

# The Movses Xorenats'i Controversy

## Two Studies

*When did this Armenian historian live and write?*

---

### Second Half of 8th Century:

"[On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene](#)" by Cyril Toumanoff (1913-1997) from the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* (Vienna, 1961), columns 467-476.

### 5th Century:

"[The Date of Moses of Khoren](#)" by F. C. Conybeare (1856-1924) from the journal *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 10 (1901), pp. 489-504.

---

Prepared by Robert Bedrosian

---

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

# On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene

by Cyril Toumanoff

\* This article, which is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes, appears in the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* (Vienna, 1961) columns 467-476.

467

ՀԵՆՐԻ ԲՆԻՔ 1961

468

Cyril 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<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup>, others to the eighth<sup>3</sup>, and still others to the ninth<sup>4</sup>. These

divergent views, and their mutual exclusion, were recently held up to irony by a Soviet Armenian savant, who reverted to the traditional date<sup>5</sup>; and he has been seconded in this by another authority<sup>6</sup>. 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

<sup>1</sup> Ps. Moses, 3. 61, 62, 68. — Cf. M. Abelyan, *Istoriya drevnearmjanskoj literatury*, I (Erevan, 1948), 198—199, 207.

<sup>2</sup> E. g., A. Zaminean, *Hay grakan patmut'won* (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", *Issledovaniya 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].

<sup>3</sup> 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 epos v "Istorii Armenii" Moiseja Xorenskago* (Moscow, 1903); G. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean, "Xorenac'woy žamanakē orošelu nor p'orj", *Ararat* (1897) [after the end of the seventh century]; N. Akinean, *Lewond Erec' ew Movses Xorenac'i* (Vienna, 1930); *idem*, s. v. "Moses Chorenaci", *Real-Encycl. d. cl.*

*Alt.*, Suppl.-bd. 6 (1935), col. 534—541 [Pseudo-Moses is identical with Lewond, 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 eighth century and 828]; S. Janašia, "K kritike Moiseja Xorenskogo", *Masalebi Sak'art'velos da Kavkasiis istoriisat'vis*, 6 (1937) 473—503 [not before the eighth century].

<sup>4</sup> 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 ašēlc'vaci 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].

<sup>5</sup> S. Malxasyanc', *Xorenac'u ašēlc'vaci šurje* (Erevan, 1940).

<sup>6</sup> Abelyan, *Istoriya*, p. 198—209.

Armenia, which division was instituted by the Emperor Justinian I in 536<sup>7</sup>. — (2) In 3. 18, he speaks of the Iranians' penetrating as far as Bithynia in the course of a war on the Empire. This occurred, for the first time in history, in the war of 604—629<sup>8</sup>. — (3) In 3.46, allusion is made to the institution, following the death of Arsaces III (c. 390), of the office of presiding prince' (*ařařnordēr nazararac'n*), along with that of *comes Armeniae* (*komēss iřxans*) 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<sup>9</sup>. At the beginning of that century, Sebēos does not mention the Khazars by name<sup>10</sup>. — (5) He makes use, in 2.62, of "Vas-purakan", to designate the territory east of lake Van; this territory, however, came to be so designated only after the partition of Armenia in 591<sup>11</sup>. Sebēos, in the early seventh century, does not yet know this term as a toponym, but uses *vaspurakan* adjectivally as

<sup>7</sup> Adontz, *Armenija v ėpoxu Justiniana* (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 203; Conybeare, *Moses of Chorene*, col. 898, n. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Conybeare, *loc. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> For this work, see, e. g., Abelyan, *Istoriya*, 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.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> Adontz, *Armenija*, pp. 230—234.

an "elevated" equivalent of "Iranian", and, thus, also to designate the territory in question, which in 591 remained in the Iranian sphere<sup>12</sup>. 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<sup>13</sup>. — (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)<sup>14</sup>; 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 in the tenth-century History of the Katholikos John VI that this term has the same sense as in Pseudo-Moses<sup>15</sup>. — (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<sup>17</sup>. — (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-

<sup>12</sup> *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.

<sup>13</sup> *Narratio*, 103 (ed. Garitte [*supra*, n. 12], p. 40): *ἡς Ἀσπουκανῶν χώρας*. For the date of this source, see Garitte, *La Narratio*, pp. 382—400.

<sup>14</sup> Adontz, *Armenija*, p. 421, n. 3.

<sup>15</sup> *Ařarhač'oyc' Movsesi Xorenac'woy* (ed. Venice, 1881), p. 33.

<sup>16</sup> *History of Armenia* (ed. Tiflis, 1912), pp. 135, 230, 245, 303, 307.

<sup>17</sup> Adontz, *Sur la date*, p. 99; Akinean, *Moses Chorenaqi*, col. 536.

sion of the dynastic nature of that social group<sup>18</sup>. 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<sup>19</sup>.

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<sup>20</sup>. 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 Oron-

<sup>18</sup> 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).

<sup>19</sup> 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. Abelyan, *Istoriya*, 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 Lewond, posed by Fr. Akinean (supra, n. 3).

<sup>20</sup> 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.

tids, 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<sup>21</sup>. 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<sup>22</sup>. 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 cousins. The Iberian (East Georgian) line of

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

<sup>22</sup> *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<sup>23</sup>. The Georgian sources, at any rate, are the first to mention the Davidic descent of the Bagratids. The earliest reference is in Juanšer's *History of King Vaxtang Gorgasal*, written between c. 790 and c. 800<sup>24</sup>, where is related the arrival in Iberia of the above Adarnase, "who was of the House of David the Prophet"<sup>25</sup>. Next comes the stone effigy in low relief of Adarnase's son, the Curopalate Ašot I the Great († 830)<sup>26</sup>, 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 DaviT'* = "the Prophet David")<sup>27</sup>. Here the

<sup>23</sup> 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.

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

<sup>25</sup> Juanšer (ed. S. Qauxč'išvili, *K'art'lis C'xovreba*, I, Tiflis, 1955), p. 243; cf. Toumanoff, *Early Bagratids*, p. 44, and *Iberia*, p. 224.

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

<sup>27</sup> 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 poezdki 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 Juanšer, 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

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<sup>28</sup>, 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<sup>29</sup>. From the latter source and from Juanšer, it appears that the claim was not, in the days of Adarnase, as yet widely known<sup>30</sup>: 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)<sup>31</sup>; soon thereafter, it was referred to in the *De administrando imperio* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus († 959)<sup>32</sup>. The latter's reference definitely betrays its Iberian provenance<sup>33</sup>. The complete and most elaborate shape was given to this theory by the Georgian historian Sumbat (c. 1030) in his *History of the Bagratids*<sup>34</sup>.

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

Ašot's youngest son Guaram who is called "the second builder" of Opiza: doubtless as the second among the Bagratids, after his father.

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

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

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 227—228; *Early Bagratids*, p. 44, n. 37 (erroneously: 38).

<sup>31</sup> *Hist. Arm.*, 8 (p. 25).

<sup>32</sup> Cap. 45.

<sup>33</sup> 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).

<sup>34</sup> 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).



becoming largely a sort of pan-Bagratid empire<sup>35</sup>. 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<sup>36</sup>. 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<sup>37</sup>. 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 be-

half of Ašot V Bagratuni († 890), Prince of Princes (from c. 862) and later, in 885, King (Ašot I) of Armenia<sup>38</sup>. 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<sup>39</sup>. 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 Juanšer 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*.

<sup>35</sup> 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.

<sup>36</sup> *Genealogie*, p. 67.

<sup>37</sup> *Streifzüge*, pp. 402—403 (not before the end of the ninth century), 428—430.

<sup>38</sup> *Genealogie*, pp. 47—59.

<sup>39</sup> *Orontids II*.

# The Date of Moses of Khoren

by F. C. Conybeare

This article, first published in the journal *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 10 (1901), was reprinted in a collection of Conybeare's *Armeniaca* titled *The Armenian Church: Heritage and Identity* Frederick Cornwallis Conybeare, (New York, 2001), pp. 867-878 compiled with an introduction by Rev. Nerses Verej Nersessian.

## The Date of Moses of Khoren\*

The traditional date of this writer's History of Armenia lies somewhere in the second half of the fifth century. It is dedicated to Sahak Bagratuni who was one of the leaders in 481 of the revolt against the Sassanid dynasty of Persia. The last events definitely related in it are the deaths, in the second year of Hazkert king of Persia, of the Translators Sahak and Mesrop, and it concludes with a lamentation over the calamities which befell the writers' country in connection with the earlier revolt of Vardan, AD 451. The historian therefore composed his work about the year 460. Such was the old and received opinion.

The accuracy and value of many of the narratives of Moses was first called in question by Gutschmid, and it will surprise no one to learn that he is rather a compiler than an original historian, a compiler moreover devoid of critical sense and ability to distinguish between legend and sober fact in so far Moses was no better and no worse than most monkish chroniclers. But it was a distinct shock not only to Armenians who prize Moses as their national Herodotus, but in a measure to Byzantine scholars as well, to receive from Professor A. Carrière in the year 1893 a demonstration, in seeming as simple as it was peremptory, that the entire history ascribed to Moses is not his at all; is not a monument even of the fifth century, but just a fake of the eighth century.

The demonstration was as follows. Professor Carrière noticed first that the account of the conversion of Constantine in Moses bk 2, ch. 83 is in close agreement with the corresponding passage of the Life of Silvester, a Latin apocryph hardly earlier in his opinion than the middle of the last half of the fifth century.<sup>1</sup> He accordingly depressed the date of Moses to at least the beginning of the sixth century. This was in July 1892. Shortly afterwards he learned from an Armenian scholar, M. Norayr, that the Life of Silvester exists in old Armenian. He went to the library of San Lazzaro in Venice, and there found four MSS of it. In them the suspicious passage of Moses lay almost word for word, and it seemed apparent that the author of the so-called History of Moses of Khoren used the Armenian version of the Life of Silvester, a version which according to the attestation of the sober historian Asoghik was made by Philo of Tirak as late as AD 690. Here was proof, short and peremptory, that the history of Moses is at best a monument of the early eighth century.

How closely the text of Moses reproduces that of the Armenian life of Silvester the reader can judge from the annexed table in which the two Armenian texts are transliterated according to the system followed by H. Hübschmann in his *Armenische Grammatik*:

Moses of Khoren	Life of Silvester
Bayts yetoy hrapureal i knojēn	Bayts hrapureal i knojēn iwrnē
iwrnē Mak'siminay i dsterēn Diokghetianosi,	Mak'sinteay i dsterēn Diokghetianosi,
yaroyts haladsans ekeghetsvoy.	ev arar haladsans ekeghetsvoy
	Kostandianos ...
ev zbazums vkayeal,	ev bazumk' eghen vkayk' ...

\* *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 10 (1901). 867

ink'n eghep'andakan borotut'eamb  
ēst bolor ēnkaleal marmnoyn apakanetsaw  
vasn yandgnut'eann:

Zor otch karatsin buzhel arioghakan  
kaxardk'n ev mariskean bzhishkk'n.

yaghags oroy ygheats ar Trdat,  
ar'ak'el nma diut's i Parsits ev i  
Hndkats. sakayn ev aynk' otch hasin  
nma yōgut:

Zōr ev k'urmk' omank' i diwats  
khratuē hramayetsin bazmut'iwn  
tghayots zenul yawazans ev jerm  
areamb luanal ev  
oghjanal. oroy lueal zlalivn mankantsn  
handerdz martsn kakanmambk'...

Yaynzham eghap'andakan borotut'iwn  
zbolor marmin t'agavorin Kostandianosi  
apakanēr...

Vasn oroy ariokean kakhardk' ev  
ariostikean bzhishkk' otch karatsin  
augnel aun andr.

ev otch Parsits ev  
Hayots ...

egh dzanayin  
k'urmk' i diwats hrapuranats yolovits  
tghayots zenul yavazansn mehenatsen,  
ev luanal jerm areamb zandzn, ev  
aynpēs ar'oghjanal asēin: ... Ev  
mairk'n zkni mankantsn ekeal ashkhatein  
ev layin zmah mankantsn, ev  
lueal t'agavorin ...

In a note at the end of this article I give a translation of these texts. Professor Carrière's brochure, confronting this late seventh-century source with the text of Moses, was an electric shock to the Armenians. It was reprinted in the journals of Venice, Vienna, Constantinople and Tiflis, and awoke them from their dogmatic repose. One of its most valuable effects indeed has been to stir them up to publish *in extenso* the sources which, according to Carrière's showing, Moses of Khoren had employed. At Venice Dr Sargsian printed from four MSS the Armenian life of Silvester, confronting it page by page with the Greek; and a little later the Patriarchal press at Ējmiadsin produced a handsome volume containing three separate texts, namely: the version of Socrates made from the Greek by Philo of Tirak AD 696; the version of the Life of Silvester made eighteen years earlier by the Abbot Grigor Dzorap'oretsi; and thirdly the so-called Lesser Socrates, a loose Armenian paraphrase, sometimes longer, sometimes shorter, of Philo's version of the Greek text of Socrates. In this paraphrase, and as an integral portion of it, is included a similar paraphrase of the Armenian text of the Life of Silvester. This publication of the threefold text (carefully and critically edited by one of the monks of Ējmiadsin, Mesrop Tēr Movsēsian) revealed one important fact, which had alike escaped the notice of Carrière and of Dr Sargsian: the text which Moses of Khoren used — if indeed he used it — is not the Abbot Grigor's direct version of the Life, but the later paraphrase or 'Lesser Socrates'.

The date and authorship of this later paraphrase are uncertain, but it is an overworking of Socrates of a kind to adapt it to the tastes and prejudices of medieval Armenian ecclesiastics. Armenian acts of martyrdom are worked into it, as also a history of the Eutychian heresy and of the Council of Ephesus inspired by a violent spirit of antagonism to the partisans of Chalcedon. A catalogue of Armenian historical MSS, formerly at Madras but lost at sea on their way to Venice, declares that the 'Lesser Socrates' was of the number, and that it was an abridgement made at the order of Nersēs Kamsarakan in the time of Anastasius, Armenian patriarch. This notice is probably based on a confusion. It is true that the translation from the Greek was made at the order of this Nersēs, for the



translator tells us so in his colophon. But there is no reason to suppose that the paraphrase is contemporary with the work paraphrased, and it is probably much later. Anyhow in Armenian literature we have no mention of it before the thirteenth century, when Kirakos of Gandzak, Michael Syrus (in the Armenian version), Vardan the Great and others cite it. On the other hand as early as the beginning of the tenth century Asoghik mentions Philo's version of Socrates, and Samuel of Ani cites it in the same century. It is thus very doubtful whether the paraphrase or 'Lesser Socrates' was composed before the eleventh century.

But in that case Professor Carrière has proved too much, and his discovery leaves us in a dilemma; for there are many traces of the History of Moses anterior to the eleventh century, and even a manuscript fragment of his text in the most ancient uncial writing, indubitably as old as the tenth century, is framed and glazed and hung up in the cell of the well-known historian Father Alishan of San Lazzaro, who — as he humorously says — treasures it up against the time when critics shall have brought down the epoch of his revered master Moses as late as the eleventh century.

And other difficulties suggest themselves. Why should Moses of Khoren in relating the conversion of Constantine have left on one side the literal version of the Life of Silvester, which was *ex hypothesi* within his reach, and have copied out the very inaccurate later paraphrase? And by what happy inspiration was he led in copying out that paraphrase to correct *maxintea* to *maximina*, *ariostikean* to *marsikean* (for which *mariskean* is a scribe's error = *μαρσικοί*), and *ariokean* to *arioghakan* (*ἀρίολοι*)? Why in the same context does he correct Serapion of the paraphrase (in Philo's version Serapion) to Soraktion, which already in many MSS of the Liber Pontificalis is given as the name of the mountain to which Silvester fled, and which in spite of Père Duchesne's authority I venture to regard as the original reading of the Latin *Vita Silvestri*?<sup>2</sup>)

Similar difficulties arise to complicate a problem which at first sight was so simple, no matter where we open the Armenian version and subsequent paraphrase of the Life, and compare with them Moses' supposed borrowings. Always with the same clairvoyance Moses pierces the double veil of the Armenian version, and of the paraphrase of it, in order to divine phrases or words which stood in the Greek original and even in the basal Latin text. Here is an example, already adduced by Dr Mesrop Tēr-Movsēsian in his introduction. It loses nothing by being set forth in English to the discarding of the Armenian text. This then is what Moses writes in bk. II, ch. 83:

He (i.e. Constantine), before he became emperor, while he was still Caesar, was worsted in battle, and in great sorrow he had fallen asleep. There appeared to him in a dream a cross of stars from heaven surrounded with writing (which) says: Hereby do thou conquer. And this he made the *signum*, and bearing it in front he won in his wars.

Note that Moses transliterates the Latin word *signum*.

The incident is otherwise narrated in Socrates bk. I, ch. 2, where it is a pillar of light that Constantine sees soon after midday. It is only in the Armenian paraphrase of the Armenian version of the Life of Silvester that we find the story told in at all the same manner. This paraphrase I therefore translate italicizing so much as agrees verbally with the text of Moses:

And the Byzantines conquered the forces of Constantine and sorrowing and hesitating he was considering what to do on the morrow for the war, *sorrowing he fell asleep*. And he sees in a

vision the superscription of stars, sign of a cross ... and he bade make the model of a cross ... and to carry it in *front in war* and he won.

There is hardly enough verbal resemblance here to warrant the idea of direct borrowing. It is also noticeable that only the direct version of the Life tells us what was written in the 'superscription of stars', viz. the words: 'Hereby conquer'. In any case however Moses of Khoren cannot depend on either version or paraphrase; for he has the Latin word *signum* imbedded in his text, where the Greek Life has σημείον τοῦ σταυροῦ, which the Armenian version and paraphrase render respectively by the words *nshan* and *awrinak*. The word *signum* therefore like an erratic block in geology reveals another source than these. Moses seems to depend for it on some early Latin, Greek or Armenian text of the Life, in which as in the existing Greek this episode was included. From the Latin text published in the *Sanctuarium* of Mombricitus it is absent.

But let us return to the episode of the blood-bath, following the guidance as before of Dr Mesrop Movsesian. Ukhtanēs, bishop of Sivas or (according to the historian Kirakos) of Urhay (Edessa) wrote early in the tenth century a work on the schism between the Georgians and the Armenians. On p. 102 of this work (Ed. Ējmiadsin, 1817) we read as follows (I italicize verbal coincidences with the text of Moses transliterated above and translated at the end of this article):

But let us revert to the topic we promised as touching the believing of Constantine, how he believed or in what manner. This is the account of the Greek historians. The King of Rome Constantine was an idolater. And *being seduced by Maximina his wife* who was grand-daughter of Diocletian Caesar, he *persecuted* the Christians, and slew *many* believers, who sacrificed not to idols. But the blessed Silvester having taken his disciples, fled into the mountain and was there in hiding. And there was *leprosy* of Constantine the king, like scab, and the physicians *were not* at all *able to heal*. The sectaries said: It is impossible for thee to be healed, unless thou muster spotless children and with their blood fill a *laver*, and while the *blood* is hot, thou enter into that laver naked, and *wash thee* with the blood, and then shalt thou *recover*. He gave command, and in haste they mustered little children many and very countless. And the king came on horseback into the Capitol's temple of idols. And the women ran, and the children in their arms with great lamentations, hair loose, and teats in the mouth of the children; they fell down before the king with bitter lamentations. And he beholding the mourning and the tribulation of the *mothers* and the *wailing of the children*, took great pity and *felt compassion* for them. Yea, even tears poured forth from his eyes, and he esteemed *better their salvation than his own recovery*. He dismissed them<sup>3</sup> in gladness to their roofs, having given to them bread and maintenance. And on that night there appeared Paul and Peter the apostles of Christ, and said: whereas thou hast pitied the children more than theyself, we are come to thee for thy succour. Send unto such and such a mountain, and bring to thee the chief bishop Silvester. And he shall prepare for thee a laver of water, and thou shalt wash therein and be healed of thy leprosy. And at dawn he sent to the mountain, and they brought the holy Silvester ...

There is a clear literary connection between this narrative and the allied texts of Moses and of the abbreviator of the Life. A text almost identical with that of Ukhtanes is also read in the oldest Armenian menologia under January 2nd, the day of St Silvester.

The crucial question now arises: Is the text of Ukhtanes also taken from the Armenian abbreviator of the Life, or is it not? For if it be not, it follows that there existed as late as 900–950 in Armenia a narrative of Constantine's conversion by Silvester to which

Ukhtanes, the menologion and the abbreviator were all indebted, and from which Moses may equally have derived his narrative.

And we must answer the question about Ukhtanes and the menologion in the negative, for their text contains elements drawn from a Latin or Greek source, but which cannot have come into it either through the abbreviator, or through the Armenian text which the abbreviator used. Thus Ukhtanes writes that Constantine came 'into the Capitol's temple of idols'. This answers to the Latin text of Mombritius 'pontifices *Capitolii* hoc dederunt consilium, debere piscinam fieri in ipso *Capitolio*', and to the Greek text of Combefis 'ἀπιόντι τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐπὶ τὸ Καπετώλιον'. In the Armenian version of the Life of Silvester and equally in the paraphrase of it the word *tachar*, which means 'temple', is used to render the word *Capitolium*. Ukhtanes and the menologion however transliterate the word *Capitolion*, just as we saw that Moses a few lines above and in the same context transliterates the word *signum*.

Let us follow this clue. Ukhtanes writes that 'the women ran with their children in their arms with great lamentations, hair loose and teats in the mouths of their children'. Of this the abbreviator — supposed to be followed by Moses — has barely a single word. He merely says that 'the mothers with the children having come were lamenting and bewailed the death of their children'. The Armenian translation of the Life is, it is true, nearer, for it has: 'There met (him) also the mothers of the children in great sadness calling out with tears, hair loose, with naked heads and full of howling laments, so as to fill all the winds with voice of lamentation.' Nevertheless the allusion to the teats of Ukhtanes is absent from this translation, and only explicable from the Greek text: ἀπήντησαν αἱ μητέρες τῶν παίδων λυσίκομοι τῶν ἰδίων μασθῶν γεγυμνωμένων. Of course the Armenian version is on the whole truest to the Greek, and renders ἀπήντησαν; but Ukhtanes alone renders μασθῶν. He also renders λυσίκομοι by the same word *herardzak* which the Armenian translator uses. Just below Ukhtanes has the phrase: 'Yea, even tears poured forth', which echoes the Latin 'prorumpens in lacrimas'. The Greek text has ἤρξατο δακρύνειν, which the Armenian version exactly renders, while the abbreviator tries to improve on it and has: 'he wept bitterly'. Ukhtanes again writes that the mothers 'fell down before the king with bitter lamentation'. So the Latin: 'Coram eo *se* in plateis fundentes lacrymas *straverunt*.' But here the Greek text of Combefis has μέγιστην πτόησιν καὶ φρικτὴν τῷ τε βασιλεῖ καὶ τῇ συγκλήτῳ ἐνεποίησαν; and this is exactly rendered by the Armenian version, while the paraphrase preserves neither the one idea nor the other. Here Ukhtanes can depend neither on the Armenian version of the Life nor on the paraphrase of it, nor on the Greek text underlying the Armenian version; but only on some ulterior Armenian text which was closer to the original Latin than any of these.

I remarked that the text of the Armenian menologion is identical with that of Ukhtanes. It is so, but here and there it supplements Ukhtanes as in the following:

*And the sectaries said: it is impossible for thee to recover and be healed of this thy complaint, unless thou muster a thousand sucking children and (unless) thou sit down in a laver ... and wash thee with warm blood of the children and then dost thou recover.*

I italicize all variants from Ukhtanes text.

This text has affinity to that of Moses in so far as 'with warm blood' is read; but why a *thousand* children? The Latin has: *missum est igitur et de rebus fisci vel patrimonii regis ad tria millia: et eo amplius adducti ad urbem Romam pontificibus traditi sunt*

Capitolii. The Greek text has merely *πλῆθος παίδων*, the Armenian version and Moses have *bazmut'iwn* which has the same sense; Ukhtanes omits altogether to say whether the victims were to be many or few.

Now if we turn to the homily of James of Sarūg upon the conversion of Constantine, a Syriac document of about AD 476, but presupposing, as Duchesne and its editor M. Frothingham admit,<sup>4</sup> a Syriac document of much earlier date, we read as follows of Constantine's decree ordering children to be sent to Rome. I cite M. Frothingham's Italian version:

Da parte dell' Imperator, salute alle città ed ai magnati. Poscia: per queste lettere vi fo sapere che devo compire oggi un voto solenne verso tutti i figli primogeniti delle madri. Che ognuno di voi faccia venire tosto *mila* fanciulli e li mandi per ricevere dono ...

The conclusion is plain. The Ukhtanes-menologion text reproduces some ancient Armenian source here allied to the lost Syriac. This old document however, unlike the Syriac, gave the chief role to Silvester. The abbreviator of the Armenian version of the Life freely copied out this lost Armenian source, of which the influence is perhaps also traceable in that Armenian version itself. But if the abbreviator used an earlier source, why may not Moses also have used the same? Why insist that he merely copied the abbreviator, when so many features of his text contradict such an hypothesis?

For the list of these is not exhausted. Moses writes that Constantine 'on hearing the wailing of the children along with the mother's howling, having felt compassion *loved-man*, esteeming better their salvation than his own'. Of all the parallel text Ukhtanes alone recites that the emperor heard the children as well as their mothers. It is a detail which is not given even in the Greek and Latin, and so it denotes some special community of source between Moses and Ukhtanes. Of still greater significance is Moses' phrase *gt'atseal marda sireats* which I render literally 'having felt compassion loved-man'. The last words denotes in some underlying Greek text the word *φιάνθρωπος*, and accordingly we find in the Greek this: *φιάνθρωπον ἦθος ἀναλαβὼν ἤρξατο δακρύνειν*, where the Latin has: *vicit crudelitatem pontificum pietas romani imperii*. In the Armenian version of the Life and in the abridgement or paraphrase of it there is no trace of the word *φιάνθρωπον*. Therefore Moses must have had access to some Armenian source which reproduced the Greek word. And his next sentence is closer to the Latin than any of the other texts: 'esteeming better their salvation than his own'. *Cur ego praeponam salutem meam saluti populi innocentis?* All the other texts both Greek and Armenian balance Constantine's health, *ὑγεία*, against the children's *σωτηρία*. Ukhtanes is no exception, but, be it noted, that in all other respects than this his narrative of this point corresponds to that of Moses, whereas the paraphrase slurs over the whole episode, and has no affinities with either.

Let us resume our conclusions. We find that there is a literary connection not merely between Moses and the paraphrase, as Professor Carrière supposed, but equally between Moses and the text of Ukhtanes and the menologion. We also find that Moses and the two latter have, sometimes singly, sometimes together, points of identity with Latin, Greek and Syriac documents ulterior and anterior to the paraphrase, which alone Moses is supposed to have copied into his History.

It follows that there once existed an older Armenian document relating Constantine's vision of the cross, his conversion by Silvester, and his cure from leprosy. Can we

identify this document? We can. Moses himself does not end the 83rd chapter in which he relates these episodes without indicating to us his source: 'By whom (i.e. Silvester) he (Constantine) having been catechized became a believer, God making away with all tyrants from before his face, *as in brief Agat'angeghos doth teach thee.*'

In establishing the existence of an early Armenian source used alike by Moses, by the abbreviator or paraphrast, by Ukhtanes and the compiler of the menologion, we vindicate the good faith of this reference to Agat'angeghos, and empty Professor Carrière's main contention of all force. That the particular work of Agat'angeghos no longer exists is no matter for surprise, seeing that barely a tenth part of the Armenian literature of the fifth and sixth centuries survives today.

Let us glance now at another narrative which Moses ends with a similar avowal of his source: 'As Agat'angeghos doth teach thee'. The episode is that of the conversion of Georgia by St Nouné. In ch. 85 of book II the course of his narrative has led Moses to mention the faith of Mihran prince of the Virk' or Iberians. This suggests the contents of ch. 86 which he prefaces thus: 'But about the faith of Mihran and of the land of the Virk' it is opportune for us now to speak. A certain woman, by name Nouné' ... Professor Carrière quotes Socrates I. 20: *Καίρως δὲ ἤδη λέγειν ὅπως καὶ Ἰβηρες ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἐχριστιάνισαν. Γυνή τις ...*

Surely it is exaggeration to say: *La parenté des deux textes est évidente*. The more so, as the reason which suggested to Socrates to here narrate the fortunes of St Nouné is clear enough. It is another story taken from Rufinus — *ταῦτα φησὶν ὁ Πουφίνος*, and by Rufinus from an oriental — *παρὰ Βακουρίου μεμαθηκέναι*. The preceding chapter, No. 19, is also drawn from Rufinus and by him from another oriental, and ends with the words: *Ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Πουφίνος παρὰ τοῦ Αἰδεσίου ... ἀκηκοέναι φησὶν*. He naturally goes on to tell the other story which Rufinus heard from Bacurius. In the sequel as Professor Carrière admits the two narratives have little in common. 'D'autre part,' he adds, 'Moïse modifie complètement l'aspect de sa narration en ajoutant ...,' and he gives a string of important additions, i.e. features present in Moses' narrative, but absent from Socrates' *rechauffée* of Rufinus. M. Carrière suggests — and it is to prejudge the issue — that in introducing these features Moses *modified his source*, Socrates to wit. But if we find that in a local Georgian document going back to the fifth century these features were already present, we may be sure that they are not 'additions' made by Moses to the Armenian version of Socrates. Of the legend of Nouné Rufinus is our earliest exponent, say about AD 400. Next comes Socrates about 440, and the version of Socrates supposed by Carrière to underlie the text of Moses was, as we saw, only made in AD 696. But the legend, told very much as Rufinus tells it, survives in Georgian, and also in the pages of an Armenian version of a history of Georgia made as early as AD 1200. The history itself so translated was much earlier, and was composed by one named Juansher. In this history at the end of the tale of Nouné this colophon remains embedded in the text: 'This brief history was found in the season of confusion, and was placed in the book called the *Kharthlis Tzkhorepa*, that is *The History of the Kharthli* (i.e. Iberians). And Juansher found it written up to the time of King Wakhthang.' This king died AD 483, and therefore the 'brief history' existed in Georgian — a tongue with which Moses of Khoren must have been conversant — as early as that date. It is pertinent therefore to enquire whether the supposed 'additions' made by Moses to the text of Socrates, or rather to the still later paraphrase of Socrates, which he really used, were present in the old Georgian document,



even though Rufinus and Socrates writing for the western world ignored or knew not of them. Professor Carrière thus enumerates the additions to or modifications of Socrates introduced by Moses.

- (1) The name of the woman, Nouné, who from being a captive as she was in Socrates becomes one of the Hrip'simian saints that had fled to Iberia.
- (2) The name of the king of Iberia, Mihran, whom Moses makes the general and governor of Georgia and not king.<sup>5</sup>
- (3) The name of the place which was the scene of the conversion, Medzkheth, chief city of Iberia.
- (4) The question (asked by the Jews of Jesus): By whose authority doest thou these things? is put by Mihran to Nouné. According to Socrates the king had not yet seen the saint.
- (5) The contemporaneity of the incidents related with the miraculous events of Trdat's conversion. Socrates sets them under Constantine.  
And on p. 41 of his brochure Professor Carrière adds three more:
- (6) The details, circumstantial but unhistorical (?), as to the deity adored by the people of Medzkheth, and as to the peculiar homage paid to that deity.
- (7) Very exact topographic details about the position of the city of Medzkheth between the two rivers, the great one (the Kur) and the lesser one (the Araghwa).
- (8) A rapid exposé of the missionary travels of St Nouné in the other provinces of Iberia.

Now every one of these 'additions' is present in the document of about AD 480 which Juansher has preserved to us, except No. 4; and that is also to be found in the old Iberian text of the legend translated by Miss Wardrop. Nor is this all. A careful comparison of Moses' text with these old sources reveals many other correspondences, for which we should look in vain either in the Greek or Armenian Socrates. Now if Moses composed his history in the eighth century, and drew his inspiration wholly from the latter, how came he to chance throughout exactly on the most ancient local form of the narrative? M. Carrière indeed suggests that the Armenian version of Socrates used by Moses was interpolated; but we have both the version and the interpolated paraphrase, and neither contains any of these characteristic incidents and details. Surely it is simpler to believe Moses when he says that he drew them, as he also drew the tale of Constantine, from Agat'angeghos. 'Peut-on voir dans cette affirmation répétée,' writes M. Carrière (p. 42), 'autre chose qu'une dissimulation flagrante des sources utilisées, étant donné qu'Agathange ne dit pas un mot des événements racontés dans les dits chapitres?'

But I have already pointed out that we have no reason to suppose that Agat'angeghos' works have come down to us in any but a garbled and mutilated form, and the sort of *impasse* into which such extreme scepticism as M. Carrière's may lead one is exemplified in his comment on point 8. Moses ends his ch. 86 thus:

Yes, we venture to say that she became a female apostle and preached, beginning from the Kgharji at the gates of the Alani and Kasbi as far as the marches of the Mask'eti, as Agat'angeghos teaches thee.

Of this M. Carrière writes: 'Les textes de Socrate et de Rufin n'ont rien du pareil. Mais Moïse de Khoren semble avoir rédigé cette notice à l'imitation du résumé des travaux apostoliques de S. Grégoire qui se trouve chez Agathange.' A glance at the Armenian

Juansher would have saved him from so much error, for therein the apostolic wanderings of St Nouné are traced more fully indeed, but in a corresponding fashion; and the same is true of the old Georgian document. St Gregory was here as little the prototype of Nouné as St Paul or Jonah.

Even if Moses wrote as late as the eighth century he could not have copied the Armenian Juansher, for this book did not exist till long afterwards; and in spite of the many identities we have signalized, their rival narratives diverge from one another in important respects; if we carefully compare Moses with the old Georgian narrative and with Juansher, we soon realize that the latter were not the source used by Moses, but rather some Armenian document older and in some respects less legendary than they. What is more likely then than that he used a work now lost of Agat'angeghos?

Want of space alone prevents my following Professor Carrière into his other contentions. I have tried to meet him on those which are his strongest. I must own that when I first read his brochure I was thoroughly convinced, and the late date of Moses seemed to me established for good and ever. But the further research made possible by Dr Movsēsian's publication entirely disposes of his main contention, for it turns out that if between the interpolator or abbreviator — whichever we call him — of the Armenian Socrates and Life of Silvester on the one hand and Moses on the other a literary connection of actual borrowing exists, then in every case it is the abbreviator who borrows and not Moses. Most of the correspondences however are explicable as joint borrowings from common documents. In one passage only, namely, at the end of ch. 20 of book I, can one feel quite sure that the abbreviator copied Moses.

Space equally forbids me to criticise in detail, as I should like to do, the work of M. Khalat'eants entitled *Armyanskii Epos*, published at Moscow 1896. He adopts Professor Carrière's view, and seeks fresh grounds for relegating Moses to the middle of the eighth century. The comparative tables in which he confronts the text of Moses with Eusebius, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory Magistros, Sebēos, P'awstos of Buzand, Eznik, Vardan, Callisthenes and other authors are most valuable and are models of accuracy, industry and research. But so far as they are intended to show that the History of Moses of Khoren was only written about 750 or later, they seem to me abortive. A careful perusal of them leaves on my mind quite another conviction, namely, that Moses wrote at the date 460, about which is traditionally assigned him. For M. Khalat'eants fails to indicate a single passage in the the History of Moses clearly copied or imitated from any Armenian text later than AD 450. It may be that Moses invented the narrative which he ascribes to Mar Aba Katina, as Professor Carrière argued in his earliest brochure. I cannot agree with him on the point, but that a similar narrative equally attributed to Mar Aba is prefixed in the MSS to the History of Sebēos, surely does not prove that Moses copied Sebēos. It rather confirms Moses' veracity.

For a long time I accepted Professor Carrière's view, but I had always an uneasy feeling that in doing so I admitted the reality of something abnormal and extraordinary, of a literary miracle in short; for his hypothesis involved several things almost without a parallel. It involved:

(1) That an unknown Armenian writer about 760 compiled a history of his country up to AD 450, assuming throughout as a mask the tone, style, prejudices and intellectual conditions and limitations which, so far as we can judge, really prevailed in Armenia during the fifth century.

(2) This eighth-century writer, though his work reveals him as a partisan, and though he is, as any monk of the fifth century would naturally be, a miracle monger and a gossip devoid of critical sense, never alludes to nor even hints at any of the stirring events which happened between 450 and 750. At the close of his work for example he breaks into a passionate lament — which still stirs our hearts as we read it — over the calamities which befell his country in 451; but of the far greater calamity of the Mohamedan conquest he seems never to have heard. Again in religious matters his writing reveals him as a keen and blind partisan, yet no echo of the Chalcedonian controversy which convulsed his countrymen from 500 onwards seems to have reached his ear. In 750 when he wrote, every Armenian monastery was ringing with this controversy, and the very abridgement of the Life of Silvester and of Socrates of which he is declared to have copied out whole chapters is full of it. Yet his voluminous work contains not the faintest allusion thereto.

(3) Thus we have found — and that too in the eighth century — an Armenian monk who, when he sat down to chronicle the long past, could make abstraction of all that was around him and near him, and throw himself into that past with consummate dramatic skill. He not only relates the events of 400–450, but describes the part he himself took in those events, with such art and archaeological knowledge as never to contradict or jar against the genuine biographies of that age. Though he writes as late as 750, he attains such verisimilitude in his descriptions of the period 400–450, that we pass from a perusal of P'awstos, of Eghishe, of Ghazar of P'arp, of Koriwn to a perusal of Moses of Khoren without any sense that we have jumped from contemporary authors to one of the eighth or ninth century.

Thackeray in his romance *The History of Henry Esmond* set himself to copy the manners and language of Queen Anne's age, and his novel is regarded by all as a *tour de force*. But as a retrospective artist Thackeray sinks into insignificance beside this eighth-century monk affecting to write in the middle of the fifth.

One would however expect so gifted a writer as the eighth-century composer of this history to have been surrounded by contemporaries of fair intelligence. Not so. He palms off upon them as the work of Agat'angeghos a paraphrase (of a late seventh-century version of Silvester's Life and of Socrates) only made the day before, perhaps centuries later, but anyhow as accessible to them as to himself.

Professor Carrière's hypothesis involves such literary miracles as these. Nevertheless for a time his *pièces justificatives* appeared to me to bear it out. I am glad to have been able to liberate myself from the yoke of a hypothesis which appeared inevitable and yet involved such difficulties. But for Tēr-Movsēsian's opportune publication I could not have done so. Let us hope that the entire episode will stimulate the Armenians to print more of the medieval treasures locked up in their MSS. Too large a space in their journals and books is given up to frothy declamations and rambling conjectures; and they go on fumbling over issues which would be settled at once by a little printing of the manuscript sources.

## Appendix

1. Moses History bk. 2, ch. 83 (verbal identities with the text of the abbreviator of the Armenian Life of Silvester are italicized):

He before he became emperor — won in his wars (see above p. 867). *But afterwards seduced by his wife Maximina, the daughter of Diocletian, he aroused persecutions of the Church,*

and having martyred many, he himself was attacked by elephantiac leprosy over his whole body and was destroyed for his audacity. The which the Ariolic wizards and the Marsik healers were not able to heal. Wherefore he sent to Trdat, to send him soothsayers from Persia and from India, but they too succeeded not in helping him. Wherefore also some pagan priests at the advice of demons ordered a multitude of children to be slain into a laver and (him) to wash in the warm blood and recover. But he having heard the wailing of the children along with the mothers' howlings, taking pity felt humane (lit. loved man), esteeming better their salvation than his own. Wherefore he receives the recompense from God, in a dreaming vision of the apostles receiving the command to be purified by the washing of the life-giving laver at the hand of Silvester, Bishop of Rome, who from him (and his) persecution was in hiding in Mount Soraktion. By whom also having been catechized he believed, God removing all tyrants from before his face, as in brief Agat'angeghos doth teach thee.

The abbreviator of the Armenian Life of Silvester, ed. Venice, San Lazzaro, 1893:

But seduced by his wife Maxintea, the daughter of Diocletian, Constantine caused persecutions of the Church, and many were martyred. Then elephantiac leprosy began to destroy the whole body of the king, as was fulfilled for him for warning from God. Wherefore the Aroykean wizards and Ariostikean healers were not able to help him. Avaunt! not of Persia nor of Armenia either. And he hesitating was in sorrow. The pagan priests by the seductions of demons (ordered) numerous children to be slain into a laver of the idols and (him) to wash himself in the warm blood, and thus they said he would recover. And forth with the soldiers of the king were sent out to all the world, to muster sinless children, unweaned from their parents, into the temple of idols to be slain into lavers. And the mothers with the children having come were lamenting and bewailed the death of their children. And the king having heard the voice of woe and lamentation, says to the bystanders: What is this that I hear? And they say: The mothers of the children, who have been mustered for slaying, out of motherly pity with broken hearts bewail and lament the offspring of their wombs.

And the king touched with remorse also bewailed bitterly and said: God forbid me to slaughter sinless infants, separated from their parents for death, although even my plague of leprosy drag me to death and I remain incurable. And he ordered to give the children to their several mothers, and goods for consolation of their woe, and he dismissed them in joy. And on that night Constantine the king saw in a vision the apostles of the Lord Peter and Paul, who said to him: The apostles ask mercy of God, and to proclaim healing of the flesh's plague, because of the mercy which thou hast shown to the sinless children. And do thou send and call Silvester the overseer of Rome, the one persecuted by thee, who is in the Mount Serapion in a cave there ...

2. Note on p. 498: The fancied resemblance of Moses II. 85 to Socrates I. 20 vanishes in the Armenian version and paraphrase of the latter. Moses writes thus:

Bayts yaghags hawatots Mihranay ev ashkharhin Vrats asel kay mez araji. Kin [v] omn ... How can this derive from the Lesser Socrates which runs: ěnd noyn zhamanaks ev Vrats lini Kotchumn ěntsayut'ean hawatoy, ěst nakhaknamut'ean. Kin [v] omn ... or from Philo of Tirak's version which runs: Bayts i děp ě arděn asel t'ě orpěs Virk' ěnd noyn zhamanakavn K'ristoněatsean. Kin [v] omn ...?

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> The decree of Gelasius De recipiendis et de non recipiendis libris can hardly be later than 490. Yet in this we read: Item actus beati Silvestri, apostolicae sedis praesulis, licet eius qui

conscriptis nomen ignoretur, a multis tamen in urbe Roma Catholicis legi cognovimus et pro antiquo usu multae hoc imitantur ecclesiae.

A book that had such vogue as early as 490 must surely have been over fifty years old. Already before 550 Leontius of Byzantium appeals to the Greek version of it as to an authoritative dogmatic text.

- <sup>2</sup> Père Duchesne however retains Soracte in his text. And surely the well-known mountain, familiar to Roman pilgrims, must have been in the original writer's mind. The form Sarapion may be explained on Duchesne's hypothesis of a Syriac original, as a confusion of the letter *Kāf* with *Pē*. In the Georgian Acts of St Nouné the same confusion seems to have engendered *neaphiuros* for *Νεώκοπος*.
- <sup>3</sup> Note that the abbreviator has this touch, yet he does not borrow from Ukhtanes, nor Ukhtanes from him.
- <sup>4</sup> In Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, 1882–83, serie terza, Rome 1883, p. 167 foll.
- <sup>5</sup> In speaking of Mihran as arajnord or governor Moses is of course more historical than Rufinus or Socrates. To the mind of a Georgian patriot he was a king.