

## 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 befel the writers country in connection with the earlier revolt of Vardan, A. D. 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 Prof. 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. Prof. 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

---

1) 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 conscripsit 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.

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 Lazaro 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 up the Armenian version of the Life of Silvester, a version which according to the attestation of the sober historian Asolik was made by Philo of Tirak as late as A. D. 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 A. Hübschmann in his *Armenische Grammatik*:

## Moses of Khoren.

Bayç yetoy hrapureal i knojēn iurmē Māk'siminay i dsterēn Diokletianos, yaroyç halatsans ekeçevoy.

ev zbazums vkayeał, ink'n ełep'andakan borotu'eamb ešt bolor eñkaleal marmnoyn apakanecaı vasn yandgnu'eann:

Zor oç karaçin bužel ariolağan kaxardk'n ev mariskean bžiškk'n.

yałags oroy yłeaç ar Trdat, arak'el nma diut's i Parsiç ev i Hndkaç. sakayn ev aynk' oç hasin nma yôgut:

Zôr ev k'urmk' omank' i divaç xratuē hramayeçin baznu'iun tıayoç zenul yavazans ev jerm areamb luanal ev oljanal. oroy lueal zlalivn mankaçen handerdz marçen kakanmambk'...

## Life of Silvester.

Bayç hrapureal i knojēn iurmē mak'sinteay i dsterēn Diokletianos, ev arar halatsans ekeçevoy Kostandianos...

ev bazumk' ełen vkayk' . . . Yaynžam ełap'andakan borotu'iun zbolor marmin t'agavorin Kostandianos apakanēr . . . . .

Vasn oroy ariokean kaxardk' ev ariostikean bžiškk' oç karaçin augnel aun andr .

ev oç Parsiç ev Hayoç . . . . .

eł dzanayin k'urmk' i divaç hrapuranaç yoloviç tıayoç zenul yavazans meheñaçn, ev luanal jerm areamb zandzn, ev aynpēs arołjanal asēin: . . . Ev mairk'n zkni mankaçen ekeal ašxarēin ev layin zmah mankaçen, ev lueal t'agavorin . . .

In a note at the end of this article I give a translation of these texts. Prof. 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 shewing, 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 Ejmiatsin produced a handsome volume containing three separate texts, namely: the version of Sokrates made from the Greek by Philo of Tirak A. D. 696; the version of the Life of Silvester made eighteen years earlier by the Abbot Grigor Tsorap'oreci; and thirdly the so-called Lesser Sokrates, a loose Armenian paraphrase, sometimes longer, sometimes shorter, of Philo's version of the Greek text of Sokrates. 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 Ejmiatsin, Mesrop V. Tēr Movsēsean) 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 Sokrates'.

The date and authorship of this later paraphrase are uncertain, but it is an overworking of Sokrates 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 Euty-chian heresy and of the council of Ephesos 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 Sokrates" was of the number, and that it was an abridgement made at the order of Nerses 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 Nerses, 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 Asolik mentions Philo's version of Sokrates, 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 Alishean of San Lazaro, 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 *marisikean* (for which *marisikean* is a scribes error = *μαρσικοῖ*), and *ariokean* to *ariotakan* (*ἀριότανοι*)? Why in the same context does he correct Serapion of the paraphrase (in Philo's version Seraption) 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>1)</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 comparé 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 D<sup>r</sup> Mesrop Tēr Movsēsean 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

1) 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 *Saraption* may be explained on Duchesne's hypothesis of a Syriac original, as a confusion of the letter *Kâf* with *Pē*. In the Georgian acts of St. Nouné the same confusion seems to have engendered *neaphiuros* for *Nεάπολις*.

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 italicising 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 can not 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 *ṗshan* and *aurinak*. 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 D<sup>r</sup> Mesrop Movsēsean. Uxtanēs, 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. Ejmiatsin, 1817) we read as follows (I italicise 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 horse-back 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>1)</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 Uxtanēs is also read in the oldest Armenian menologia under Jan. 2, the day of S. Silvester.

The crucial question now arises: Is the text of Uxtanēs 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 Uxtanēs, 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 Uxtanēs 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 Uxtanēs writes that Constantine came "into

1) Note that the abbreviator has this touch, yet he does not borrow from Uxtanēs, nor Uxtanēs from him.

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 *tačar*, which means "temple", is used to render the word *Capitolium*. Uxtanēs 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. Uxtanēs 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 Uxtanēs is absent from this translation, and only explicable from the Greek text: ἀπήνησαν αἱ μητέρες τῶν παιδῶν λυσίκομοι τῶν ἰδίων μασθῶν γεγωνωμένων. Of course the Armenian version is on the whole truest to the Greek, and renders ἀπήνησαν; but Uxtanēs alone renders μασθῶν. He also renders λυσίκομοι by the same word *herarjak* which the Armenian translator uses. Just below Uxtanēs has the phrase: "Yea, even tears poured forth", which echoes the Latin "prompens 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". Uxtanēs 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 μεγίστην 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 Uxtanēs 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 Uxtanēs. It is so, but here and there it supplements Uxtanēs 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 italicise all variants from Uxtanēs text.

This text has affinity to that of Moses in sofar 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 Capitoli.* The Greek text has merely *πλήθος παιδων*, the Armenian version and Moses have *baemuthiun* which has the same sense; Uxtanēs 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 476 A. D., but presupposing, as Duchesne and its editor M. Frothingham admit<sup>1)</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 Uxtanēs-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 Uxtanēs 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

1) In Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, 1882—3, serie terza, Rome 1883, p. 167 foll.



Uxtanēs. Of still greater significance is Moses' phrase *gı̄aceal marda sireac* which I render literally "having felt compassion loved-man". The last words denotes in some underlying Greek text the word *φιλόανθρωπος*, and accordingly we find in the Greek this: *φιλόανθρωπον ἡθος ἀναλαβῶν 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 *φιλόανθρωπον*. 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*. Uxtanēs 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 Prof. Carrière supposed, but equally between Moses and the text of Uxtanēs 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 83<sup>rd</sup> chapter in which he relates these episodes without indicating to us his source: "By whom (i. e. Silvester) he (Constantine) having been catechised became a believer, God making away with all tyrants from before his face, *as in brief Agathangelus doth teach thee*."

In establishing the existence of an early Armenian source used alike by Moses, by the abbreviator or paraphrast, by Uxtanēs and the compiler of the menologion, we vindicate the good faith of this reference to Agathangelos, and empty Prof. Carrière's main contention of all force. That the particular work of Agathangelos 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 to-day.

Let us glance now at another narrative which Moses ends with a similar avowal of his source: "As Agathangelus doth teach thee".

The episode is that of the conversion of Georgia by S<sup>t</sup> 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: *Καιρὸς δὲ ἤδη λέγειν ὅπως καὶ Ἰβήρης ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν 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 S<sup>t</sup> Nouné is clear enough. It is another story taken from Rufinus — *ταῦτα φησὶν ὁ Ρουφίνος*, and by Rufinus from an oriental — *παρὰ Βακουρίου μεμαθημένα*. The preceding chapter, n<sup>o</sup> 19, is also drawn from Rufinus and by him from another oriental, and ends with the words: *Ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ρουφίνος παρὰ τοῦ Αἰδεσίου . . . ἀκηκοέναι φησὶν*. He naturally goes on to tell the other story which Rufinus heard from Bacurius. In the sequel as Prof. 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 prejudice 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 400 A. D. 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 696 A. D. 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 A. D. 1200. The history itself so translated was much earlier, and was composed by one named Juançer. 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 Juançer found it written up to the time of king Wakhtang." This king died A. D. 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. Prof. Carrière thus enumerates the additions to or modifications of Socrates introduced by Moses.

1<sup>o</sup>. The name of the woman, Nouné, who from being a captive as she was in Socrates becomes one of the Rhipsimian saints that had fled to Iberia.

2<sup>o</sup>. The name of the king of Iberia, Mihran, whom Moses makes the general and governor of Georgia and not king.<sup>1)</sup>

3<sup>o</sup>. The name of the place which was the scene of the conversion, Medzkhet, chief city of Iberia.

4<sup>o</sup>. 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<sup>o</sup>. 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 Prof. Carrière adds three more:

6<sup>o</sup>. The details, circumstantial but unhistorical (?), as to the deity adored by the people of Medzkhet, and as to the peculiar homage paid to that deity.

7<sup>o</sup>. Very exact topographic details about the position of the city of Medzkhet between the two rivers, the great one (the Kur) and the lesser one (the Araghwa).

8<sup>o</sup>. A rapid *exposé* of the missionary travels of Saint Nouné in the other provinces of Iberia.

Now every one of these "additions" is present in the document of about A. D. 480 which Juančer has preserved to us, except n<sup>o</sup> 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

---

1) 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.

narrative? M. Carrière indeed suggests that the Armenian version of Socrates used up 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 Agathangelus. 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 Agathangelus' 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 Kłarji at the gates of the Alani and Kasbi as far as the marches of the Maskēti, as Agathangelus 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 Juançer would have saved him from so much error, for therein the apostolic wanderings of S<sup>t</sup> Nouné are traced more fully indeed, but in a corresponding fashion; and the same is true of the old Georgian document. S<sup>t</sup> Gregory was here as little the prototype of Nouné as S<sup>t</sup> Paul or Jonah.

Even if Moses wrote as late as the eighth century he could not have copied the Armenian Juançer, for this book did not exist till long afterwards; and in spite of the many identities we have signalised, their rival narratives diverge from one another in important respects; if we carefully compare Moses with the old Georgian narrative and wit Juançer, we soon realise 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 than that he used a work now lost of Agathangelus?

Want of space alone prevents my following Prof. 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 D<sup>r</sup>

Movsēsean'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. Halatiansz entitled *АРМЯНСКІЙ ЭПОСЪ*, published at Moscow 1896. He adopts Prof. 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 Nazianz, Gregory Magistros, Sebeos, Faustus of Byzant, Eznik, Vardan, Kallisthenes and other authors are most valuable and are models of accuracy, industry and research. But so far as they are intended to shew 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. Halatiansz fails to indicate a single passage in the History of Moses clearly copied or imitated from any Armenian text later than 450 A. D. It may be that Moses invented the narrative which he ascribes to Mar Aba Katina, as Prof. 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 prefix in the mss to the history of Sebeos, surely does not prove that Moses copied Sebeos. It rather confirms Moses' veracity.

For a long time I accepted Prof. 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

I. That an unknown Armenian writer about 760 compiled a history of his country up to the year A. D. 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.

II. 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 befel 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.

III. 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 archeological 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 Faustus, of Elisaeus, of Lazar of Pharp, of Goriun 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 to be surrounded by contemporaries of fair intelligence. Not so. He palms off upon them as the work of Agathangelos a paraphrase (of a late seventh century version of Silvester's life and of Socrates) only made the day before, perhaps centuries later, but any how as accessible to them as to himself.

Prof. 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 diffi-

culties. But for Têr Movsêsean'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.

I. Moses History bk 2, ch. 83 (Verbal identities with the text of the abbreviator of the Armenian life of Silvester are italicised):

He before he became emperor — won in his wars (see above p. 490). *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 ne 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 catechised he believed, God removing all tyrants from before his face, as in brief Agathangelos doth teach thee.*

The abbreviator of the Armenian Life of Silvester, ed. Venice, San Lazaro, 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 . . . . .

II. 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: Bayç yağags havatoç Mihranay en ašxarhin Vraç asel kay mez araji. Kin omn . . . How can this derive from the Lesser Socrates which runs: ənd noyn žamanaks ev Vraç lini Koçumn əntsayut'ean havatoy, əst naxaxnamut'ean. Kin omn . . . or from Philo of Tiraç's version which runs: Bayç i dēp ē ardēn asel t'ē orpēs Virk' ənd noyn žamanakavn K'ristonēaçcan. Kin omn . . . ?

Oxford.

F. C. Conybeare M. A.