

# MOVSÉS KHORENATSI AND GHAZAR P'ARPETSI

REV. VREJ NERSES NERSESSIAN

There are a number of phrases in Book III of Movés Khorenatsi's *History of the Armenians* and Book I of Ghazar P'arpetsi's work of the same name which are verbally similar. In Movés's *History* these occur in the last part of Book III beginning with chapter 51, covering the years c. 420 to 440. In Ghazar's *History* they are found in chapters 11 to 19.<sup>1</sup> The following are typical examples:

## Movés

III. 52 ... կարգեալ ըստ ձեռոյ  
օրինակի յունականին  
զվաղնջոցն գրեալ շարագիր  
տառից եկեալ ետուն ցմեծն  
Սահակ եւ Մեսրոպ:<sup>2</sup>

III. 56 ... Ի նմին առուր եւ նա  
(Շապուհ — V. N.) անդէն ի  
դրանն մարդկանէ նենդեալ  
սատակեցաւ:<sup>3</sup>

III. 67 ... մնչ եւ ցսկիգրն ամին  
երկրորդի Յագկերտի եղելոյ  
Պարսից թագաւորի, յելս ամսոյն  
նաւասարդի, յառուր իւրոյ  
ծննդեանն:<sup>4</sup>

## Ghazar

I. 11 ... կարգել զվաղնջոցն  
գտեալ շարագիրս տառիցն, գորս  
ոչ ուրուք էր հոգացեալ ...<sup>5</sup>

I. 12 ... Ի նմին առուր եւ գորդի  
նորին զՇապուհ... անդէն ի  
դրան մարդկանէ դառով  
յարքունիքն սատակեցին:<sup>6</sup>

I. 18 ... յիսկզբան ամին երկրորդի  
Յագկերտի որդւոյ վռամայ  
Պարսից արքային, յամսեանն  
նաւասարդի ... յերկրորդ ժամու  
առուրն ուր եւ զօր ծննդեան  
երանելոյն ...<sup>7</sup>

A possible reason for these coincidences is that both texts depended on a common prior source. The absence, however, of independent evidence for existence of such a work, other than fifth-century author Koriun's biography of Mesrop, the inventor of the Armenian alphabet, has led scholars to assume that the author of one of these *Histories* must have used the other as his source.

Ghazar wrote his *History* around AD 500. Hence, for those who accept the traditional fifth-century date for Movés's work, it was Ghazar who had borrowed these passages from Movés's *History*.<sup>8</sup> This is supported by a

comparison of the relevant passages which reveals a striking difference in style. Movsés's writing is crisp and matter-of-fact while Ghazar's is expansive, provides little extra information and gives the impression that he was padding out his material. Father Poghos Ananian pointed to Ghazar's statement that he had read many previous *Histories*, and suggested that he had not mentioned Movsés or Eghishé (author of an history of the Armeno-Persian war in 450-51) because his intention had been to write a continuation to the works of early classical Armenian historians Agat'angeghos and P'avstos Buzand.<sup>9</sup>

The difficulty with this view is that Movsés's composition appears not to have been generally available until at least the seventh century, and it seems unlikely that Ghazar, writing at the request of the Mamikonian prince, Vahan, would have had access to work, which was written for a Bagratuni lord, Sahak, so soon after its composition.

The alternative solution, favored by those who believe that Movsés's *History* was composed later than the fifth century, is that its author had utilized Ghazar's composition. This view also presents a number of problems and leads to inconsistencies. For instance, both Movsés and Ghazar placed the first year of the Armenian king Vramshapuh during that of Shapuh, who is apparently a composite figure formed from the second and third Persian kings named Shapur (AD 309-379 and 383-388 respectively), whereas Koriun placed it much later during the reign of the Persian king Yazdegerd I (399-420).<sup>10</sup> If Ghazar had written his *History* before Movsés, why did he ignore the contemporary Koriun's clear evidence on Vramshapuh? Historian Hakob Manandian's explanation, that a later unknown hand had amended Koriun's text, has received little support.<sup>11</sup>

For the Christian era, Movsés was working to his own chronological system for Armenian history. In this scheme his correlation of the Roman emperors with the Persian kings was out of phase.<sup>12</sup> For the fifth century the error was as much as 40 years and vitiated his chronology for the kings of Armenia. One of the steps he appears to have taken to make the numbers fit was to place Vramshapuh's reign much earlier in relation to the kings of Persia than it actually had been. Ghazar had no such overall scheme and his adoption of this chronology can be accounted for only by assuming that, for some reason, he had preferred to follow Movsés rather than Koriun.

Moreover, if Movsés had utilized Ghazar's *History*, then the details unique to Movsés's composition have to be explained as Movsés's "additions".<sup>13</sup> But this extra information is significant and there is no independent evidence to doubt its authenticity. Movsés knew, for instance, that the fifth-century Armenian author Eznik, had gone to Constantinople while a student without permission.<sup>14</sup> Ghazar does not mention this but it is confirmed by independent data.<sup>15</sup>

The hypothesis for the late composition of Movsés's *History*, placing it sometime between the seventh and ninth centuries, assumes that the work was composed in support of Bagratuni aspirations to the Armenian throne in opposition to those of the Mamikonian *gens*.<sup>16</sup> It is reasonable to expect therefore that Movsés's supposed additions would have served this intention, or at least not have clashed with it. But this has not been demonstrated. On the contrary, one of the "additions" states that Vardan Mamikonian, grandson of the *kat'oghikos* Sahak, had been elevated to the rank of *stratelat* (general) by the Eastern Roman emperor Theodosius II and also offered the Armenian throne by the Persian king Vram (Bahram V).<sup>17</sup> Why, it must be asked, would a propagandist for Bagratuni kingship have gone out of his way to record, let alone invent, a statement to the effect that the rival Mamikonians had once been considered to be of royal rank, and incidentally emphasized the close relationship of that *gens* both with the royal Arshakunis and the revered and sainted Sahak Part'ev?<sup>18</sup>

In the eighth century such comments would not have strengthened the Bagratuni claim to the kingship of the Armenians. Around 482, however, when the Bagratunis had no such ambition, they could have been recorded safely as historical facts. We may contrast this with historian T'ovma Artzruni's claim that one Vahan Artzruni, not otherwise known, had been considered as a possible king at this time,<sup>19</sup> clearly an attempt to place the status of the Artzrunis at royal level in order to support their own claim to kingship at the time T'ovma was writing in the early tenth century.

A comparison of other relevant passages shows that the two works reflect specific political conditions. Movsés stresses the confusion, which existed throughout much of the fifth century and the need that the Armenians felt for political and military support from the Eastern Roman empire to keep the Persians at bay. In contrast, Ghazar is keen to play down disagreements and to emphasize the unity of the Armenian commonwealth, reflecting the more favorable conditions pertaining at the turn of the century under the governorship of his patron, Vahan Mamikonian. He also ignores hostile and unmanly actions by the Persian king, such as the imprisonment of the Armenian king Artashir (reigned 422-428) and the confiscation of his possessions,<sup>20</sup> in order not to perturb the prevailing amity between the Armenians and the Persians. The following important differences may be noted:

Movés

III. 50 King Khosrov [III] negotiates with the Roman emperor.<sup>21</sup>

III. 50 Khosrov is imprisoned in the castle of oblivion in Persia.<sup>22</sup>

III. 50 Pargev Amatuni attempts to rescue Khosrov on the way to Persia but is captured and blown up like a wineskin.<sup>23</sup>

III. 51 Vram Křman succeeds Artashir on the Persian throne during the reign of Vramshapuh.<sup>24</sup>

III. 57 The emperor Theodosius bestows the title of *stratelat* on Vardan Mamikonian.<sup>25</sup>

III. 63 In considering the deposition of King Artashir of Armenia, *kat'oghikos* Sahak suggests that the matter be discussed with the emperor, Theodosius.<sup>26</sup>

III. 63 The Armenian *nakharars* accuse Sahak of sympathy with the Greeks.<sup>27</sup>

III. 64 Vardan Mamikonian, Sahak's grandson, is offered the kingship of the Armenians by the Persian king.<sup>28</sup>

III. 64 King Artashir of Armenia is imprisoned by the Persians and his possessions confiscated.<sup>29</sup>

Ghazar

I. 9 not mentioned.<sup>30</sup>

I. 9 Khosrov is exiled to Persia.<sup>31</sup>

I. 9 Not mentioned.<sup>32</sup>

I. 12 Vram Křman ascends the Persian throne after death of Vramshapuh.<sup>33</sup>

Not mentioned.

I. 13 Sahak's suggestion is not mentioned.<sup>34</sup>

I. 13 This accusation is not mentioned.<sup>35</sup>

I. 14 This offer is not mentioned.<sup>36</sup>

I. 14 Not mentioned.<sup>37</sup>

In Movsés's account, *kat'oghikos* Sahak suggests to the Armenian *nakharars* that a solution to the proposed deposition of King Artashir should be sought through the Eastern Roman emperor, Theodosius II, and not through the Persian king<sup>38</sup>. Subsequently, at the Persian court the *kat'oghikos* is accused of sympathy with the Greeks. This is in keeping with Movsés's phil-Hellenic stance and his suspicion of the Persians. It was a possible view between 450 and the treaty of Nuarsak in 484, when the Armenians were in armed conflict with the Persians and the Eastern Roman connection was an option, which they wished to keep open. This was no longer the case after the treaty, and certainly had no significance in the eighth century, by which time the Persian empire had ceased to exist.

The omission of this material by Ghazar who, incidentally, had also received a Greek education and would therefore have been expected to be as Hellenophilic as Movsés, indicates that he was deliberately avoiding reference to friendly contacts between the Armenians and the Eastern Romans. To publicize the existence of such contacts after the improvement of Armeno-Persian relations would have been embarrassing for his patron, Vahan Mamikonian, who was then *marzpan* (governor) of Armenia. Hence, Ghazar emphasized the chivalrous attitude of the Persians; for example, that the abducted ladies of the noble Kamsarakan house had been treated with care and in conformity with Christian custom.<sup>39</sup>

The hypothesis of a late date for Movsés also incorporates the belief that its author had utilized Buzand's *History of the Armenians*.<sup>40</sup> This being a record of the fourth century, it would have been reasonable to suppose that a fifth-century author could have quoted from it without obviously giving himself away. It is surprising, therefore, that Movsés does not quote directly from it, if at all, and the data believed to derive from it is hardly recognizable as such. On the other hand, Ghazar's *History* extends to the end of the fifth century and includes the death of Movsés's patron, Sahak Bagratuni. Consequently it is plain that an author purporting to be writing at Sahak's request could not have used it. We are thus faced with the paradox that Movsés apparently quoted verbatim from a work clearly written after his own time, yet disguised quotations from one composed before his time.<sup>41</sup>

It is clear that neither of the above hypotheses for the existence of common passages in the two *Histories* is satisfactory and the solution to the problem must be sought elsewhere.

In his letter to Vahan Mamikonian, Ghazar mentions a Movsés *p'ilisop'os*, no longer living at the time (c. 490-495), who had been mocked and persecuted by certain churchmen because of his education abroad.<sup>42</sup> Unfortunately, there is a lacuna in the manuscript at this point depriving us of further details. Philologist Step'anos Malkhasian, however, showed that the description of this Movsés is consistent with the autobiographical details found

in Khorenatsi's remarks appearing in the final chapter of Book II and the lament at the end of the *History*. For instance, in the lament he complained that

...զծիծաղելն զմեզ եւ զարճամարճելն իբրեւ զանճատաստնովք, եւ որ ինչ պիտանայու ունիցի արուեստ: (...they make an evil of themselves by mocking and despising us as unstable and lacking any useful art.)<sup>43</sup>

Malkhasian concluded that Movsés "the philosopher" and Movsés Khorenatsi were the same person.<sup>44</sup> This view requires further examination.

The fifth-century church historian Sozomen gives the explanation of the term "philosopher" in relation to Christians; it was used to describe Christian hermits.<sup>45</sup> Having studied in a Greek school, Ghazar would have been aware of this meaning. It is therefore significant that he also states, at the beginning of his letter, that he had stayed two years in the canton of Siunik', in the winter in a cave with a renowned cleric named Movsés, and in the heat of the summer with Mushé, the bishop of the region. Caves being the refuge of hermits, we may conclude that the persecuted philosopher and the renowned cleric with whom he had stayed were the same person. Furthermore, Movsés Khorenatsi was known to later writers both as *k'ert'ogh* (grammaticus) or *k'ert'oghahayr*,<sup>46</sup> and as "philosopher". For example, the eleventh-century Armenian historian Step'anos Taronetsi Asoghik calls him *p'ilisop'a*,<sup>47</sup> and a chronicle attributed to At'anas Taronatsi (7th century) describes him as *matenagir* (author) and *p'ilisop'a*.<sup>48</sup>

This interpretation is supported by indications in Movsés's *History* of the conditions under which he was working. From his remarks to his patron it appears that he had written the *History* in installments, and that the task had become progressively irksome to him. The unavailability to him of works in Greek indicates, that he was writing far from Hellenic centers of learning. Thus he was aware of Plato's dialogues, some of which were available in Armenian translation, but which he did not use, and of the first-century BC Greek historian Diodorus's *Library of History*, no Armenian translation of which is known, and to which he did not have access.<sup>49</sup>

All this is consistent with the *History* having been composed not at the court of a king or *nakharrar*, as implied by the hypothesis of an eighth-century date, but in an isolated location, while his description of mount Masis as the "southern mountain"<sup>50</sup> suggests that he was situated in north-eastern Armenia. This agrees with hints that he was living in the vicinity of the cantons of Geghark'unik' and Goght'n.<sup>51</sup> The conclusion is that the *History of the Armenians* was written in an isolated location, possibly in Ayrarat or northern Siunik'.

It is possible, therefore, to identify the philosopher/hermit Movsés with Movsés Khorenatsi.<sup>52</sup> A number of unexplained details now fall into place:

Movsés had retired to a cave in view of the persecution, which he had suffered on his return from abroad. He would have composed his *History* there, thus explaining the discovery by modern critics that he had used few reference books and that all of them had been in Armenian, confirmed by his own comment that some of the *History* had been written from memory.<sup>53</sup> Ghazar had stayed with Movsés and would have seen the latter's *History of the Armenians* there, thus explaining his use of phrases found in it when composing his own *History* some years later.

We come now to the question of the date of completion of the first edition of Movsés's *History*. Since it was written at the request of Sahak Bagratuni, the most probable period for its composition would have been around the time of the latter's governorship of Armenia, viz. from 482 to his death at the battle of Ch'armanayn in 483.<sup>54</sup> The evidence for the period when Ghazar was staying in the cave is found in his letter to Vahan Mamikonian in which he says that in his youth he had been sent to study amongst the [Eastern] Romans by his teachers, and that on his return to Armenia he had lived with the Kamsarakan family "until the year of" Vahan's նուաճում (submission).<sup>55</sup> Wearing by his work, he had spent two years in Siunik' in order to rest.

The exact time he had gone to stay in the cave is indicated by the words գՀես այնորիկ, just after he had mentioned his residence with the Kamsarakans. Vahan's նուաճում is believed to refer to the treaty of Nuarsak in 484. If further the phrase գՀես այնորիկ means "after that", as has been assumed, then Ghazar had stayed with Movsés during the winters of the years 484/485 and 485/486.<sup>56</sup> But Ghazar is vague about this period of his life and there is an alternative meaning for the phrase գՀես as "together with".<sup>57</sup> Interpreting գՀես այնորիկ as "together with that", i.e. during the time that Ghazar was domiciled with the Kamsarakan family, then we may conclude that he had stayed with Movsés sometime between the years 482 and 484. There is support for this in Ghazar's statement that he had stayed with Movsés in the winter and with bishop Mushé in the summer. He was presumably with the Kamsarakans, in the spring or autumn. Although the household may not have been located in a single place during the war,<sup>58</sup> it may be noted that the Kamsarakan lands consisted of the cantons of Shirak and Arsharunik' in the Ayrarat region, which were contiguous with northern Siunik' and the canton of Geghark'unik', in which general region Movsés must have been located.

In examining Movsés's remarks to his patron it has been noted that the last reply to a definite command is found in Book III, chapter 55.<sup>59</sup> This comment must have been written at a time when Movsés had believed that Sahak Bagratuni was still alive. In fact, Sahak had died in battle in the summer of 483 but rumors had reached Armenia in the winter of 483/484 that he had survived and had taken refuge in Georgia. As a consequence, a search party had been sent

to find him, but without success.<sup>60</sup> The latest that chapter 55 could have been written, therefore, was the winter of 483/484 since after that Sahak's death would have been confirmed. If Ghazar had stayed with Movsés in the winters of 482/83 and 483/84 he would have been there while Movsés was composing the final chapters of his *History*, and may well have assisted in writing it. If however his stay had been in the period of 484 to 486, he would have seen Movsés's *History* but not have assisted in its composition.<sup>61</sup>

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> All quotations from Movsés Khorenatsi and Ghazar P'arpetsi are from the following editions: Movsés Khorenatsi, *Patmut'iun Hayots*, K'nnakan Bnagire ev Nératzut'iune M. Abeghiani ev S. Harut'iuniani, Lratsumnére A. B. Sargsiani (Critical text and Introduction by M. Abeghian and S. Harut'iunian, Additions by A. B. Sargsian), Erevan, 1991; Ghazar P'arpetsi, *Patmut'iun Hayots Ev T'ught' Ar Vahan Mamikonian* (History of the Armenians and Letter to Vahan Mamikonian), 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Venice, 1933. Supposed verbal borrowings by Movsés in I. 16 and III. 59 from P'arpetsi's description of Ayrarat (I. 8) and from *Ashkharhagrut'iun* (Geography) (see Robert W. Thomson (ed.), *Moses Khorenats'i. History of the Armenians*, Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1980, pp. 50f.), are little more than general similarities.
- <sup>2</sup> This is the "A" reading. The "T" manuscripts have «նշանազիր». Khorenatsi, *Patmut'iun Hayots*, p. 326.
- <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 332.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 355.
- <sup>5</sup> P'arpetsi, *Patmut'iun Hayots*, p. 48.
- <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 110. Koriun has ... «յառաջնում ամի երկրորդ Յագկերտի, որդւոյ Վռամայ թագաւորին պարսից, ... ի կատարել ամսոյն նաւասարդի, ... յերրորդ ժամու աւուրն պաշտաման, որ եւ զօր ծննդեան ի նոյն աւուր», see N. Akinian (ed.) *Patmut'iun Varuts S. Mashtotsi* (The History of Life of St. Mashtots), Vienna, 1952, chapt.18, p. 56.
- <sup>8</sup> Manuk Abeghian, *Hayots Hin Grakanut'ian Patmut'iun* (History of the Ancient Literature of the Armenians), in *Erker* (Works), Vol. III, Erevan, 1968, p. 355.
- <sup>9</sup> Father Poghos Ananian, "Grots Giuti T'uakane ev Vramshapuh Hayots T'agavori Vetserord Tarin" (The Date of the Invention of the Alphabet and the Sixth Year of the Armenian King Vramshapuh), *Bazmavep*, Vol. 143, No 1-2, 1985, pp. 127f.
- <sup>10</sup> Khorenatsi, *Patmut'iun Hayots*, III. 50, p. 321; Ghazar P'arpetsi, *Patmut'iun Hayots*, I. 9, p. 36; Koriun, *Patmut'iun Varuts*, chapt. 7 and 21, pp. 22, 65.
- <sup>11</sup> Hakob Manandian, "Hay Greri Giuti Taret'ui Harts'i Shurje" (On the Question of the Date of Invention of the Armenian Alphabet), in Ashot Hovhannisian (ed.), *Mesrop Mashtots*, Erevan, 1962, p. 109.

- <sup>12</sup> L. Shahinian, "Vorn e Khorenatsu Hayots Patmut'ian Zhamanakagrakan Hamakarge?" (What is the Chronological System of Movses Khorenatsi's *History of the Armenians?*), *Banber Matenadarani*, Vol. 8, 1967, pp. 21-56.
- <sup>13</sup> Thomson, *Moses*, pp. 47, 313. Gagik Sargsian's hypothesis that Movses had lived at the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth (*Hellenistakan Darashrjani Hayastane ev Movses Khorenatsin* [Armenia of the Hellenistic Age and Movses Khorenatsi], Erevan, 1966, p.11.) and hence had used P'arpetsi's *History* (*Movses Khorenatsu Hayots Patmut'ian Zhamanakagrakan Hamakarge* [The Chronological System of Movses Khorenatsi], Erevan, 1965, pp. 104, 120), creates more problems than it solves.
- <sup>14</sup> Khorenatsi, *Patmut'ian*, Book III, 60, p. 341.
- <sup>15</sup> Eznik's letter in *Girk' T'gh'ots* (Book of Letters), Tiflis, 1901; Galust Ter Mkrtchian (ed.), *Knik' Hawatoy* (Seal of Faith), ed., Ejmiatzin, 1914; see also in Maurice Tallon, *Livre des lettres*, Beirut, 1955, pp. 50 f.
- <sup>16</sup> Cyril Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History*, n.p.: Georgetown University Press, 1963, pp. 332f.
- <sup>17</sup> Khorenatsi, *Patmut'ian*, III, 64, p. 348.
- <sup>18</sup> Hrachia Ach'arian thought that it had been added by Movses in order to raise the profile of the Mamikonian family; see H. Ach'arian, "Mesrop Mashtots", *Ejmiatzin*, No. 11-12, 1956, p. 43. On the other hand many critics have accused Movses of denigrating the Mamikonians in order to please the Bagratunis.
- <sup>19</sup> T'ovma Artzruni, *Patmut'ian tann Artzruniats* (History of the House of Artzrunik'), Constantinople, 1852, pp. 47, 86.
- <sup>20</sup> Khorenatsi, *Patmut'ian*, III, 64, pp. 348-349.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 320-321.
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 322-323.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 335.
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 346-347.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 348-349.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>30</sup> P'arpetsi, *Patmut'ian Hayots*, pp. 34-36.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 34-36.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 53-56. Vram Krman was Bahram IV (c. 388-399). It has been suggested that the manuscript is corrupt in this respect (Sargsian, *Movses Khorenatsu*, pp. 100-104). The early 15th century fragment of P'arpetsi's *History* does not resolve the point since the passage on Yazdegerd I is missing in it; see Bishop Norayr Pogharian, "Noragiut Hatuatz Ghazar P'arpetsu Hayots Patmut'ian" (A Newly Discovered Fragment of Ghazar P'arpetsi's *History of the Armenians*), *Banber Matenadarani*, No. 8, 1967, pp. 263-274.
- <sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 57-69.
- <sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 69-76.

- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>38</sup> Khorenatsi, *Patmut' iun*, III, 63, pp. 346-347.
- <sup>39</sup> P'arpetsi', *Patmut' iun*, III, 79-80, 86; pp. 472-478, 508 f.
- <sup>40</sup> Thomson, *Moses*, pp. 46-49.
- <sup>41</sup> Thomson's comment, that Movses does not mention Buzand and P'arpetsi by name because "they were eulogizing the Mamikonian family, whose role he consistently negates" (Thomson, *Moses*, p. 311), fails to address this problem.
- <sup>42</sup> P'arpetsi, "T'ught' Ghazara P'arpetsuo: Meghadrut' iun Stakhos Abeghayits" (Letter to Vahan Mamikonian), in *Patmut' iun*, p. 643 f.
- <sup>43</sup> Khorenatsi, *Patmut' iun*, III, 68, pp. 358-366.
- <sup>44</sup> Movses Khorenatsi, *Hayots Patmut' iun, Targmanut' iun, Neratzut' iun ev Tzanot' agrut' iunner Doktor S. Malkhasiani* (Movses Khorenatsi, *History of Armenians*, introduction, translation into modern Armenian and annotations by Dr. S. Malkhasian), Cairo, 1953, pp. 14-16. Cf. Father Poghos Ananian, "Movses K'ert'oghahayr Ev Movses Khorenatsi" ("Movses K'ert'oghahayr and Movses Khorenatsi"), *Bazmavep*, Vol. 149, 1991, p. 19.
- <sup>45</sup> Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, III, 14. It may be noted that the Syrian bishop Daniel, appearing in the story of the creation of the Armenian alphabet (Koriun, P'arpetsi, Khorenatsi) is described as *p'ilisop'a* in a seventh century chronicle (*Ananun Zhamanakagrut' iun*, Venice, 1904, p. 57, and by Step'anos Taronatsi (*Patmut' iun*, St. Petersburg, 1885, II, 6).
- <sup>46</sup> Taronatsi, *Patmut' iun*, II, 1, p. 77.
- <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 2; p. 79.
- <sup>48</sup> Under date 474; see A. S. Mat'evosian, "Movses Khorenatsin ev At'anas Taronatsu Zhamanakagrut' iune" (Movses Khorenatsi and At'anas Taronatsi's Chronicle), *Patma-Banasirakan Handes*, No. 1, 1989, p. 226.
- <sup>49</sup> Edward Gulbekian, "Movses Khorenatsi's Remarks to His Patron", *Le Muséon*, No. 97, 1984, pp. 75-79.
- <sup>50</sup> Khorenatsi, *Patmut' iun*, I, 12, p. 40. A misprint in Thomson's translation transposes, this to "northern" (Thomson, *Moses*, pp. 89-90).
- <sup>51</sup> Step'anos Malkhasian suggests that Movses's surname referred to the village of Khorea(n), near Goght'n; see his *Khorenatsu Areghtzuatzi Shurje* (About Khorenats's Enigma), Erevan: ArmFAN publications, 1940, pp. 144-147.
- <sup>52</sup> Such an identification was first proposed by Gnel Galemk'arian in *Tach'ar* weekly, No. 20, May 1912; quoted by Morus S. Hasrat'ian, "Vorn e Movses Khorenatsu tzndavayre" (Where is Movses Khorenatsi's birthplace?), *Lraber Hasarakakan Gitut' iunneri*, No. 12, 1969, p. 89. (Hasrat'ian's article is reprinted in his *Patma-Hnagitakan Usunnasirut' iunner*, Erevan, 1985, pp. 49-64).
- <sup>53</sup> Khorenatsi, *Patmut' iun*, III, 1, pp. 257-258. An example of the failure of his memory is provided by his references to Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea. He quotes certain facts about the bishop from Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* and then states that Firmilian had written an history of the persecutions of the church in the days of the Roman emperors Maximianus, Decius and Diocletian, (II, 75, p. 213). This work had also referred to events in Armenia under a king Khosrov. There is no evidence that Firmilian had written such a work; the early Christian Biblical scholar. St. Jerome (c. 347-419 AD.) gives no works by him in his *Lives of Illustrious Men* (see Henry Wace and Philip Schaff, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3,

Oxford, 1842), but a book entitled *Concerning the Deaths of the Persecutors (De mortibus persecutorum)* had been written in the early fourth century by the early Christian apologist Lactantius (c. 260-c. 340), and did indeed deal with Roman emperors named Maximianus, Decius and Diocletian, although not with an Armenian king Khosrov. Furthermore, Jerome also mentions that Lactantius was also known as “Firmianus” (*Firmianus qui et Lactantius*), a name sufficiently similar to “Firmilianus” for confusion to have occurred. Since, however, Lactantius Firmianus’s work was in Latin, which Movses did not claim to have studied, it follows that he had either seen a Greek version to which information on Armenia had been added, or he had heard about it. In any case, it is clear that he was relying on memory in writing this part of his *History*, for which he apologises soon after (III.1).

- <sup>54</sup> For the date of the battle, see Karen N. Iuzbashian, “Erb é sksuel Vahan Mamikoniani Glkavoratz Apestambut’ iune” (When Did the Rebellion Led by Vahan Mamikonian Begin?), *Patma-Banasirakan Handes*, No. 1, 1984, pp. 95-101.
- <sup>55</sup> P’arpetsi, *Patmut’ iun*, p. 604. Cf. P’arpetsi’s use of the word in III. 80 and 89. Malkhasian noted that its meaning was uncertain in Pavstos’s *Patmut’ iun Hayots* (*History of the Armenians*), Erevan, 1968, p. 326, n.100.
- <sup>56</sup> Abeghian, *Erker*, III, pp. 343-347.
- <sup>57</sup> Cf. «...եւ քուրմք զ’նոցի’ն զ’հետ լի’նելով, դադարեն առ նոսա» in Khorenatsi, *Patmut’ iun*, II, 12, and «... Սաթի’նկան, զ’հետ նորա եկեալք» *ibid.*, II, 58, p. 187.
- <sup>58</sup> The Kamsarakan princes were allied with Vahan Mamikonian and were frequently on the move during the war. Two of their ladies were taken hostage by the Persians; see P’arpetsi, *Patmut’ iun*, III, 79, p. 472.
- <sup>59</sup> Gulbekian, p. 72. The remark in Book III, chapter 65 is not relevant since it is not a direct reply to a command or question but a general expression of relief that he had completed his task.
- <sup>60</sup> P’arpetsi, *Patmut’ iun*, III, 77, p. 458 f.
- <sup>61</sup> There is reason to believe that Movses had some assistance in the composition of Book III. In Book I, he addressed remarks and complaints to his patron in fourteen of the 32 chapters and then extensively in the appendix on the Persian myths. In Book II, his remarks are much less frequent, occurring in eleven chapters out of 92, while in Book III we find remarks in only five chapters out of 67.

ՄՈՎՍԵՍ ԽՈՐԵՆԱՑԻ ԵՒ ՂԱԶԱՐ ՓԱՐՊԵՑԻ  
(Ամփոփում)

ՎՐԷԺ Ա. ԲՀՆՅ. ՆԵՐՍԷՍԵԱՆ

Մովսես Խորենացիի եւ Ղազար Փարպեցիի *Հայոց Պատմութիւն* երկերուն միջեւ առկայ մամուրփիւնները, հետեւաբար նաեւ երկու պատմագիրներուն կենսագրական առընչութիւններ յաճախ նիւթ եղած են հայ բանասիրութեան մէջ:

Մեկնելով բնագրային բաղդատութիւններէ, ժամանակի պատմա-քաղաքական արեւելումն եւ այլ մատենագիրներու անդրադարձումներէ, կը պարզուի թէ Խորենացիի եւ Փարպեցիի *Հայոց Պատմութիւն*ներու մամուրփիւնները արդիւնք են ամոնց 482-83ի եւ 483-84ի ձմեռները միասին՝ Սիւնիքի հիւսիսային շրջանը գտնուող քարայր-մենաստանի մը մէջ անցընելուն:

Կ'եզրակացուի նաեւ, թէ շատ հաւանաբար Փարպեցին օգնած է Խորենացիին՝ անոր *Հայոց Պատմութեան* երկնումի վերջին գլուխներուն ատեն: Կը նոյնացուին Մովսես Խորենացին ու Մովսես Փիլիսոփոսը որուն հետ իր անցուցած ժամանակին յիշատակումը կը կատարէ Փարպեցին՝ Վահան Մամիկոնեանի ուղղած իր թուղթին մէջ: Կը պարզուի նաեւ, որ Խորենացին իր *Հայոց Պատմութեան* վերջին հատուածները ամբողջացուցած է 483-484ին: