpose, numerous hospitals, inns, hospices were built with stable sources of income. Besides, the council abolished some *heathen customs* from the princely families. But more typical was the article containing exhortations to lords and servants. To the lords: “[...] to show mercy to their servants, and their inferiors, and their followers, to love them like the members of their own families, and not to oppress them unjustly with exorbitant taxes, remembering that they too had a Lord in heaven” [Buz., IV, 4, 45]. As to servants, he ordered them: “[...] to be obediently faithful to their masters so that they might receive a reward from the Lord” [Buz., IV, 4, 46]⁷. And Moses was inclined to believe that: “Thenceforth one could see that our country was not like uncivilized barbarians but like a well-mannered civilized nation” [Khor., III, 20,13]⁸.

It seemed also that the king Arshak found the way of prosperity combining the interests of different social groups, estates and classes and turn his realm “[...] into the likeness of an universal order of solitariry-communities” [Buz., IV, 4, 84]. For this purpose, he acted, however, not only by persuasion, but used compulsory methods, too. Under the sparapet (commander-in-chief) Vasak Mamikonean, the army took control over all Great Armenia and prevented or suppressed the attempts of mutiny of separatists. In this regard at the court, a group of nobles became influential who believed in possibility of solution of all the problems of the country by means of good administration. The leading figure of this faction was Glak Hayr Mardpet, the highest eunuch and the supervisor of the royal treasures and estates⁹.

Proceeding from this idea, Arshak II worked out his *retro-Hellenistic* program desiring to restore the Hellenistic state model which endowed the king with absolute authority over the realm¹⁰. Particularly, it meant recognition of his person as the supreme landholder of Greater Armenia by the *right of weapon* (cw~ra dorivkteto§). On the same ground, it promised to restore his image of the source of right and justice (novmo§ e[myuco§]¹¹.

Mosēs Khorenatsi puts the following formula in the mouth of the Parthian king Arshak the Brave which, seems, expresses just this right of Hellenistic kings: “For the frontiers of the brave [...] are their weapons: as much they cut,

⁷ Օրմանեան, 186-192.

⁸ In this and like definitions of Mosēs, the scholars trace one of the basic ideas of the national ideology of the Armenians. See Zekiyan, 472-474.

⁹ See in detail Markwart, 58-70. Attracting the feelings of the separatists, *Buzandaran* depicts Glak with extremely negative colors [Buz., V, 3, 196].

¹⁰ Մանթաշյան, 2009, 25-31.

¹¹ Chaniotis, 57-62.

that much they hold (q̄h uuhmānp̄ p̄wəwəg [...] q̄l̄n̄n̄ h̄r̄k̄n̄g, n̄rp̄w̄n̄ h̄w̄t̄w̄n̄l̄ ʿ ujp̄w̄n̄ n̄l̄n̄h̄)” [Khor., I,8,4]¹².

With a view to bring about this retro-Hellenistic program, Arshak II made his first (and the most resolute) step by founding a new royal city. It was situated in the province Kogovit, on the southern slopes of Mount Ararat. And it bore the king's name – Arshakawan. Both Buzand and Moses record about this event from the view-point of the Armenian dynasts and represent the newdwellers as trustees, debtors, slaves, delinquents, thieves, murders, divorced men, shedders of blood, liars etc [Buz., IV,12 116, ; Khor., III, 27,4].

However, other information is also traceable in the texts of the both authors. It concerns the Hellenistic experience of founding cities which used Arshak II. I mean *synoicism* – the settling of inhabitants from various places in the same site and forming a new city community (polivteuma)¹³. Endowed with absolute creative power, the king directed the process using his material and human resources. From this point of view, the account of Buzand seems more exact: “It was around that time that the king built himself a dastakert in the designed valley of Kog. And he ordered a royal edict proclaimed in every district of his dominion and announced on every public square in his realm, and filled all the regions and districts with the royal proclamation: “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, 116].

In other words, Arshak II proclaimed his absolute right over Greater Armenia. He stated also the freedom of everyone to follow the royal prescriptions. Obviously, this retro-Hellenistic program was utopic since times had changed irreversibly. Now, it was the time of hereditary magnates, who saw in the king's actions a great danger for their power and prestige. So, they united their efforts and made their best to stop the king. As to the Church, it shared the position of the magnats. It refused recognizing king's absolute power and reputation from the point of view of Christian canon and axiology. According to them, the king was one of numerous subjects of the Omnipotent God unable to pretend to the role of the *revealed god* (ejpifanhv§)¹⁴. Common for the king's royal ancestors this title was now assessed to be inherent only to Christ¹⁵. On this ground, the early Armenian authors bear witnesses about the competition (sometimes even rivalry) between the royal and church authorities.

¹² Thomson finds it to be a rather correct quotation from Theonis Progymnasmata. See **Moses Khorenatsi**, *History of the Armenians*, 82, n. 5.

¹³ On many-sided relations of Hellenistic kings with cities see **Ehrenberg**, 191-205; **Strooman**, 148-150.

¹⁴ This title was usually associated with the titles *bevefactor* (εὐεργετής) and *savior* (σωτήρ). About these and other homogeneous titles see **Goodenough**, 57-75; **Gruen**, 7-24.

¹⁵ Despite this *Armenian austerity*, the process of divinization of royal authority was en route both in Christian Rome and Sasanian Iran. See **Canepa**, 100-103; **Daryee**, 2008, 63-67.

It started already in the days of Tiridates III and Gregory the Illuminator. Their well-known dispute on supreme authority is thought to be the best display of the said. According to Agathangelos, it took place before the Armenian conversion to Christianity. The scene of it was the temple of the goddess Anahit, in the village Yerez of the province Aclisene. In response to the pagan king's claim for absolute power, Gregory stressed: "I [served you] looking for no reward from you, but for the reward of God, whom belong all the visible and invisible creations" [Agath., V,12]¹⁶.

In its conflict with Arshak II, the Church finally took the side of the magnates who looked for support either of Iran or Rome¹⁷. The king's efforts for balancing these opposite poles were fruitless. The policy of Tiridates III to meet the interests of all sides (both...and) was now unreal¹⁸. The contradictions were implacable. And it became more obvious on the background of the new aggravation of the relations of the two super-states.

It began at the end of 350-s. In 359, Shapur II invaded North Mesopotamia and captured Amida, the important military and economic center¹⁹. He devastated the southern and south-western regions of Great Armenia, as well. After that, he took Tigranocerta and Ani of Daranalia²⁰. As a result, Great Armenia was drawn into a long war on the side of Rome. The war came to its heights under Julian the Apostate (361-363) who even reached the vicinity of Ctesiphon, but was routed and killed²¹. The new Roman emperor Jovian signed a treaty with Shapur which Ammianus calls *ignominious*²². He surrendered to the enemy all the lands obtained by Diocletian including Nisibis and Sangara. The article of the treaty, by which the Roman side pledged to refrain from supporting them, was disastrous for the Armenians: "To these conditions there was added another, which was destructive and impious, namely, that after the completion of these agreements, Arsaces, our steadfast and faithful friend (*amico nobis semper et fido*) should never, if asked it, be given help against the Persians" [Amm., Mar., XXV, 7, 12]²³.

While these events took place, tension between the king Arshak and his opponents reached its apogee. Taking advantage of the difficult situation, the forces of magnates attacked Arshakawan, looted and killed its citizens. It was the tragic end of the retro-Hellenistic paradigm of social reformation. The magnates took the upper hand with a view to accomplish their own program

¹⁶ Calzolari, 53-57.

¹⁷ Asdourian, 160-161; Daryae, 2009, 19.

¹⁸ Մտնախախտում, 2009, 22.

¹⁹ Lenssen, 37-45.

²⁰ Eremyan, 92.

²¹ Jones, 567-568.

²² "Quo ignobili decreto firmanto, nequid committeretur per indutias contrarium pacis[...]" [Amm. Marc., XXV, 7, 13]. Cf. Asdourian, 153-154; Farrokh, 205-206.

²³ Mommsen, 409.

which demanded *limitation of the king's rights in favour of the hereditary dynasts*.

Soon, Shapur II waged war on Great Armenia (364-368), and that provided new opportunities for the magnates. The Shah reconized Mehrujan Arcruni the Armenian king, furnished him with an army to take on the throne and restore Zoroastrianism as the religion of the country. Many opposing magnates joined him. As to the king Arshak, he defended his case successfully with full support of sparapet Vasak Mamikonean. But the conflicting forces were unequal, and the king's adherents began to abandon him: "[...] 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, 141].

At last, the king remained alone with a circle of faithful friends and servants. Through his ambassadors Shapur invited Arshak to come and negotiate the terms of peace and friendship. Though he attested the proposal with sacred symbols, but he broke it afterwards. When Arshak II arrived to the camp of the Shah, he was detained and imprisoned in the Andəməš (Anhush) jail, where he died²⁴. The queen Parandzem tried to organize resistance of the patriotic forces but failed. She was besieged in the fortress Artages for a year and surrendered. However, she managed to send the young prince Pap to the Romans.

The new Roman emperor Valens, at first reluctantly, but later officially, supported the prince to assume his ancestral throne. The central event was the combat which took place in 371, in the valley of Dzirav, near St. Npat Mountain. The Armenian and Roman joint forces defeated the enemy. For the young prince, the victory paved the way to royal dignity²⁵.

1. Historical and esoteric semantics of Npat site and Panarmenian Assembly.

According to Buzand, the battle field was chosen by Pap: "And so, the Persian army came and raided into the Armenian Midlands. Then Pap king of Armenia likewise ordered the army assembled at Bagawan. And the Greek forces that were in Eřand and Bacišn came to king Pap and assembled together. And they dug a ditch around the camp near Mount Npat by the Ep'rat River, arrayed themselves and made ready for battle" [Buz., V,4,197].

This choice, apparently, was determined not only by military considerations. It had profound spiritual motivations as well. There was a religious and esoteric perception of geographic space of Great Armenia. And it ascribed an exceptional role to the Npat site in the *spiritual unity of the country*. Indeed, the Mount was situated in the district Bagrewand of Ayrarat

²⁴ About this jail see in detail Traina, 188-190.

²⁵ Երևույթ, 99-101; Garsounan, 1997, 86-87.

region. In vicinity of it, Bagawan was situated, the name of which “[...] translated from Pahlavi means *the village of gods* (Dicawan)” [Agath., 916, 2]. As to Bagrewand, the scholars etymologize it proceeding from the Av. *raēva* (rich), *raēvant* (possessing wealth). It expressed one of the basic concepts of the Zoroastrian axiology denoting spiritual and material opulence. Ahura Mazdā granted it to his true creatures endowing them with *xwarrah* (glory)²⁶. After the conversion to Christianity the site had not lost its significance, since it (and correspondingly the fest of Navasard) was devoted to the commemoration of the great prophet John [Buz., IV,15,126]. Later, a monument to Gregory the Illuminator was erected there [Łazar Parb., III, 76, 17].

The etymology of the toponym Npat/Nifavths sheds a new light to the said. Among its numerous interpretations, that which derives the toponym from Av. *nāfya* appears more probable. It is accepted to be the parallel to the Ved. *sapinda*, Gr. *ajgcisteĩs*, Lat. *agnatio* denoting *agnatic group*. As a rule, it comprised the descendants of the same patriarch (mid. Pers. *nāfapat* and Arm. *nahapet*) tied with strict responsibilities. With a view to the common ethnarch, the term could extend its borders to national entity²⁷.

The case is obvious in Great Armenia. The ancient Armenians believed themselves to be the descendants of the mighty hero Hayk²⁸. On this ground, they considered themselves as the members of the same patriarchal house – *յիւսիքային տոհմ*. This concept existed for centuries and initiated some important institutions of social organization of the Armenians²⁹. Among them, a particular role belonged to the Panarmenian Assembly (Ašxarhažoxov) held on the slopes of St. Npat Mount at the beginning of every year, in the month Navasard. It represented a ritualized action aimed at the renewal of macro-and-microcosms worn during the previous year. And it implied the comeback of its partisans to the *beginning of time and space*³⁰.

According to the comparative mythology, this text is archetypical with numerous variations. However, its core narrative is rather stable*. And the scholars define it as the *Creative Myth of Twins* well-attested in different mythological traditions³¹. They restore (certainly, only in general features) the syntax of the myth as follows: before everything, there existed the twins who

²⁶ Russell, 1985, 447-455.

²⁷ Perikhanian, 2008, 641-646.

²⁸ Petrosyan, 2009, 155-161.

²⁹ In Hellenistic political theory: “Idealtypisch verwaltete der König sein Reich wie ein Hausvater sein Haus (oikos)”. Heinen, 89-90.

³⁰ On the carnival structure and ideology of the Navasard Assembly see Степанян, 1991, 48-49.

* I am pleased to express gratitude to Prof. Armen Petrosyan whose advice on the twins' mythology was very useful for my interpretation of the Panarmenian Assembly.

³¹ Petrosyan, 2002, 14-22.

were destined to initiate the tripartite cosmos and human commonality³². Frequently, they were bestowed with opposite qualities. The bearer of positive qualities (strong, brave, wise and active) sacrificed his brother and from his body created the sun, stars, planets, waters, plants, animals etc³³. Thereafter, his creative activity concerned the social classes comprising the priests, warriors and commoners: "The action of sacrifice is thus seen to be one of expansions or amplifications, taking matter from the microcosm of victim's body, and expanding it to macrocosmic form and dimensions"³⁴. Best of all, this concept was incorporated in the deeds of Ved. Manu/Yama (Puruša), Old Pers. Manuš/Yima (Gayōmart), Rom. Romulus/Remus³⁵. It is also worth to notice that the killing of the second partner was replaced by the lowering of his social status in some (probably, later) traditions.

The primordial couples played important role in the Armenian mythology as well – Hayk/Bel, Sanasar/Baghdasar, David/Msra Melik etc. While Bel and Msra Melik were killed, Baghdasar stayed barren and left his homeland Sasun³⁶. It gave chance to Hayk, Sanasar, and David for putting foundation (or rebuilding) of the Armenian microcosm. In the frame of historical time and space, these heroes provided models of behavior for the kings: "Insofar as the king and the social hierarchy are alloforms of one another, when the one is created, it can only be from the other: the unity within the king is divided into the social classes, and the diversity of the classes merges into the king"³⁷.

In other words, the personality of the king was estimated to be the crosspoint of opposite qualities and intentions – unity and diversity of isomorphic macro-and-microcosms. For performing this role, he had to go through initiations. For the Armenian kings, the Navasard Assembly was of great importance. Records about it are fragmentary, but compiled together they demonstrate a rather standard syntax of ritual actions and world-view system. The said goes in full accordance with the modern Critical Social Theory recognizing "[...] the centrality of rules, practices, meaning, knowledge, action and agency in the constitution and reproduction of social life"³⁸. Proceeding from this idea, I prefer to trace the following aspects of the Navasard ritual actions: *a.* social context, *b.* inversion and comeback to the primordial social utopia, *c.* restoration of social barriers and hierarchy.

³² Dumézil, 119-125.

³³ Beit-Hallahmi, Paluszny, 345-353.

³⁴ Lincoln, 1986, 163-164.

³⁵ Lincoln, 1975, 129-136.

³⁶ Petrosyan, 2002, 117-121.

³⁷ Lincoln, 1986, 158.

³⁸ Pleasants, 32.

a. Social context of the Assembly. We have numerous records of the early medieval Armenian historians where the social context of the Assembly is formulated explicitly. Agathangelos: “[...] Dicavan which was full of the *magnates and army and a great crowd* assembled from all the sides” [Agath., 916,4]. Buzand: “Then the men of the realm of the land Armenia – the *naḫarars*, *magnates*, *nobles*, *kusakals*, *aṣḫarhakals* and *azats*, the army leaders, judges, chiftains and princes, not to mention the army commanders and even [some] of the *řamik* and *řinakan* – gathered together in a council of still greater accord” [Buz., III, 21,64].³⁹

The same structure of the Assembly is traceable in the text of C. Tacitus. Telling about the ascendance of Zeno-Artashēs to the Armenian throne (18 A.D.), he underlines: “[...] but *the nation’s liking* (favor nationis) inclined towards Zeno, son of Polemon, king of Pontus, who from his earliest infancy had imitated Armenian manners and customs, loving the chase, the banquet, and all the popular pastimes of barbarians, and who had thus bound to himself *chiefs and people* (proceres plebumque)” [Tac., Ann., II, 56, 2].

In accordance with the Hellenistic theory and practice, the primary sources use sometimes more common definition of the Assembly – *the king and his army*. They unite all the participants into a body featuring them as real or potential warriors. In this regard, Moses Khorenatsi seems very exact. Representing the reign of Artawasd II (55-34 B.C) in negative colours, he tells about his conflict with the army on domestic and foreign policy: “Being blamed *by his troops* for his excessive sloth and great gluttony, and especially because Antony had deprived him of Mesopotamia, he became fourious and commanded an army to be raised [...]” [Khor., II, 22,4]⁴⁰.

All the said gives reason to speak about the Panarmenian Assembly as a model of the Armenian society. It originated from the social conditions which preceded the state organization and represented *the collective will of the Armenians*. In various ages of history, it preserved its functions, though ritualized and mostly modified.

b. Social inversion in the frame of Assembly. In the mythological world-view of the ancient Armenians, there was a social concept based on the hierarchy of productive activity: hunting/ herding, agriculture and crafts. Most clearly it is traceable in the epic *Sasna Ğřer* many fragments of which go back to times of Indo-European entity⁴¹. Its heroes – and especially David – scorned and denied all the forms of productive activity, except hunting. According to them, only this form was able to secure equality and justice in communal life⁴². The

³⁹ Մանանդյան, 79-82.

⁴⁰ This tradition was still alive in the fourth-fifth century Armenia. See Garsoïan, 1999, 259-267.

⁴¹ Petrosyan, 2002, 23.

⁴² Степанян, 1991, 40-42.

hunters were thought to possess only what was necessary for moderate (natural) life following the moral imperatives established by God⁴³.

The society of hunters made up the utopia to which the communities came back ritually at the beginning of every year. As I have underlined above, it was true about Navasard fest as well⁴⁴. The best corroboration of this idea is the well-known account of Grigor Magistros about the last words of the dying king Artashēs. The author's source was the song of the minstrels: "Who will give me the smoke of the censer and the morning of Navasard, The running of the stags and the coursing of the deer? We sounded the horns and beat the drum; as is the manner of kings" [Gr. Magistros, Lettres, 33].

In other words, the first stage of the Navasard ritual was aimed at the carnival inversion - the effacement of social barriers and reconstruction of the primordial unity and equality of the Armenians. The royal hunt was believed to be the effective way for reaching this purpose. In the role of the object of sacrifice, instead of king's twin, the sacred animals (stags and deer) figured. Their bodies were taken as *the material* for compiling the macro-and-microcosms of forthcoming year. And the spirit of gaiety and exaltation dominated everywhere.

c. Restoration of social barriers and hierarchy. The second stage of the Navasard ritual represented the reverse movement from sacral time and space to material (profane) world. Its essence was formulated in disintegrating of the primordial unity. Diversities again began to play important role in the life of society. Moreover, they were believed to outflow from the king's personality to give birth to the three principal social classes – the priests, the warriors, and the commoners.

The king's identity with each one of the classes was taken as granted. We have fragmentary but trustworthy evidences about it. According to Moses, the king Eruand "[...] having built temples appointed his own [twin] brother Eruaz as high priest" [Khor., II, 40,3]. In other words, he separated the functions of priesthood and the warrior-ruler. The king was the head of the class of warriors under the heavenly protection of the valiant Vahagn. And it was believed, that through this deity he received the divine mandate of royal authority⁴⁵.

As to the king Artashes I, he was at first identified with the herdsmen and warriors passing through initiation. By the words of Mosēs, his tutor (dayeak) Smbat Bagratuni, saving him from the massacre of the royal family: "Wandered

⁴³ In this conjuncture, the parallel with the Platonian social utopia is obvious. The herdsmen of the mountain tops were "[...] unskilled in the arts generally, and especially in such contrivances as men use against one another in cities for purposes of greed and rivalry and all the other villainies which they devise one against another" [Plato, Leg., III, 677c]. Cf. A. Verlinsky, 2009, 227-230. Most probably, the philosopher also came from ancient (Indo-European) mythological tradition.

⁴⁴ Степанян, 1991, 48.

⁴⁵ Garsoïan, 1976, col. 185-186.

for a long time on foot over the mountains and plains in disguise with the child and brought him up in the cottages of shepherds and herdsmen (սնուցանէ ի հովուանս եւ յանդերդս) [...] [Khor., II, 37,14]”. After that, the education was continued at the Parthian military camp. Here, the tutor “was greatly honored” by the generals, and “the child was among the king’s sons (մանուկն ընդ որդիս թագաւորին) [Ibid.]”.

In the light of the said, a new interpretation of, so-called, border-stones of the king Artashēs seems probable. They were erected to mark the limits of the lands of rural communities containing inscriptions in the Aramaic. One of them is translated by A.G.Perikhanian as follows: “Divided the land between villages Artashes the king, Eruandakan, the good, the son of Zareh, the victor of everything which supports evil”⁴⁶. Attributing his name (and authority) to communal lands, the king, certainly, emphasized his particular relationship to communities in world-view aspect as well. His Aramaic epithet *the good* (TB) is to be paralleled with the Greek *eujergevthḡ* (benefactor) and *eujsebhvḡ* (pious) signifying his creative potency and activity.

From this point of view, returning to the syntax of the Npat Assembly, the following must be underlined: it came to its desirable end with the restoration of the king’s creative potency. He regained his royal dignity. And it was believed that the macro-and-microcosms received new stimulus for peace and integrity. In this regard, one can even trace parallels between the Armenian Navasard Assembly and the well-known western carnival tradition⁴⁷.

2. Syntax and semantics of the combat of Dzirav valley.

The observed aspects of the Npat site made up the extratextual context of the combat under the consideration. Now, my task is to discuss the important features of the narrative on this event compiled by Buzand and Moses Khorenatsi. At first sight, the both texts show obvious similarities in rhetoric and artistic style of narrative which is quite common for the early Armenian historiography, and Moses formulates it as “worthy of the most polished and elaborate exposition” [Khor., II,7,2]. This approach was aimed at the illustrating of God’s providence on the victory of the Armenian and Roman forces over the enemy. And the Biblical parallels emphasize this idea.

Besides similarities, there are numerous differences (and even contradictions) in the texts of Buzand and Mosēs concerning the details of the combat. In this regard, the scholars pay attention to the following obvious facts: *a.* in the text of Moses, the Roman emperor is named Theodosius instead of Valens, *b.* the role of the archbishop Nersēs the Great is magnified at the

⁴⁶ Perikhanian, 1966, 17-29.

⁴⁷ Степанян, 1991, 49.

expense of the role of Pap, *c.* the role of the sparapet Mushegh Mamikonean is shadowed, while Smbat Bagratuni holds a leading position, *d.* Mehrujan Arcruni is killed with a solemn ritual while (as it is well attested) he escaped the Dzirav defeat.

However, despite these discrepancies, another level of narrative is also traceable in the text of Moses. It connects the events of the combat with Assembly tradition. Combined with the records of Buzand, it displays a unique narrative based on pre-Christian world-view system and axiology. Like all narratives, it has its *beginning*, *development* and *end* which spatially correspond to three stages of action⁴⁸.

The first stage represents the summit of Mount Npat: “Now when Nersēs the Great saw all this, he went up to the summit of the mountain Npat. Lifting his hands to heaven, he kept them up in supplication like the first prophet Moses until the second Amalek was defeated” [Khor., III, 37,14]. Buzand, on the contrary, underlines the activity of Pap: “[...] he took the great high-priest Nersēs with him, went up, and took his stance on Mount Npat, while all the forces of the Greeks and the Armenians went down to the site of the combat” [Buz., V, 4, 199]. The summit was thought to be the pole of *sanctity and eternity*. And the sparapet Mushegh came up with his standards and weapons to receive blessing from the archbishop and mandate of activity from the young king.

The second stage is the field of Dzirav where the Roman and the Armenian joint forces met the Persian troops. The Roman forces under the count Addē and stratelate Terentius struck a fortified camp and performed defensive function. The Armenian forces under the sparapet Mushegh performed the offensive operation. The youth of the valiant noble families (մանկունք քաջ նախարարացն Հայոց) were among them under aspet Smbat Bagratuni. For them, obviously, the combat was an important step of initiation to the class of *virility (warriors)*.

The youths (ejfevboi) differed from the males by their appearance as well. About one of them, Artawasd, the son of Vačē, Buzand gives the following colorful description: “He was [still] a boy in years and in accordance with the pattern set for boys by Armenian custom, the head of the young Artawasd had been shaven at that time in boyish fashion according to regulation, leaving only the forelock and a hanging braid” [Buz., V, 43, 255]⁴⁹.

The battle was bloody, and many heroes from the both sides fell. At last, *the Persian host lost heart*: “Thus, strengthened by help from above, the Greek and Armenian armies in concert filled the entire plain with corpses of the

⁴⁸ They make up *the plot of history*, see **White**, 4-5.

⁴⁹ The *youths* (տղայք/մանկունք), *men* (սրբ), and *old man* (ծերք) made up the degrees of social gradation of the noblemen in ancient and medieval Armenia. See **Bais**, 388-391.

enemy and pursued all the fleeing survivors” [Khor., III, 37,19]. It must be added that this stage was performed in the scope *historical present*.

The third stage takes place *at the edge of the fen of Kogovit*. It tells about the last minutes of Mehrujan Arcruni. Moses, certainly, was informed that the death of this antihero happened some years later, by the hand of the companion-in-arm of the sparapet Manuel Mamikonean [Buz., V, 43, 256]. But he deviates from historical truth for the sake of completing his narrative in accordance with the ancient myth and ritual: “But because the impious Mehrujan’s horse was wounded, he was unable to make a quick escape with the fugitives. The Armenian general Smbat quickly caught up with him, slew his companions, and took the villain prisoner [...]” [Khor., III, 37, 20].

Let me notice again that it occurred at the edge of the fen. For understanding the real meaning of the phrase, it must be taken into consideration the fact that *fens* (շաւք = donakei~wn, arundinetum) likewise marshes and swamps were associated with underworld in various mythological traditions⁵⁰. It means that the place of Mehrujan’s execution was also chosen with strict intention.

Summing up the said, we can outline the esoteric essence of the three stages of the narrative. They represented the three layers of mythological cosmos – heaven, earth, and underworld. It was believed that the narrative time *came to its end* at the last cosmic layer (underworld). But it was also believed that, due to the cyclic character of mythological time, it had potency to return to its starting (sacral) point⁵¹.

For demonstrating this cyclic movement, it seems necessary to outline the basic semantic patterns of the narrative under the consideration. They are compiled according to symmetry of dual opposition comprising the basic elements of the narrative situation: mountain summit – valley, valley – fen; *We* (the Christians, the joint Armeno-Roman army) – *They* (the enemy Mazdeans, the Persian forces). The symmetry is obvious in the main actors as well: two kings – the legitimate on the summit (Pap) and the illegitimate in the valley and fen (Mehrujan Arcruni), two high-priests – the Christian on the summit (Nerses the Great) and his supposed Mazdean opponent, two sparapets – Mushegh Mamikonean and (again) Mehrujan Arcruni.

However, there is also another actor whose semantic code is beyond the strict couple opposition. In spite of that, he participates in all oppositions. I mean Smbat Bagratuni whose noble family held the hereditary office of the royal coronate (թագադիր, թագակապ). As it was noticed above, his

⁵⁰ About the underworld and its inhabitants in early Indo-European ideology see Гамкрелидзе, Иванов, 525-536.

⁵¹ Leeming, 238-239.

homonymous ancestor brought the young Artashes through all the layers of initiation and crowned him as the legitimate king of Greater Armenia.

With this privilege-function Moses composes the last act of his narrative: "And thinking that perhaps Nerses the Great might free him (Mehrujan), he therefore did not take him to the camp but found at the spot, opportunely for destruction of the impious one, some people living in tents who had lit a fire and an iron spit for roasting meat. This he heated bent into a circle like a crown, and making it red hot said: "I crown you, Mehrujan, because you sought to be king of Armenia: and it is my privilege as *aspet* to crown you according to the customary right of my ancestors". And while it was still red hot he placed it on Mehrujan's head, and thus the wicked one was killed" [Khor., III, 37, 23].

Another semantic line is also important for the widening of the scope of the narrative. It again concerns the mythological concept of the *fen*. In our sources, we find numerous accounts depicting the royal hunt in similar sites. Moses tells about the favour of Artawasd II for hunt: "He wandered about in the marshes, fens and rocky places, tending wild asses and boars" [Khor., II, 22, 4]. About the Armenian king Shapur (415-421) he records: "Again another time they were hunting wild boars among reeds with fire [...]" [Khor., III, 55, 12].

These and the like evidences give reason to think that Moses tends to represent the execution of Mehrujan Arcruni as hunt scene. In other words, the Dzirav combat is, indeed, patterned on the Navasard fest as ritual of twin sacrifice for the sake of restoration of cosmic and social harmony and order. This conclusion demonstrates the real motive of Moses for deviating from the text of Buzandaran.

And in the last sentence of his account of Dzirav combat, he confirms this idea: "Thenceforth the land was peaceful and subject to Pap's rule" [Khor., III, 37, 24]. It meant that the cyclic movement had come to its expected end. And the Armenian society again gained its hierarchic integrity⁵².

Epilogue.

All the said gives me opportunity for elucidating Pap's accession to the throne in a new light. We have three versions of that event recorded by P'awstos Buzand, Moses Khorenatsi and Ammianus Marcellinus. According to the Armenian authors, the Roman emperor immediately recognized Pap the king of Great Armenia at the request of the Armenian nobility. Led by their political preference, they represent the archbishop Nersēs the Great and the sparapet Mushegh Mamikonean in the role of the initiators of the actions.

⁵² Navasard sacrifice is traceable in the relations of Arshak II with his nephew Gnel. The king's messenger Vardan Mamikonean assures the young prince that *the king does not want to spend the feast of Navasard without him* and calls him to Shahapivan, the royal camp "with the walled hunting preserve" [Buz., IV, 15, 126]. On his arrival, Gnel is arrested and murdered without trial. According to king's propaganda, it is done for the benefit of Great Armenia.

Ammianus, of course, is free of that preference, and his text is more exact. Therefore, I follow it in outlining Pap's early activity.

By the words of Ammianus, Pap's comeback was initiated by the two Armenian noblemen, Cylaces and Arrabannes, one of them was *the prefect of the nation, and the other commander-in-chief*⁵³: "However, for that moment assistance was refused them; but Para (Pap) was conducted by the general Terentius back to Armenia, where he was to rule that nation *without any of the insignia of royalty*; which was a very wise regulation, in order that we might be accused of breaking our treaty of peace"[Amm. Marc., XXVII, 12,10]⁵⁴.

However, the forces of Pap were limited, and he was forced to look for refuge in the remote mountains of Lazica. Meanwhile, Sapur started a new company against Great Armenia: "[...] he burnt all the fruit trees, all the fortified castles, of which he had become master by force or treachery" [Amm. Marc., XXVII,12,12]. In this critical circumstance, the Emperor decided to send forces in support of Pap.

Unfortunately, Amminius does not relate the subsequent events. In the main traits, they are restored on the records of the Armenian authors. According to them, many of the Armenian magnates began to join Pap hoping to secure the independence of Great Armenia. By the words of Mosēs, they adopted a new policy at the instigation of Nerses the Great: "[...] all the princes, both those who willingly accepted the rule of Pap and who did not (զամենայն նախարարսն, որք կամակից էին ընդ տերութիւնն Պապայ եւ որք ոչ)" led him to the Armenian land [Khor., III, 36,10]. Pap accepted all of them, apparently following his great ancestor, Tiridates III, the king who used to appeal the whole Armenia: "[...] to provinces and districts, nacarars and troops and šinakans and everybody" [Agath., XII,1].

The sides came to terms, and the Dzirav combat and Assembly ritual demonstrated just this idea. In other words, both Pap and the magnates had learned the lesson of the reign of Arshak II. They showed willingness to correct the mistakes of recent times and stand above the group and individual selfishness.

The both sides recognized the necessity of compromise. Two ways of the latter were essential in the considered period. *The first*, so-called, Assambly compromise exposed the collective-psychological aspect of the Armenian unity based on ritual (and direct) participation of its members. In order to obtain a new light to this aspect, the following must be underlined: despite the primary Assembly, in Great Armenia of the fourth century, the Council of the nobles

⁵³ Markwart identified these persons as follows: in Cylaces he saw Cłak Hayr Mardpet, in Arrabanes the hazarapet of Greater Armenia Afawan (Ահաւան). See **Markwart**, 154-156.

⁵⁴ "Sed pro tempore adiumentis negates, per Terentium ducem Para (Papa) reductur in Armeniam, *recturus interim sine ullis insignibus gentem*, quod ratione iusta est observatum ne fracti foederis nos argueremur et pacis" [Amm., Marc., XVII,12, 10].

started to gain momentum. It was held in different places – Artashat, Vałarshapat, Shahapivan etc. Breaking with this tendency, Pap demonstrated his adherence to the old tradition. Perhaps, he hoped to gain the support of people (šinakans and famiks) as well.

As to the *second* way, it was still in process of formation. In effect, it implied a search to formulate the Armenian entity as Christian *convention* (ճօճի) based on rational (moral and legal) values and preceptions. This aspect is obviously traceable in the text of Mosēs Khorenatsi. By his words, Nersēs the Great prayed for his people *like the first prophet Moses* (հաւնգոյն նախաւնարգարէին Մովսիսի). The convention implied a new kind of social relations based on collective responsibility before the Omnipotent God.

Buzand puts one of the most exact definitions of the convention in the mouth of dying Manuel Mamikonean, the spa-rapet: “Would that it had been my lot to die for the true-lords of this realm, the Aršakuni, for our wives, for our children, for the people serving God, for brothers, companions and faithful friends” [Buz., V, 44, 260]. According to Eliše, this collective hero was the main actor of the *Vardananc rebellion* against Sasanian Iran for the Christian identity of the Armenians (450-451).

If my interpretation of Dzirav combat is true, Pap deviated from the retro-Hellenistic utopic program of Arshak II. He planned to give a new start to the Armenian unity under powerful royal authority meeting the interests of all the social classes. However, the experience of Dzirav gives reason for another preposition as well. It sounds as follows: choosing the field of the combat and the Assembly in the site of Bagrewand, Bagawan, St. Npat Mount, where the memory of old gods was still alive, the young king, probably, desired to emphasize the peculiarity of Armenian Christianity⁵⁵. Of course, this proposal sounds tentative but it is in full accordance with the fact that Armenian Church gained autocephaly just under Pap⁵⁶.

These positive tendencies would have to prevail over the destructive separatist tendencies to secure the homeostasis of Great Armenia both in domestic and in foreign policy. The starting impetus of Pap’s reign promised success in this difficult way. As it is obvious from further history, the hopes did not come true, and at last the young king shared the tragic destiny of his father, he was murdered. The causes of his failure were of different character –

⁵⁵ In this regard, the observation of Garsoïan sounds very convincing: “[...] the Armenian kings, even after their conversion to Christianity, as well as the Iranian rulers were endowed with valor (k’ajutiwn), good fortune (baxt), and especially the “transcendental glory” (Mid.Pers. xwarrah, Arm. p’ark). These sacred potencies came from Zoroastrian deities - Ahura Mazda, Anahit, Vahagn (Vərətragna). **Garsoïan**, 2004, 436.

Probably, Pap came also from the fact that Armenian Zoroastrianism differed from orthodox Iranian Zoroastrianism in some considerable aspects. Cf. **Russel**, 1987, 14.

⁵⁶ **Օրմաւնեան**, 251-253. Some scholars find Pap (like his father Arsha II) to be an adherent of Christian Arianism. See **Terian**, 18.

political, social, religious, psychological, individual etc. They demand complex investigation which is, however, beyond the limits of the present article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Մովսես Խորենացի, Պատմություն հայոց, Մատենագիրք հայոց, հ. Բ, Անթիլիաս, Մեծի տանն Կիլիկիոյ կաթողիկոսութիւն, 2003, էջ1743-2121; **Moses Khorenatsi**, History of the Armenians, Translation and Commentary on the Literary Sources by Thomson R.W., Cambridge (MA), London: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978.

Ագաթանգեղոս, Պատմություն հայոց, Մատենագիրք հայոց, հ. Բ, Անթիլիաս: Մեծի տանն Կիլիկիոյ կաթողիկոսութիւն, 2003, էջ1295-1735; **Agathangelos**, History of the Armenians, Translation and Commentary on the Literary Sources by Thomson R.W., Albany, New York: Univ. of New York Press, 1974.

Փաւստոս Բուզանդ, Պատմություն հայոց, Մատենագիրք հայոց, հ. Ա, Անթիլիաս: Մեծի տանն Կիլիկիոյ կաթողիկոսութիւն, 200, էջ 278-428; The Epic Histories Attributed to Buzand, “Buzandaran Patmut’iwnk” Transl., Introduction and and Commentary by Garsoïan N. G.,Cambridge (MA) Harvard Univ. Press, 1989.

Ammianus Marcellinus, Roman History, v.III (Books 27-31), With Engl. Translation by Rolfe J.C., Cambridge (MA), London: Harvard Univ. Press, 1986.

Plato, Complete Works, Edited, with Introduction and Notes by Cooper J.M. (Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett Publ. Company, 1997).

Tacitus C., Histories, books, IV-V, Annals, books, I-III, With English Transslation by Jackson J., Cambridge (MA), London: Harvard Univ. Press, 1998.

Studies

Adonz N. (1970), Armenia in the Period of Justinian: The Political Conditions Based on the *Naxarar* System, Transl. with partial revision, a bibliographic note and appendices by Garsoïan N.G., Lisbo: Galuste Gulbenkian Foundation.

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

Bais M. (2003), La vechiaia nella letteratura armena antica, Bazmavep, n.1-4, pp. 373-434.

Beit-Hallahmi B., Paluszny M. (1974), Twinship in Mythology and Science: Ambivalence, Differentiation, and Magical Bond, Comprehensive Psychiatry, v.15/4, pp. 345-353.

Calzolari V. (2011), Une page d’histoire arménienne: La affrontement entre le roi mazdéen Tiridate et Grégoire l’Illuminateur près du temple de la déesse Anahit en Akliséne, Religions en perspective, n.24, pp.45-61.

- Canepa M.P.** (2009), *The Two Eyes of the Earth: Art and Ritual of Kingship between Rome and Iran*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: Univ. of California Press.
- Chaniotis A.** (2005), *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History*, Malden (MA), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Daryee T.** (2008), Kingship in Early Sasanian Iran, *in* *The Sasanian Era. The Idea of Iran*, v.III, ed.by Curtis V.S. and Stewart S. (London, New York: I.B.Tauris), pp.61-67.
- Daryaee T.** (2009), *Sasanian Persia: The Rise and Fall of an Empire*, New York: I.B.Tauris.
- Dignas B., Winter E.** (2007), *Rome and Persia in Late Antiquity: Neighbours and Rivals*, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Dumézil G.** (1994), *Le roman des jumeaux*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Ehrenberg V.** (1964), *The Greek State*, New York: W.W. Norton.
- Երեմյան Ս.Ս.** (1984), Պայքար Մեծ Հայքի թագավորության անկախության համար, Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 2, Եր., ՀԽՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., էջ 71-110.
- Farrokh K.** (2007), *Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War*, Oxford, New York: Osprey Publ.
- Փարազաշեան Ա.Մ.** (1895), Քննական պատմություն հայոց, մաս, II, Թիֆլիս, Մ. Դ. Ռոսինեանց հրատ.
- Гамкрелидзе Т.В., Иванов В.В.** (1984), *Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы. Реконструкция и историко – типологический анализ праязыка и протокультуры*. т. I – II, Тбилиси, изд. ТГУ, 1984.
- Garsoïan N. G.** (1976), *Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia*, *Handes Amsorya*, n.90, col. 177-234.
- Garsoïan N.G.** (1997), The Aršakuni Dynasty, *in* *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times*, v.1, *The Dynastic Periods: From Antiquity to the Fourteenth Century*, ed by Hovannisian R.G. (New York: St.Martin's Press), pp.63-94.
- Garsoïan N.G.**(1999),“T'agaworanist Kayank” kam “Banak Ark'uni”: Les residences royales des Arsacides Arméniennes, *in* *Church and Culture in Early Medieval Armenia*, Ashgate: Variorum Collected Studies Series, pp.251-277.
- Garsoïan N.G.** (2004), Armeno-Iranian Relations in Pre-Islamic Period, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, v. 2/4, pp.436.
- Goodenough E.R.** (1928), *The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship*, Yale Classic Studies, 1928, v.2, pp. 55-102.
- 8. Gruen E.S.** (1993), The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism, *in* *Imagines and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed.by.Balloch A.W, Gruen E.S., Stewart A.A., Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: California Univ. Press, pp.7-24.

- Heinen H.** (2003), *Geschichte des Hellenismus. Von Alexandre bis Kleopatra*, München: Vrlg.C.H.Beck.
- Jones A. H. M.** (1992), *Julianus, F.C.*, *The Oxford Ancient Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 567-568.
- Leeming D.A.** (1998), *Mythology: The Voyage of the Hero*, New York, Oxford: Oxford Univ.Press.
- Lenssen J.** (1999), *The Persian Invasion of 359: Presentation by Suppression in Ammianus Marcellinus' Res Gestae, 18,4.1 -18,6,7*, in *The Late Roman World and its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*, ed.by Drijvers J.W. and Hunt D., London and New York: Routledge, pp. 37-45.
- Lincoln B.** (1975), *The Indo-European Myth of Creation*, *History of Religions*, n.15/2, pp. 121-145.
- Lincoln B.** 1986), *Myth, Cosmos, and Society: Indo-European Themes of Creation and Destruction*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard Univ.Press.
- Mahé Annie et J.-P.** (1986), *Histoire de l'Arménie, des origines a; nos jours*, Paris: Perrin.
- Սախանյան Հ.** (1986), *Ֆեոդալիզմը հին Հայաստանում. Արշակունիների ու մարզպանության շրջան, Եր., հրատ. Մելքոնյան ֆոնդի.*
- Markwart J.** (1930), *Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen nach griechischen und arabischen Geographen*, Wien: Mechitaristen-Buchdruckerei.
- Mommsen Th.** (1999), *A History of Rome under the Emperors*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Օրսանեան Մ.** (2001), *Ազգապատում, հ. Ա, Էջմիածին, Մայր Աթոռ.*
- Perikhanian A.G.** (1966), *Une inscription araméennien du roi Artashes trouvée au Zanguézour (Siwnik)*, *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, v.3, pp.17-29.
- Perikhanian A.G.** (2008), *Iranian Society and Law*, in *Cambridge History of Iran*, v.3/2, *The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods*, ed. by Yarshater E., Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, pp.627-680.
- Petrosyan A.** (2002), *The Indo-European and Ancient Near Eastern Sources of the Armenian Epic*, *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, v.42, pp. 1-236.
- Petrosyan A.** (2009) , *Forefather Hayk in the Light of Comparative Mythology*, *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, v. 37/1-2, pp.155-162.
- Pleasants N.** (1999), *Wittgenstein and Idea of a Critical Social Theory: A Critique of Giddans, Habermas and Bhaskar*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Russell J.R.** (1985), *Armeno-Iranica*, *Acta Iranica*, v.25, pp. 447-458.
- Russell J.R.** (1987), *Zoroastrianism in Armenia (Harvard Iranian Series, 5)*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard Univ. Press.

- Степанян А.А.** (1991), Развитие исторической мысли в древней Армении. Миф, рационализм, историописание, Ер., изд АН Арм. ССР.
- Ստեփանյան Ա.Ա.** (2009), Մեծ Հայքը անտիկ համաշխարհայնացման գործընթացների ծիրում, Պատմության հարցեր, հ.1, Եր., Զանգակ, էջ 10-43:
- Ստեփանյան Ա.Ա.** (2012), Պատմության կերպափոխությունները Մեծ Հայքում, Գիրք Ա. Արտաշիսյան դարաշրջան, Եր., Ս.Խաչենց • Փրինթինգտոն:
- Strooman R.** (2011), Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age, *in* Political Culture in the Greek City after Classical Age, ed.by Nijf O.M. and Aston J., Leuven, Paris, Walpole (MA): Peeters, pp. 143-162.
- Terian A.** (2011), Patriotism and Piety in Armenian Christianity: The Early Panegyrics on Saint Gregory, New York: St.Vladimir Seminary Press.
- Տրախնա Ջ.** (2003), Բանասիրության վայր Սասանյան կայսրությունում. Անհուշ բերդը, Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, 1, էջ 186-202.
- Toumanoff C.** (1963), Studies in Christian Caucasian History, Georgetown: Georgetown Univ.Press.
- Verlinsky A.** (2009), The Cosmic Circle in the *Statesman* Myth, Hyperboreus, v.15/2, pp. 221-250.
- Zekiyan B.-L.** (1987), L' "ideologie" nationale de Movsēs Xorenac'i et sa conception de l'histoire, *Handes Amsorya*, n.101, pp. 471-485.
- White H.** (1984), The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Thought, *History and Theory*, v.23/1, pp. 1-31.

ԱԼԲԵՐՏ ՍՏԵՓԱՆՅԱՆ

Պրոֆ., պատմական գիտությունների դոկտոր
ԵՊՀ համաշխարհային պատմության ամբիոնի վարիչ
bertstepanyan48@gmail.com

ԽՈՐԵՆԱՅՈՒ ՄԻ ՀԱՏՎԱԾԻ ՄԵԿՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՇՈՒՐՁ

(Պատմություն հայոց, III, 34, 2 - 24)

ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ

Հոդվածը նվիրված է IV դարում Արշակ II-ի (350-368) և (հատկապես) Պապի (370-374) գահակալության տարիներին տեղի ունեցած Հայոց պատմության դրամատիկ իրադարձություններին:

Ի պատասխան տոհմիկ նախարարների անջատողական նկրտումների՝ Արշակ արքան որդեգրել էր մի քաղաքականություն, որն առավել պատեհ է սահմանել իբրև **հետհայաց հեղինգով**: Մի քաղաքականություն, որն ավելի քան հինգհարյուր տարի առաջ հաջողությամբ կիրարկել էր Արտաշես I-ը՝ հիմք դնելով Արտաշիսյան դարաշրջանին: Այն համադրում էր զորեղ արքայական իշխանությունը, ազատ գյուղական համայնքը, արհեստավարժ ծառայողական ավագանին, զարգացած քաղաքային կյանքը: Արշակ II - ի բարեփոխումների հանգուցակետը դարձավ Արշակավանը՝ արքունի դաստակերտը, կառուցված ըստ այս սկզբունքների: Սակայն, երկար կյանք չունեցավ. ընկավ ընդդիմադիր նախարարների հարվածի ներքո: Արշակավանի բախտը կիսեց և արքան. զրկված ներքին ու արտաքին օժանդակությունից՝ նա դարձավ պարսից դավադրության զոհը: Երկիրը մնաց անտերունչ:

Աղետից սթափված նախարարների և հռոմեացիների օժանդակությամբ արքայազն Պապը վերադարձավ Մեծ Հայք և սկսեց ղեկավարել հակապարսկական պայքարը: Գլխավոր ճակատամարտը տեղի ունեցավ Բագրևանդ գավառում, Ձիրավի դաշտում, սրբազան Նպատ լեռան ստորոտին:

Հոդվածում մանրամասն քննության է ենթարկվում ճակատամարտի մասին Պատմահոր պատումը՝ շեշտադրելով դրա առասպելաժխտական բովանդակությունն ու նշանաբանությունը: Հայդն բացահայտվում է, որ ճակատամարտի տեղը և մարտավարությունն ընտրված էր ըստ Հայոց Աշխարհաժողովի հարացույցի, որի հիմքում դրված էր **Երկվորյակների** տիեզերաստեղծ առասպելը: Վերջինս ծավալվում էր ըստ կայուն (հարյուրամյակներով մշակված) խաղընթացի, հընթացս որի *մաշված* տիեզերն ու ընկերային համակեցությունը (հակաժամանակ) վերագտնում էին իրենց համասեռության ու միասնության իդեալական բևեռը (վերժամանակ):

Հաջորդ շրջափուլում վերադարձ էր կատարվում դեպի իրական և կայուն տիեզերք ու համակեցություն (ժամանակ): Սրբազան որսը նկատվում էր իբրև այս անցումների կարևոր նախապայման. զոհաբերվում էր արքայի երկվորյակը (փոխակերպված եղնիկի կամ եղջերուի) և նրա մարմնից վերածնվում էր տիեզերքը: Նաև՝ նոր համակեցությունը՝ բաղկացած հիմնականով հանրախմբերից՝ քրմեր, ռազմիկներ, արտադրողներ:

Ձիրավի ճակատամարտն ըստ այս խաղընթացի ներկայացնելու նպատակով՝ Պատմահայրն անգամ շրջանցել է պատմական ինչ-ինչ իրողություններ: Համաձայն նրա՝ հենց այստեղ իր անարգ մահն է գտել Մեհրուժան Արծրունին, ում պարսից շահը խոստացել էր Մեծ Հայքի գահը: Այլ խոսքով՝ Մեհրուժանը ներկայացվում է իբրև Պապի ծխական երկվորյակը, ով անպայմանորեն պետք զոհաբերվի հանուն համընդհանուր կարգի ու խաղաղության:

Ասվածը հիմք է տալիս Պապ արքայի կառավարման սկիզբը լծորդելու ավանդական Աշխարհաժողովի իմաստաբանությանն ու կառույցին: Այն միտված էր պետականության շուրջ համախմբելու հայոց համակեցության բոլոր հանրախմբերին՝ համաձայնեցնելով նրանց շահերն ու նկրտումները: Քառսի հաղթարման այս **աշխարհաժողովային** հարացույցը էականորեն տարբերվում էր Արշակ II-ի **հետհայաց հեղինակից**. Ինչպես ցույց է տալիս պատմության փորձը՝ այն վերջին ներունակ քայլն էր փրկելու Արշակունյաց Մեծ Հայքը քաղաքական և ընկերային էնթրոպիայից:

АЛЬБЕРТ СТЕПАНЯН

Проф., доктор исторических наук
Заведующий кафедрой всемирной истории ЕГУ
bertstepanyan48@gmail.com

К ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ ОДНОГО ФРАГМЕНТА МОВСЕСА ХОРЕНАЦИ

(История Армении, III, 34, 2-24)

РЕЗЮМЕ

Статья посвящена драматическим событиям армянской истории, произошедшим в период правления Аршака II (350-368) и Папа (370-374).

В ответ на сепаратистские устремления армянской родовой аристократии, царь Аршак и его ближайшее окружение выработали новую политическую линию, которую можно охарактеризовать как *ретро-эллинизм*. Ее успешно применил еще Арташес I (189-160 до н.э.) – основоположник династии Арташесидов. Она объединяла ряд важных компонентов социального общежития: сильная царская власть, служилая бюрократия, свободная сельская община, развитая городская жизнь.

Средоточием реформаторской деятельности Аршака II стал Аршакаван – новый царский град, построенный по названным принципам. Однако он простоял недолго: пал под натиском родовой аристократии и был сравнен с землей. Горькая участь выпала и на долю самого царя: лишенный внутренней и внешней поддержки, он стал жертвой козней персидского двора.

Опираясь на поддержку Рима и патриотически настроенных нахараров, царевич Пап возвратился в Великую Армению и возглавил антиперсидскую борьбу. Ее главным событием стало сражение, произошедшее в Баграванде, на Дзиравском поле, на склонах священной горы Нифат.

В статье детально анализируются сведения Хоренаци о сражении, выявляя их мифоритуальный код. Это дало возможность определить, что место и план (сценарий) сражения были выбраны не случайно. Исходной точкой служила модель Общеармянского народного собрания (Ашхаражохов). Она строилась на *Близнечном мифе*, который предполагал трехтактное движение космоса и социума от хаоса (антивремя) к полюсу идеальной гармонии (вечность). Следующая фаза приводила к реальному космосу (время). Священная охота рассматривалась как необходимое условие подобных переходов. На ней ритуально жертвовался двойник царя (чаще, замененный

оленью или косулей) и из его тела воссоздавался космос. Это касалось, естественно, и социума с его основными классами – жрецы, воины, производители.

С целью представить Дзиравское сражение по данному сценарию, Хоренаци порой даже обходит исторические факты. Это, в частности, касается его утверждения о том, что на сражении был убит Меружан Арцруни, которому шах обещал трон Великой Армении. Иными словами, Меружан изображается как ритуальный близнец Папа, которому предстоит быть пожертвованным ради всеобщего порядка.

Все сказанное дает основание связывать начало правления царя Папа с идеей Общеармянского народного собрания. Оно имело целью объединить все слои общества вокруг национального государства. Этот путь существенно отличался от ретро-эллинизма Аршака II. И как показывает история, был последним эффективным шагом избегать политической и социальной энтропии, грозящей Аршакидскую Армению.