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HAYK’S SPIRIT IS IMMORTAL

Danielyan E. L.
Doctor of Sciences (History)

ETERNAL GLORY AND HONOR TO THE HEROES
AND THEIR COMRADES-IN-ARMS WHO SACRIFICED THEIR LIVES
FOR THE FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE FATHERLAND

More than 4500-year-old roots of the Armenian Army are hallowed by the freedom struggle of the Armenian nation for the defence of the Fatherland against foreign invaders. The Armenian liberation torch sanctified by Hayk Nahapet (Patriarch) passed over from Hayots Dzor\(^1\) to Avarayr, Zeytun, Sasun, Sardarapat and has reached Artsakh. The heroes sacrificing their lives for the liberation of the Fatherland are immortalized.

---

\(^1\) Մովսէս Խորենացի, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Երևան, 1991, էջ 32-37: The year 2008 marked the 4500th anniversary of the victory of the Armenian Patriarch Hayk against Bel at the battle of Hayots Dzor (on the shore of Lake Van). The calendar calculation of the date based on the periodicity of “Hayk’s Cycle” of the “Ancient Armenian era” was done by the famous Armenologist Ghevond Alisahian (1820-1901) (Ալիշան Ղ., Յուշիկք հայրենեաց Հայոց, հ. Ա, Վենետիկ, 1920, էջ 85). There was no leap-year in the ancient Armenian era, since a year was always considered to consist of 365 days; hence the year and the date were movable. Thus 1460 years, according to the Julian calendar, amount to 1461 years, according to the Armenian Calendar. By such periodicity of the “Cycle of Hayk”, 2492 BC denotes the year of Hayk’s victory. The beginning of the victorious year was Navasard 1 (=August 11). New discoveries connected with the observations of the starry sky (the 6th millennium BC - Zorats kar (Karahunj)), the first half of the 3rd millennium BC - Metsamor), archaeological excavations and petroglyphs in the Armenian Highland, bear witness to the deep Haykian roots, and that the glorious victory of Hayk symbolized the beginning of a very important new epoch of the Armenian history. The Armenian Apostolic Church has kept counting the years in the Church Calendar, according to “Hayk’s Cycle”. Movses Khorenatsi (the 5th century) depicted Bel as the head of the evil forces trying to conquer the world. Patriarch Hayk was engaged in peaceful work on the Armenian land, when Bel made an attempt to subjugate him. But even the enemy’s enormous force did not help them to realise their evil intention. Hayk killed Bel with his trident (the triple spear) arrow shot from his wide bow in the battle of Hayots Dzor.
The works of the Armenian Golden Age literature (the 5th century) «History of Armenia» by Movses Khorenatsi, "The History of Vardan and the Armenian War" and "Commentary on Genesis" by Eghishe are unique phenomena in the world historical literature where ethnic genealogy and patriotism are brought together in a spiritual unity.

Movses Khorenatsi passed to the future generations the Hayk’s commandment given before the battle of Hayots Dzor as a display of the Armenians’ unyielding will of freedom: "We shall either die and our household will fall in servitude of Bel, or showing on him the success of our fingers, we’ll scatter his horde away and gain victory"\(^2\). Hayk’s victory symbolizes the victory of the Light over the darkness. It is at the very source of the Armenian freedom-loving struggle, as a token of future victories.

The Armenian Fatherland - Hayastan-Armenia has been protected and sanctified thanks to the spiritual wisdom, strong hand and sacrificed blood of its heroes. From the depth of the Armenian history their memory reached the 5th century and Movses Khorenatsi dedicated it to future generations: “I like to call thus, for their courage: Hayk, Aram, Tigran, since the descendants of heroes are heroes”\(^3\).

The Motherland is represented by the surrounding landscape with snow shining peaks of Mt. Ararat-Masis and Mt. Aragats, Mt. Ara and Mt. Khustup, Mt. Kaputjugh and Mt. Kirs, Mt. Mrav and Mt. Dizapayt, freshwater lakes, Sevan and Parvana, masterpieces of architecture Garni and Geghard, St. Echmiadzin and St. Hripsime, Zvartnots and Karmravor, Amaras and Gandzasar, Haghbat and Sanahin, Gladzor and Tatev, Kobayr and Noravank, castles and fortresses of Tignis and Maghasaberd, Amberd and Kakavaberd, Tavush Berd and Lori Berd...

---

\(^2\) Movses Khorenatsi, p. 35:  
\(^3\) Ibid, p. 85.
The Armenian history’s knowledge spiritually ties with the native land, keeps vigilant the call of blood, leads to Vaspurakan, Van, Sasun, Mush, Karin, Kars, Ani, Bagavan, Bardzr Hayk’ (Upper Armenia) and Tayk’, Tsopk’ and Aghdznik’, Rshtunik’ and Mokk’, Armenia Minor and Cilicia where our ancestors lived and created.
The castle of Amberd (7th c.) and the Vahramashen Church (11th c.)

Vahka, Cilician Armenia

Kakavaberd (9th-10th cc.)
Tavush Berd (10th c.)
Kars fortress (9th-10th cc.), Vanand

Ishkhan Church (7th c.), Tayk
Ani Cathedral (1001)
Haghbat Monastery (10th-13th cc.)

Tatev Monastery (9th-14th cc.)
Gandzasar St. Hovannes Church (13th c.), Artsakh

In the historical chronicles are recorded the cherished names of statesmen and heroes descending from forefather Hayk and famous for their patriotic acts of courage: Kings Aram Haykian, Haykazun Arame of Ararat (Urartu), Argishti I, Paruyr Skayordi, Tigran Ervandyan, Artashes I, Tigran II the Great, Arshakuni Trdat III the Great, Arshak

The cognition of the Armenian spiritual roots is a guarantee to protect and lead the nation’s vital capacity with wisdom. The thoughts of Movses Khorenatsi (“The Armenian world… the most magnificent of the northern [nations]”)⁵ and Eghishe (“With the two rivers⁶ and the Ark [of Noah] we are higher than all”)⁷ show that in the 5th century the Armenian people’s liberation struggle against the foreign conquerors was endowed with spiritual awareness of such an idea.

Sparapet Vardan Mamikonyan and his comrades-in-arms who with the cross of Christ sacrificed their lives in the battle of Avarayr (451) for the sake of the Fatherland and faith were canonized saints by the Armenian Apostolic Church according to the canon established by Catholicos Vrtanes I (333-341).

---

⁴ Sparapet, Commander-in-Chief of the Armenian Army.
⁵ Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 358:
⁶ The Euphrates and Tigris rivers flowing from the Paradise (Gen. 2.14-15).
⁷ Խաչիկյան Լ., Եղիշեի “Արարածոց մեկնութիւն”, Երևան, 1992, էջ 245:
Before the battle of Avarayr General Vardan made a speech directed to the Armenian army which served also as a commandment to the future generations: “My brave soldiers let us not turn our backs to the mortal human’s huge sword, so that if the God grants us the victory we shall destroy their power and thus the truth will rise. And if for us the time has come to end our life with a holy death in this war, we shall accept it joyfully, but only do not mix the spirit of courage with cowardice”.

According to Eghishe, the motto of the Armenian freedom-fighters at the battle of Avarayr (May 26, 451 AD) was: «Unconscious death is death, conscious death is immortality».

The freedom-loving spirit of Hayk and Vardan centuries later led General Davit Bek (the 1720s), the fidais, commanders and statsmen Aghbyur Serob, Arabo, Gevord Chaush, Hrayr, Andranik, Garegin Nzhdeh, Aram Manukyan and their comrades-in-arms (the 19th - the beginning of the 20th century) in their struggle against Turkish invaders.
Their spiritual presence in the national life is symbolic and inspiring. They are individuals whose acts of courage inspire new Haykazun generations. Patriotism has been a huge barrier against enemies with larger number of arms and soldiers.

As early as May 24, 1915, the Allied Governments publicly informed the Turkish government that “in the presence of these new crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization... they will hold personally responsible for the said crimes all members of the Ottoman Government as well as those of its agents who are found to be involved in such massacres ...”

In fact, under the pressure of the victorious Allies, on December 14, 1918 the Turkish cabinet made the formal decision to set up the courts-martial, which charged several Turkish officials with mass murder and plunder of Armenian deportees, but several key figures who had fled (Talaat, Enver, Djemal, Nazim and others) were tried in absentia; they were sentenced to death (in absentia). The Kemalists opposed the trials which soon ended.


The Armenian Revolutionary Federation (Dashnaktsutyun) carried out a secret operation of retribution - *Nemesis*, one of the heroic pages of the Armenian national liberation struggle’s history as revenge for the Armenian Genocide. In 1920-1922 the main Turkish perpetrators (Talaat, Enver, Djemal, Cemal (Jemal) Azmi, Bahaddin Sakir, Said Halim Pasha, Fatali Khan Khoyski and Behbud Khan Jivanshir) of the Armenian Genocide were found and assassinated by the Armenian avengers:

Soghomon Tehliryan
Arshavir Shirakyan
Aram Erkanyan

Petros Ter-Poghosyan
Artahses Gevorgyan
Misak Torlakyan
Stepan Tsaghikyan

During WW2, the Great Patriotic War the Armenian people displayed great courage and military skills. 106 Armenians were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union. Nelson Stepanyan and Hovhannes Bagramyan received the award twice. In the war and post-war years 108 Armenians were promoted to the rank of general, and with an additional four eventually achieving the rank of Marshal of the Soviet Union: Hovhannes Bagramyan, Hamazasp Babajanyan, Sergei Khudyakov (Khamperyants) and Admiral Hovhannes Isakov; four achieved the rank of Vice-Admiral and five Counter-Admiral.

---

12 S. Tehliryan assassinated Talaat and after a two-day trial was found not guilty by the German court, and freed.
13 Арutyünian К.А., Погосян Г.Р., Вклад армянского народа в Победу в Великой Отечественной Войне, Ереван, 2010, с. 841-846.
14 Ibid., p. 857. Aganov Sergey, an active participant of the Great Patriotic War, later, in 1980 achieved the rank of Marshal of the engineering troops.
During the Artsakh Liberation war (1991-1994) Monte Melkonyan, Simon Achikgyozyan, Leonid Azgaldyan, Shahen Meghryan, Tatul Krpeyan, Davit Sarapyan, Ashot Ghulyan (Bekor), Vahagn Vardevanyan, Yura Hovsepyan (Yura of the 26th), Vardan Stepanyan, Nikolay Vanyan, Valeri Vardanyan, Karo Qahqejyan, Vigen Zakaryan and their many devoted comrades-in-arms heroically sacrificed their lives for the Fatherland and recreated the spirit of Armenian military art\(^{15}\).

The squad *Eghnikner*,
commander Shahen Meghryan
(near the monastery of *Erits Mankants*)

The Liberation Army special operations force,
commander Leonid Azgaldyan

Yura Hovhannisyan, Arthur Papazyan, Arkadi Ter-Tadevosyan and Felix Gzoghyan.

The day of the liberation of Shushi (May 9, 1992), the church of Holy Amenaprkich (Ghazanchetsots).
The Head of the Artsakh Diocese of the Armenian Apostolic Church, Bishop Pargev Martirosyan and Fr. Grigor Markosyan with the state, military and political figures of the Artsakh Liberation Movement.
Thus has been laid the foundation of the rebirth of the Armenian army\textsuperscript{16}. The artificially formed Azerbaijan was defeated in the war waged against Artsakh and begged a ceasefire through intermediaries. But instead of learning lessons from that shameful defeat, aggressive Azerbaijan falsifying history and distorting reality spreads lies over the world, and from year to year (having bought a large number of weapons with petro-dollars) more frequently violates the 1994 cease-fire agreement\textsuperscript{17} targeting the borderlines of the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic, and houses and civilians.

On the night of April 1-2, 2016 the enemy launched openly offensive operations with artillery, armored vehicles and aircraft. The notorious Azerbaijani army committed in the Turkish style genocidal violations against the peaceful population torturing and slaughtering the elderly people, killing a twelve-year-old child and wounding two others with rocket firing. The Artsakh Republic Defense Army successfully defeated the enemy’s criminal actions in four-day military operations. During the military operations the Armenian forces destroyed 2 helicopters, about 30 tanks, “Grad” type volley

\textsuperscript{16} Armenian Army 2015 (Special Forces) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n_DR3EAIeQI
\textsuperscript{17} See video: Militay Force.
\textsuperscript{18} https://goo.gl/jD8akV
installations, heavy flame thrower system, engineering equipments, drones. The Azerbaijani armed forces had a large number of casualties. As during the Artsakh Liberation war, this time, too, the Armenian military forces, that defeated the enemy, were led by the just idea of the fight for the defence of the Fatherland which multiplies the military morale and strength of the Armenians. The Armenian commanders, soldiers and volunteers and their many devoted comrades-in-arms fought with the spirit of Hayk and heroically sacrificed their lives for the defence of the Fatherland.

Junior Sergeant Abajyan Robert 1996-2016
Private Abgaryan Tigran 1996-2016
Private Abrahamyan Aram 1996-2016
Military contractor Abrahamyan Harutyun 1985-2016

Sergeant military contractor Abrahamyan Robert 1993-2016
Private Aghajanyan Misha 1996-2016
Private Aleqsanyan Bagrat 1995-2016
Private Alikhanyan Vladimir 1996-2016

Sergeant Andreasyan Arman 1996-2016
Lieutenant-Colonel Arakelyan Alexan 1982-2016
Private Asatryan Aghasi 1996-2016
Private military contractor Balayan Aznaur 1987-2016

19 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dWXUj8nJ7nM
20 Robert Abajyan fought the battle until the very last minute; then he blew himself up with a grenade.
Captain Urfanyan and his unit were in a long fight against the enemy. Due to the enemy’s prevailing forces, Armenak courageously sent back his unit and continued to fight alone. During this battle, the Captain singlehandedly hit one tank and ten Azeri soldiers. Using his last grenade, he waited until the enemy was close and blew himself up with the rest of the Azeri unit. Glory be to our Heroes!

The National Security Council (April 12th, 2016) discussing the issues related to the violation of the ceasefire of 1994 by the Republic of Azerbaijan and their offensive
operations towards NKR recorded that during the military operations launched by Azerbaijan the Armed Forces of Armenia successfully performed their tasks. The defence army of the NKR defeated the enemy, destroying their plans. This time, too, the aggressive Azerbaijan’s leadership begged the mediators to consolidate a ceasefire. About such a cowardly behaviour of official Baku Archbishop of Artsakh Diocese Pargev Martirosyan said, “when it starts to lose it starts to ask for the ceasefire”.

On the night of April 2, E. Maloyan, an infantry battalion commander with six soldiers, who aimed at bringing back one of the captured stations, did not know that the enemy unit approaching them was a big 150-people division. The Armenian commander decided to stay and enter into the battle. The shootout lasted for an hour and a half. After that, the Major and his soldiers passed around the position, delivered a blow from the right wing and threw the enemy into confusion. As a result, the enemy retreated, and the station has been returned.

During Azerbaijan’s aggression against Artsakh on April 2-4, 2016 Armenian serviceman bravely were suppressing adversary attacks and inflicting punitive measures. Numerous servicemen were appreciated for high military, moral and strong-willed qualities. Substituting their commanders who were either killed or wounded, they were able to lead successfully military operations. Among them were M.M. Muradyan, G.V. Avagyan, D.A. Khatayan, S.S. Safaryan, A.G. Aghasyan whom Superior Command awarded the rank of lieutenant.

22 http://news.am/eng/news/326670.html
Private Manukyan Gevorg destroyed enemy helicopter

Private Petrosyan Marat destroyed 5 enemy tanks

Junior sergeant Stepanyan Vahan took out from a burning Azerbaijani helicopter important documents proving that Azerbaijan's military-political leadership planned a large-scale operation.

Sergeant Hovhannisyan Rafael destroyed 2 enemy tanks.

Corporal Khachatryan Gevorg destroyed 2 enemy tanks.

Corporal Sahakyan Samvel destroyed 2 enemy tanks.

Private Hayk Melkumyan destroyed enemy tank
Commending the patriotic spirit, combat readiness and unity of the Armenian soldiers, commanders and volunteers, Archbishop Pargev Martirosyan, the Head of the Artsakh Diocese of the Armenian Apostolic Church said, “I am delighted by the Armenian soldiers; these 18-19 year-old boys are true heroes. What a wonderful and perfect generation. It comes out of patriotism; it is not something that is acquired, but that patriotism is transformed into talent, bravery and ability. When you are ready to sacrifice your life, God gives you everything. I am delighted by my people that reacted spontaneously; everybody came to Artsakh and stood in the front line. The Armenian people are truly a sacred nation.”

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HITTITE SOURCES OF THE PERIOD OF MURSILI II FOR ANCIENT HISTORY OF ARMENIA

Ghazaryan R. P.
PhD in History

The period of the reign of Mursili II (1321-1295 BC), one of the most prominent kings of Ancient Orient, is full of events that shed light on the history not only of the Hittite state, but also other countries of Western Asia. The sources created during his reign allow forming almost a complete picture of the years of his reign. His period is of special interest also for those studying ancient history of Armenia, particularly, of the western part of the Armenian Highland.

We should especially point out two versions of the Annals of Mursili II - The “Ten Year” Annals and the “Extended” Annals1. The “Ten Year” Annals represent the events of the first ten years of the king’s reign and the “Extended” Annals include almost the whole period of his reign.

Mursili II who ascended the Hittite throne in a very complicated period, was the youngest of the five sons of Suppiluliuma I (1344-1322 BC), the founder of the New Hittite state. Since the first years of reign the young king had to struggle hard against the internal and external enemies of Hatti. The situation became harder also because of the continuing plague in Hatti that had taken a lot of human lives and put the state in a difficult condition. There were also problems within the royal family connected with his stepmother; Suppiluliuma I’s the second, Babylonian wife. However, the Hittite king could make a lot of achievements during the first ten years. He succeeded in restoring the unity and territorial integrity of the state and suppressing the rebellions in the subject countries. After the death of two of his brothers, Sharri-Kushuh and Telipinu, he managed to continue the political line started by his father and sat their sons on the thrones of Halpa (Aleppo) and Kargamis. Those north Syrian territories had a very important position as they were close to the territories of Egypt and Assyria, the enemies of Hatti. Mursili was also able to destroy the Kingdom of Arzawa which was the core of the Arzawa confederation of states, in the west of Asia Minor. In the north and north-east the Kaskean and Hayasean issues were also temporarily solved. Thus, we can record that the first ten years of the reign of Mursili II were really of special significance for the whole period of his reign. Perhaps this is why he singled out his “Ten Year” Annals where, as well as in the “Extended” Annals there is a lot of information on the “lands” of the western part of the Armenian Highland. Below we will

discuss the content of these, as well as a number of other texts created during the reign of Mursili.

Thus after solving the Arzawa issue (in the fifth year according to the Annals) Mursili moved to the north-east of the state - the city of Samuha\(^2\) and stopped in the city of Ziulila\(^3\). These cities were situated in the Hittite Upper Land\(^4\) situated in the north-eastern part of the Hittite state - in the territory from the upper stream of the Halis to the big bend of the Upper Euphrates reaching the basin of the river Gayl in the north. It was one of the most important lands of Hatti and mainly included the territories that later became known as Armenia Minor. In the geographical sense most of its territory was in the Armenian Highland\(^5\). It is also interesting that the name of Upper Land is closely connected with the name of Upper Armenia mentioned in the Armenian sources. In the geographical sense the territory of Upper Armenia was close to the territory of Upper Land or, likely, comprised part of it\(^6\).

According to the Annals, in the seventh year of his reign Mursili II waged a war against the Kaskean land Tibiya\(^7\), against its tribal chief Pihhuniya who already during the reign of Suppiluliuma I had attacked and brought destruction in the Hittite Upper Land (Pihhuniya’s troops had advanced up to the city of Zazzisa\(^8\) and conquered the city of Istitina\(^9\) as well). In the seventh year of the “Extended” Annals there is a mention of another land of the Armenian Highland - Dankuwa\(^10\). During the same year in the

\(^2\) In the text the city was mentioned as Sammaha (Keilschrifttexte aus Boğhazköy (henceforth KBo) III 4 III 48): See also Del Monte G., Tischler J., Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, VI. Die Orts-und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Wiesbaden, 1978 (henceforth RGTC, VI), S. 337-341; ՀԼՏ, էջ 85-90. The majority of researchers now locate Samuha in the place of the archaeological site Kayalı pınar (situated on the northern bank of the river Halis, about 55 km to the south-west of Sebastia) (see Müller-Karpe A., Recent Research on Hittite Archaeology in the “Upper Land”, Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite period, Acts of the international conference held at the University of Florence (7-9 February 2007), Roma, 2009, pp. 109-117. Central-North Anatolia corresponds to Central-North Asia Minor). The city was also one of the most important spiritual centers of Hatti (about the pantheon of Samuha see Haas V., Geschichte der Hethitischen Religion, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1994, S. 578-580; ՀԼՏ, էջ 85-90). It was mentioned in Suppiluliuma I’s Annals as well (see Güterbock H.G., The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as told by his Son, Mursili II, Journal of Cuneiform Studies, 1956, p. 63).

\(^3\) About the location of the city of Ziulila see RGTC, VI, S. 515.

\(^4\) In the Hittite sources the land was mentioned either as Upper Land or Upper lands (see RGTC, VI, S. 293-294). The toponym can also be translated as highland (see Rüster Ch., Neu E., Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus Boğazköy-Texten, Wiesbaden, 1989, S. 228). See also ՀԼՏ, էջ 90-91. The toponym was mentioned in Suppiluliuma I’s Annals as well (see Güterbock H.G., op. cit., pp. 63, 65, 67, 114).


\(^7\) See RGTC, VI, S. 425-426. It was situated in the region of the East Pontic mountains and bordered on Upper Land.

\(^8\) See RGTC, VI, S. 497. ՀԼՏ, էջ 109-110. See also ՀԼՏ, էջ 59-60. It was probably situated in the eastern part of Upper Land.

\(^9\) KUB XIV 17 II 7-17. According to V. Khachatryan the land of Dankuwa (medieval Mtini, modern settlement of Mitini) was in the Yerznka region (Խաչատրյան Վ., Վոստուկյան անգրագետ, Երևան, 1971, c. 60;
north-eastern part of his state Mursili faced a new problem connected with the country Hayasa (Azzi)\textsuperscript{11}. First trying to solve the matter in a peaceful way Mursili II sent letters demanding from Anniya\textsuperscript{12}, the king of Hayasa (Azzi), to return the Hittite subjects that had found refuge (or had been taken captive) in Hayasa. But the Hayasean king wanted to exchange captives: he refused to return the Hittite captives as long as he had not been given his subjects that the Hittites held. Getting Anniya’s refusal, during the eighth year of his reign Mursili II attacked the Hayasean border city of Ura\textsuperscript{13}. There is no information on the outcome of the campaign but later the Hittite king had to move towards Hayasa (Azzi) again. According to the events of the eighth year of the “Extended” Annals the Hayaseans hearing about the forthcoming campaign of Mursili, sent an ambassador to him, agreeing to fulfill the Hittite king’s demands.

During the ninth year of his reign Mursili went to Kummani\textsuperscript{14} to take part in the celebrations dedicated to the goddess Khepat. Here the king of Hatti received news that the Hayasean (Azzi) troops had attacked the Hittite city of Kannuwara\textsuperscript{15}. He sent Nuwanza, one of his commanders, to the north-to Upper Land. According to the Hittite sources Nuwanza defeated the Hayasean army near Kannuwara (700 chariots and an infantry of 10.000). At the same time the Hittite king had to move his troops from Kargamis to Tegarama\textsuperscript{16} in order to be closer to the immediate site of military actions.

\textsuperscript{11} In the “Ten Year” Annals the toponym was mentioned in relation to the events of the 7th, 9th and 10th years. See RGTC, VI, S. 59-60; 63-64. CLS, \textsuperscript{12} There is mention of Anniya in the seventh year of the “Ten Year” Annals as well. In the parallel text of the “Extended” Annals there is information about Anniya in the events of the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th years. About the name of Anniya see Kapanjian G., Историко-лингвистические работы. К начальной истории армян. Древняя Малая Азия, т. 1, Ереван, 1956, c. 71-73. \textsuperscript{13} See \textsuperscript{14} Kummani was another name or part of the land of Kizzuwatna (probably the eastern part of future Cilicia).

\textsuperscript{15} RGTC, VI, S. 171-172. CLS, \textsuperscript{16} RGTC, VI, S. 383-384. Tegarama was one of the eastern lands of the Hittite state. In the geographical sense it was part of the Armenian Highland. The specialists traditionally tended to identify Tegarama (Assyrian Til-Garimmu) with “the Home of Torgom” (Bet-Togarma mentioned in the Bible) (IQB, 14; LC, 6)). The majority of the researchers located Tegarama in the place of the present settlement Gyurun (Arm. Kyurin), in the district of Sebastia.
Here, because of the winter and following his commanders’ advice he temporarily interrupted the military actions against Hayasa and moved his troops in another direction. In the ninth year of the “Extended” Annals there is also information that after the battle of Kannuwara Nuwanza marched towards the region of the Saliti Mountains\textsuperscript{17}, after which he moved towards the land of Kaska.

In the tenth year of his reign Mursili II started a military campaign towards Hayasa (Azzi). After holding a show of force in the city of Ingalawa\textsuperscript{18} the Hittite king invaded Hayasa. The Hittites surrounded and captured the Hayasean strengthened city of Aripsa\textsuperscript{19} which was “in the sea” and the inhabitants of which had escaped to the nearest mountains. After ravaging AripsaMursili II also subjugated the Hayasean city of Duggama\textsuperscript{20} the inhabitants of which showed no resistance. The Hittite king did not ravage the city but he took 3000 inhabitants of Duggama to Hatti as soldiers. In the eleventh year of his reign Mursili II again marched against Hayasa (Azzi). The elders of Hayasa, considering the exceeding military force had to start negotiations with the king of Hatti. They sent Mutti\textsuperscript{21} from the city of Halimana\textsuperscript{22} to the Hittite king. The Hayasean side was obliged to provide troops to the Hittite army, as well as to return the Hittite captives that they still had. Thus, for some time Mursili II succeeded in neutralizing the Hayasean threat in the north-east of Hatti\textsuperscript{23}.

There is also information about the events on the river Dahara (Melas) dated the twenty first year of the “Extended” Annals\textsuperscript{24}. It is mentioned that the king of Hatti defeated the enemies of the country and followed them up to the region of the Elluriya Mountains\textsuperscript{25}, and then reached the region of the river Dahara (Melas).

\textsuperscript{17} See AM, 122-123. ՀԼՏ, էջ 84-85, 110. According to A. Kosyan it was near Kannuwara, to the north-west of modern Erznka (ancient Eriza).

\textsuperscript{18} Ingalawa probably was situated in the west of the later territory of Upper Armenia (Գաբրիելյան Ա., Հայասա. քաղաքական և մշակութային պատմությունը, էջ 44-46).

\textsuperscript{19} KBo IV 4 IV 5; RGTC, VI, S. 37. ՀԼՏ, էջ 38-39: It is likely that during the campaign in the 10th year of his reign Mursili II moved from the territory of Upper Armenia towards Turuberan and reached the basin of Lake Van where the city of Aripsa was situated (Գաբրիելյան Ա., Հայասա. ուղղաթիռների պատմականությունը, էջ 67-68).

\textsuperscript{20} RGTC, VI, S. 435-436. ՀԼՏ, էջ 99: Taking into account the fact that Duggama was close to Aripsa it can be assumed that it was also situated in the province of Turuberan of Great Armenia not far from Lake Van (see Գաբրիելյան Ա., op. cit., p. 70).

\textsuperscript{21} See Գաբրիելյան Ա., op. cit., pp. 48-49.

\textsuperscript{22} The scarcity of material does not allow to suggest a precise location for the city of Khalimana.


\textsuperscript{24} AM, S. 158-159. There is information on the river in Suppiluliuma’s Annals as well, where it is mentioned that the king’s father (Tudhaliya III) conquered the land of the river Dahara (Güterbock H.G., op. cit., p. 110). See RGTC, VI, S. 551-552. About the location see also Matthews R., Glatz C., op. cit., p. 66.

\textsuperscript{25} RGTC, VI, S. 140. The toponym was also mentioned in Suppiluliuma’s Annals where his father (Tudhaliya III)
In Mursili II’s “Extended Annals” (according to A. Goetze events of the twenty second year\textsuperscript{26}) there is also information about the land of Pahhuva\textsuperscript{27}. The king of Hatti sent commander Nuwanza to the Land of Kalasma\textsuperscript{28} with troops. The latter captured and destroyed Kalasma, Lalha\textsuperscript{29} and Midduwa\textsuperscript{30} and appeared before the king in the Land of Pahhuwa with a lot of trophy. After that Mursili returned to Hattusa.

Thus, Mursili II’s Annals contain a lot of information on the western regions of the Armenian Highland (Hayasa, Azzi, Upper Land, Tegarama, Kummaha, Pahhuwa, Samuha, Zilula, Zazzisa, Danguwa, Ura, Aripza, Duggama, Kannuwarwa, Ingala, Balimar, the Saliti Mountains, the Elluriya Mountains, the river Marassanta, the river Dahara).

Mursili II’s “Prayer” texts are also of great interest\textsuperscript{31}. There can also be found the names of a number of towns and lands that were in the Armenian Highland.

Speaking of Mursili’s reign it should be stressed that at least for twenty years, i.e. during the most part of his reign, Hatti was in the deadly claws of the plague epidemic which caused the death of thousands of people and brought the country to the brink of abyss. In his prayer texts Mursili complained that the gods cruelly punished his country with this. He warned the gods that Hatti could become a trophy for the enemies. The king also mentions that if everybody died in Hatti, there would remain no one to make sacrifices to the gods. Mursili II saw the reason of the affliction of his country in the sins committed by him or others. He found out that one of the reasons was his father Suppiluliuma I. In the text of “prayer” dedicated to the Weather God of Hatti it is mentioned that the king had discovered an old table which depicted the ritual performed by his forefathers dedicated to the river Mala (Euphrates). But his father had ignored the
campaigned to the region of the Elluriya Mountains (see Güterbock H.G., op. cit., p. 109; Matthews R., Glatz C., op. cit., pp. 62-63): The Elluriya Mountains may correspond to the Medieval toponyms Olor, Halüris or Haloras in the Armenian Taurus (see Адонц Н., Армения в эпоху Юстиниана, Ереван, 1971, с. 11; Հայաստանը մ.թ.ա. XV-VII դարերում, էջ 54. See also ՀԼՏ, էջ 112. In one of the prayer texts of Mursili mentioned are the lands that had become enemies of Hatti. The land of Kalasma was also mentioned among them (see Singer I., Mursili’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A). In Hittite Prayers, p. 53). See also Matthews R., Glatz C., op. cit., p. 59.

26 KBo V 8 IV 20 (AM, S. 162-163).
27 See RGTC, VI, S. 296. See also CLS, էջ 75-77. According to V. Khachatryan, it was east of Isuwa, probably in the region of the Byurakn Mountains, see Խաչատրյան Վ.., Հայաստանը մ.թ.ա. XV-VII դարերում, էջ 86; ibid, Հայաստանը մ.թ.ա. XV-VII դարերում, էջ 54. See also CLS, էջ 112. In one of the prayer texts of Mursili mentioned are the lands that had become enemies of Hatti. The land of Kalasma was also mentioned among them (see Singer I., Mursili’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A). In Hittite Prayers, p. 53). See also Matthews R., Glatz C., op. cit., p. 59.
28 About the location of Kalasma see RGTC, VI, S. 163-164. Judging from the information of the sources the land of Kalasma was close to Isuwa and Pahhuwa and can be located in the region of the Mountains of Mndzur. See also Խաչատրյան Վ.., Հայաստանը մ.թ.ա. XV-VII դարերում, էջ 54. See also CLS, էջ 112. In one of the prayer texts of Mursili mentioned are the lands that had become enemies of Hatti. The land of Kalasma was also mentioned among them (see Singer I., Mursili’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A). In Hittite Prayers, p. 53). See also Matthews R., Glatz C., op. cit., p. 59.
ritual and according to him it had become one of the reasons of the epidemic in Hatti. On Mursili’s order ritual ceremonies were performed in which he personally participated, thus hoping to put an end to the epidemic32.

Mursili II’s “prayer” addressed to the Hittite god Lelvani on the subject of his wife Gassuliyawia’s illness has been preserved. The text mentions the queen’s dream she had in the city of Samuha33.

Besides, one of the “prayer” texts from the time of Mursili has been preserved, where several accusations are made against the last wife of Suppiluliuma I, Tawannana. The text also mentions the attempt of the queen to carry out a palace coup probably during the campaign of the king to Hayasa (Azzi) in the 10th year of his reign. It is also mentioned that the queen had tried to use the eclipse against Mursili II34. The depiction of the eclipse allows to specify the chronology of Mursili’s reign. According to a part of the researchers the eclipse took place on June 24, 1312 BC. It was a full eclipse seen both in the northern and central parts of Asia Minor, as well as in the Armenian Highland35.

One of the texts bearing the name “Judicial process”36 gives the description of black magic performed in a forest near Kummaha (Arm. Kamakh)37 towards three senior officials (one of them was Sharri-Kushuh, Mursili II’s brother, the king of Kargamis).

Mursili II has also left the edited Annals of his father Suppiluliuma I38. There the events start from the moment when a considerable part of the territory of the Hittite state, together with the capital Hattusa, had come out of Tudhaliya III’s control and the city of Samuha had temporarily become the capital. Because of the illness of the king of Hatti prince Suppiluliuma led the campaigns of the Hittite army. Then the events of the period of the reign of Suppiluliuma started. The activity of the king of Hatti ends by his Syrian wars as a result of which the Hittites conquered Northern Syria having defeated Mittani before that.

34 See Singer I., Mursili’s Accusations against Tawannana (CTH 70). In Hittite Prayers, p. 77.
36 Werner R., Hetitische Gerichtsprotokolle, StBoT 4, Wiesbaden, 1967, S. 64-67; <LS, ց 65-66, 145:
37 In Suppiluliuma I’s Annals Mursili II mentioned that his grandfather Tudhaliya II had moved to Hayasa and there, near the city of Kummakha he met with the troops of the Hayasean king Karanni and gave battle. Later the settlement again passed under the Hittite dominance and was mentioned as a separate political unit (Houwink ten Cate Ph. H. J., op. cit., p. 75. Քոսյան Ա., Հայասան և Ազզին. Շնորհի վերուստ. առասպել, ծես և պատմություն, Երևան, 2002, 3, ց 225-241).
Thus, in Suppiluliuma’s Annals are also mentioned a number of towns and lands that were in the Armenian Highland (Samuha, Tegaramma, Kummaha, Isuwa\(^{39}\), Hayasa, Arziya\(^{40}\), Elluriya, Upper Land, Cuhapa\(^{41}\), the river Marassanta\(^{42}\), the Laha Mountains\(^{43}\)). Some of them were mentioned in Mursili’s Annals as well.

There exist texts of treaties signed between Mursili II and his vassals\(^{44}\). For example, in a treaty signed between Mursili II and Ugarit’s king Nikmepa, the king of Hatti demanded the king of Ugarit immediately to help him if he waged war on any country. The treaty also enumerates the most powerful countries of the time -Hanigalbat (Mitanni), Egypt, Babylon and Alzi (Aghdznik)\(^{45}\).

To sum up, we can again mention that in numerous sources of the time of Mursili II there is a lot of information on the toponyms of the Armenian Highland (the information has wide geographical coverage - from the western districts of the Armenian Highland to Lake Van and the territory of Aghdznik), which is important for the elucidation of the history of Armenia of the 14\(^{th}\)-13\(^{th}\) centuries BC. A considerable part of the toponyms were mentioned only in the above-mentioned sources. In this respect, they are of great value.

_Translated from Armenian by S. E. Chraghyan_

---


40 RGTC, VI, S. 45. The Hittite commander, prince Kantuzili campaigned and captured the city and ravaged it (see Güterbock H.G., op. cit., p. 60). According to V. Khachatryan it was in the place of the medieval Armenian city of Artsn (see Խաչատրյան Վ., op. cit., p. 51).

41 According to Suppiluliuma I’s Annals the Hittite king moved from Issuwa to the land of Cuhapa, ravaged it and entered Hayasa, the region of the Laha Mountains, then returned to Isuwa. (KUB XXXIV 23 (Güterbock H., op. cit., p. 83). Cuhapa was to the north-east of Isuwa, probably near the Byurakan Mountains. In the Assyrian inscriptions it was mentioned as Sukhum (Հայաստանը մ.թ.ա. XV-VII դարերում, էջ 58).

42 In one section of “the Extended Annals” also (according to A. Goetze in the twenty fifth year, see AM, S. 178-179) there is information about the river Marassanta (Halis) (the river Halis originates from the western foot of the Anti-Taurus Mountains in Armenia Minor). In the twenty sixth year of the Annals there is also a mention of the river (the king of Hatti went on his next campaign against the Kasks and crossed the Red (Marassanta) river) (see AM, S. 182-183).

43 The mountains were probably located to the north-east of Isuwa. V. Khachatryan expressed an opinion that the Laha Mountains were the Mountains of Byurakan or Haykakan Par (Խաչատրյան Վ., Վոստոչի պրովինցիա Հետիոտյան իմպերիա, Վ. 1. Հայաստանը մ.թ.ա. XV-VII դարերում, էջ 58).

44 Beckman G., Hittite Diplomatic Texts, Atlanta, 1996, N 9, 10, 11, 12, 20, 29, 30, 31, 31A, 31B.

THE ARMENIAN HIGHLAND, ASIA MINOR AND MESOPOTAMIA AT THE END OF THE 14th C. - THE BEGINNING OF THE 13th C. BC
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In French Oriental studies of the 19th century a considerable attention was paid to research of ancient and medieval history of Armenia; it was important for development of Armenology. M. Brosset made great contribution to this field juxtaposing Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions’ data with some information contained in the medieval Armenian sources (in his translation) relating to ancient history. Along with the Armenian sources’ translation M. Brosset researched the works of J.-Fr. Champollion (1790-1832), J. Oppert (1825-1905), Fr. Lenormant (1837-1883) and others devoted to the studies of the problems of history of the countries of Western Asia and Egypt based on the decipherment of hieroglyphic and cuneiform inscriptions. French orientalists touched also some topics of the history of ancient Armenia. M. Brosset did not exclude that those works reflecting the primary stage’s results of the decipherment of hieroglyphic and cuneiform inscriptions could contain incomprehensible shortcomings. At the same time he considered important a comparison of some historic names with the facts of “Biblical history” and those mentioned by Greek historians.¹

M. Brosset noted: «In the 17th century BC, the period of the XVIII Dynasty the country, mentioned in the Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions, in the north of Mesopotamia is called Remene, and the nation that lives there Remenen». According to his opinion, it had to be “the Egyptian name of Armenia and Armenians” (“nom égyptien de l’Arménie et des Arméniens”), because the classical name Armenia originated since very early times.²

As follows from M. Brosset’s interpretation of the military inscriptions of the Annals of Tutmos III on the wall at Karnak Temple³ the troops of Egyptian pharaoh reached Babylon and Armenia. In the last period of his reign, during his campaigns to the

¹ Marie Brosset concentrating attention to the toponyms and royal names which until his time remained unfamiliar, noted that they could become a basis for future discoveries (M. Brosset, Sur l’histoire ancienne de l’Arménie, d’après les textes hiéroglyphiques et cunéiformes. - Bulletin de l’Académie Impériale des sciences de St-Pétersbourg, 1871, t. seizième, p. 333).
² Ibid., p. 334.
³ Tutmos III (XVI – the mid-XV century BC) was the sixth pharaoh of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt (История Древнего Востока. Зарождение древнейших классовых обществ и первые очаги рабовладельческой цивилизации, ч. II, М., 1988, c. 238):
mountains located to the north of Mesopotamia les Remenen ou Arméniens were mentioned as payers of tribute⁴:

According to H. Brugsch, «L’étude des inscriptions historiques nous a appris aujourd’hui, que le nord de ce monde était borné par les montagnes de l’Arménie, appelées les quatre supports du ciel»⁵:

H. de Riancey noted that Seti I (1290-1279 BC), a pharaoh of the Nineteenth Dynasty of Egypt, the son of Ramesses I and the father of Ramesses II (1279-1212 BC), among the taxpayer countries and peoples mentioned also «Arménien ou Remenen», who cut trees in their forests to open paths for his army⁶. H. de Riancey wrote that «grands chefs des Remenen» bowing to the pharaoh and glorifying his valor, said: «Tu apparaïs comme ton père le soleil et on est vivifié par tes regards». According H. de Riancey’s opinion, «L’Arménie fut une des premières à secouer le joug égyptien»⁷.

Fr. Lenormant mentioned «Armenen ou Remenen» among those who rebelled against Ramesses II, noting that the monuments on the banks of the Nile testify as to his victories, as well as the uprisings of the Upper Niles’ population. The rebels were joined by Armenia, Assyria, Mesopotamia and other countries⁸:

From the end of the 1880s along with the opinion of identification Remene with Armenia appeared also another opinion about its localization in Lebanon. The main argument for this opinion was a mention of մայրիների in Egyptian sources. P. Guieysse suggesting an alternative decipherment concerning the mentioned inscription, noted: «Grand chiefs of the country of Remenen, bowing to the lord of two regions, praising his courage, say: «You appear like your father Ra and we get life seeing you».⁹ In the section relating to the cutting of trees the researcher reads. «The trees of the country of Remenen were cut and taken to the Nile’s mouth, as well as for the great sails of Amon that were built in the peaceful and mighty life, as is Ra».¹⁰ About the Remenen’s country P. Guieysse noted that «exploitation of trees, most probably of cedars could be profitable only in a coastal part of the neighbouring country. The capital city of the population - «Remenen» of Liban (Lebanon) was in a marchy place, coastal side or a site resembling

---


⁵ H. Brugsch, op. cit., p. 4.


⁹ P. Guieysse, Inscription historique de Séti Ier, Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l’archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes, publié sous la direction de G. Maspero, t. 11, Paris, 1889, p. 56.

¹⁰ Ibid.
a bay of Lake Serbonis, which at present does not exist in a coastal part of Syria»11:

In ancient times cedar, owing to its huge height, was considered to be a tree with wonderful qualities. It was used in building temples, palaces, as well as construction of cult monuments attributing them a certain supernatural power originating from cedar.12

Diamantis Panagiotopoulos also researching materials related to the localization of the toponym under discussion, wrote: «The so-called Annals of Thutmos III, the longest monumental inscription known from Egypt, represents a valuable source of information not only for the campaigns of the king in the Syra-Palestinian territory but also for their direct or indirect material outcome within Egypt».13 Denoting that the Syra-Palestinian region was subdivided into three geographical areas named $D_{\text{Zah}}$ (Djahy), $R_{\text{mmn}}$ (Remenen)14 and $R_{\text{tnw}}$ (Retenu)), D.Panagiotopoulos supposed that «all three have a vague meaning and cannot be regarded as territories with strictly defined boundaries... In the context of the Annals, Djahy can be roughly identified with Palestine... Retenu, a name given to a region that apparently extended from Syria to Palestine». As far as it concerns Remenen (here: Remene) he considered it together with Palestine, noting. “Lebanon /Remenen and Palestine/».15 It is obvious that the suggestion of D. Panagiotopoulos about the localization of «Remenen» resembles the above mentioned opinion of P. Guieysse.16

---

11 Ibid., p. 56, com. 5. Concerning information about the import of Մայրի trees into Egypt from a faraway country it’s interesting to compare it with information of historical-geographic character related to the mention about the campaigns of Sargon of Akkad (2316-2261 BC) and his grandson Naram-Suen (2236-2200 BC) in Akkadian sources where is mentioned the country-name Armanum (Armani). Analysing the questions related to this problem A.G. Kifishin came to the conclusion that here «we have the oldest mention of Armenia (the 3rd millennium BC), which from the I millennium BC it is mentioned as the country of Arme» (А. Кифишин, Географические воззрения древних шумеров при патеси Гудеа (2162-2137 гг. до н.э.). – «Палестинский сборник», вып. 13 (76), 1965, с. 66, cf. Вяч. Вс. Иванов, Выделение разных хронологических слоев в древнеармянском и проблема первоначальной структуры гимна Вахагну, - ПП, 1983, № 4, с. 32-33).

12 See V. Loret, Etude sur quelques arbres Egyptiens, Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l’archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes, t. 11, seconde année, Paris, 1880, p. 62. It’s notable that J. de Horrack compared his decipherment of an Egyptian inscription’s with information by Diodorus Siculus about Sesoösis (Sesostris) (J. de Horrack, Notice sur le nom égyptien du cèdre, Revue archéologique ou recueil de documents et de mémoires, Paris, 1864, vol. IX, pp. 44-47). Sesoösis «built a ship of cedar wood, which was two hundred and eighty cubits long and plated on the exterior with gold and on the interior with silver. This ship he presented as a votive offering to the god who is held in special reverence in Thebes» (Diodorus Siculus, with in English translation by C. H. Oldfather, books I and II, London, 1960, I. 57.5). As it is noted: «Practically all Greek and Latin writers called him Sesostris, and about him stories gathered as about no other ruler in ancient history with the exception of Alexander the Great. "In Greek times Sesostris had long since become but a legendary figure which cannot be identified with any particular king" (J. H. Breasted, A History of Egypt, from the earliest times to the Persian conquest, New York, 1909, p. 189). But certain facts narrated in connection with him were certainly drawn from memories of the reign of Ramses II of the Nineteenth Dynasty» (The Library of History of Diodorus Siculus published in Vol. I of the Loeb Classical Library edition, 1933 http://goo.gl/30Jlw).


14 $R_{\text{mmn}}$ of the original D. Panagiotopoulos deciphered “Remenen”. In the above mentioned 19th century studies the countryname was used in the form of “Remene”.


16 P. Guieysse, op. cit., p. 56, com. 5.
Thus, until the mid-70s of the 19th century in French Oriental studies and Armenology dominated the idea of identification of Remene and Remenen with Armenia and Armenians. Later prevailed a supposition of localization of «Remenen» in Lebanon. It may be ascertained that identification of Remene with Armenia had a conceptual significance for the French Armenologists and it keeps its imporance for the further research of the problem.

In this context may be considered the mention of Armenia in Jean-François Champollion’s study of the question of the trade routes of Egypt, who wrote about «a well known road which just from Memphis leads to Phoenicia from where all other roads lead to Armenia and the Caucasus, as well as via Palmira to Babylon»17.

Coming to the problem of identification of Ararat-Urartu with Armenia in French Oriental studies and Armenology of the 19th century it is necessary to take into consideration the works by J. Oppert, E. Cavaignac, Fr. Lenormant, M. Brosset, Fr. Tournebize and F. de Saulcy.

J. Oppert wrote that in the Nineveh inscriptions «Urarta literally expresses the name Ararat which signifies Armenia in the biblical texts» («Urarta, ce qui exprime à la lettre le nom Ararat qui signifie l’Arménie dans les textes bibliques»).18 E. Cavaignac noted in the same way: «le royaume arménien d’Ourartou (Ararat)»19:

M. Brosset had followed Fr. Lenormant’s chronological concept, according to which Tiglatpalasar ascending the throne on July 2, 930 BC, campaigned many times «dans les montagnes de l’Arménie».20

According to Fr. Tournebize, an early mention of Armenia in Assyrian cuneiform sources relates to 1300 BC, the period of the reign of Salmanasar I21, and concerning the campaigns of Tiglath-Pileser II22 there are testimonies of the cuneiform inscriptions of the Elassar23 palace, from which follows that «he conquered Nairi which was the Assyrian name of a southern part of Armenia ("nom assyrien d’une partie de l’ancienne Arménie méridionale") and it was situated on two slopes of Masius,24 in the area of the middle stream of the Upper Tigris and the Euphrates»25:

In a great inscription of Calakh or Nimroud26, according to J. Oppert, it is stated that Sardanapal III in 920 BC was informed that Amika, l’Arménien27 refused to pay tribute to

---

21 Fr. Tournebize, Histoire politique et religieuse de l’Arménie, Paris, 1, p. 16. In accordance with the present day accepted chronology, Salmanasar I reigned in 1274-1245 BC (+/-10) (История Древнего Востока, ч. II, с. 100):
22 In accordance with the present day accepted chronology, Tiglath-Pileser II reigned in 967-935 BC (see: Ռ. Ղազարյան, Մերձավոր և Միջին Արևելքի երկրների պատմության հիմնահարցեր (Ք.ա. IV հազարամյակի վերջ - Ք.ա. I հազարամյակի վերջ), Երևան, 2011, էջ 53):
23 Larsa, biblical Elasar in souther Babylonia.
24 Strabo, XI. 12. 3-4.
25 Fr. Tournebize, op. cit., p. 16, 17.
26 It is located to the south of Nineveh, in the site of modern city of Nemrud on the bank of the Tigris river; in ancient times it was called Calhu (A. Kuhrt, The Ancient Near East, London and New York, vol. I, 1997, p. 362):
him. Sardanapal marched towards the country of Zamua\textsuperscript{28}, to the Amika’s capital city Zamri.\textsuperscript{29}

Fr. Lenormant noted that in 877 BC Salmanasar IV\textsuperscript{30} during his 27\textsuperscript{th} campaign subdued different parts of Armenia and plundered Van.\textsuperscript{31}

M. Brosset noted that in 741 BC «Armenian Sardur (Arménien Sardur) together with Matie\textsuperscript{32} confronted “Tiglatpalasars IV\textsuperscript{33}». In the area of the city of Kumukhi\textsuperscript{34} the Assyrian king captured many towns and founded the town of Asurbaza in Armenia»\textsuperscript{35}. A contemporary of Sarduri II (764-735 BC)\textsuperscript{36} was Tiglath-Pileser III (745-727 BC).\textsuperscript{37}

According to Fr. Lenormant, Assyria was destroyed by the Babylonian king and his ally «Median Arbak» (here: Varbak – A.D.) in 789 BC, at the time of “Sardanapal.”\textsuperscript{38} M. Brosset mentioned Assurbanipa who is mentioned in Greek sources by the name of Sardanapal. He noted that Sardanapalle guerrier differs from the other king with the same name during whose reign in 789 BC was destroyed the “Nineveh empire”\textsuperscript{39}. The data concerning the fall of Nineven, as well as the names of the mentioned kings are fixed by much earlier date than is accepted in historiography, according to which the capital of Assyria Nineveh fell in 612 BC under the blows of the allied forces of Babylon, Media\textsuperscript{40} and Armenia. Assyria was finally destroyed in 605 BC. Arbak (Varbak) mentioned by Fr. Lenormant was the king Media Kiasar and the king of Babylon - Nabopalsar (626-605 BC).


\textsuperscript{28} It is mentioned at the time of the invasion of Sargon II into the Van Kingdom (714 BC), when along with neighbouring districts he captured Zamua (see \textit{Cd^n}, h. I, \textsuperscript{3}235): Zamua was to the north of the Minor Zab (АВИИУ, 1951, № 2, с. 289, прим. 51):

\textsuperscript{29} J. Oppert, op. cit., liv. III, ch. IV, pp. 318, 319.

\textsuperscript{30} In accordance with the present day accepted chronology, Salmanasar IV reigned in 782–773 BC. The 877 BC was the 6th year of the reign of Ashurnasirpal II (883–859 BC) (A. Kuhrt, op. cit., t. II, p. 479).

\textsuperscript{31} Fr. Lenormant, Manuel de l’histoire ancienne..., t. II, p. 72. It means that “Salmanasar” (here’ Ashurnasirpal) was unable to subjugate Armenia in the whole, because there was resistance by the natives. This fact, probably, caused his 31\textsuperscript{st} campaign in 873 BC. According to Fr. Tournebize, these districts had never been completely subjugated (Fr. Tournebize, op. cit., p. 17):

\textsuperscript{32} The king of Bit-Agusi in northern Syria (\textit{Cd^n}, h. I, \textsuperscript{3}315):

\textsuperscript{33} There was no “Tiglatpalasar IV” in the history of Assyrian.

\textsuperscript{34} Kumukh, Kummukhu of the Assyrian cuneiform sources corresponds to the country of Commagene mentioned by the ancient sources (АВИИУ - ВДИ, 2(36), 1951, 42., с. 313, прим. 1).


\textsuperscript{36} The confederation formed in the West by Sarduri II attacked Assyria, but in the battle of Arpad (in the north of Syria) (743 BC) the troops of the Van Kingdom and its allies were defeated (\textit{Cd^n}, h. I, \textsuperscript{3}317).

\textsuperscript{37} A. Kuhrt, op. cit., t. II, p. 479, 557. A. Kuhrt mentioned Sarduri II as the founder of Erebus and Arghishinili (Ibid., p. 557), but it is well known that Arghishiti I was their founder.

\textsuperscript{38} Fr. Lenormant, op. cit., t. II, pp. 77–80.

\textsuperscript{39} M. Brosset, op. cit., p. 339.

\textsuperscript{40} История Древнего Востока, М., 1979, с. 166.
In Movses Khorenatsi’s “History of Armenia” Kiaxar is mentioned under the name of Varbakes and Assyrian king – Sardanapal. According to Movses Khorenatsi, Haykazun Paruyr Skayordi had been in power in Armenia, participated in the destruction of Assyria (612 BC): According to Movses Khorenatsi, the last of those who lived in the time of the Assyrian kingdom, from the times of Semiramis or Ninos was our Paruyr in the time of Sardanapal. After the fall of the Assyrian kingdom Median king Kiaxar-Varbak crowned Haykazun Paruyr, the son of Skayordi.41

Saint-Martin noted that according to Movses Khorenatsi, Paruyr Skayordi was the 36th of the descendants of Hayk, i.e. he was Haykazun.42

Movses Khorenatsi while writing about patricid Assyrian princes, who flew to Armenia, mentioned «our valiant ancestor Skayordi»,43 i.e. Haykazun Skayordi. M. Brosset considered him among the Armenian kings.44

M. Brosset rightly considering Movses Khorenatsi as the 5th century author45, noted that the data conveyed by him are the genuine source on the ancient history of Armenia. At the same time, according to M. Brosset, kings with the Armenian names Amika, Sarda, Urzaha are not mentioned in Movses Khorenatsi’s work, meanwhile there are the names of several Assyro-Babylonian kings in Tovma Artsruni’s work46, which are in the basis of the facts mentioned by Fr. Lenormant.47

M. Brosset noted, that according to the inscription of Khorsabad (situated in 20 km to the north from Nineveh), «Sargon campaigned to Armenia and subjugated the ruler of Van Iranzou: The latter’s son was Aza agains whom rebelled Armenian Urzaha. Ulloussoun, the brother and succesor of Aza, subdued Urzaha, but Sargon defeated the latter and joined to Assyria the towns of Armenia»48. The case in question is the devastating campaign of Sargon II to Armenia in 714 BC.

According to Fr. Lenormant’s opinion, Urtsa, roi d’Arménie, one of whose vassals was Ulloussoun of Van.49 But Aza, as well as his brother Ulloussoun were not the kings of Van, but of Manna, to the south-east of Lake Urnia who had been appointed by Sargon50: The forms of the names Urzaha or Urtsa are the variants of the same name Rusa and, as noted Fr. Lenormant, after his brother’s death Ulloussoun «... was reconciled with Rusa and gave him twenty two castles with their garrisons»51.
Fr. Lenormant identified Rusa with Hrachya, the son of Paruyr. As far as the above mentioned information of Movses Khorenatsi about Paruyr Skayordi related to the period of the fall of Assyria, it may be suggested that within the circle of chronological succession of events presented by Lenormant he interlaced the images of Rusa I (735-713 BC), Rusa II (684-645 BC) and Rusa III (629-601 BC).

It is notable that the 19th century above-cited Orientalists mentioned by M. Brosset while deciphering Assyrian inscriptions referring to the kings of the Van kingdom by different names, at the same time denoted them with the ethnic indicator, e.g. Amika l’Arménien, Arménien Sardur, Ursa53, roi d’Arménie. Fr. Tournebize also mentioning them as Armenian kings, at the same time used as a country-name the form Ourarti54 (Ararat).55

The British scholar H. Rawlinson (1810-1895) concerning an Assyrian inscription containing information about king Arama, noted: «I may here notice, once for all, that there is no doubt whatever about the reading of Ararat, nor its identity with Armenia»56:

J. Oppert, H. Rawlinson, Layard H., 57 compared some toponyms mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions describing the Assyrian troops’ campaigns to the north with data from the Bible and Movses Khorenatsi’s “History of Armenia.” E.g. in relation to the “Minni” province name in one inscription, H. Rawlinson noted that it was mentioned also in the Khorsabad and Van inscriptions and corresponded to a kingdom’s name in the Jeremiah’s prophecy «...summon against her these kingdoms: Ararat, Minni and Ashkenaz... ».58 With regard to this H. Rawlinson mentioned Arzeskan (Archesh), «which was the capital city of Arama, king of Ararat», whom he mentioned among the descendants of Haik.59 The source of such a notion is Movses Khorenatsi’s information about Aram60 which H. Rawlinson weaved with an information about Arame or Aramu of Archesh (the mid-9th century BC).61

In the translation of an inscriptions describing the Assyrian troop’s campaign H. Rawlinson referred to the invasion of the Assyrians «towards Armenia» and identifying...
the hydronym Artseni with jArsevnia» (Արածանի), Ararat mentioned as a country-name he compared with Great Armenia and denoted the king as «Asiduri (Sarduri) of Armenia».62

F. de Saulcy mentioned the name of Armenia in the form of Armina63, as it is in the threelingual Behistun (Old Persian, Elamit and Babylonian) inscription (Armina/Arminiya=Uraštu).64 Thus, the study of the ethno-spiritual foundations of Armenian history has been important for historical and philosophical comprehension, which played a certain role in the theoretical elaborations of the French Armenologists. The Haikian/Haikazun (the descendants of Patriarch Haik) genealogy presented in Movses Khorenatsi’s "History of Armenia" was considered by Saint-Martin and V. Langlois from the ontological standpoint in historical context by the method of correlation of the biblical and Armenian traditional notions.65

Certain comments on the cuneiform inscriptions of the Van Kingdom in the context of the ancient history of Armenia are of special interest in the works of French Armenologists and other European specialists. They called the language of the inscriptions Vanique (Vannic) or Armeniaque (Armenian)66. The significance of Movses Khorenatsi’s work67 in discovery of the Van cuneiform inscriptions68 is determined by their important place in the historical cultural heritage of Armenia. The comments on the country name Armenia and the ethnic name Armenian, on the basis of the decipherment of the Assyrian and Van cuneiforms are an important contribution by the European and particularly French Armenologists of the 19th century to the studies of the history of the Van (Ararat-Urartu) Kingdom as an integral part of ancient Armenian history.

Translated from Armenian by S. E. Chraghyan

62 Ibid., p. 44.
64 P. Lecoq, Les inscriptions de la Perse achéménide, Gallimard, 1997, pp. 139, 246.
67 Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 54:
THE OFFICIAL LIST OF THE CATHOLICOI OF “AGHUANK”  
OR OF THE SEE OF GANDZASAR

Maghalyan A. V.  
PhD in History

Manuscript No. 2561 of the Mashtots' Matenadaran in Erevan, dated 1664, is a copy of the “History of the Land of Aghuank” by Movses Kaghankatuats’i. At a later date, an official list of the Catholicoi of “Aghuank” or of the See of Gandzasar was added to the manuscript (folia 262a–263a).

The previous owner of this manuscript was the renowned archaeologist and specialist in folklore Khach’ik Tsayragoyn Vardapet Dadian, who published a description of the manuscript with the full text of its lengthy colophon in the periodical “Ararat” in 1895. His handwritten copy of the colophon, penned in Shahbulagh on February 25, 1889, with the added list of the names of the Catholicoi of “Aghuank”, is now kept at the Catholicosal archive of the Matenadaran.

The official list begins after the chapter “Names of the Patriarchs of Aghuank, Their Years and Accomplishments”, i.e. with the 44th Catholicos Markos, who succeeded Lord Movses in 993, and ends with those who held the office down to the middle of the 18th century. The compiler of the List utilized Mkhit’ar Gosh’s “Catholicoi and Events in the Land of Aghuank through the 12th century” for the hierarchs who held the office until the 12th century.

Judging from the remark “even at this time, 1185 [of the Armenian Era]” in the line pertaining to Catholicos Nersês, the list was prepared in 1736. What follows, with the mentioning of Israel Jraberdt’s in the List, was added in 1763, in other handwriting, just before the end of the three-year rivalry for the office, when he was defeated by the legal successor to the See of Gandzasar Hovhannës Hasan-Jalalyan (1763–1786).

Hovhannës Hasan-Jalalyan was succeeded by the anti-See Catholicos Simeon Jraberdt’s (1794–1810) and Sargs Hasan-Jalalyan (1794–1798, 1812–1815), the brother of the late Catholicos Hovhannës. The abolition of the See of Gandzasar took

---

1 Թօփճեան Յ., Ցուցակձեռագրաց Խ, Վաղարշապատ, հ. 1, Պատմութիւն, 1898, էջ 100-101:
2 Պատմութիւն, 10 (1895) էջ 378-380:
3 Մատենադարան, Պատմութիւնութիւն Կաթողիկոսի որոշ հանդիպումներ, Երևան, 1987, էջ 384-391:
4 Մովսէս Կաղանկատուացի, Պատմութիւն Աղվանից աշխարհի, Երևան, 1983, էջ 347:
5 Միքայել Մկրտչոյեց Սիմյոնեաց, Պատմութիւն Աղվանից աշխարհի հանդիպումներ, Երևան, 1901, էջ 384-391:
6 Սիմյոն Մկրտիչ, Սիմյոնեաց, Չարենցեաց, Երևան, 1973, էջ 90, տես նաև Րաֆֆի. Երկերի ժողովածու, հ. 9, Երևան, 1987, էջ 481:
place in 1815, when the rank of its hierarch was reduced to that of a Metropolitan by a decree of the Tzar through the mediation of the Catholicos of All Armenians. For the remainder of his life, Catholicos Sargsis was Metropolitan (1815-1828). His death marks the end of the vestiges of the Catholicosate of the See of Gandzasar.

It should be noted that this concise list is an important source for the study of the history of Artsakh and in particular the Catholicosate of Gandzasar. The text provided below is that of Manuscript No. 2561, folia 262a–263a.

ʼՄուիսուն հայերապետություն ապաստանի, աստիճան տեսնություն էր Մուիսուն հայերապետություն ապաստանի, աստիճան տեսնություն էր Մուիսուն հայերապետություն ապաստանի, աստիճան տեսնություն էր

(262α) Տեր Յովհաննէս. Ծ (50)
Տեր Ստեփանոս. Ծ (51)
Տեր Յովսեփ. Ծ (52)
Տեր Մարկոս. Ծ (53)
Տեր Ներսէս. Ծ (54)
Տեր Ստեփանոս. Ծ (55)
Տեր Մարկոս. Ծ (56)
Տեր Ներսէս. Ծ (57)
Տեր Ստեփանոս. Ծ (58)
Տեր Յովսեփ. Ծ (59)
Տեր Ստեփանոս. Ծ (60)
Տեր Մարկոս. Ծ (61)
Տեր Ներսէս. Ծ (62)
Տեր Ստեփանոս. Ծ (63)
Տեր Յովսեփ. Ծ (64)
Տեր Ստեփանոս. Ծ (65)
Տեր Յովսեփ. Ծ (66)
Տեր Ստեփանոս. Ծ (67)
Տեր Յովսեփ. Ծ (68)

7 In the above cited work by Mkrtumyan, the date is given mistakenly as ՆԸ (408 = A.D. 959), at which time the Catholicos in office was Davit’ (958–965; cf. Մկրտումյան Լ., op. cit., p. 218).
8 In Mkrtumyan’s publication is mistakenly printed Davit’ (cf. ibid.).
Strangely enough, Mkrtumyan omits this important line even though it is found in the copy utilized by him (see Մատենադարան, Կաթողիկոսական դիվան, fold. 240, doc. 132; cf. Մկրտումյան Լ., op. cit., p. 219). This and another omission (see the next note) distort the rest of the Catholicosal numeration.

This line too is omitted in Mkrtumyan’s edition (ibid.).
There were two Catholicoci at this time, Suk'ias and Peter. We were unable to determine their order of succession - 56

Patriarch Step'anos died - 772 (1323) - 57

Patriarch Karapet - 855 (1406) - 58; until 873 (A.D. 1424), we found the date.

Patriarch Mat'tos - 885 (1436) - 59

Patriarch At'anas - one year - 60

Patriarch Hovhannēs, son of Chalal - 890 (1441) - 61

Patriarch Mat'tos - 903 (1454) - 62

Patriarch Ār'stakēs - 922 (1473) - 63

Patriarch Nersēs was confirmed in his seat - 927 (1478) - 64

[262v]

Patriarch Shmavon - 930 (1481) - 65

Patriarch T'umay Sokot'luets'i - 930 (1481) - 66

Patriarch Ār'ak'el - 930–945 (1481–1496). We found his dates in the old church of Sogut'lu - 67

Patriarch Ār'stakēs - 965 (A.D. 1516) - 68

Patriarch Sargis - 1003 (1554). Khach'īnu Ghshlaghets'i died in the year 988 (1539) - 69

Patriarch Grigoris the defector - 1005 (A.D. 1556) - 70

Patriarch Davit' Arjadzorets'i was hanged in the rectory of Gandzasar by the wicked, those accursed by the Cross - 71

Patriarch P'ilippos Tumets'i - 1012 (A.D. 1563) - 72

Patriarch Hovhannēs died in 1470, according to the inscription on his tomb at the Church of St. Hakob in Metsiran: «Այս է հանգիստ Տէր Ովհանէս կաթողիկոսին Աղվանից. թվ. ՋՋԹ  (1470)»; see Դիվան հայ վիմագրության, պր. V, Արցախ, էջ 17.

Patriarch Hovhannēs, 13 the builder of the church of Ganch14 - 1082 (1633) - 78

11 At the Matenadaran is kept a decree issued to Catholicos Hovhannēs of Gandzasar on August 6, 1462 by Begum-Khat'ūn, the wife of Kara-Koyunlu Sultan Jhanshah, confirming his rights and privileges as Catholicos; see Մատենադարանի պարսկերեն վավերագրերը. հրովարտակներ, պր. I, կազմեց Հ. Փափազյանը Երևան, 1956, էջ 45–47; for a Russian copy, see Մատենադարան, Կաթողիկոսական դիվան, թղթ. 241, վայ. 197). Catholicos Hovhannēs died in 1470, according to the inscription on his tomb at the Church of St. Hakob in Metsiran: «Այս է հանգիստ Տէր Ովհանէս կաթողիկոսին Աղվանից. թվ. ՋՋԹ  (1470)»; see Դիվան հայ վիմագրության, պր. V, Արցախ, էջ 17.

12 At the Matenadaran is kept a decree by Pedishah Ya'qub Ak Koyunlu (1478–1490) issued on April 24, 1487, granting Catholicos Shmavon his rights to the See (Մատենադարան, պարսկերեն հրովարտակներ, պր. I, էջ 50–52; for a Russian copy, see Մատենադարան, Կաթողիկոսական դիվան, թղթ. 241, վայ. 198).

13 At the Matenadaran is kept a similar decree by the Safavid Shah Abbas I (1587-1629) issued in 1606, granting Catholicos Hovhannēs his rights to the See of Gandzasar (Մատենադարան, պարսկերեն հրովարտակներ, պր. II, կազմեց Հ. Փափազյանը, Երևան, 1959, էջ 84-85.

14 This information is confirmed by the following inscription found on the southern wall of the Church of St. John the Baptist in Gandzak: «Ի ժամանակ Ովհանէս կաթողիկոսի, թվ. ՊԱՐ (1633) ամի շինեցավ սուրբ Ովհանէս եկեղեցին» (see Դիվան հայ վիմագրության, Վ, Արցախ, էջ 227).
Patriarch Grigor - 1083,15 died 1102 (1634–1653) - 79
Patriarch Petros Khandzkets’i [263a] - 1102, died 1124 (1653–1675)16 - 80
Patriarch Mēlkisēt’, a second, Arashets’i17 - dwelt quite uninhibitedly near Gandzasar; we heard nothing of what preceded and followed <him> - 81
Patriarch Simēon the Graceful, of Jrabert’s18 Great Kunets - 82
Patriarch Yeremiay Chalets’i - 1125 (1676), in opposition, assumed the Catholicosate, in evil partnership <and> utter depravity with a certain Bishop Yeghiay, a Catholicos by name, who consecrated Patriarch Yeremiay and called <him> Catholicos19 - 83
Patriarch Yesayi K’olatakets’i,20 near Gandzasar - 84
Patriarch Nersēs, a reprobate, absolutely miserable21 - 1155 (1706) even at this time, 1185 (1736) - 85
Patriarch Israyēl of Great Kunets, who currently looks after the people - 1212 (1763)22 - 86.

15 The 1634 decree of Shah Sefi (1629–1642), wherein he establishes the succession of Catholicos Grigor following the death of Catholicos Hovhannēs is preserved (see Մատենադարանի պարսկերեն հրովարտակները, պր. II, էջ 110).
16 See Մկրտումյան Լ., Գանձասարի կաթողիկոսությունը Պետրոս Խանձքեցի կաթողիկոսի օրոք, Լրաբեր հասարակական գիտությունների, 1, 2000, էջ 88-97.
17 The name Mēlkisēt’ Arashets’i appears twice in the list.
18 Noteworthy details on the circumstances about the elevation of Simēon Khotorashents’i to the Catholicosate are found in a colophon of a Gospel manuscript at Matenadaran (No. 8965) by the scribe Grigor the priest։ «Շնորհիւն Տեառն Ամենակալի և նորին օգնականութեամբն աւարտեցաւ եռահրաշ և հոգիազարդ Ավետարանս` թուին ՌՃԻԴ (1675)
ամին, յուլիսի ամսոյ ԺԸ (18) աւուրն. ի երկիրս Գանձակայ, ի գեօղս Քարահատ` ընդ հովանեաւ Սուրբ Աստուածածնիս։ Եւ ի թագաւութեամբն պարսից Շահ Սո ւլէյմանին, ի հայրապետութեամբ Lord Simēon of the House of the Aghuank’, the most-wise and holy Patriarch of the See of Gandzasar, pupil of Lord Petros, Catholicos of the same See, who in that year was taken to Christ and who had stated in a firm will that after his death the chief abbot Simēon should become Catholicos, this with the approval of the Shah of Persia and the great Patriarch, Lord Hakob, Patriarch of Holy Ejmiatsin, who also at this time was at the Shah’s palace”).
19 On these events, see Մկրտումյան Լ., Սիմեոն և Ե րեմիա կաթողիկոսների «հակաթոռության» խնդիրը 17-րդ դ. վերջին քառորդին, Էջմիածին, 2000, 3, էջ 75–83. Yeremiay Hasan-Jalalyan died in 1700, as attested by his tombstone։ «Այս է տապան Երեմիա կաթողիկոսին Աղուանից ։ յազգէն Ջալալ Դօլին. ՌՃ ԽԹ (1700) թուին» (see Դիվան, V, Արցախ, p. 65).
20 The renowned historian and activist within the national liberation movement, Esayi Hasan-Jalalyan, whose Catholicosal rights and privileges were established by Shah Sultan Husein of Iran, in a decree of 1701; see Մատենադարանի պարսկերեն վավերագրերը. հրովարտակներ, պր. III, կազմեց Ք. Կոստիկյանը, Երևան, 2005, էջ 149-152.
22 This line of later information must have been an addition found in the exemplar of the manuscript.
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Lieutenant-general Tovmas Hovhannes Nazarbekyan (Foma Ivan Nazarbekov) (1855-1931) is one of those rare military men who participated in several wars: 1877-1878 Russian-Turkish, 1904-1905 Russian-Japanese, during WWI Russian-Turkish, 1918 February-June Armenian-Turkish, then in 1918 December Armenian-Georgian, 1919-1920 Armenian-Tatar, 1920 autumn Armenian-Turkish military operations.

During 1914-1918 T. Nazarbekyan was one of the witnesses of the tragedy of Western Armenians during the Armenian Genocide. On his order photographs of the consequences of the Turkish genocidal brutalities were taken. In his Memoirs T. Nazarbekyan presented the reports of his officers who depicted the mass killings of the Armenians organized and committed by the Ottoman authorities in full detail.

1 This article presents the General’s unprinted Memoirs, including the period from June, 1914 to April, 1916 and is mainly based on the memoir notes of T. Nazarbekyan, which are kept in the General’s personal fund at the National Archives of Armenia.

2 In 1907 T. Nazarbekyan resigned. The reason was that the higher command had refused to grant him the military rank of major-general with the absurd excuse that during the Russian-Japanese war the limit of general rank was reached. The rank would be granted only in case T. Nazarbekyan resigned. Offended by such an attitude he preferred resigning and receiving that rank (probably the main problem here was that T. Nazarbekyan was Armenian and adhered to the Armenian Apostolic church. Such an attitude at this period cannot be explained otherwise). After the start of World War I, he turned to the Caucasian Army asking them to restore him in the regular army. Overcoming some difficulties his request was satisfied. Unfortunately in his Memoirs the General does not write about what he was doing in the period from 1907 until the end of June 1914.

3 For T. Nazarbekyan’s service list and awards see Армениян Грант. Генералы-армяне в Российской империи, Ереван, 2008, с. 168-170. One part of the memoirs which includes the period from October 1917 to April 1918 was published in the magazine ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 2, թ. 53:

4 T. Nazarbekyan’s Memoirs were written in 1928-1929. He used not only the documents he had, part of which were lost after his arrest by the Soviet authorities, but also had correspondence with his military friends generals Hovhannes Hakhverdyan [on December 23, 1930 H. Hakhverdyan was arrested in Leningrad on the basis of the indictment forged
During the military operations of 1914-1916 the General repeatedly came into contact with Armenian volunteer units and their commanders. He particularly singled out Dro’s volunteer unit to which General M. Silikyan gave the following assessment in one of his letters written during the Soviet period: “Dro’s squad is a magnificent squad, the pride and beauty of Armenia”.6

Under T. Nazarbekyan’s command fought the 1st Armenian volunteer unit of Andranik. General Nazarbekyan was one of those single commanders whose authority Andranik recognized.

6 For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 22, թ. 9: For more details see ՀԱԱ, Բալասան Հայոց պատմության հատված, Երևան, 2015, էջ 467-478.
In his Memoirs he considered insubstantial the indictments concerning the Armenian volunteers. He denied the false information distributed during Nikolay Romanov’s (junior, Nikolay II’s uncle) period as officiating, Viceroy of the Caucasus and Commander-in-chief of the Caucasian Army⁷, as if Armenians carried out “mass killings” of Muslims⁸.

T. Nazarbekyan highly appreciated the fighting capacity of the Russian Army and though in some cases he said critical words about the planning of the military operations and the higher command, he never meant to discredit or defame the Army and the command. The General tried to regard and interpret this or that operation in an unbiased manner and expressed his opinion on this or that decision. At the same time he did not hide his joy and pride when he presented this or that victorious military operation or battle of the Caucasian Army.

The main part of his Memoirs he

---

⁷ For more details see Սահակյան Ռ.. Ռուբեն ավագ քահանա Բեկգուլյանցի նամակները Արևմտյան Հայաստանում ռուսական իշխանությունների քաղաքականության մասին. Լրաբեր, 2009, 3, էջ 297-301: For the original of the manuscript see ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 28, էջ 7:

⁸ In our days also the factual historical picture is distorted for political purposes. Rafik Safarov, leading researcher of the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of NAS of Azerbaijan is especially distinguished for falsification: he falsified the information rendered by the sources and twisting the facts, as well as wrongly using the name “Eastern Anatolia” instead of Western Armenia he brought groundless accusations against the Armenians and volunteers serving in the Russian Army and denying the fact about the 1.5 million Armenians subjected to the genocide, he talked nonsense that the Armenians and volunteers serving in the Russian Army ”killed 1.19 million Muslims in Eastern Anatolia during 1915-1918”. He also makes a similar accusation against Russians who allegedly annihilated 88 thousand Muslims in the province of Batumi in 1915 (see Р. Сафаров. Участие народов Кавказа в Первой мировой войне, http://www.kavkazoved.info/news/2015/02/07/uchastie-narodov-kavkaza-v-pervoj-mirovoy-vojne-vojne.html). Safarov’s anti-scientific report (Доклад представлен в ходе международной научно-практической конференции “Кавказ в годы Первой мировой войны” (Пятигорск, 28-30 ноября 2014 г.). Доклады публикуются в авторской редакции.) serves the denial of the Armenian Genocide by Turkey. It should be mentioned that in the autumn of 1914 the Ottoman army and the notorious organization ”Teshkilate mahsuse” carried out mass exterminations of Armenians in the province of Batumi, as well as in the district of Kars. For more details see Д. Мартirosyan. Трагедия батумских армян: просто “резня” или предвестник армянского геноцида? http://regnum.ru/news/1236705.html Ռ. Սահակյան, Փաստաթղեր Առաջին աշխարհային տարիներին ռուսահպատակ հայերի զանգվածային կոտորածների մասին, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Լրաբեր հասարակական գիտությունների, 2012, 4, էջ 256-276; Ibid, Բաթումի նահանգի հայութեան կողոպուտն ու սպանութիւնները Ա. համաշխարհայինի սկզբում՝ 1914ի աշնանը (ֆաստաթղթեր). Հայկազեան Հայագիտական Հանդէս. 2013, ԼԳ հատոր, Երևան, էջ 7-45:
starts after the assassination of the heir to the Austrian throne Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo\(^9\). The Caucasian military district (CMD) had also been led to a fighting condition.

Two thirds of the forces of CMD were removed to the Russian-Austrian front\(^10\). In case of the Ottoman attack the viceroyalty would appear in a dangerous state. T. Nazarbekyan considered the transfer of those forces from the Caucasus a mistake, since in the troop units there were a great number of officers who had participated in the 1877-1878 Russian-Turkish war, had combat experience in mountainous terrain and knew very well the area of military operations\(^11\). The Caucasian cavalry division\(^12\) formed in Armavir\(^13\) and prepared for being sent to CMD was moved to the Russian-Austrian front and later was moved back to the Russian-Turkish front. Among its fighters was Semyon Budyonni - the future Marshal of the Soviet Union.

T. Nazarbekyan mentions with regret that the Russian-Turkish front was unjustly considered secondary, so the High Command in the person of General Nikolay Romanov considered it possible to cede to the Turks even the whole of the Caucasus region. General Nikolay Romanov understood his mistake in 1915 when he was appointed Viceroy of the Caucasus and Commander in Chief of the Army. During his officiating four more army corps were added to the Caucasian Army\(^14\).

In the morning of October 17, 1914 the German-Turkish warships bombed the Russian Black Sea coast cities of Sevastopol, Novorossiysk and Theodosia. This marked the Ottoman Empire’s full entry into WWI. The enemy managed to sink several Russian military and commercial ships and damage a number of coastal buildings. In response to that pirate attack on October 20, 1914 Russia, and then Great Britain and France declared war against the Ottoman Empire.

In such conditions T. Nazarbekyan could not remain as an indifferent observer and presented a report to the Caucasian Army chief of staff, General Nikolay Yudenich in order to serve in the acting army. On October 16, 1914 T. Nazarbekyan was appointed commander of the 2\(^{nd}\) Caucasian infantry brigade. The unit would operate

---

\(^9\) СУШ, §. 45, g. 1, q. 1, p. 3:

\(^10\) См. Е. В. Масловский. Мировая война на Кавказском фронте 1914-1917 г. Стратегический очерк. Париж, 1933, с. 32; История Первой мировой войны 1914-1918, Москва, том, 1, 1975, с. 197.

\(^11\) СУШ, §. 45, g. 1, q. 1, p. 5-6: Among the moved units was the 13\(^{th}\) Life-Guards Erivan regiment. According to the Soviet Union marshal V. M. Shaposhnikov, the Erivan regiment "was the oldest regiment of the Russian Army and had been founded during the reign of (tsar - R.S.) Mikhail Fyodorovich Romanov (1596-1645 - R.S.) which was stationed near Tiflis" (see Шапошников Б. М.. Военно-научные труды. Москва, 1974, с. 82).

\(^12\) С. М. Буденный. Пройденный путь. Москва, 1959, с. 12-13.

\(^13\) It was founded in 1839 by the Armenian emigrants in Russia (in the present Krasnodar region) and was called Armavir after the name of one of the old capitals of Armenia.

\(^14\) СУШ, §. 45, g. 1, q. 1, p. 5 212-6:
within the 4th Caucasian cavalry division of the *Atropatene squad* located in Northern Persia, the commander of which was General Fyodor Chernozubov.

In his Memoirs T. Nazarbekyan referred to the formation of Armenian volunteer units and some of their commanders. He qualifies them as "beloved folk heroes". T. Nazarbekyan mentions that the Russian command initially allowed forming four units.

T. Nazarbekyan considers it important to emphasize the fact that in the summer of 1914, in Karin-Erzrum the leaders of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation refused the Young Turks' offer to cause disturbances in the Caucasus and support the Turkish army.

In November, 1914 the *Atropatene squad* reached considerable success in Northern Persia. It made the Kurdish tribes find ways to reach an agreement with the Russian command and stop their resistance. But the Turkish attack around the city of Sarighamish did not allow the advance to continue and on December 1 the *Atropatene squad* received the command to retreat.

In the battle of Sarighamish the Russian troops totally defeated the 3rd Ottoman army and the Turkish troops were unable to launch an offensive towards the Caucasus Viceroyalty.

In his Memoirs T. Nazarbekyan refers to the self-defense fights of Armenians that started in Van on April 7, 1915. He recalls the details of the reasons of the Armenians' resistance pointing out that the main reason was the policy of the Ottoman authorities to exterminate Armenians.

During the military operations of 1915 T. Nazarbekyan’s most famous battle was the battle of Dilman (in the basin of Lake Urmia). Having a wide spy network in Northern Persia, as well as in the Russian *Atropatene squad* the Ottoman command had managed to find out that in the city of Dilman and around it the Russians did not have enough troops, so it decided to launch an attack. The attack aimed at defeating the Russians in the region of Dilman, and then attack in the direction of Yerevan and further reach and occupy the oil districts of Baku, at the same time raising the Caucasian

---

15 Russian units were often called after the name of the place where they operated. For example, after conquering Van General A. Nikolaev’s unit was given the name the Van squad.

16 The Iranian name Atropatene-Aderbaigan-“Azerbaijan” later (from the second half of 1918) was stolen and given for pan-Turkic purposes also to a formation artificially created in the cis-Caspian territory of Eastern Transcaucasia.

17 *ՀԱԱ*, է. 45, է. 1, հ. 1, էջ 14 և 15-16:

18 In fact the number of the volunteer units was six. The 5th unit under the command of Yardan (Sargsis Mehrabyan) did not move to the front since its warriors had no weapons. One unit mainly composed of Hunchakian volunteers, had formed in Kars. After participating in the military operations it was dissolved in January, 1915.

19 *ՀԱԱ*, է. 45, է. 1, հ. 1, էջ 15 և 16-15:
Muslims. For that purpose in March, 1915 the 3rd Collective division under Khalil bey’s command was sent to Persia from the province of Van.

Khalil’s purpose was to move to Jugha (Julfa) after defeating the Russians near Dilman, and then replenish the division with Muslims, invade Zangezur, Artsakh (Karabakh), the provinces of Yelizavetpol (Gandzak) and Baku, aiming at making a raid into Dagestan and with the help of the rebellious Muslim population of the Caucasus separate the region from Russia.

On April 16, General F. Chernozubov sent to the region of Dilman the 2nd Caucasian infantry brigade under T. Nazarbekyan’s command. There were 8 battalions, 12 Cossack sotnyas (hundreds) and 12 cannons under his command. Khalil’s 10-12 battalions, 12 cannons and around 6 thousand Kurds stood against the 2nd brigade.

In the morning of April 16, 1915 the enemy attacked and occupied Dilman. The units of the 2nd Caucasian infantry brigade appeared in a difficult state since not all the forces had arrived yet. General T. Nazarbekyan recalls: “At that difficult moment I noticed a small unit advancing. They appeared to be an Armenian unit under Smbat’s (Smbat Boroyan - R.S.) command that had been sent to the mountain pass of Sevablur (Black hill) for intelligence gathering...” On T. Nazarbekyan’s order the volunteers took positions to the south-east of the village Mukhanjik to resist the enemy that was trying to encircle the left defense flank, and not to let them pass to the rear. Realizing that the success of the battle depended on the bravery of Armenian soldiers the General commanded Smbat “to die but not to retreat”.

The positions occupied by the Armenians were the keys of Dilman. The enemy’s dense troops attacked the defense site taken by the Armenian unit. According to T. Nazarbekyan: “the unit’s members had to fight at closes with the enemy. Owing to Smbat’s (Smbat - R.S.) energy and intrepidity all the rapid attacks of the enemy were unsuccessful and after that the enemy stopped the offensive and retreated.”

In the morning of April 17 additional units arrived including the other companies of the Armenian 1st unit under the command of Andranik. That day the enemy only cannonaded the Russian positions and did not take active actions.

In the early morning of April 18, at 4 AM the enemy attacked. The main blow of the Turkish attack was directed at the center and left flank of the Russian defense. The whole weight of the defense of the center was taken by the Armenian 1st unit. Andranik

---

20 Корсун Н.. Алашкертская и Хамаданская операции на Кавказском фронте мировой войны, М., 1940, с. 154.
21 Масловский. Е.В., Мировая война на Кавказском фронте 1914-1917 г. Стратегический очерк. Париж, 1933, с. 156.
22 Н. Корсун. Алашкертская и Хамаданская операции, с. 42. According to T. Nazarbekyan’s Memoirs the enemy had 16 battalions, 2 squadrons, 8 cannons, 12 machine guns and 5 to 6 thousand Kurds, see ЦУ, ф. 45, г. 1, к. 2, р. 33 2п.п.-34:
23 ЦУ, ф. 45, г. 1, к. 2, р. 27 2п.п.-28:
24 ЦУ, ф. 45, г. 1, к. 2, р. 28:
25 ЦУ, ф. 45, г. 1, к. 2, р. 28 2п.п.:
personally went through the volunteer positions, encouraged the fighters “reminding them of their responsibilities”\textsuperscript{26}.

Failing in the center, the Turks directed their blow at the right flank of the Russian defense aiming at passing to the Russian rear. The soldiers of the 6\textsuperscript{th} artillery regiment positioned here, mainly staffed with reserve troops, wanted to leave positions. Only after T. Nazarbekyan’s weighty intervention they continued to fight\textsuperscript{27}.

The attack of the enemy was halted after which T. Nazarbekyan started a counterattack with his forces. In his turn Andranik, taking the fighters for attack, pushed out the Turks from the village Barchishli which finally cemented the Russians’ victory. The fight stopped only at night\textsuperscript{28}.

On April 19, T. Nazarbekyan commanded to start chasing of Khalil’s division. On the same day the congratulatory telegram of Viceroy of the Caucasus I. I. Vorontsov-Dashkov and General F. Chernozubov addressed to T. Nazarbekyan was received, which said that the latter was presented for the award Order of St. George, 4\textsuperscript{th} class.

In the battle of Dilman the Turks’ loss was about two thousand killed, and that of the Russians’ - 600 killed and 800 wounded\textsuperscript{29}. 21 of the volunteers were killed and 55 wounded\textsuperscript{30}.

On April 19, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Caucasian brigade within the Atropatene squad moved in the direction of Van. The General gladly records that on May 4 Van was liberated from the Turkish-Kurdish encirclement as a result of the advancement of the Armenian volunteer units and Russian forces.

T. Nazarbekyan also recalls the warm welcome the population of Van showed towards the volunteers and Russian Army. The General records the important fact that the Russian command appointed Aram Manukyan Governor of Van and the liberated regions. T. Nazarbekyan proudly records: “The Van defense showed that Armenians can counterattack the strong enemy with their meager resources”\textsuperscript{31}.

After the liberation of Van by the Russian Bayazet squad the enemy began to accumulate forces on the southern shore of Lake Van. In order to protect Van from that side an advance guard under I. Trukhin’s command was sent there. Besides the Russian divisions the 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} Armenian units were included in it. By joint forces they succeeded to put the enemy forces to flight and capture their four cannons.
On June 16, 1915 T. Nazarbekyan moved with his brigade along the northern shore of Lake Van. On their way they saw the empty Armenian villages, which had been destroyed and were full of corpses of people.

On June 18 the brigade camped in the Armenian village Panz, and on June 21, they reached Artchesh. According to the General the Russian soldiers, among whom there were those from Kuban, were surprised by the abundant crop of the province, which surpassed theirs.

On June 23, the brigade reached the Armenian village Norashen, and the next day the General received an order to advance towards Artske. On June 26, the brigade moved from Artske to Khanik where they reached at 5 PM. On their way they saw Kurdish villages with their inhabitants and in Khanik there lived Circassians, who had left with the retreating Ottoman army.

On June 27, T. Nazarbekyan received an order from the corps commander General P. Oganovski to make an attack in the direction of Kop on June 28.

On June 28, according to the order of the corps commander, the 6th Caucasian infantry regiment went towards Later, then Derik where General Oganovski’s headquarters was located.

In the morning of June 29, the Russian forces attacked with the purpose of driving the Turks out of Kop and liberating the village Purkhus. However, the attack failed and the Russians suffered considerable losses.

On June 29, the enemy getting reinforcements started to attack. The measures taken by the Russian command failed since the enemy had managed to occupy the heights dominating over the terrain.

On June 30, T. Nazarbekyan received an order to move to the village Later with his forces - the 5th Caucasian infantry regiment and one battery of mountain artillery, and to attack and occupy the village Torton on July 1. It could be concluded from the intelligence data that the enemy had managed to prepare well - the dominating heights were in their hands, the trenches were in several rows. The enemy force was about three battalions. Thus, the attack was fraught with large losses, so T. Nazarbekyan decided to use his superiority in artillery. The success was supported by the circumstance that one of the batteries managed to open flank cannon fire which decided the outcome of the attack. The Turks could not resist and escaped in panic. The General records: “When we approached the enemy positions or to be more exact, the trenches, we were shocked by the scene that rose in front of us. All the trenches were literally filled with corpses which was the result of the shrapnel fire of the two cannons.

32 ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 3, թ. 16:
33 In the 19th century Russia fought to strengthen its position in the Northern Caucasus. The mountain dwellers showed fierce resistance to the Russian troops. In 1859 the Russians managed to gain victory and a considerable number of Muslim mountain dwellers (the Adyghes, Chechens, Kabardians and others) left for the Ottoman Empire. They were known by the collective name Circassian.
34 It is famous for its early medieval Armenian church.
that had shot along the trenches. Most of the people were tall, tough, with dark faces and in a very good outfit\textsuperscript{35}.

The same day General P. Oganovski ordered to deploy one battalion of the 5\textsuperscript{th} regiment and four mountain cannons in a nearby village in the morning of July 2. It meant weakening the 5\textsuperscript{th} regiment. T. Nazarbekyan considered that the enemy would get additional forces and definitely attempt to return its lost positions, so the regiment would find itself in a difficult state. But General Oganovski kept to his point of view. T. Nazarbekyan ordered colonel Dokuchaev to strengthen the positions and be alert since it was possible that the Turks would try to attack at night.

The attack on the enemy’s position was first successful. With the support of the artillery the right column rapidly advanced and threatened to move to the enemy’s rear; it was also observed that the Turks had begun to panic. On the whole the attack went according to the plan. But at that time artillery and gun shots were heard in the rear, from the direction of Torton. At the same time large troops of the enemy were moving in the direction of General T. Nazarbekyan. It was obvious for the General that colonel Dokuchaev had not managed to repress the enemy and now the Turks were attacking from the direction of Torton. The situation was grave. The enemy’s numerous forces were threatening from three sides.

According to the General, at that hard moment military chief\textsuperscript{36} of the Labinsk Cossack Regiment, Pyotr Abashkin\textsuperscript{37} approached him asking to let him attack with his cavalry regiment since the terrain was suitable for such an operation. As T. Nazarbekyan confessed: “To be honest, I was very much surprised at this initiative and, of course, I happily consented”\textsuperscript{38}.

The rapid and unexpected attack of the Cossack cavalry regiment had a shocking effect on the Turks who started to retreat irregularly. In its turn the infantry made an attack. Around 300 soldiers and several officers of the enemy were captured\textsuperscript{39}.

The next day T. Nazarbekyan received an order to leave one battalion of the 6\textsuperscript{th} regiment, 2 mountain cannons and with 4 private battalions to move towards Torton, and then Nazik\textsuperscript{40}, which at that time appeared to be the Turks’ rear, in front of General Sharpantie’s\textsuperscript{41} squad, and then to move in the direction of Mush. The above-mentioned operation would be carried out by several squads simultaneously.

\textsuperscript{35}ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 3, թ. 25:
\textsuperscript{36}A military rank in the Cossack troops which was equivalent to the rank of lieutenant colonel.
\textsuperscript{37}Pyotr Abashkin (1868-1934), Russian military, Cossack, major-general.
\textsuperscript{38}ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ.3, թ.33 շրջ.-34 :
\textsuperscript{39}ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 3, թ. 34:
\textsuperscript{40}It was famous from old times in the Armenian province of Turuberan for its scenic Lake Nazik beloved by Armenians.
\textsuperscript{41}Claas-Gustav-Robert Sharpantie (1858-1918), general of the Russian Army, commander of the Caucasian Cossack division.
On July 5, 1915 T. Nazarbekyan’s squad made an attack in the direction of the villages Nazik and Metsk occupying the settlements. And near the village Tapavank the Cossacks captured about 500 Turkish soldiers, who they sent to Manazkert.

On their way they met Armenians miraculously saved from the Turkish-Kurdish atrocities: they were mainly from the Armenian settlements of the Mush Valley. As the General confesses, he wanted to adopt one of the orphans but the boy refused saying that he had to find his parents, and if he failed to find them alive, he would avenge the Turks.

As T. Nazarbekyan writes in his Memoirs, during those days they received disturbing news that the Turks’ troops had been largely supplemented and that the situation in the districts of Kop and Manazkert was alarming.

On July 8, 1915 T. Nazarbekyan received an order to retreat. On July 9, his squad left the village Kanashir and reached Tapavank. They got alarming news. Commander of the Labinsk Cossack Regiment Colonel A. Noskov reported from the Mush Valley that 12 Turkish battalions were advancing. The retreat was associated with great difficulty because a large number of refugees were coming from the Mush Valley, and it was necessary to ensure their safety. T. Nazarbekyan says the following: “A lot of soldiers, in spite of the exhaustion, carried the refugees’ children on their shoulders. I witnessed the following scene in Tapavank: a one-legged Armenian was asking the soldiers to save his little brothers. The Armenian soldiers readily took them. They wanted to seat him (the elder brother – R. S.) on the two-wheeled cart (transporting cartridges, but he categorically refused to follow them saying that he had decided to die in his house.

On July 19, 1915 T. Nazarbekyan entered Arnis with the available forces from where he moved out on July 20 with a great number of refugees. He left one battalion of the 7th infantry regiment, the 1st and 2nd Armenian units, the Nerchinsk Cossack regiment and one artillery battery in Arnis and ordered to wait until the last refugees passed from Artchesh and Van.

42 <ЛУЛ, ф. 45, оп. 1, д. 3, л. 44 гг.:

43 Alexander Noskov (1870-?), a Russian military, Cossack, colonel, commander of the 1st Labinsk Cossack regiment. In his memoirs T. Nazarbekyan communicates an important fact about those “predominant” forces. He writes: “The Labinsk Cossack cornet (I don’t remember the surname) had been sent for the squad headquarters communication. Later he told the officers of my headquarters, that when on July 9 the Labinsk regiment commander was preparing a report for me from the Mush Valley, he turned to his officers and said that they had to make General F. Nazarbekov retreat. He asked how many birds there were on the tree. Somebody counted them and said - 12. Then report that from the Mush Valley 12 taburs (battalions - R. S.) are attacking”. See <ЛУЛ, ф. 45, оп. 1, д. 3, л. 48 гг.-49:
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In the Berkri gorge a great number of refugees had accumulated. The sight of the escape of Armenian and Assyrian refugees from Northern Persia in December, 1914, rose before the General’s eyes again. They were protected by Dro’s unit and the squadron of frontier guards under the command of rittmeister Korolkov that had voluntarily joined him. The soldiers and Cossacks assisted the refugees as much as they could.

On August 20, 1915 a letter by I. I. Vorontsov-Dashkov, the Caucasus army commander-in-chief, was received from the 4th Caucasian army corps headquarters, which said that General T. Nazarbekyan, as a very deserving officer of the front, had been awarded with the French military medal “Médaille militaire”.

At that time the command of the Caucasian army, in the person of General N. Yudenich, initiated vast secret operations in order to occupy the fortress of Erzurum (Karin). General N. Yudenich was hurrying to occupy the city as it had become known that the Allies had decided to stop the operation of occupying the straits in January, 1916. And it would give a chance to the Ottoman command to move additional forces from Dardanelles to the Russian-Turkish front, and it made N. Yudenich hasten the planned operation.

In October, 1915 T. Nazarbekyan’s 2nd Caucasian infantry brigade was reorganized into the 2nd Caucasian infantry division. Commander of the 4th Caucasian army corps, General P. Oganovski, tells T. Nazarbekyan that he has presented him for the rank of lieutenant-general. But, as it turned out later, the presentation of the corps commander “disappeared” for unknown reasons. At T. Nazarbekyan’s request General P. Oganovski presents him for the rank of lieutenant-general the second time, but in vain.

In his Memoirs General T. Nazarbekyan mentions military senior pastor Ruben Bekgulyants who was visiting the military units to address the spiritual needs of the Armenian soldiers. At the same time he actively assisted in moving the orphan children to the rear.

---

46 Rank of a senior officer in the cavalry.
47 The full name is “Médaille militaire”. It was established in 1852. In its significance the medal is second only to the order “Legion of Honour”.
48 Ruben Bekgulyants (1875-1935), senior pastor.
On November 29, 1915 General T. Nazarbekyan received an order to make an attack. General Vladimir de Witte was appointed commander of the 4th Caucasian army corps.

On December 19, 1915 Commander-in-chief N. Romanov made an instruction to the troops to attempt to attract the Kurds to their side and eliminate the hostility between the Armenians and Kurds. The General T. Nazarbekyan believed that it was impossible to realize such an intention, because “the cultural level of the Kurds is at a very low level, especially that robbing and killing Christians is considered courage and pride for every Kurd”49.

During January 1916 T. Nazarbekyan’s military units carried out enhanced intelligence which became difficult due to the continuous heavy snowfall. They learnt from a captive Kurd that the enemy was retreating. General Nazarbekyan’s forces managed to occupy Khnus. The Armenian volunteers also directly participated in the attack.

On February 3, 1916 T. Nazarbekyan and the Armenian volunteers liberated Mush. The same day the Russian troops occupied Erzurum. This is how T. Nazarbekyan qualified that operation: “In spite of the severe weather, difficult terrain, inevitable shortage of food and the Turks’ assistance from the west and south (in the fights - R. S.), after the five-day long unprecedented attack the tempered Caucasian army managed to occupy Erzurum, where was the Turkish stronghold in Asia Minor50.

49 ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 7, թ. 22 շրջ.-23:
50 Ancient Armenian city Karin-Erzrum was in Western Armenia, but since the headquarters of the Turkish troops from Asia Minor (which geographically is to the west of the Armenian Highland) was stationed there, so T. Nazarbekyan mentions “Asia Minor”. 
Its fall was inevitable, but that it could happen so fast was a surprise to us51. Colonel Movses Silikyan (Moisey Silikov) (in the future - general), commander of the 6th regiment of the 2nd Caucasian infantry division was appointed military commandant of Erzurum.

Around 50 families had remained in Mush, among which there were Armenians as well. Most of the Armenians had been killed in the summer of 1915. Only craftsmen had been left alive. There was shortage of food in the city. The Armenian quarter of the city was almost completely destroyed. The liberation of Mush gave a chance to the Armenians who escaped the Turkish-Kurdish massacres, mainly the Armenians of Sasun, to descend to the city from the mountains.

On February 8, 1916 T. Nazarbekyan sent one battalion with two cannons and a Cossack sotnya to restrain the Kurdish attacks in the direction of Baghesh (Bitlis). They managed to destroy the Kurds and make them escape with significant losses.

T. Nazarbekyan received an order to send help on February 11 to General D. Abatsiev's squad which was moving from Datvan to Baghesh. On their way they had constant fights with the Kurds. The weather and the rivers and streams that had overflowed ahead of time hindered the advance as well.

On one of the bridges across the Euphrates the General met two volunteers of the 4th Armenian unit who were looking for their relatives. T. Nazarbekyan noticed that the projections of the bridge were completely red. One of the volunteers clarified that in 1915 the Turks and Kurds threw the Armenians into the river from the bridge and those who refused to obey, were beheaded. And that is where the red colour of the projections came from52.

On February 18, three people, the representatives of the Armenians who had remained alive in Mush visited T. Nazarbekyan. They told in detail about the Turkish-Kurdish atrocities.

During the time he was in Mush one of his subordinates, Staff-captain Krim-Shamkhalov came to T. Nazarbekyan. He reported that he had managed to gather detailed and accurate information from the Turks and Armenians about the massacre of Armenians by the Ottoman authorities. The General asked the officer to present the facts in the form of a report, which was done. Krim-Shamkhalov's report is fully presented in the General’s Memoirs53.

51ՀԱԱ, վ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 10, թ. 7 էջ.-8:
52ՀԱԱ, վ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 10, թ. 17 էջ.-18:
53ՀԱԱ, վ. 45, ց. 1, գ. 10, թ. 20 էջ.-27: The report of the Staff-Captain was first published by academician M. Nersisyan (see Հայերի ցեղասպանությունը Օսմանյան կայսրությունում: Փաստաթղթերի և նյութերի ժողովածու Կազմ.՝ Մ. Գ. Ներսիսյան, Ռ. Գ. Սահակյան, Մ. Գ. Ներսիսյան խմբ., Ե., 1991, էջ 501-504). The copy of Krim-
Two German missionaries - Alma Johansson and Bodil Bjorn witnessed the massacres of the Armenians of Mush.

In the morning of February 19 the Russian troops occupied Baghesh (Bitlis). The road leading from Mush to Baghesh was subjected to the attacks made by the Kurdish chiefmian Musa bek’s bandits. The General depicts Musa bek as the sworn enemy of Armenians and Christians in general\[54\]. Mainly the servicemen of the rear units fell victim to the Kurds. The punitive groups organized several times by the Russian command had no essential effect.

The units and troops that were in Mush and in the neighbourhood were in grave conditions: there was shortage of food. The supply service could not provide the necessary food. As T. Nazarbekyan confesses he did not know what to do to provide people with food. This problem was solved by a renowned figure of the Armenian liberation movement, member of ARF Rostom (Stepan Zoryan) who was the plenipotentiary of the Caucasian department of the union of All-Russian cities. He asked the General to provide him with troops in order to look for corn in the desolate villages. T. Nazarbekyan agreed on the condition that half of the found corn would be given to the troops. The mutual agreement gave an opportunity to solve the problem of food\[55\].

T. Nazarbekyan recalls the atrocities which were based not only on his personal observations but also on the reports received from unit commanders. Through Ashot Atanasyan, agronomist and public figure, he sent the reports, as well as the photographs of the massacres to the American representative in Van.

The intelligence data received at the beginning of March proved that the Turks planned a large attack on Baghesh. T. Nazarbekyan decided to send there one battalion and two mountain cannons as an assisting force. At the same time Kurdish armed
groups appeared in the heights of the Mush Valley. The Russian forces managed to parry the enemy’s attack and start counterattack. The 1st Armenian unit stood out in the fights. On May 15, the unit was ordered to pass to Baghesh to strengthen the defense there.

On March 16, the fights for Baghesh continued on the same scale. In their reports the unit commanders once again mentioned about the good armament and combat readiness of the enemy, as well as about the constant Turkish attacks. However, the Russian forces continued to keep their positions not letting the Turkish-Kurdish forces advance.

On March 25, T. Nazarbekyan received a report which said that the Turks had started to attack. It was inferred from their actions that they wanted to bypass the Russian defense wings and separate Baghesh from Mush. The Kurds became more active in their actions.

On March 26, the Turkish-Kurdish attack went on. The enemy managed to advance more and more in the Russian defense wings. The situation became threatening. General T. Nazarbekyan sent his last two battalions to the defense troops. Worried by the created situation, on March 29 the General moved towards Baghesh. On their way they met refugees of Sasun, exceptionally women and children. They were walking in ragged clothes. It deeply moved T. Nazarbekyan. He recalls: “I wanted so much to encourage them in their mother tongue (our mother tongue, i.e. Armenian - R.S.) but to my shame I was able to do it only mentally, as I did not know my mother tongue to the degree to realize my wish personally”56.

T. Nazarbekyan received encouraging news - Baghesh had managed to resist thanks to the three battalions he had sent. They had managed to encircle one of the Turkish units, defeat and capture about 500 soldiers and officers and machine guns57.

In the morning in Baghesh T. Nazarbekyan witnessed a shocking incident: about 50 naked Russian soldiers were running down the mountains. It turned out they had been captured by the Kurds who had feasted all night. They had brought a great number of young Armenian girls and treated them with terrifying violence and then they had undressed the Russian soldiers and started to shoot at them. Some of them had managed to escape58.

On March 31, the corps commander and T. Nazarbekyan reached Baghesh. On April 1, T. Nazarbekyan and colonel Obraztsov, commander of the Baghesh squad, studied the positions. The same day assistant forces came to Baghesh; the 3rd Armenian unit under Hamazasp’s (Srvandztyan) command was among them. Owing to all this significant forces accumulated in Baghesh which created a great chance to counterattack the enemy and occupy the heights dominating over the city but the commander of the 4th Caucasian Army corps, General de Witte did not even consider it
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necessary to answer the suggestion. The latter appointed T. Nazarbekyan as commander of the Baghesh squad, ordering him to protect the city.

On April 6, T. Nazarbekyan, his chief of headquarters and the officer of the field engineer service studied the terrain and decided where to build the defense positions. Both the servicemen and the able-bodied population were included in this work\(^{59}\). At this part General T. Nazarbekyan’s Memoirs ended.

*Translated from Armenian by S.E. Chraghyan*

\(^{59}\) In the Russian-Turkish front the Russian forces had managed to destroy completely the enemy. In 1917 preparations were made to occupy Constantinople but as a result of overturning the Provisional Government and coming into power of Bolsheviks (in October) all the efforts were dashed. The Russian Army started to leave the front. The Armenians were left almost alone against the Turkish forces. It was necessary to organize a regular army to resist the enemy. T. Nazarbekyan was among the Armenian and Russian officers who stayed in Armenia and initiated the organization of the Armenian Army together with his supporters. The Armenian military showed its fighting efficiency during the May heroic battles of 1918 when the enemy’s advance was restrained and the last remains of the Armenians were saved from total annihilation, and on May 28 was proclaimed the Republic of Armenia. General T. Nazarbekyan had his serious contribution in this. He occupied different command posts in RA. On December 2, 1920, after the establishment of the Soviet power in Armenia T. Nazarbekyan and several hundred officers were unfairly arrested. The General was sent to Moscow, the Butyrka prison and then to the concentration camp of Ryazan. Upon returning the General established himself in Tbilisi. He kept body and soul together with the help of the food given by the American Committee for Relief in the Near East. The General was sick and was not able to move about. The Soviet authorities of Georgia had refused to appoint him a pension, giving reasons that during the war T. Nazarbekyan had not been wounded. In August, 1928 they even threatened to throw him out of the house\(^{59}\). The renowned Armenian General T. Nazarbekyan died living in difficult conditions. After the collapse of the USSR and the restoration of Armenia’s independence a lot of good names of Armenian soldiers were restored, including that of T. Nazarbekyan. One of the quarters of Yerevan was named after him and a military medal was established by the Ministry of Defense of RA.
In 1914, when World War I broke out, the leaders of the Young Turk government of the Ottoman Empire thought that the opportune moment had come to implement the monstrous scheme, planned in great detail in advance, to do away with the Western Armenians - that is, to draft all the Armenian able-bodied males and youths to the Turkish army, to deprive them of arms and to recruit them in the “working battalions” and ultimately to exterminate them, to collect from the Armenians’ houses all the arms and even the kitchen knives, to gather all the Armenian intellectuals and cruelly massacre them, to organize mass deportations of the remaining helpless Armenian population to the Syrian deserts and to subject them to the unspeakable tortures and pogroms. All these acts of violence compelled the Western Armenians to resort to self-defense in the various regions of the country as in Yozghat (in the central region of Asia Minor) and nearby - in the mountain area of Akdagh, in Shatakh (about 40 km south of Van Lake) followed by the heroic battle of Van, then those of Mush, Sasun, Shapin-Garahissar, Moussa Ler (Dagh), Urha-Edessa (Urfa) and later, the heroic resistance fights in Marash, Ayntap and Hadjn. In all these self-defensive battles, the people themselves, women and men, young and old alike, revolted and waged, with self-made arms, a struggle of life or death against the armed soldiers of the Ottoman regular army to defend their elementary human right for survival and their national identity.
In those tragic days, in the soul of the Armenian people reawakened the courageous spirit of heroism inherited in the bloodlines from the depth of centuries to prefer “conscious death” to slavery and to withstand violence with joint forces\(^1\).

From the very beginning of the World War I, the town of Yozghat, which had 48 villages around it and a total Armenian population of 75 thousand, stood out against the mobilization, the arm-collection and the deportation organized by the Ottoman government\(^2\). This fact was testified also by our eyewitness survivors from Yozghat, Mesrop Mesropian (b. 1900), Hakob Papazian (b. 1901), Srbouhi Galtakian (b. 1902), Arshakouhi Petrossian (b. 1903), Barounak Papazian (b. 1906), Veronika Berberian (b. 1907), Hovakim Karakekedjian (b. 1907), Anoush Topalian (b. 1910) and Herminé Ter Voghormiajian (b. 1912)\(^3\).

In April, 1915, in the region of Yozghat, the Turk policemen, together with various Islamic tribes and the illiterate and fanatic rabble, encircled the villages of Yozghat, Bouroun Gheshla, Eylendjé and Goumgouyou (in the central region of Asia Minor), which had a population of about 8 thousand Armenians. The elements capable of taking up arms gathered in the village of Goumgouyou, where the peasants of the villages of Qiller and Beuhrenk, whose houses were razed to the ground and were miraculously saved from extermination had found shelter with their fighting forces under the leadership of Abissoghom Arakelian and Hadjibey Papazian. They formed fighting groups and organized a fortified self-defense.

Zekia bey, with his slaughterers, launched an attack on the Armenians’ positions, but the peasants of Goumgouyou, men and women together, caught them unawares by

---

1 Սվազլյան Վ., Արևմտահայոց ինքնապաշտպանական գոյամարտերը Հայոց ցեղասպանության ընթացքում (1915–1923 թթ.) ըստ ականատես վերապրողների վկայությունների, Պատմաբանասիրական հանդես, 2, 2015, էջ 30-60:
2 Պատմագիրք Եոզկատի եւ շրջակայից (Գամիրք) հայոց, խմբ. Ա. Դարեան, Ա. Երկանեան, Պէյրութ, 1988, էջ 775:
shouting “hooray” and dropping their hand grenades. The very first volley sent 35 enemy corpses sprawling on the ground, including that of Zekia bey. Seeing this defeat, the rabble abandoned the front and ran away.

The executioner of the Armenians of Yozghat, Ghassem bey, infuriated by that defeat, sent a telegram to the commander of the Fourth Turkish Army demanding regular troops, saying: “With these forces, the Armenians are capable, one day, to march to the capital and occupy it”\(^4\).

The Turkish government sent a regular army equipped with cannons under the command of Ghassem bey, along with a revengeful mob and started to shell the Armenians’ fortified houses. Only 10 people escaped from this turmoil, who ascended the inaccessible forests of Akdagh under the leadership of Hadji Papazian and joined the young struggling countrymen of Chat\(^5\).

The alarming news of mobilization, arm-collection, deportation and massacres organized by the Turkish government had already reached the inhabitants of the Chat village of Yozghat, who had also decided to oppose and to deliver nothing to the enemy, not to send the Armenian youths to the Turkish army, but to ascend the Akdagh mountain and to take up arms to defend the honor and the life of their fellow countrymen.

With a view to struggling against the outnumbering forces of the enemy, the heroes of Akdagh had chosen the guerrilla warfare mode of fighting, which afforded the possibility to cause severe damage to the enemy, to exhaust its military potential and to increase, at the same time, the defensive and food supplies of the Armenian fighting groups\(^6\).

On the 30\(^{\text{th}}\) of April, the slaughterer of Yozghat, Ghassem bey, entered the village of Chat with 100 horsemen and gave the order to mobilize the youth and to hand over the arms.

The peasants of Chat answered: “We have no arms and the young people have ascended the mountain”\(^7\). Ghassem bey sent two policemen up the mountain Akdagh to search for the fugitives, but the insurgent villagers of Chat held them captive and tying them on horses, set them free toward the Turkish side. Hearing about that incident, the government sent 200 policemen to search the village of Chat; they handcuffed 80 notables of the village and took them to Boghazlian, while the village itself was subjected to looting and ravage. Among the notables were the inhabitants of the village of Chat, Samvel Indjeyan, and his father.

A dweller of the “Ararat” retirement home in Los-Angeles, Barounak Papazian (b. 1906, Yozghat) took out, in 2001, a photograph of his beloved hero Samvel, which he
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\(^4\) Ավետեան Մ., Հայ ազատագրական ազգային յիսնամեայ (1870-1920) յուշամատեան եւ Զօր. Անդրանիկ (Վերլուծական հայեցողութեամբ և վաւերական տուեալներով), Փարիզ, 1954, էջ 299:
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 300.
\(^6\) Պատմագիրք Եոզկատի եւ շրջակայից (Գամիրք) հայոց, էջ 779:
\(^7\) Ibid.
had kept with great care for so many years and showed it to me saying: “…The village of Chat was an hour and a half distance from our town. They separated the men and took them to the valley with their hands tied. A father and his son had been tied together. The son, Samvel, said: “Father, I'm going to run away. I don't want to be killed by an axe; I'd rather die from a bullet”\(^8\).

Samvel cut the rope tying him to his father with a knife he had hidden in his garments and fled to the Akdagh Mountain. Many others followed his example.

Adam, the leader of the Armenian braves positioned on the mountain instructed his freedom-fighters to gather all the refugees of Chat and help them to ascend the Akdagh Mountain, which would become the center of the combat. There were gathered more than 1,000 Armenians.

They all were in good solidarity with each other and helped one another, since their source of inspiration was the heroic character of General Andranik Ozanian, who was scoring victories far off. The large group of fighters under the leadership of Adam had taken the pledge to withstand and to take revenge on the enemy. The Armenians of Yozghat, Samsun and Bafra followed also their example. The mountaineers killed the 200 Turkish soldiers, who were attacking them and put on their uniforms in order not to differ from the Turks. In the battle of Akdagh, Samvel was remarkable by his unusual bravery. He had served in the Turkish army and was an expert rifleman. Samvel taught the fighters the secrets of strategy. In his group was also his valiant and devoted wife, Gyulizar\(^9\).

Incidentally, many women fought on Akdagh side by side with their husbands, holding in high esteem the honor and dignity of the Armenian woman.

Besides the groups of Adam, Samvel, Gulbenk, Hadji, Zil Ohan, Artin, the group of Manouk from Tentil was also fighting on the Akdagh Mountain.

From the very beginning of World War I, the villagers of Tentil near Yozghat also withstood the Turkish murderers. When they compelled the village youths to be enlisted in the Turkish army, the countrymen of Tentil firmly decided to put up a resistance. More than 4,000 villagers of Tentil, young and old, ascended with their supply of provisions, the huge cavern of the mountain, which not only had a dangerous location, but it was also full of bats and reptiles; moreover, the

---

\(^8\) Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 350, էջ 527:

\(^9\) Աւետեան Մ., op. cit., p. 310.
spring was outside the cavern. Tentil had about 700 young men, but among them barely 200 were armed.

The Turkish government sent a regular army of more than 2,000, which was accompanied by the fanatic rabble. They laid siege to the cavern and to the spring situated outside the cavern. The people were deprived of water. An unequal battle followed. The Armenian women and girls were also fighting. The Armenians suffered 135 losses, while the Turks suffered thrice as much. The Armenian leader Manouk tried to break through the siege and ascend with his group the Akdagh Mountain. Some were taken captive, others were martyred. Only 20 people succeeded in ascending the summit of Akdagh and to join the freedom-fighters, who had taken refuge there, creating the regiment of Vindictive Braves…

One of the heroes of Akdagh was also the bold and indomitable leader Hadjibey Papazyan. He, too, had served in the Turkish army and was a good rifleman. He was always thinking about passing to the Caucasus and joining the Russian army, but various Turkish hordes of murderers constantly attacked his compatriots and being unable to leave his people unprotected, he successfully fought with the members of his group those unequal battles. When the Turks encircled him in the Greek village of Gharapir, he, with his friends killed 35 Turks and again ascended the Akdagh Mountain. However, Hadjibey Papazyan and his group had decided to cross the Russian border. He joined to his 40 freedom-fighters the combatants of Deli Papaz, Abraham, Zil Ohan and Gara Khachik. Many of them sailed from the coast of the Greek town of Termé to Trapizon, described the situation to the Russian command; the latter sent armed troops and liberated the town of Termé.

In the spring of 1917 the fighting groups of the Armenians of Chat approached, the borderline occupied by the Russian army, however, our native mountain passes were still swarming with Turkish murderers. The sense of duty to destroy them compelled the freedom-fighter Samvel Injeyan, who had won the title of “hero,” to remain in front of the...
enemy’s fire and to continue the armed struggle. He said: “Here is buried half of our souls, the greater part of our beloved ones. Thousands of murderers are still roaming about. How can we escape from this heavy debt?”

The Armenian fighting groups of Yozghat have fought from the beginning of World War I till the armistice of 1918 in the native territories, in the mountains and valleys of Akdagh, Pontos and Taurus. They have fought during four years against the regular Turkish forces, destroying the enemy. The valiant Armenian fighters of Yozghat played a major role in the heroic struggle waged against the Turkish oppressors for the survival of the Armenian people.

After World War I part of the Armenian freedom-fighting groups of Akdagh, about 400 combatants under the leadership of commander Manouk, fighting against the Turks, reached Erez (Yerznka) and joined General Andranik’s army in the province of Bardzr Hayk’ (Բարձր Հայք) of Great Armenia. Many of the heroes of Akdagh entered Russia after sailing for 5-6 days, while commander Samvel and his braves reached in 1919 (after exterminating in the Taurus Mountains the Turkish murderers they met on their way) Cilician Armenia to help the Cilicians in the struggle waged for their independence.

If the four-year struggle for survival of Akdagh with its extensive sweep and the involvement of numerous fighting groups and popular masses against the armed regiments of the Turkish government was a life-and-death issue, then the self-defensive battle of Van, with its strategic organization made the feat of the valorous citizens of Van a particular model of heroism, which had originated by the armed self-defense of the peasants of Shatakh.

The eyewitness survivor Andreas Gulanian (b. 1907) from Shatakh has testified about this fact: “…Beginning from the late autumn of 1914, post-guards (so-called cordons) had been located in all the villages of Shatakh, among them two post-guards in Sevtkin Village.” The Shatakh people, foreseeing the impending danger, started to buy arms in order to defend themselves. The prefect of Shatakh, Meytibey, being suspicious, arrested the superintendent of the Armenian schools of Shatakh, Hovsep Choloian. During the search the list of the Shatakh countrymen, who had arms, was discovered in his pocket.

Hearing the news, a general meeting of the elderly people and the young men of Shatakh was held in the center of Tagh, where they decided to create a self-defensive military body with a view to destroying the two Turkish post-guards in Sevtkin, since the
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10 Պատմագիրք Եոզկատի եւ շրջակայից (Գամիրք) հայոց, էջ 780-781:
10 Ճիզմէճեան Մ., Պատմութիւն ամերիկահայ քաղաքական կուսակցութեանց. 1890-1925, Ֆրէզնօ, 1930, էջ 312:
12 Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 26, էջ 123:
road led from there through Vostan and the Hayots Dzor to Van. The Shatakh villagers demanded the commander of the Turkish guards, Corporal Bayri, to leave the building, but the Turks opened fire. A two-sided shooting started. The eyewitness survivor Andreas Gulanian continued: “…We were watching the fight from the top of the mountain, together with my mother, hidden behind a stone. There were about forty shots. Then the shots stopped. The sky was cloudy, but it was not cold. Holding my mother by the hand, we descended the valley and came to the village as the other women did and we were told what had happened. Corporal Bayri was killed and his assistant, together with the askyars, threw down their guns from the inn window and, holding up their hands, surrendered”.

The details of the Sevtkin battle reached Van. The governor of Van, Djevdet pasha, arrested the famous political activist Mr. Ishkhan (Nikoghayos Mikaelian, originally from Artsakh) and ordered him to go and to calm down the rebellion of the Shatakh people. However, before getting to their destination, the Turk policemen escorting Ishkan and his friends killed them in the village of Hirj (in Hayots Dzor) at night and buried them in the ground.

On the same day, Djevdet pasha arrested also a member of the Turkish Parliament, Arshak Vramian (Onik Derdzakian), who worked in Van. They took him to the shore of Lake Van, tied a sack full of stones to his neck and drowned him in the lake.

Eyewitness survivor Sirak Manassian, born in 1905 in the village of Kem of Hayots Dzor has referred to the historical events of the heroic battle of Van: “…On the 4th of March 1915, we heard that they had killed the public-educational man, Mr. Ishkhan in the neighbouring village of Hirdj. …When we heard that, we and all our compatriots got much alarmed and started to get ready for the attack of the Turks”.

13 Ibid.
14Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 35, էջ 142.
The eyewitness survivors of the heroic battle of Van Vahan Ktranian (b. 1900), Tovik Baghdassarian (b. 1901), Manvel Maroutian (b. 1901), Aghasi Kankanian (b. 1904), Sirak Manassian (b. 1905), Smbat Davtian (b.1905), Patrik Saroian (b. 1906), Siranoush Toutoundjian (b. 1906), Ghazar Gevorkian (b.1907), Yervand Shirakian (b.1907), Ardsrun Harutyunian (b. 1909), Nshan Abrahamian (b. 1908), Silva Byuzandian (b. 1908), Kadjberuhi Shahinian (b. 1908), Varazdat Harutyunian (b. 1909), Ardzvik Terzian (b. 1910), Shoghik Mkrtchian (b. 1911) recalled and told us various remarkable episodes about the heroic battle of Van.\(^\text{15}\)
“Aygestan was besieged on all sides,” remembered Shavarsh Hovivian, “the cannons were placed on the south near the Hadji Bekir barracks, on the north near the Toprak Kale barracks over the height of Bardzants leaving the district of Aygestan between two fires, while the eastern and western sides were surrounded by a military chain at close range of rifles, where the regular army units kept watch all day long.”

The town of Van was divided into two districts: Aygestan and Kaghakamedj. The barracks of Hamoud Agha in Aygestan, which was vacant, on that day was filled with 130 Turkish soldiers and had thus become a trouble for the Armenian fighters. However, the citizens of Van were unanimous and resolute; they had made a pledge: “To die the rifle in their hand rather than to be slaughtered like sheep.”

The citizens of Van held a general meeting and elected a self-defensive military council under the leadership of Armenak Yekarian, Aram Manukian and Hrant Galikian. The freedom-fighters - Kaytsak Arakel, the gunsmith Grigor from Bulgaria, the painter Panos Terlemezian and others were also in Van. A special body for the supply of provisions was also elected, for providing the people with food products. The rich families of Aygestan contributed money, cereals, seeds, food products and sheep to the needs of the city population. It was decided to centralize all this stock and the people had to use it thriftily. Gevorg Sujian willingly placed his large house at the disposal of the Special Body for the supply of provisions.

The Amrashen sapper battalion was also established, where skilled craftsmen, carpenters, plumbers worked with spades, pickaxes, axes collected from the various houses of the town to construct defensive bulwarks and ramparts, while the blacksmiths urgently made spears to arm the population.
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16 The King of Van-Ararat (Urartu) Kingdom Rusa I built the city fortress Rusakhinili [city of (King) Rusa]. Modern toponym “Toprak Kale” appeared as a result of the Turkish falsification policy of the Armenian toponyms.
17 Ճիզմէճեան Մ., op. cit., p. 315.
18 Ibid., p. 313.
19 Հայոց պատմություն, հ. III, գիրք երկրորդ, Երևան, 2015, էջ 493-498, 501-513:
20 Ճիզմէճեան Մ., op. cit., p. 317.
The artillery of the barracks of Hamoud Agha in Aygestan gave the Van citizens no rest with its constant bombings. The Amrashen sapper battalion, displaying resourcefulness, dug an underground tunnel reaching imperceptibly beneath the barracks ground and blew it up totally, freeing the citizens of Van of that nightmarish situation.

The people, men and women alike, were buckled down to work. Aygestan was divided into four regions. In every one of these regions, there was a Red Cross Hospital for the treatment of the wounded.

On Tuesday, the 7th of April, 1915, at 7 o'clock in the morning, the Turkish soldiers held two Armenian women coming from the village of Shushants situated at a distance of one hour from Aygestan and wanted to dishonor them. Two valiant Armenian guards came out of the neighbouring trench and saved the two women, but they fell victim themselves to the shower of bullets. This became the signal for the beginning of the battle. Rifle shots were followed by incessant cannon fires.21

It was planned also to create an “urgency group,” which would instantly offer assistance to the fighters in danger or difficulty.22

The citizens of Van had also created a workshop for the manufacture of gunpowder under the leadership of the editor of the “Van-Tosp” periodical, Vardan
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21 Ibid., p. 322.
22 Ibid., p. 323.
Papikian and Kakavian brothers, who perfected the quality of the fuming gunpowder, while the “Model” rifles had already become useless, therefore a workshop for the manufacture of bullets was also created, which produced 800 bullets daily. A workshop for the repair of the damaged arms was also created under the leadership of Nazaret Madoian and Sahak Kelekian. The number of the self-defenders of Van was 20 thousand, but they had only 250 rifles, which subsequently increased to 400-500.

During the self-defense of Van, a “Guardianship Body” was also created, whose task was to take care of the people coming from the neighbouring villages. Everything was organized on a very high level and everybody realized the importance of his job.

A remarkable role in the self-defense of Van had the brass band of the pupils of the pedagogical college “Varzhapetanots” under the leadership of Khachatur Bujikanian. The brass band was under the command of the Armenian military authorities and during the whole course of the battle, it moved to and fro from one position to the other, it raised, with its bold tone, the military ardor of the fighters of Van and, quite the reverse, it had a negative effect on the Turks, who were beside themselves with rage and fired unnecessary and aimless shots. Djevdet pasha complained, saying: “We can bear anything, but not the sound of this music”.

According to the testimony of one of the eyewitnesses of the self-defensive resistance of Vaspourakan, Shavarsh Hovivian: “...From the very first day, Aygestan acquired the appearance of a self-legislative government and, with its military, municipal and economic councils, it gave the most striking evidence of patrimonial talent and competence in the most democratic manner, namely, every individual voluntarily brought his share to the pressing task of self-defense.”

The eyewitness survivor Manvel Marutian (b. 1901, Van, Berdashen village) has also testified: “...I remember the events of 1915; I see them as though they are before my eyes. A lot of Armenian youth had been taken to the Turkish army. News spread that they had been brought out of the army and were shot by Turks. Then they attacked the Armenians and began to plunder. The Armenians’ self defense and rebellion occurred. The pasha called Aram Manukian and said: “Send an efficient person to calm them.” Arshak Vramian, who was a Parliament member in Constantinople, elected by the Armenians, went to Manukian and said: “I am going, but you shouldn’t come. My heart is predicting something bad.” The Turkish boatmen hung heavy iron loads on Vramian’s neck and threw him into the sea. After Vramian’s murder we felt that it was deceit and very soon it would burst out, so we began to arm ourselves. In Kaghakamedj two hundred people had guns. We fought for 25-30 days; it was a fighting of ‘life or death.’ The inhabitants of Van fought against the regular Turkish army, which had 15 thousand soldiers and Kurd rabble, but Armenians resisted. The teenagers fired cannons; they used tinder to fire them. Each contained ten kilograms of gunpowder. They removed the tinder, took it away and filled it again. There was a Frenchman, ‘Mon...”
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23 Ibid., p. 332.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid., p. 334.
Cher’ by name; he was a chemist. He said: “I’ll make gun-powder.” And he prepared gun-powder. Then he was killed. About 200 people were under arms, 400 people prepared the trenches by night. Whoever had food supplies, brought them to the Primacy. Every person had a function. They had sent a girl from Aygestan to collect news from the Armenians, but she was killed on her way back. Hearing the news that the resisting Armenians had been awaiting for the Russian army coming in a week, the Turks left gradually KaghaKamedj.

We were children, but we were not afraid; we collected cartridges. My father was an architect; he surveyed the construction of the positions. The priests and the vardapets were also fighting. The Turks drove the Kurds on us. I remember, when the fighting was over a man came and said: “Everywhere are slaughtered corpses. The priest is beheaded on the church threshold and his head is put before the Holy Virgin’s portrait.” After the Turkish army left all the villages we entered were full of corpses, and furious dogs, cats and vultures were devouring the corpses, which the Turks had slaughtered and filled in pits. They were committed to the earth without prayers. The Vaspourakanis gave 30-40 victims, but thousands were killed among the defenseless people. Whatever I’m telling you are my memoirs as an eyewitness. The Russian army approached. The volunteer army entered first, and we were saved.\(^{26}\)

The eyewitness Tovik Baghdassarian (b. 1901) has narrated: “...The Turks fought against the Armenians for thirty days. The Armenians were digging trenches. We had no experience, we did not know what was taking place, but the children of Van knew a lot. When they brought us from the Varag Monastery to Van, I saw at the Armenian quarters - in Aygestan, the band was playing “Our Motherland”\(^{27}\) to encourage the Armenian fighters. After thirty days, the Turks began to escape hearing the name of the Russians.”

\(^{26}\) Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 32, էջ 135:
\(^{27}\) Սվ. 2011, Վկ. էջ 133:
The eyewitness from Van, Sirak Manassian (b. 1905), related in great detail: “Every morning the brass band marched, playing, in the streets of Van, followed by the children. The self-defense of Van had already begun. An Armenian told us: ‘Children, go and collect the used bullets so that they can prepare new ones.’ We went and collected the bullets and handed them to the workshop. The day came when the battle became more intense in Van and Aygestan. The Vaspourakanis, who had gathered there, defended with unyielding will and determination Aygestan and the center of Van, Kaghakamedj, where violent combats took place. Hearing that the Russian army was advancing from Salmast to Van, the Turks departed panic-stricken. Our heroes attacked and not only they exterminated the Turks, but also acquired a considerable amount of artillery units, bullets, etc. On the 6th of May the Armenian flag waved over the citadel of Van. The Vaspourakanis welcomed with great love the Russian soldiers and the Armenian volunteers under the leadership of General Andranik.”

The eyewitness survivors of the heroic battle of Van have later proudly narrated unforgettable episodes about these glorious historical events.

While in the villages surrounding Van, the Turks had time to exterminate on the spot thousands of Armenians. When the Russian army units approached Van, they were followed by the Armenian writers Hovhannes Tumanyan and Alexander Shirvanzadé, who became witnesses of bewildering scenes of torture by the Turkish slaughterers: “…Wherever they had the opportunity,” wrote Hovhannes Tumanyan in his memoirs, “they had massacred the Armenians, mainly the males and had taken away the beautiful women. And if they had sufficient time and the fear from the Russian army and of the Armenian volunteers had not been close, they had invented barbaric scenes: they had crucified people, they had cut various body parts of live people and had arranged them in different patterns; games had been invented, people had been forcibly placed below the waist in cauldrons and boiled so that the live half could see and feel… They had cut with red-hot iron bars the various parts of the body and roasted them on fire, they had roasted live people; they had massacred children before the eyes of parents and parents before the eyes of children…”

Naturally, if the citizens of Van did not resort to self-defense, they would also be martyred, testified the eyewitness survivor from Van, the Honored Artist of Gyumri.

---
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Theatre, Artsrun Harutyunian (b. 1907) and added, "...Self-defense is born when there is violence against the people."³⁰

Consequently, the self-defensive heroic battles waged against the acts of violence committed by the Ittihat government in Akdag, Shatak, Van and elsewhere were the noble outburst of the self-defending struggle of Western Armenians, their voice of protest addressed to the Great Powers of the world. The following popular song, communicated to us by the eyewitness survivor from Van, the Professor of Chemistry at the Yerevan State University, Doctor Aghassi Kankanian (b. 1904), is a testimony of those historical events:

"Ah! Vaspourakan, sorrowful Armenia,
Countless heroes were sacrificed,
They resisted so long in the terrible battle
And were martyred for the love of the nation.

Van, a little town with its districts,
Full of corpses in hundreds and thousands,
The field was colored red with blood,
The clouds, the sky and the stars raised their voice
And roared and ordered loud enough
To be heard in Europe and America..."³¹

However, neither Europe nor America do not interfere; only the Armenian volunteers and the Russian soldiers lent a hand to the helpless people. From the very beginning of World War I, the Turkish governors organized new, brutal persecutions, acts of plunder and murder toward the Western Armenians, directing the main blow to Mush (Moosh) and Sasun, which were well-known in the past as the important centers of the Armenian national liberation movement.

Carrying out the instructions of the Turkish government, the local authorities elaborated and implemented, along with the military command, the monstrous plan of the annihilation of the Armenians of the said provinces.

³⁰Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 40, էջ 150:
³¹Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 628, էջ 599:
In the spring of 1915, the Turkish regular regiments, together with the Kurdish tribes, attacked the Armenian population of Mush and Sasun provinces. The inhabitants of the villages of Tsrnk and Goms were brutally exterminated.

The Armenians of Mush were saved from a total annihilation owing to the approach of the Armenian volunteers and the Russian army, who were chasing the retreating Turks and they reached Bulanekh in the beginning of May, drawing near to Mush.

Turks appeared to be in a grave situation. Under these conditions, the armed resistance of the Armenians of Mush was organized and led by one of the more resolutely disposed leaders of Mush, Hakob Kotoian. However, the opportunity was missed due to the existing discords.32

Soon, the situation on the front line changed, the Russian army retreated. The Armenians found themselves, once more, at high risk of being massacred by the Turks.

At the end of June, the Turkish forces took the offensive and the condition of the Mush population became distressing. Turks occupied the heights of the town and encircled the Armenian quarters. The massacre and the holocaust of the Armenian population started. This fact was testified also by our eyewitness survivors from Mush (Moosh) Noyemzar Mouradian (b. 1883), Hrant Gasparian (b. 1908), Rehan Manoukian (b. 1910).

Reduced to despair, the inhabitants of Mush began to fight with their limited number of rifles. Men and women were fighting side by side, the children helping the adults.

On the 20th to 30th of June, 1915 heavy battles were fought against the outnumbering Turkish forces and brigands. The Armenian population of Mush helplessly fought for every house. However, the numerical and armament superiority of the Turks compelled the citizens of Mush to retreat.

---

700 Armenian fighters succeeded in forcing their way through the encirclement and ascending the mountains. The Turks invaded Mush and massacred the whole population. Only 400 people were saved. The same hard lot fell also on the peasants of about 100 Armenian-inhabited villages of the Mush plain, who were ruthlessly slaughtered in the barns and cattle-sheds. Around 15-20 thousand people ascended the St. Karapet mountain and opposed the enemy. However, the leaderless and helpless struggle for survival ended unsuccessfully, suffering countless losses. The town of Mush was completely ravaged.

During this, a group of Armenian fighters retreated from the Mush plain to Sasun (Sassoun) to join the Sasunis and with combined forces to oppose the Turkish and Kurdish massacrers. This fact was testified also by our eyewitness survivors from Sassoun Hakob Grigorian (b. 1903), Yeghiazar Karapetian (b. 1886).

The news about the mass massacres of the Armenians arriving from Mush and the various provinces of Western Armenia had compelled the Sasunis to get ready for self-defense having at their disposal only a thousand old and new military and hunting rifles.

The defensive groups of Sasun led by Petara Manouk, Rouben, Koms, Ishkhan Sharo and others had been able, in March 1915, to beat off the Turkish and Kurdish forces invading Sasun, who had attacked the village of Talvorik.

During the months of April-May, the Sasunis put up a heroic resistance against the Turkish forces, however, being unable to stand the heavy shelling of the enemy, the Armenian fighters, suffering great losses, retreated to the slopes of the Andok Mountain and continued the self-defense of the region.

Unyielding battles occurred in June in the region of Assank. The fighters of Gomunts Monastery and Talvorik raised a panic among the Kurd brigands and seized the Satan bridge. The villagers of Ksok came to their aid.

On the 30th of July, the Sasunis liberated the village of Shenik, but, launching a new attack, the enemy took possession of the cattle-sheds situated on the slopes of Andok and massacred the thousands of women and children, who had taken shelter
there. The Sasunis still surviving in the mountains of Andok, Tsovassar and Gerin heroically defended themselves against the attacking Turks and Kurds. About 30 thousand homeless Armenians saved from the massacres of Mush and the Mush plain and sheltered for months on end in the mountains of Kana and Havatorik stood up, with great difficulty, to the enemy. However, here again, the leaderless struggle for the survival of the Sasunis was cruelly suppressed.

The eyewitness survivors have also testified about these tragic events. “...The Turks attacked and began to massacre,” a survivor from Sasun, Arakel Davtian (b. 1904) has narrated, “They took away the beautiful girls and women. There was a freedom-fighter in our village, named Missak, who had a gun. He went into the monastery and started to fight. We had no arms. Sasun resisted for two months. The Turkish soldiers came and besieged us. We had no help whatsoever, and they slaughtered many of us.”

The eyewitness survivor from the village of Shenik of Sasun, Khachik Khachatrian (b. 1900), has also testified: “...The Turkish army came, about sixty thousand in number. They came and surrounded the village. Our fighters resisted bravely. Twice the Turkish army invaded the village and twice our freedom-fighters and those who had arms drove them out. Our combatants were gathered in the center of the village. Three days before our people had left the village and gone to Andok, the children (and I among them) with the women had gone with them. It was the beginning of July. There was no bread, no water, no salt, we had only unsalted meat. We stayed there for about forty-five days and the battle went on. After that our provisions came to an end. We were fed only on roasted flour. The Turkish soldiers came and invaded Andok. The valleys were filled with the corpses of children. Their mothers were not able to save them. The Turks and the Kurds were firing. People fell by the dozen. The young brides were taken away. At the end, they were dropping the people from the mountain top into the river to spare the bullets. The river carried away innumerable bodies...”

The eyewitness survivor, Yeghiazar Karapetian (b. 1886) from Sasun, presenting day by day and in great detail those tragic events, has noted: “...The attacks of the Kurds on the Armenians were, seemingly, of an unofficial character, but there was a general belief that they were all performed according to the instructions of the government.” At the end, the eyewitness has concluded: “...Thus, this Armenian-populated province, which was bound to the land and the plough for centuries became, in the course of one day and one night, deserted and uninhabited, while its real owners were slaughtered with swords, burned in fire, drowned in water by the hands of the ruthless Turks and Kurds in a monstrous operation; its victims were the Armenian dwellers, of both sexes, of one hundred and five villages, totaling seventy to eighty thousand souls in number. Their wealth, worth millions, was pillaged. ...”

---
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June was the Sunday of Vardavar, the merry holiday of the Armenian nation, which, alas, was converted into the Sunday of burning of the Armenians of the Taron plain…”\(^{35}\)

Along with these events, the below-cited popular song was woven, which was communicated to us by Moushegh Hovhannisian (b. 1908, Sasun) in Talin:

“…The province of Sasun with its forests, With its high mountains as ramparts Always withstood the Turkish army, Sasun smells now of hot blood.”\(^{36}\)

The smell of “hot blood” was spread also in the heroic towns of Western Armenia: Shapin-Garahissar and Sebastia (Svaz), Malatia (Armenia Minor), Karin (Upper Armenia), Kharberd (Harput, in Tsopk), Amid (Diarbekir) and others, and in the Armenian-inhabited localities of Asia Minor: Pontos, Izmit, Bursa, Ankara, Konia and elsewhere. Turkish butchers exterminated with unspeakable cruelty all the Armenians, not sparing even the infants.

Disobeying the detrimental order of the Turkish government, the Armenians of Shapin-Garahissar gathered together and decided to fight to the last drop of their blood.

The survivors from Shapin-Garahissar Mkrtich Khachatrian (b. 1907) and Khoren Ayvazian have related that the town of Shapin-Garahissar was surrounded by more than 16 Armenian villages.

\(^{35}\) Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 1, էջ 79:
\(^{36}\) Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 627, էջ 599:
The population was occupied with agriculture and trade. They were also very studious. When World War I broke out, 300 Armenian youths were drafted into the Turkish army, but they were not given arms; they were sent to form the “amêlê tabour” (“labor battalions”), and were condemned to penal servitude and were eventually killed\(^\text{37}\).

Mass arrests and pogroms started in May 1915: surrounded by the Turkish and Circassian gangs. The condition of the Armenians became alarming day after day. On June 2, 1915, the rabble of brigands released from the jails, led by the Turkish policemen, attacked the market of Shapin-Garahissar and the pillage started, while the Armenian shopkeepers were taken to the prison with their hands bound.

The eyewitness survivor Kadjouni Gharagyozian (b. 1905, Shapin-Garahissar, Tamzara village), who worked at the Gyumri railway station, has also testified: “...One day, as usual, father went to his town cloth shop, but he did not return in the evening. And no one returned from the town. We got news that they had searched the shops of 300 Armenian merchants; that they had made them stand in line and taken them to prison. Among them had been our dear father.

Our neighbours and relatives came to console us. The next morning mother took me to town to see father in prison. We had gone some distance when people coming towards us told us not to go to town, shouting: “They are slaughtering the Armenians”. We did not know what to do, we returned home, for my younger sisters and brothers were alone at home. The following day I had gone to town and from the corner of the market I was watching what was going on at police headquarters. I saw that they brought 8 men there. Then they made them stand under our cemetery wall and shot them. We heard that they had killed the 300 merchants by axes in the prison. We also heard that the Armenians of Shapin-Garahissar had ascended the fortress of the town at night and started their self-defense\(^\text{38}\).

\(^{37}\) Յուշամատեան Մեծ եղեռնի, խմբ. Գ. Ահարոնեան, Պէյրութ, 1965, էջ 771-780:
\(^{38}\) Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 98, էջ 234:
The citizens of Shapin-Garahissar held an urgent meeting and created a Military Resistance Council under the leadership of Ghoukas Deuvletian, Avag Tourikian, Garegin Karmirian, Shapouh Ozanian and Israyel Ozan, who would organize the defense of the population. It was necessary also to free from the prisons the illegally arrested innocent Armenian shopkeepers. During the meeting, the hero of the liberation struggle, Mourad of Sebastia, announced that he had at his disposal 10 thousand young refugees from various places, who were ready to join the Russian army; however, the Turkish battalion coming from Karin-Erzrum had encircled Shapin-Garahissar.

In June 1915, the citizens of Shapin-Garahissar started to take off the paving-stones of the streets and raised with them barricades, the men constructed bulwarks; the women sewed sacks, which the children filled with sand to protect themselves. They installed also artillery batteries in some Armenian houses. The Turkish gangs of brigands, who started the fight, received a severe blow from the Armenians.

Shapouh Ozanian attacked, with his "urgency group," the government building, where the Armenian shopkeepers were kept. Taken unawares, the Turkish sentries ran away out of extreme fear.

When the Armenians entered the building, they found all the Armenian detainees ruthlessly killed with axes and lying on the ground. On his way back Shapuh Ozanian was shot, filling his compatriots’ heart with great sorrow.

On the following day, the Turkish artillery heavily shelled the Armenian district of Partez and the extensive fire destroyed about 3 thousand wooden houses. The Armenians’ condition became inconsolable. The shelterless Armenians, 5,062 in number, were compelled to retreat to the ancient fortress built on a neighbouring hill. The Turks encircled the fortress and a bilateral shooting started. Soon, the Turks received reinforcement and, with the help of German officers, started to bombard the fortress.

On the 7th day of battle, the governor of Sebastia, Muamer, sent a messenger, bearing a white flag, to the Armenians advising them to surrender, but they had pledged to fight to the last drop of their blood. The Turkish cannons shelled the fortress for two days. On the third day, governor Muamer demanded the Armenians to surrender, but the Armenian freedom-fighters were adamant. A shortage of water and food supplies was being felt in the fortress, but the citizens of Shapin-Garahissar were inflexible, they had decided: "To die with dignity, arm in hand."

On June 23, Turks, after an uninterrupted volley of gunfire, succeeded in capturing the gate of the fortress. Two young Armenian freedom-fighters were waging a life or death struggle against 70 Turkish soldiers, who had managed, by climbing down the cliff, to gain access to the gate of the fortress. It was a critical moment and it was necessary to carry a bomb to the guards of the gate. All of a sudden, a 14-year-old boy, Hmayak Tevekelian, crossed himself and, taking off his cloak, wrapped the dangerous bomb in it and ran toward the gate, but the little hero fell down, near the cave adjoining the gate shot by a shower of bullets. From inside the cafe, a woman’s hand cautiously
picked up the bomb and flung it on the Turks, killing them on the spot. Inside the fortress, an epidemic had started due to the decay of accumulated corpses. In this desperate situation, the fighters decided to run the enemy blockade by a night attack and to move away to the neighbouring regions in order to save the life of those confined in the fortress, many of whom had drunk poison with a view to not falling into the hands of the enemy. Despite the silence of the following days, the Turks did not dare to approach the fortress. On June 29, however, on the 27th day of the Armenian self-defense, the Turks invaded the fortress and started to kill the still alive, defenseless people with axes. The Armenian women having self-esteem threw themselves into the abyss of the canyon in order to save their honor. The eyewitness survivor Hakob Terzian (b. 1910, Shapin-Garahissar), whom I met in New York in 1979, told me about the little defenseless Armenian boys who remained in the fortress: “I am already 79 years old. I am from Shapin-Garahissar. When we resisted the Turks, they killed some of us and they took the children of my age to the Turkish orphanage. They stripped us. The officer drew out his sword, put it on our throat and the mullah said: “give up the Christian faith and adopt the Islamic religion”.39

Later on, a sad, but reassuring popular song was woven as a lullaby:

“That is the shirt of the brave man, my little one,
Who was called your father, sleep, sleep, my little one,
Come now, grow up fast, my little one,
Learn to suck the blood of the wicked, sleep, sleep, my little one!”40

That is why, in order not to deceive its nation, faith and native land, Armenians have resisted against the enemy. But when the Russian soldiers retreated, the Armenians of Van, Sasun, Shatakh, Shapin-Garahissar (Nicopolis), Mush, Baghesh (Bitlis), Vagharshakert (Alashkert), Daruynk (Bayazet), Babert, Karin-Erzrum and other localities were compelled to follow them and to migrate to Eastern Armenia. Seeing no other way out, they abandoned, with tearful eyes, their native land, their millennial historic cradle and, whimpering, took the road of migration. Destitute, exhausted and leaving their dead kinsfolk unburied on the roadside, the remaining Western Armenians arrived, after great difficulties, in Igdir (Surmalou), which would suffer the same fate. The words of the following popular song about Surmalou have been communicated to me by the well-known and beloved singer, Hayrik Mouradian (b. 1905), a survivor from Shatakh:

---

39 Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 100, էջ 242:
40 Ibid., p. 780.
“Eh, Surmalou, dear Surmalou!
There’s no sound of bells and no Armenian speech,
You’ve become a forest of nest-destroying wolves,
You, that were rich in schools, you, populous province.” [Sv. 2011: T. 655, p. 609]

The talented survivor from Mush, Shoger Tonoian (b. 1901), in the below-cited elegy of her composition, has condensed that great indescribable national sorrow:

“We abandoned the sweet plains and meadows of Mush,
Our sacred lodges, houses, roofs and Homeland,
Chapels and monasteries, books and canons, Bibles
Were abandoned and remained in the hound’s muzzle.”

The deportation was a real tragedy.
Suffering countless human losses on the trek, dispossessed of their native land and property, hardly evading the gun-fires of the Turkish and Kurdish massacres, leaving unburied their dead kinsfolk on the road, the interminable human flood of Western Armenian deportees was dolefully moving forward through clouds of dust; while those moving in the forefront of this flood of deportees had, with the help of the Armenian volunteers and the soldiers of the Russian army, crossed the Arax river, had reached Edjmiadsin and had bunched up under the walls of the monastery, the other end of the procession was still in Western Armenia…

The life of the Armenians of Cilicia had also become a nightmare.

The Baghdad railway, which had a particular economic importance, passed through the Armenian-populated territory of Cilicia. This circumstance troubled the
Turkish government, since the laborious and active Armenians living in Cilicia could, by their prosperous state, become predominant in Turkey’s economy. The Armenian villages and settlements were scattered in mountainous Cilicia from Hadjn, Zeytun to Deurtyol; and their populations, although engaged in silk-production, carpet-making and other national handcrafts, had a sufficiently enlightened new generation owing to the presence of Armenian and foreign schools and colleges, which had played an important role in the formation of their mental-conscious outlook.

Besides, the outrages and the massacres, which had started in many provinces of Turkey, coupled with the promised, but not implemented “Reforms” following the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878, had not completely exterminated the naturally freedom-loving Cilicians. Zeytun, the eagle-nest of Cilicia had, for a long time, become the flash point of Turkish tyranny and the latter decided to square accounts with the bold inhabitants of Zeytun as well.

The details of these events were divulged in the narratives of the eyewitness survivors from Zeytun, Gyurdji Keshishian (b. 1900), Barunak Shishakian (1902), Hovsep Bshtikian (b. 1903), Karapet Tozlian (b. 1903), Eva Choulian (b. 1903), Sedrak Gaybakian (b. 1903), Gayané Adourian (b. 1903), Samvel Ardjikian (b. 1907), Harutyun Alboyadjian (b. 1904).42

42 Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 252-258, էջ 432-444:
The Cilicians, who were the worthy inheritors of the Armenian Princedom (1080-1197) and the Kingdom of Cilicia (1198-1375) and had glorious traditions of the national liberation struggle of the past, could once again fight in sacrifice.

The eyewitness survivor from Zeytun, Karapet Tozlian (b. 1903) has mentioned, referring to his past: "...Zeytun had an iron ore. I remember: we used to melt the ore in father's shop; we took it to town, and the blacksmiths made bullets and cartridges. ...We had two uncles. My father and uncle were gunsmiths, so that when the enemy came we would be ready, and would not bow our heads before the Turks."...Since the Zeytuni mothers lulled their infants to sleep, still in their cradle, singing in our dialect, the following lullaby:

“My son will soon become a brave,
He will knock the enemy’s body down
And with his silver-ringed rifle on his shoulders
He will selflessly fight!”

---
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However, the Turkish government had already, as in the other localities, collected the Armenians’ weapons and drafted the young men into the Turkish army, although many of them had managed to escape from the army and hide themselves in Zeytun. Khurshid pasha came with an army of three thousand soldiers to claim the deserters, who had taken refuge in the ancient St. Astvatsatsin (Holy Virgin) Monastery, built on the top of the Berzenka Mountain. In the middle of March, 1915, the enemy started to shell the monastery. The self-defensive fighters of Zeytun, under the leadership of Panos Chakerian, responded to the enemy’s attack, sparing their scanty bullets.

The braves of Zeytun, under the leadership of Aram Cholakian, jumping from the back windows of the monastery, arrived, through the forests, at the burg of Fendedjak to lend a helping hand to the fighters waging a self-defensive resistance there.

On the 9th of April, 300 notables of Zeytun were taken to the military barracks, followed also by their families, who were all deported to unknown places. These were the first deportees. The forcible deportation from Zeytun started. First the district of the monastery was deprived of its inhabitants and subsequently all the villages surrounding Zeytun were deserted. Then the eagle-nest of Zeytun was ravaged.

The deportation and massacre of the Armenian population of Cilicia started in the spring of 1915. One after the other Marash, Ayntap, Hadjn, Antioch, Alexandretta (Iskenderun), Kessab and the other Armenian-inhabited were deserted.

“The forcible deportation of the Armenians was only a fraudulently veiled death sentence,” wrote the French publicist René Pinon in his published work entitled: “La suppression des Arméniens. Méthode allemande - travail turc” (The Extermination of the Armenians: German Method - Turkish Work).45

---

On the deportation trek, the ruthless policemen and the criminals and murderers set free from the prisons and wearing military uniforms, plundered and robbed everybody, ravished and dishonored the women and the girls.

The disarmed, leaderless and helpless Armenian people were driven, with tearful eyes from their native flourishing homes under the strokes of whips and bayonets. The genocidal policy initiated by the Turkish government had embraced almost all the Armenian-inhabited localities.

The leaders of the Ayntap self-defence:
Astour Levonian, Avetis Galamkerian, priest Nerses Tavukchian

The extermination of the Armenians was realized both on the spot and in the places of exile, in the vast deserts of Mesopotamia, especially in Rakka, Havran, Rasul-Ayn, Meskene, Suruj, Deir-el-Zor and elsewhere.
According to the information provided by the survivors, the massacre began in April, on Easter Sunday, so that the Armenians, too, would be worthy of the Passion of the Christ and the Armenians would dye their Easter eggs with their own blood. And the affliction of the Armenians turned into a song, which resounded in a heart-breaking manner:

“They dismantled the tents on Zatik-Kiraki, They drove all the Armenians into the desert, They slaughtered the Armenians like goats, Armenians dying for the sake of faith!”

The countless corpses of the “Armenians dying for the sake of faith” were scattered everywhere, since the Ottoman soldiers had become “butchers”:

“The place called Der-Zor was a large locality, With innumerable slaughtered Armenians, The Ottoman chiefs have become butchers, Armenians dying for the sake of faith!”

---

46 The Armenian words “Zatik-Kiraki” mean Easter Sunday.
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On the 18th of July, an order for the deportation of the Armenians of Kessab arrived. In those very days, the Very Reverend Tigran Andreassian, a preacher, escaping from the group of people deported from Zeytun, had returned to his native Moussa Ler (Dagh) and had told about the inexpressible sufferings of the poor exiles.

Seeing that their turn would come soon, nearly all the inhabitants of the seven villages of Moussa Ler united together on the 19th of July and decided to disregard the disastrous order of deportation. About the Moussa Ler self-defence struggle we wrote in details in our article “The heroic battle of Moussa Ler according to the testimonies of the eyewitness survivors”⁴⁹.

When relating their childhood memories, the survivors still remembered the way their mothers had taught them the Armenian alphabet by writing the Mesropian letters on the hot sands of the desert up to the time, when the Sisvan School, established by the Armenian General Benevolent Union, began to function in some tents, along with the adjoining hospital and orphanage in Port Said (Egypt).

Still in May, 1915, the new Turkish governor of Edessa-Urha (Urfa), Ali Haydar, an Ittihat member, organized the arrest of forty local Armenian notables and demanded from all the Armenians of the town to hand over their arms in forty-eight hours. At the end of July, the enlightened primate of the Armenian Diocese of Urfa, the Very Reverend Artavazd Galenterian, was put under arrest. In those days, new caravans of the Armenians deported from Zeytun and neighboring provinces, all deprived of their valiant youths, arrived in Urfa. The thirty-five thousand Armenians of Urfa decided, after a special deliberation, to have recourse to arms similar to the inhabitants of Moussa Ler.

In October 1915, the heroic self-defense of Urha (Urfa) was organized under the command of Mkrtich Yotneshbayarian and Harutyun Rastkelenian. The whole Armenian population of Urfa rose up. Children and old people, boys and girls fought like one man, in self-oblivion, during twenty-five days and nights uninterruptedly. The Armenian quarters were divided into six fighting regions, where eight hundred fighters were
positioned. The Armenian self-defenders of Urfa took oath: “We are ready to die, the arm in our hands”\(^{50}\).

However, the Turk policemen and the rabble launched a new attack and occupied the Armenian Catholic Church. The Urfans let the enemy invade the Armenian quarter and lying in ambush, annihilated them. Their intrepidity had become proverbial:

“Urfa is large; it cannot be separated,
Its ground is firm; it cannot be dispersed,
The braves of Urfa
Are alone of their kind.”\(^{51}\)

Meeting an obstinate resistance, a regular Turkish army composed of six thousand soldiers, under the command of Fakhry pasha, was sent to Urfa, to which were joined twelve thousand brigands. The defenders of Urfa opposed a heroic resistance and inflicted heavy losses on the Turkish murderers. Fakhry pasha, enraged, declared in a worried tone: “What will our situation be if, in these critical days, several Urfas stood against us?”\(^{52}\).

The Armenian women and girls were, along with the men, worthy of great praise with their exploits in the heroic battle of Urfa. Worthy of remembrance was Khanoum Ketendjian, a graduate of the American College in Kharberd (Harpoot). The commissar of the Turkish garrison, Youssef effendi, has recounted one of her courageous feats: “...After a while we were all encircled. Someone ordered with a shrill voice “Surrender!” We, the Turks, did not answer. The volley of gunfire was repeated. At the third volley, the inner and outer lamps shattered. The invaders had already rushed inside. Several guns were fired, too. The uproar increased in volume. They were dragging someone to the door of the mosque. From the man’s entreating voice I recognized that he was Ali, our policeman from Kalabeoyn. I dared to look to see what they were doing. I saw in the dim light that somebody wearing trousers but having woman’s hair was passing the rope round Ali’s neck. They hanged him from the lamppost. The commanding voice was hers, who started to call out the names of more than 30 women. The latter replied “Present” in a feminine voice. Indeed, they were all women wearing men’s clothes. After checking that no one was killed or wounded, they all departed singing like fabulous heroes. When I remember all this, my bones begin to shudder”\(^{53}\).

\(^{50}\) Սահակեան Ա., Դիւցազնական Ուրֆան և իր հայորդիները, Պէյրութ, 1955, էջ 818:
\(^{51}\) Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 638, էջ 602:
\(^{52}\) Արզումանյան Մ., Հայաստաν. 1914-1917, Երևան, 1969, էջ 453:
Seriously wounded in the knee and lying on a stretcher, Mkrtich Yotneghbayrian passed from one position to another and encouraged the fighters. Fakhy pasha sent a mediator, the German factory-owner, M. Eckart, to M. Yotneghbayrian exhorting him to stop the battle and to surrender. But the heroic son of Urfa answered him: “If you have the feelings of a civilized and Christian man, save the innocent Armenian people, who are being massacred in the deserts!”

The situation of the Armenians was becoming deteriorated day by day. On the next day, the enemy tightened the siege of Urfa and destroyed the Armenian quarter by a heavy cannonade. The condition of the Armenians became more critical. On the 23rd of October, the Turks invaded the Armenian quarter and cruelly slaughtered the devoted heroes of Urfa and deported the surviving 800 families of the neighbouring Armenian-inhabited village of Kamourj to Deir-el-Zor and ruthlessly massacred the majority of them on the road.

These historical events were narrated by three of the survivors of Urfa, Khacher (b. 1893), Khoren (b. 1893) and Nvard (b. 1903) Ablapoutians in their memoirs.

Referring to these historical events it should be pointed out that still in the days of World War I, in 1916 two of the Allied countries, England and France, had signed a secret agreement. According to the Sykes–Picot Agreement, in case of the defeat of Turkey, Cilicia, having two million six hundred thousand hectares of arable and fertile

54 Յուշամատեան Մեծ եղեռնի, էջ 804:
55 Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 143-145, էջ 294-299:
lands, would pass under the supervision of France. The English and French authorities had earlier agreed with the Armenian National Delegation in Paris that, if the Armenian volunteers fought against the German-Turkish forces, the Armenians would enjoy ample political rights after the victory and the Armenian volunteers would constitute the garrison of the towns of the newly formed Autonomous Armenian Cilicia.

Consequently, Armenian young men escaping from the Turkish army, from the roads of exile, from various places and even arriving from America (those who recently emigrated there: natives of Moussa Ler, Ayntap, Marash, Kessab, Hadjn, Hoosenik, Chengoosh, Sebastia, Kharberd, Arabkir and other localities) were enlisted in the French army, creating the “Oriental (Armenian) Legion”. The Armenian volunteers, filled with a feeling of vengeance for their innumerable innocent martyred kinsfolk and defying death, defeated the Turkish army and won the magnificent victory of Arara (on 19 September 1918), near Nablous (Palestine). This historical event, too, found its reflection in an Armenian popular song:

“One by one I counted four years,
The Armenian soldiers took Nablous,
They were one thousand five hundred in number,
The English and the French were amazed”56.

The French and the English commanders-in-chief praised the brave Armenian legionaries. On the 12th of October, 1918, General Allenby sent a telegram to the President of the Armenian National Delegation in Paris, Poghos Noubar Pasha, saying: “I am proud to have the Armenian regiment under my command. They fought courageously and had a great share in the victory”57.

After WWI the Armenian legion was removed to Cilicia by the French command. Numerous Armenian deportees from Cilicia, miraculously saved from Deir-el-Zor, Ras-

---
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ul-Ayn and other living cemeteries, emaciated and destitute, gradually returned and resettled in their Homeland. In February 1919 military power in Cilicia was concentrated in the hands of the English command. In November the English troops were replaced by the French contingents. Taking the advantage of the French authority’s uncertainty the Turkish troops headed by Kemalists resumed genocidal actions against Armenians.

Starting from January of 1920, the Turkish forces launched an attack on the Armenian locations of Cilicia. During the violent battles, which lasted for more than twenty days, the Armenians of Marash were slaughtered and the town was burned to ashes.

The following concise, though figurative popular song has been composed under the direct impressions of those bewildering historical events:

“Marash is called Marash, alas!
Marash, how do they call you Marash?
When they burn a church in Marash,
And they burn Armenians in the church!”

The eyewitness survivor from Marash, Verginé Mayikian (b. 1898) referred, in the memoir she has narrated, to the political events of the time, which were disappointing for the Armenians: “...We led a comparatively peaceful life until 1920, when the French authorities were still in Cilicia. The French and Armenian newspapers always wrote that the French forces would always remain in Cilicia, because the prestige of France had grown after the First World War, while that of Turkey, on the contrary, had decreased. But that peace, alas, did not last long. We gradually felt that the Turks began to hate us. One day, we woke up and realized that the French had covered the hoofs of their horses and had abandoned Marash silently. We got up in the morning and were astonished, since nobody knew anything about it. Even the famous Hakobagha Khrlakian, who supplied the French army with rations free of charge, had heard nothing from General Dumont concerning their departure. Thus, the French army was no longer in Marash by September 1920. It seemed that the Turks knew about it beforehand. At night, we heard gun-shots here and there. It frightened us...”

Thirteen thousand Armenians perished during the massacres of Marash. Subsequently, the surviving eight thousand residents of Marash, together with the six thousand Armenians from Urfa, were forcibly deported to Aleppo, Damascus, Beirut,
Jerusalem, Baghdad and to the regions of Anatolia (Asia Minor) found under Greek domination.

On the 1st of April, 1920, the Kemalist Turks besieged Aynatap. The life of about ten thousand Armenian refugees from Aynatap and eight thousand from Sebastia, who had just re-established and found peace there after the end of the war and the armistice, became once more turbulent. The Armenians of Aynatap took up a self-defensive position. A central military committee adjoining the National Union was created on the spot under the leadership of Adour Levonian. The latter took stock of the arms and the ammunition of the 750 fighters and organized the manufacture of shells.

The eyewitness survivor Sandoukht Hekimian (b. 1908, Aynatap) has testified about those historical events: “In 1920, Ali Keledj attacked Aynatap with a tremendous army. The leader of the self-defensive committee of Aynatap was Adour Levonian. He collected the copper cauldrons from the inhabitants of Aynatap and had them melted to make shells. He and his volunteers attacked the enemy and broke through the siege, forcing the twenty-four thousand soldiers commanded by Ali Keledj to flee in dismay in one night shouting: “The Armenians are filled with vengeance”. The Armenians of Aynatap had composed a song about Adour Levonian”.

In the meantime, Turkish troops laid siege to the town of Hadjn; the town had, initially, an Armenian population of 35,000, of which only 6,000 had been rescued from the Genocide.

The citizens of Hadjn were resolute. They formed the superior council of the self-defense of Hadjn under the leadership of their governor, advocate Karapet Chalian and elected as the defense commander officer Sargis Jebejian, General Andranik’s comrade-in-arms. Four military companies and a squadron composed of sixty cavalrymen were organized. Hadjn and its environs were divided into four defense regions: Trenches were dug. Everybody was in a fighting mood.

The people of Hadjn, who were in great need of arms, waited impatiently for the help expected from abroad through the National Union of Adana; the help included not only arms and ammunition, but also new fighting forces. Nevertheless, no help was received and the condition of the unarmed freedom-fighters of Hadjn became desperate, since the French high-ranking military representatives conducted an equivocal policy and, though they had promised to provide provisions and ammunition for the self-defense of Hadjn, they not

---

61 Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 269, էջ 454: The son of the same eyewitness survivor, Gevorg Hekimian (b. 1937, Beirut) has sung that song, which he had heard from his mother (Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 641, էջ 604).

62 In the enemy’s opinion, “The complete destruction and extermination of the Armenian citadel of Cilicia, Hadjn, was an hour’s job and that they would be capable of burying the six thousand Armenians with a slight attack” (Թէրզեան Ս. Յ., Հաճընի ութամսեայ դիւցազնամարտը, Պուենոս-Այրես, 1956, էջ 241).
only broke their word, but informed also the Turks about the organization of the self-
defensive plan of the Armenians. The freedom-fighters of Hadjn seized the enemy’s
enormous cannon with great difficulty, but they could not use it to defend themselves
because of the lack of shells. Starvation caused a great distress to the inhabitants of
Hadjn. “People were obliged to eat cats, mice, dogs, leather, the bark of trees,
moccasins, etc”63.

The enemy reinforced the army with new cannons and innumerable regular armed
soldiers. After prolonged and obstinate battles and a heroic resistance, which lasted for
eight months, the Turkish forces were able to destroy and to burn down all the stone
houses of Hadjn by crosswise heavy cannonade. Hundreds of valorous combatants fell
on the fortifications; thousands of Hadjn denizens were cruelly massacred. Only 380
people succeeded in accomplishing a breakthrough by fighting and came out of the
terrible encirclement of fire.

“All three hundred Armenian braves,
All armed with rifles,
Gave a blow to Doghan bey’s army,
Hadjn fell, shouting “Vengeance!”.”64

With yells of “Vengeance!” fell also the town of Ayntap; it heroically resisted,
fighting intermittently, for 314 days, as well as the ancient capital of Cilicia, Sis, the
valiant eagle-nest, Zeytun, the town with a historic past, Tarson, the commercial center,
Adana and various other Armenian-inhabited localities of Cilicia.

The Treaty of Sevres (August 10, 1920),
provided that the Entente countries should establish a
supervision over Cilicia and that the Turkish troops
should be evacuated from Cilicia. With hope and faith
with regard to the future, they began to restore the
ravage and to cultivate the abandoned orchards.
Ignoring the Treaty of Sevres and taking advantage of
the indecision and weakness of the French military
administration, the Turkish forces and the local
bandits directed their arms towards the Armenian
population of Cilicia.

Not only did the French military administration
evade to undertake serious measures to ensure the
security of the Armenians, but they left also the local
authority in the hands of the Turkish military officials,
who, furthermore, were not disarmed. In 1921 Turks
came to an agreement with the Allied States and urged the French to evacuate their

63 Արամ Ասպետ, Դրուագներ Հաճընոյ հերոսամարտէն, Պէյրութ, 1961, էջ 242:
64 Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 649, էջ 607:
peace-maintaining forces from Cilicia. In accordance with England’s instructions, the French government, breaking its obligations as an ally towards the Armenians, handed Cilicia over to Turkey by an agreement signed on the 20th of October, 1921, in Ankara, condemning the Armenian population of Cilicia to the danger of massacre65.

Whereas, of the 30,000 frisky and joyful inhabitants of the eagle-nest Zeytun, only 1,058 had miraculously survived the Armenian Genocide and had returned to restore their ruined and burned houses. Many of them united led by the national hero Aram Cholakian and his comrades in arms, Hovhannes Simonian, Karapet, Manouk and other braves, the group of courageous men led by Avetis from Adana fighting in the inaccessible mountains of Amanos.

This gradually increasing large group, about 500 people, composed of male and female armed heroes, fighting day and night in the impassable Taurus Mountains, like the guerrillas of Akdag in the Pontos Mountains, frequently attacked the Turkish bands. Although they were pursued by the Turkish soldiers, however, overcoming unspeakable hardships, they continued to fight against the enemy forces hoping to save the cradle of their ancestors, the one-time flourishing Cilicia.

It was in that period that the national hero Soghomon Tehlirian took revenge for the millions of victims of the Armenian Genocide by killing, in Berlin, the great criminal Talaat pasha, who had escaped justice66.

The Armenian people has also imparted a poetic tinge to that startling event:

“Talaat pasha fled to Berlin,

"In 1921 the verdict of Young Turk leaders was issued, according to which 4 out of 31 criminals - Talaat, Jemal, Enver and Nazim - were condemned to death, while the remainder of the 27 were condemned to imprisonment for different terms. After World War I the trial of Young Turk leaders began in Turkey, with charges of war crimes. Among the accusations was the organization and implementation of massacres of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. However, several were charged ‘in absentia’ as they had managed to flee the country. In 1922 one of the organizers of Armenian Genocide, Talaat, was assassinated in Berlin by an Armenian student, Soghomon Tehlirian. This was the beginning of the “Nemesis” (named after the goddess of revenge in Greek mythology) operation, worked out at the 9th session of the ARF party in autumn, 1919, the aim of which was to execute the death sentence of Young Turk leaders in Turkey. “Nemesis” was a clear, thoroughly worked out operation, which with time was efficiently implemented by the Armenian avengers, pursuing only the aim of justice. A special committee was formed to discover the hiding-places of the criminals living in different corners of the world. In June, Tehlirian’s trial for killing Talaat began in Germany, which in fact became a trial against the organizers of the genocide. Given European acknowledgment of Talaat’s responsibility as chief architect of the genocide, Tehlirian was acquitted. In Rome, on December 6, a bullet from a gun wielded by another Armenian avenger Arshavir Shirakyan killed the leader of the first Young Turk government – Said Halim. In Berlin on April 7, 1922 Armenian avengers Arshavir Shirakian and Aram Yerkkanian executed the death sentence of the former governor of Trabzon Jemal Azmi and the founder of “Teshikelateshi Makhsuse” criminal organization – Behaeddin Shakir. In Tbilisi on July 25 Armenian avengers Stepan Tsaghikian, Artashes Gevorgian and Petros Ter-Poghosian murdered one of the butchers of the Armenian Genocide – Jemal Pasha” (http://www.genocide-museum.am/eng/chronology.php).
Tehlirian caught him up,  
He shot him in the forehead, knocked him down,  
Fill your cup with wine, brother!  
Fill your wine and drink to our health!

They buried Talaat pasha in the ground  
And sent the news to his bitch-mother.  
Long live the German judge!  
Fill your cup with wine, brother!  
Fill your wine and drink to our health!67

Although the “German judges” acquitted the Armenian avenger showing an understanding attitude, nevertheless, the condition of the Western Armenians did not improve therewith.

Moreover, in 1921, after the forcible deportation of the Armenian population of Cilicia, it was the turn of the Armenians of Asia Minor, whose majority had been ruthlessly massacred during the Genocide and those, who were miraculously rescued continued their existence in the Armenian inhabited localities under Greek domination and especially in the port of Izmir.

In 1922, the Kemalist Turks burned down also the Armenian and Greek quarters of Smyrna (Izmir), driving the Christians to the seashore. That horrifying event has been recorded in the memory of the Western Armenians as “the calamity of Izmir”68, since Kemal Ataturk cynically declared: “Turkey belongs to the Turks”69.

In addition, the Allied States recognized by the Treaty of Lausanne, in 1923, the Ankara government of Mustafa Kemal and its right over Eastern Thrace, Izmir and Cilicia, as well as, over all those territories, which, by the Treaty of Sevres, would have passed to Armenia. Moreover, they also acknowledged the new “frontiers” of Turkey, which illegally included also the former regions of Eastern Armenia, namely, Kars, Ardahan and Surmalu (Igdir). While a smaller part of Historic Armenia continued to exist as the First Republic of Armenia (1918-1920), the Soviet Republic of Armenia (1920-1991), then, starting from 1991, as the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic, however, the greatest part of the Armenian people was left dispersed in the various countries of the world. Thus, the Armenian Diaspora was created as a historical reality.

Thus, although the Turkish government cruelly suppressed the two dozen heroic self-defensive battles of the Western Armenians in the various localities during the years of the Armenian Genocide (1915-1923), nevertheless, the devoted Armenian heroes, who fought for their elementary human rights for life and for the physical

67 Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 650, էջ 607: 68 The great fire of Smyrna and the Armenians’ massacre witnessed a survivor from Afion-Garahissar, Arpine Bartikian (b. 1903) remembering with emotion the ghastly scenes she had seen (Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 195, էջ 380 Վկ. 564, էջ 586) (see in details in our article: “The Armenian Genocide according to the testimonies of the eyewitness survivors.” - Fundamental Armenology, Issue 1, 2015, pp.525-526) 69 Սվ. 2011, Վկ. 195, էջ 382:
survival of their nation, recorded brilliant pages in the history of the national liberation struggle of the Armenian people, about which the eyewitness survivors have also testified.

Summarizing the two dozen self-defensive resistance battles for survival of the Western Armenians fought during the Armenian Genocide, we come to a number of conclusions\textsuperscript{70}:

- From the very beginning of World War I (1914), the Young Turk government had collected the arms of the Armenians, even the kitchen knives. The Armenians were disarmed and during the battles for survival, they were fighting against the Turkish armed forces with self-made arms;
- The government had drafted into the Turkish army the Armenian youths and able-bodied males aged 17-45, who, by the secret order of Enver pasha, were taken to secluded places and brutally killed out of sight. Therefore the self-defenders were reduced in number;
- The government had collected the talented intellectuals and had crushed their skulls with stones in the deserts, so that the Armenians would be deprived not only of self-defenders, but of the leading minds as well;
- The Armenian people never have started the fighting; however, when injustice and violence were done to them, they requited the enemy according to what they had done;
- The Armenian self-defenders acted separated from one another;
- The Armenians have been unyielding towards the enemy, but humane with regard to the unarmed population, women, children and old people, in contrast to the Turks, who tortured to death the women, old people and even infants;
- The Armenian people have suffered great losses (human, material, cultural, territorial, etc.). Their aim has always been to live peacefully and with a creative life in their millennia-old cradle;
- The Armenian people have always been alone and without any help during their self-defensive resistance for survival, often also betrayed in return for their unreserved devotedness. The Great Powers have acted as mere observers and have displayed only a belated humanitarian and orphan-supporting aid.

Whereas, when the Armenian people have jointly clenched in one fist, they have succeeded in restoring their statehood by the heroic battle of Sardarapat (1918). Later on, when they have pinned their hope on the people’s nation-wide spirit, they have liberated the forcibly-seized (during the Soviet power) Artsakh as a result of the victory

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Սվազլյան Վ.}, Արևմտահայոց ինքնապաշտպանական գոյամարտերը Հայոց ցեղասպանության ընթացքում, էջ 58.
in the Artsakh Liberation war (1991-1994), which is the long awaited victorious stage of our national rightful demand…

It is therefore appropriate to mention the following popular prayer:

“Our Lord, keep unshakable
Our heroic Mother Armenia
Grant us long-lasting peace,
Life and sun, liberty,
With our Armenian State flag
May the Armenian nation live forever.
Amen.”

Translated from Armenian by
T. H. Tsoulkian

71 Սվազլյան Վ., Կիլիկիա, Վկ. 1391, էջ 250:
ON THE DEPORTATION AND MASSACRES OF THE ARMENIAN POPULATION OF CONSTANTINOPLE AND SMYRNA DURING THE YEARS OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Kharatyan A. A.
Corresponding Member of NAS RA

It is known that deportation and massacres, as main components of the Armenian Genocide, included the Armenian population of Constantinople and Smyrna as well. The Young Turks started the actions of annihilation of the Armenians in Constantinople, as everywhere, according to a premeditated plan: the arrests, deportation of the intelligentsia, conscription of able-bodied Armenian men in the 20-45 age categories in the Ottoman army with the aim of disarming and annihilating them on the way to exile, then measures directed at the displacement of the Armenian population from the lower strata to all the others.

On April 24, 1915 started the deportation and massacres of the Armenians in Constantinople which first of all spread over the intelligentsia. On that day and during the following weeks the Armenian community of Constantinople was deprived of its intelligentsia - thousands of people were arrested, sent to exile and killed.

Before the start of and during the mass deportations and massacres in Western Armenia the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople was isolated from Western Armenia. In October 1914, after the Ottoman Turkey’s entry into the war and at the beginning of 1915 the correspondence of the Patriarchate with eparchies was prohibited and the news on the deportations and massacres that the Patriarchate received were denied by the authorities.

Already in mid-April German Ambassador Hans Baron von Wangenheim who was following the outrageous actions of the Turks in Western Armenia, cynically repeated the explanations of the Young Turks about Armenians: “Without doubt, excesses and acts of terror have taken place against the Armenians in eastern Anatolia (i.e. Western Armenia-A.Kh.) and, in general, the events have probably been related correctly by the Armenian side, even if they were somewhat exaggerated. In many cases they have been sparked off by the distress and suffering that every war, even in industrialised countries, brings with it; however, in other cases, the blame was actually on the Armenians, and one can only accuse the authorities of not taking the necessary precautions in good time and of taking unnecessarily rigorous measures afterwards instead.”

A week after the start of mass arrests and deportation of the Armenian elite by the Turkish authorities, on April 30, Wangenheim had already admitted the fact of the Turkish repressive actions against Armenians and reported from Constantinople to Berlin that numerous Armenians from all classes of society had been arrested, including doctors, journalists, authors, clergymen, also some deputies: “The offices of the newspaper Azatamart, a body of the Dashnakcutyun party, to which many of the arrested belong, were closed down by the authorities. During the following days most of them were deported to the interior of Asia Minor”\(^2\).

In the course of several weeks 2345 Armenian intellectuals were arrested in Constantinople, no charges were brought against them but most of them were later killed.\(^3\) The police department of Constantinople cooperating with German specialists had sent its previously compiled lists to the district police. “The sent package was opened and only a few of the mentioned people in the list regulated in advance could escape. I, Shavarsh Misakyan together with Prof. A.Khachatryan, H. Cheokuryan, G. Mesrop and some others were among those escaped ones”\(^4\).

At the same time the Ottoman authorities directed their blow against the Armenian cultural institutions of the capital city with the goal of complete extermination of the Armenians living in Constantinople. A few days later Talaat cynically, within the frame of genocidal policy, “explained” to the First Dragoman of the German embassy: “Among the local Armenians there were a number of personalities who were politically not quite safe; these were, of course, to be found in particular among the members of the clubs and editorial offices. The fear that in case of an unfavourable change in war, these elements could take the opportunity for stirring up trouble; was not to be overlooked. The time seemed favourable for removing all these suspects from the capital. Many people would definitely be among the deportees who were by no means guilty…”\(^5\)

The German embassy in Constantinople tried to squeeze out the maximal from Armenians for the benefit of Germany and its ally Ottoman Turkey. Employee of the embassy Mortman addressed Patriarch Zaven to urge the Armenian soldiers of the Caucasian front not to fight against the Turks. The Patriarch refused saying that the Armenians of Russia were out of his spiritual powers and he was simply the vicegerent of the Catholicos of Ejmiatsin in Constantinople. By the way, the same proposal was made to Gr. Zohrap shortly before his arrest\(^6\).

Since the Ottoman Turkey’s entry into the war and parallel to the intensification of the persecutions against the Armenian population the Patriarchate did its best to mitigate the situation to some extent. The Patriarch and national administration receiving ominous news from the provinces invited to their meetings respected and

---

\(^2\) http://www.sci.am/downloads/musgen/WolfgangGust.pdf

\(^3\) Дадрян В. Н., История армянского геноцида, Ереван, 2007, с. 284.

\(^4\) Սիրունի Յ., Ինքնակենսագրական նոթեր, Ե., 2006, էջ 200:

\(^5\) http://www.sci.am/downloads/musgen/WolfgangGust.pdf

\(^6\) Զավէն պատրիարք, Պատրիարքական յուշերս. վաւերագիրներ և վկայութիւններ, Թեհրան, 2014, էջ 116:
authoritative persons for consultation - Gr. Zohrap, A. Gasparyan, A. Antonyan, H. Boyajyan, R. Zardaryan, M. Natanyan et al.

All the efforts of the Patriarchate to complain to the criminal authorities, who at the same time pretended to be guiltless, had no result. The answer was the new conscription and from the beginning of 1915 - the disarmament of the Armenian soldiers, their isolation in labour battalions and annihilation. After arresting the intelligentsia actions were taken to annihilate the Armenians of Constantinople. On April 29 the Armenian population was made to hand in their weapons; thus the authorities also aimed to justify the propaganda noise directed against them.

“The “Law on Deportation” was hastily passed on May 27; on June 1 it was published and enforced immediately under the title “Temporary Law on Measures to Be Taken from Military Point of View against Those Who Act in Opposition to the Government’s Activity in Wartime…. The document is signed by members of the Ottoman government. The segment “Resolution” also contains a statement which reveals the genocidal intent of the Ottoman government”8. The command of the Ottoman army was given an unlimited authorization to subject the Armenian population to deportation from their settlements9.

On May 31 Wangenheim telegraphed the department of the Foreign Affairs. He particularly informed: “…Enver Pasha by putting the state of war (or emergency) forward as a pretext, intends to close a large number of Armenian schools, to suppress Armenian newspapers, to prohibit Armenian postal correspondence…”10.

The authorities directed the next blow in the city against the Armenians who were emigrants and those who lived in the suburbs. After the spontaneous deportations this one already had the administratively organized character that the Patriarch dated to August, 1915: “During the last two weeks started deportation of single men who came from provinces (Western Armenia) to Constantinople. Up to the present 4-5 thousand people were suddenly deported abandoning their business. Among them there were also those who had families. The families of those who were exiled to Ayash (in central Asia Minor) and Changheri (Chankiri) were also informed to leave Constantinople, but then we could stop it. It was the beginning of the deportation of the Armenians of Constantinople…”11

The deportation of the provincial Armenians continued during the next months as well. On October 15, 1915 witness Prof. Hakobyan wrote: “No one has been left in Constantinople: we can see no Armenian in the streets. Scantiness and non-existence

---

7 Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը 1914-1918. Դիվանագիտական փաստաթղթերի ժողովածու, հ. 1, հյուս. Հայաստանի և Հունաստանի պատմություն, Երևան, 2006, էջ 28:
9 Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը, էջ 29: Дадрян В. Н., op. cit., p. 284.
11 Զավէն արքեպ.,Պատրիարքական յուշերս.Վաւերագիրներ և վկայութիւններ, Գահիրէ, 1947, էջ 148:
are terrible. Most of the Armenian immigrants (from Western Armenia-Kh.A.) have been deported from Constantinople.”

The Young Turkish authorities undertook the large-scale deportation of the Armenians from Constantinople. On November 29, 1915, the Chairman of the German-Armenian Association Dr. Johannes Lepsius wrote to Reichskanzler Bethmann Hollweg that the Armenian Committee of Sofia had sent him a message according to which: “In spite of the previous promises of the Constantinople high authorities of the Turkish government the deportation of the Armenians from Constantinople has started. Till now 10,000 people have already been deported who were mostly butchered in the Izmit Mountains. The deportation list of the remaining 70,000 people is ready.”

On December 4, the same information was sent to the German embassy in Constantinople from Berlin by Undersecretary of State, A. Zimmermann asking to decisively protest if the information he received was true. Arthur Zimmermann, wrote to his Ambassador Wolff-Metternich in Constantinople that according to his information “the Turkish government is attempting to force the remainder of the Armenian people to convert to Islam. It is obvious that we cannot watch quietly while such actions are going on”.

On December 7, 1915 the German Ambassador in Constantinople Count Paul Wolff- Metternich reported to the Reichskanzler B. Hollweg: I have learned from a very trustworthy source that according to information provided by the local Chief of Police, which I beg to keep secret, lately about 4000 Armenians also from Constantinople have been deported to Anatolia (Asia Minor-A.Kh.) and that the remaining 80000 Armenians still living in Constantinople are to be gradually cleared away, 30000 having already been deported during the summer and a further 30000 having fled. In Metternich’s message the number of the Armenian population of Constantinople is greatly reduced. It is obvious that the mentioned number (80000) was based on the official statistical data presented by the Young Turks. In its efforts to deny the Declaration (May 24, 1915) of the Allies condemning Turkey in new crimes against humanity and civilization, the Turkish agency of “Havas” was greatly decreasing the number of the Armenians in Constantinople bringing it down from 200 thousand to 77.836 people, of whom only

---

12 Մալէզեան Վ., Ճամբուս ծայրը, h. Բ, Փարիզ, 1955, էջ 92;
13 Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը, էջ 353:
14 Ibid, pp. 354-355. See also Լեփսիուս Յո., Գաղտնի տեղեկագիրը. հայ ժողովրդի ջարդերը (Երևան, 2003, էջ 134), where it is mentioned that a total of 10,000 Armenians were deported and there is no information on their new residence. According to the note sent to Reichskanzler B. Hollweg by German ambassador in Constantinople Wolff-Metternich on December 7, published by V. Gust, 30,000 Armenians were deported from Constantinople to the interior of Asia Minor (1915, 12.07, DE-001, see: Wolfgang Gust, The Armenian Genocide 1915/16 from the Files of the German Foreign Office http://www.sci.am/downloads/musgen/WolfgangGust.pdf).
15 Wolfgang Gust, op. cit. [1915-12-12-DE-002]
16 Ibid. [1915-12-07-DE-001].
17 Զաւէն արք., op. cit., p. 108.
230 people were allegedly arrested as “participants” of a revolutionary movement. However, leaving aside the problem of the number of the Constantinople, which needs adjustments, we should notice that Metternich’s remark was true in the sense that the Young Turks were going to continue the deportation of Armenians from the capital. The deportations from Constantinople continued in the first half of 1916 as well. On May 12, 1916 Patriarch Zaven wrote to the German Ambassador: “Every week hundreds of men are being exiled from Constantinople and Smyrna for various reasons” and that their property was being confiscated and sold.

J. Lepsius mentions that after the appeals of ambassadors in Constantinople the Turkish governors “abandoned the idea of spreading the measures of general deportation over the Armenian population of Constantinople and Izmir. But they silently continued the deportation of Constantinople Armenians. A total of 10000 people were deported and there is no information about their new residence.”

Without other archival or documentary data we believe it would be difficult to restore at least the approximate number of Armenians deported from Constantinople. As we could see, at the end of November, 1915 J. Lepsius counts 10.000 deportees, the same number, as had been presented by the Armenian committee in Sofia and the above mentioned A. Zimmermann. But Ambassador Metternich in his turn, as we could see, had been informed “from a trustworthy source” that in the summer of 1915 about 30000 Armenians had already been deported from Constantinople whom he considered to be joined by “approximately 4000 Armenians deported from Constantinople to the interior of Asia Minor recently.” He wrote about it on December 5, 1915. If we add to this Patriarch Zaven’s record addressed to the German Ambassador on May 12, 1916 about the exile of hundreds of men from Constantinople and Smyrna every week, it will be clear that the total number of Armenian deportees from Constantinople reached 40000.

18 Զաւէն պատրիարք, Պատրիարքական յուշերս, Թեհրան, 2014, էջ 141-142: To some extent the Turkish officials referred to this falsified statistics when counting the number of Constantinople Armenians within 75-80 thousand (see Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը 1914-1918, հ. 1, էջ 361, 355-356). Opposing the official number, German diplomat Mordmann reported that the number (75.000) was much smaller than the real one and he counted 120-130 thousand people (ibid., p. 361). A. Barbi mentions 150 thousand people (see Барби А., В стране ужаса. Мученица Армения. Москва, 2008, с. 56), and German religious and scientific figures, including J. Lepsius, mention that this number reached 180.000 (Լեփսիուս Յ., Գաղտնի տեղեկագիրը. հայ ժողովրդի ջարդերը, էջ 1, էջ 332). We can assume that they meant the number of Constantinople Armenians after the deportations carried out in April and October 1915, because their invocation was written on October 15, 1915 (ibid. p. 330).


21 Л. Бекета, Армения в Турции. История Востока, выпуск 14, 1926, с. 28.

22 Wolfgang Gust, op. cit. [1915-12-12-DE-001]
The Turks treated the deportees from Constantinople, as from everywhere, in the usual manner: the deported groups were annihilated on the way either completely or almost completely, so few of them reached the place of exile\textsuperscript{23}. In one of the court sessions of the regional figures of the Young Turks’ party pharmacist Grigor testified that from 180 Armenians deported from Constantinople to Changheri only 30 had remained alive\textsuperscript{24}.

Patriarch Zaven believed that the condemnation of the actions of the Young Turkish executioners in the press of European countries and in general the Entente countries forced the Young Turks to make some concessions in Constantinople from the beginning of 1916\textsuperscript{25}

But in spite of the promises of Enver, Khalil and Jemal given to the chargé d’affairs of German Embassy in Constantinople K. von Neurath, Ambassador Metternich and others (in November and December 1915)\textsuperscript{26}, the arrests and deportation of the Constantinople Armenians continued as we could see, in May 1916 as well.

In this regard it should be mentioned that the problem found a realistic and persuasive explanation in J. Kirakosyan’s observations. Taking into account the situation in April-May 1915, he noted: “Certainly the whole Armenian population of Constantinople would have been deported if the Young Turkish authorities had had technical means for that. The capital of the empire was in a critical condition, the armed forces of Entente seriously threatened it”\textsuperscript{27}.

During 1915-1916 the Armenian community of Smyrna faced the horrors of the deportation as well. Referring to the telegram received from Athens the newspaper “Mshak” (Մշակ) (it was always sensitive to the situation in Smyrna) reported already in April that the persecutions against Armenians had resumed, people had been arrested\textsuperscript{28}. The Young Turks started the deportation from the Armenian population around Smyrna, just as in Constantinople – from the suburbs. In a record of the German embassy (August 9, 1915) it was said that “The population of the Armenian villages of Izmir has been evacuated taking into account several circumstances”\textsuperscript{29}. It should be concluded that the exile from around Smyrna took place in July-August 1915, but there

\textsuperscript{23} According to Nayim Bey’s memoirs among the Armenians deported to the banks of the Euphrates there were inhabitants from around Istanbul (see Փափազյան Ավ., Հայերի ցեղասպանությունը ըստ երիտթուրքերի դատավարության փաստաթղթերի, Լոս Անճելես, 2005, էջ 17).
\textsuperscript{24} Անումյան Մ., Երիտթուրքերի 1919-1921 թթ. դատավարության փաստաթղթերը ըստ օսմանյան մամուլի, Երևան, 2011, էջ 100:
\textsuperscript{25} Զաւէն պատրիարք, Պատրիարքական յուշերս, էջ 211, 213: Cf. Барби А., В стране ужаса. Мученица Армения. Москва, 2008, с. 56.
\textsuperscript{26} Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը, հ. 1, էջ 254, 353, 355-356:
\textsuperscript{27} J. Kirakosyan considers that after a heated dispute in the center of Ittihad it was decided to deport distinguished Armenian people for the time being and to deport the rest in a more appropriate time (Կիրակոսյան Ջ., Առաջին համաշխարհային պատերազմը և արևմտահայությունը, Երևան, 1965, էջ 251).
\textsuperscript{28} «Մշակ», 1915, 28 ապրիլ:
\textsuperscript{29} Լեֆրեներ Է., Ֆռիմանէստ և Հայաստանը, Երևան, 2006, էջ 184:
is no mention of the settlements and the number of people. In a note of a “Statistical register” it is mentioned that the Armenian population was deported from Izmir and its dioceses in August 1915 and February 1916³⁰.

As mentioned by Radovitz, attorney of the German embassy in Constantinople, in its leading article the Young Turkish newspaper Tasvir-i Efkar (“Reflection of opinions”), rendering Talaat’s and Enver’s intention of carrying out deportations, “promoted the necessity of the deportation of Armenians from those cities and provinces”³¹.

The first deportation of Armenians from Smyrna happened in July-August 1915 when its governor Rahmi Bey demanded from Kh. Intcheyan, the spiritual leader of Armenians to make the people present “the list of names and home addresses of people belonging to the Dashnakcutyun committee”. Otherwise Rahmi threatened to banish all Armenians from Smyrna. Arrests and then deportations started³². Probably A. Guyumchyan saw the deportation of these 300 people, calling them “The first caravan of Armenian prisoners”. Other groups also followed this one: “The persecutions did not spare the members of their families either. Even old men and women were arrested and deported”, - writes the author³³.

A witness, the owner of the Smyrna printing house Khosrov Matikyan referred to by L. Yerkanyan, also speaks about the first deportation carried out by Rahmi. According to him their family “formed part of the first caravan comprised of 200 people and left Izmir”³⁴.

Kh. Matikyan refers this deportation to June 1916 and A. Guyumchyan does not mention any date at all. L. Yerkanyan mentions that this deportation took place in 1915³⁵. Further studies will probably spread additional light on that issue³⁶.

We believe that the references of American Consul of Smyrna about the of Young Turkish center’s mania against the major figures of Dashnakcutyun of Smyrna and the behavior of Rahmi Bey in this regard refer to 1915. He says that Rahmi had received a strict reprimand from Talaat for “not having shown control within his province”, i.e. not having shown vigor during the deportations³⁷. After that Rahmi organized the overall “conspiracy case” and threatened to deport all the Armenian community to Ankara if he was not told names of 15 revolutionary leaders. “Somehow”, - the former consul says, - “he “found” fifteen names and announced that he was going to hang those people”³⁸.

³⁰ Մատենադարան, դիվան Ա. Ալպոյաճյանի, N21/2:
³¹ Արմենական վորոս և գենոցիդ արմեններ էիր Թուրքիա (1913-1919), էջ. 408.
³² Գույումճեան Ա., Իզմիրի մօտավոր անցեալէն խորհրդա ծութիւններ, «Հայրենիք», Բոստոն, 1956, 12-14 դեկտեմբերի:
³³ Ibid, դեկտեմբերի 14:
³⁴ Երկանեան Լ., Յուշեր ու փուշեր, “Յուսաբեր”, 1957, 3 հունիսի:
³⁵ Ibid, հուլիսի 4:
³⁶ Մատենադարան, Ա. Ալպոյաճյանի դիվան, N21.10
³⁷ Նույն տեղում:
³⁸ Դեսպան Հենրի Մորգենթաուի պատմությունը, Երևան, Հայոց ցեղասպանության թանգարան-ինստիտուտ, 2012, էջ 174:
As a result of it 70 Armenian families at night had been woken up and deported “as if to Ankara”. In his turn Ambassador Morgenthau wrote that George Horton, the U.S. Consul General at Smyrna had informed him that seven Armenians were sentenced to the gallows for some crime committed in 1909. “But neither Rahmi Bey, nor the military commander believed those accusations”\(^{39}\).

Rahmi, who played a double game with the Armenians of Smyrna, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the Constantinople Center, turned to the latter substantiating the fact of not carrying out the death sentence with the right of the condemned to write a petition, according to the Ottoman law. The response from the Center added nothing new to the Young Turks’ cynicism: “Technically you are right. First hang them and then send the request for amnesty”, - it said\(^{40}\). Rahmi was ready to stay aside, but thanks to Morgenthau’s mediation all the condemned were released.

In a document dated July 10, 1916, published by J. Lepsius, it is said that the protestant and catholic Armenians, comprising a minority in comparison with the majority of Armenians belong to the Armenian Apostolic Church around Smyrna, were also deported\(^{41}\).

We should assume that after August 1915 till May 1916 in Smyrna, just as in Constantinople, the arrests and deportations of Armenians continued every week about which as we could see above testified Patriarch Zaven in May 1916.

One of the striking episodes of the deportations of Armenians from Smyrna was the incident of November 1916, in which commander of the 5\(^{th}\) army, German L. Von Sanders got involved. The reason for the deportation was as always invented by Rahmi about which German diplomat Radovitz informed in his telegram. He informed that in the Catholic cemetery bombs and ammunition were discovered which “they say, were hidden there by Armenians”. That was enough for the vali to demand that Kh. Intcheyan and the community tell the names of people under suspicion and hand in the hidden weapons. On November 2 a lot of arrests were made and the next day 300 Armenians with their families were deported by the railway. “They would be followed by the next groups of deportees”, - the diplomat writes. It means that Rahmi had undertaken the mass deportation of the whole community. “The deportations are run by Smyrna chief of police whom the vali gave freedom of action”, - Radovitz added\(^{42}\).

J. Lepsius published L. von Sanders’ November 16, 1916 report to the German Embassy on these events. In the morning of November 10 he sent Kyazim Bey, the head of headquarters of the army he commanded, to the vali to say on his behalf that such mass arrests were intolerable and threatened the city. And if the police continued such mass arrests, he would inhibit them with military force. The general gave the vali time till the midday of the same day. After the midday Kyazim Bey came to Sanders and

\(^{39}\) Ibid.
\(^{40}\) Ibid.
\(^{41}\) Լեփսիուս Յո., Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը 1914-1918, էջ 327:
\(^{42}\) Армянский вопрос и геноцид армян, с. 408.
said that the vali had promised to stop the arrests and deportations which would not occur any more.\footnote{Լեփսիուս Յո., Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը 1914-1918 թթ., էջ 345-346.}

On November 11 Rahmi and Sanders met. The latter considered Rahmi’s reasons for the deportations of Armenians groundless and demanded to ensure safe conditions for them.\footnote{Ibid, p. 346.} For his justification Rahmi explained that the Young Turkish committee of Smyrna had always been dissatisfied with him for sparing the Armenians because of which his positions had become unstable in Constantinople from where the demand for the deportation of Armenians came.\footnote{Արմենական հարցը և գենոցիդ արմենի, էջ 408.} Finally, the General received a written confirmation from Rahmi that an end would be put to the deportations and those Armenians who were innocent would be returned back from exile.\footnote{Լեփսիուս Յո., op. cit., p. 347.} In his telegram dated November 15, 1916 German Ambassador Kuhlmann informed that the deportations of Armenians from Smyrna were stopped and the case was closed.\footnote{Ibid.}

The political considerations of the German General towards the Armenians of Smyrna particularly came from the intention to dissociate, himself from Turkish executioners. “If not for Sanders governor Rahmi - Armenophobic and persecuting Armeians, would have sent all the Armenians of Izmir to the dessert” - rightly notes L. Yerkanyan\footnote{Երկանեան Լ., նշվ. աշխ., “Յուսաբեր”, 1957, 4 յունիսի:} V. Dadryan came to the same conclusion.\footnote{Դադրան Վ. Ն., op. cit., p. 292.}

In a document (“Answer the questionnaire of the Patriarchate”) kept in Matenadaran that was sent to the Patriarchate by the Armenian Primacy of Smyrna on December 3, 1919; it is recorded that the local Armenian population was partly deported on November 15 and in December, 1915, then on October 25, 1916.\footnote{Մատենադարան, դիվան Ա. Ալպոյաճյանի, թղթ. 8, վավ. 21|3, էջ 1-2:}

The Armenians of the settlements around Smyrna also severely suffered during the years of the deportations. Rahmi himself followed the path of the Young Turk leaders of the capital - first starting the deportations from the suburbs and only then to pass to the Armenian population of the city. According to the data presented by the above-mentioned primacy people from the following settlements were deported: “In February 1915 Gushata - totally, in August 1915 Tikili - totally, in November 1915 Krkaghach - partly, in November 1916 Eotemish - partly, and the outskirts of Perkama - Frnuz.”\footnote{Ibid.}

As we can see, numerous other settlements around Smyrna have been left out of the statistics and unfortunately there are no data about them up to now.
We should now get to the question that follows from all this - how many people were subjected to deportations from Smyrna and its neighbourhood during 1915-1916. Certain data concerning it are very scanty and will at least stay such as long as the corresponding Turkish archives are close and if anything is preserved in them. According to the data of the Smyrna primacy the Armenians deported from Smyrna were taken to Afyonkarahisar, Konya, Aleppo and Deir ez-Zor.

"Till 1922 around 30.000 Armenians lived in Smyrna. In September 1922 the Kemalist troops made a real carnage in Smyrna, destroying and burning the Armenian and Greek quarters of the city. The intentional burning of the city had the purpose of terrorizing the Christian population, making them leave the city forever.

The quarters were full of the corpses of tens of thousands of Armenians and Greeks.
Armenian and Greek victims of the Smyrna massacres, September, 1922

Many people trying to find salvation on the English, Italian and American warships that had dropped anchor in the sea and were merely observing, drowned.

The accumulation of the refugees in the port of Smyrna, September, 1922

Thus, the disaster of Smyrna became one of the last episodes of the Armenian Genocide.52

Translated from Armenian by S. E. Chraghyan

52 http://www.genocide-museum.am/arm/online_exhibition_16.php
The Cilician Armenians have emigrated to the USA for individual, educational, economic, political, cultural, religious and other reasons. The emigration (mainly of bachelors: students, tradesmen, artisans, farmers and workers), which, at the beginning bore a temporary character and was prompted by educational and economic reasons, was subsequently transformed into a mass deportation following the periodic massacres (1894-1896, 1909) and the Armenian Genocide (1915-1923) perpetrated in the Ottoman Empire. It involved Armenians from their Homeland, including Cilicia, deprived of the prospects of a safe economic, political, cultural and religious life.\(^1\)

The horrible massacres organized by the Young Turks in Adana (Cilicia), in 1909, compelled Armenians to emigrate to unknown horizons. Though these massacres had occurred in Cilicia, the groups of Armenians departed from nearly all the Armenian-inhabited regions of the Ottoman Empire, since the terror of finding themselves in a similar situation in those places anytime was too great. Rev. Macallum, the missionary who was the eyewitness of the carnage and the miserable state of the Cilician Armenians suggested to the organization, rendering medical, material and other assistance to the survivors of the massacre to allocate all the available amounts for transferring the miraculously saved Armenians to the USA, Canada or Brazil, since it was clear that “the next massacre was only a question of time”.\(^2\)

Until 1911, the Armenians leaving the Ottoman Empire for the USA departed from certain regions: those emigrating from Western Armenia left from the main port on the Black Sea, Samsoun, while those emigrating from Cilicia sailed from the Mediterranean port cities of Alexandrette and Beirut. During the subsequent years, numerous Armenians escaping the Turkish policemen left for America from these two ports, where police control was comparatively loose.\(^3\)

As the Cilician Armenians increased in number and gradually settled in the USA, national structures, educational, cultural, benevolent, spiritual, political and other national unions, as well as various organizations (compatriotic, party, professional and others), having an important role and significance in the preservation of the national identity, were created with a view to reassembling and reorganizing the nation in the all-

---

\(^{1}\) Ավագյան Ք., Ամերիկայի Միացյալ Նահանգների հայ գաղութի պատմությունը (սկզբնավորումից մինչև 1924 թ.), Երևան, 2000, էջ 42:


\(^{3}\) Ibid., p. 60.
assimilating American environment and to making the ties with the native cradle and people more effective and durable.

The first Armenian organization founded in 1886, in New York, “The Armenian Union” had taken also two schools, found in the Motherland, under its patronage and had raised a considerable sum in favor of Zeytun set on fire at the end of the 19th century and in favor of other national institutions.

Already at the end of the 80s of the 19th century, the created compatriotic unions had gradually embraced nearly all the native towns, villages and burgs, including also Cilicia (particularly: Adana, Marash, Urfa, Hadjin, Ayntap, etc.). The above-cited compatriotic unions were well-organized and rapidly populating national unions, which, gaining in breadth in the course of time, founded their branches in nearly all the cities of the vast country where their compatriots lived. In this respect, Bishop Moushegh Seropian has noted: “Just as there is no town or village left in Armenia and Cilicia where America has not its representatives, so there is no town or village in America, 20 or more compatriots of which haven’t got a special organization in their birthplace contributing to the cause of education”.

In addition to the Cilician-Armenian “Krtasirats” (Education-Lovers’), “Ousoumnasirats” (Study-Lovers’) and “Dprotsasirats” (School-Lovers’) societies, functioning in the USA, numerous compatriotic societies and unions appeared gradually, especially beginning from the 1900s, to support in every way the native Armenians in despair, to restore the demolished localities and schools, as well as to support the innumerable orphans. Deriving from the above-mentioned “Study-Lovers” societies, reorganizing their former activity in the course of time and owing to historical circumstances, these compatriotic societies and unions bore, starting from 1914, the names of “Ayriakhnam” (Widow-Supporting), “Vorbakhnam” (Orphan-Supporting), “Vorbasirats” (Orphan-Lovers’), “Akhhatakhnam” (Charitable) and “Npastamatuyts” (Allowance-Granting), in accordance with the new tasks set before them. A number of (“Tiknants Vorbakhnam”) Women’s Orphan-Supporting and (“Hivandanotsayin Ozhandak”) Hospital-Care Auxiliary societies of the Cilician-Armenian Compatriotic Unions also functioned along with the above-cited new societies entitled to support the fellow-countrymen and in close cooperation with them. All the enumerated societies assigned considerable material means to find out the expatriated compatriots and especially those exiled to Deir-el-Zor and to the other areas of the Arabian Desert in order to render them multilateral assistance. The above-mentioned compatriotic unions made also an appreciable contribution to promote, materially, morally and militarily, the Caucasian, in 1916, and subsequently the Cilician volunteer movements, to forward financial assistance through the Cilician Catholicosate in favor of the needy fellow-

---

4 Սերոբեան Մուշեղ Եպիսկոպոս, Ամերիկահայ տարեցոյցը, Ատարի, 1912, էջ 170-171, 175, 176:

5 Ibid., p. 171.
countrymen and to assist, by all possible means, the nation-supporting efforts of the allowance-granting society of the Middle East and other organizations⁶.

The Armenian-Americans actively participated in the volunteer movements organized in the years of World War I, then in the Caucasus and subsequently in Cilicia beginning from the self-defensive battles of Van, in 1915, till the heroic battle of Arara, in 1918, when the Armenian volunteers bravely fought side by side with the regiments of the Entente States, Czarist Russia and France against the German forces and the Young Turk and Kemalist authorities.⁷ The motto of the volunteer movement was: “Autonomy to the six vilayets and to their inseparable part - Cilicia, under the strong protection of Russia”⁸.

On October 27, 1916, the governments of France and Great Britain, with the participation of the Chairman of the Armenian National Delegation in Paris, Poghos Nubar, had come to a joint agreement in London (Sikes-Picot Agreement) to form a regiment called the “Oriental Legion” (“Légion d’Orient”), composed of Armenian and Arab volunteers, which would fight, as an auxiliary force, in the years of the war, as part of the French army, exclusively in Syria and Cilicia (which formed a part of Asian Turkey) and subsequently, following the victory against the Turks, would secure, as an urban garrison, the autonomy of Cilicia under French protectorate⁹.

On November 26, 1916, the “Oriental Legion” was established out of voluntarily recruited Ottoman subjects. The recruitment had started in Egypt, the core of which was formed from 600 Moussalerians (who found asylum in Port-Said through French support)¹⁰, then also from 300 Egyptian-Armenians, as well as deserting refugees from the Ottoman army and other places¹¹.

---

The Armenian National Union of America  
(Founded in 1917)

testifies with deep appreciation that Mr. Haroutyoun Sarenian Marashtsi, in response to the appeal of our Union in 1917 and in accordance with the instructions of the Armenian National Delegation, has been registered as a volunteer and has courageously fought under the French flag at the Palestinian and the Cilician fronts in the name of justice and the liberation of Armenia.

Armenian National Union of America Boston, Massachusetts, USA, 1921

The volunteer movement had aroused great enthusiasm among the emigrant Armenians and particularly among the Armenian-Americans. Owing to the high consciousness manifested by the Armenian-Americans with regard to its unity, it had become possible to hold in Boston, from 16-26 March, 1917, seven sessions of solidarity negotiations, during which the ANUA had been organized. The Union was composed of the representatives of the four parties (Social-Democratic Hnchak, Reorganized Hnchak, Armenian Revolutionary Federation - Dashnak, Armenian Constitutional Democrats), of the Armenian Apostolic church and the Evangelical church and of the Armenian General Benevolent Union. A central body for the Union consisting of 18 members had been elected (Chairman: Mihran Svazlian)\(^\text{12}\). After a short time 187 branches of the Union had already been created. The Union was recognized by the American official circles as a body representing the Armenian-American Community, becoming thus the first Armenian lobbyist organization in the USA. The object of the Armenian National Union of America was to unite the material and moral forces of the Armenian-Americans and to put them in the service of the liberation and reconstruction of Cilicia and the immediate assistance of needy people, as well as to realize Armenian-supporting propaganda and diplomatic enterprises in the USA\(^\text{13}\).

\(^{12}\) Ընդհանուր Հայ Ազգային Միութեան Ամերիկայի. 1917-1921 թթ., Պոստոն, 1922, էջ 11, 12: Ապահովագործիչ եւ կանոնագրութն Հայ Ազգային Միութեան Ամերիկայի, Պոստոն, 1917, էջ 2, 19, 20: Թեոտեր, Ամերիկայի կազմակերպություն, ԺԶ տարի, Կ. Պոլիս, 1922, էջ 286:

In a short time, in only six months (from June 9 to November 3, 1917), 5,000 Armenian-Americans had registered to participate in the volunteer movement started under French patronage, however, because of the shortage of transportation means (instead of putting at their disposal one or two large transport ships, 17 freighters of insufficient tonnage, carrying at most 70 people each, had been provided\textsuperscript{14}), only 1,172 volunteers had the possibility to depart, while the remaining subsequently joined the USA army and fought against Germany on the Western fronts.\textsuperscript{15}

These young people, mostly from Kessab, Sebastia, Harpoot, Arabkir, Chenkoush, Tigranakert and Husseynik embraced nearly all the Armenian-inhabited States of USA.\textsuperscript{16} The majority of these volunteers were members of the Reorganized Hnchak,

\textsuperscript{14}Պօյաճեան Թ. Յ., op. cit., p. 38.
\textsuperscript{15}Տեղեկագիր Հայ Ազգային Միութեան Ամերիկայի, p. 27. Տեփոյեան Պ. Յ., Միհրան Տամատեան (1863-1945), Գահրէ, 1956, էջ 196.
Armenian Revolutionary Federation (Dashnaksutyan), Social-Democratic Hnchak and Armenian Constitutional Democratic parties. According to P. Tepoyan’s definition, “The Armenian-Americans were, by nature, trained and highly-qualified patriots thanks to the party efforts of several decades. Undoubtedly the environment of free-thinking and free-life had its great share in nurturing that patriotism.” Among those Armenian-Americans who registered as volunteers in the “Oriental Legion” were a number of high-ranking military men (Commanders: Jim Changalian, Hayk Azatian, Tigran Boyadjian, Ruben Herian, Garageuzian, Vahan Churkents, Very Rev. Fr. Vagharshak Arshakouni, John Shishmanian and others).

---

17 Պոյաճեան Տ. Յ., op. cit., p. 86.
18 Տեփոյեան Պ. Յ., op. cit., p. 186.
19 Յուշամատեան Մուսա Լերան, p. 428. Պարթեւեան Սուրէն, Արար. Հայկական Լէգէոնը, Աղեքսանդրիա, 1919, էջ 88, 102.
The representative of the Armenian National Union of America, Ruben Herian, has personally participated in the preparation of the identity documents of Armenian-American volunteers at the basement of the St. Gregory the Illuminator Church of New York.

The volunteers passed a preliminary training period in Paterson (State of New Jersey), were registered in New York, then sailed to Bordeaux or Marseille (France) and subsequently to Port-Said (Egypt) or Monarca (Cyprus) to be equipped with arms, to get trained for months and to join the other Moussalerians receiving training there until then.²⁰

²⁰ Պոյաճեան Տ. Յ., op. cit., pp. 10, 46.
In Monarca (Cyprus)

Armenian-American Legionnaires training in Cyprus, 1916
The Armenian-American volunteers of the “Oriental Legion” have, along with their brave fellow-countrymen, had a serious input on September 19, 1918, in the defeat and retreat of the German-Turkish army on the impregnable heights of Arara, in Palestine. Twenty-two Armenians were killed and more than 70 were wounded in Arara\textsuperscript{21}. Subsequently, the legionnaires participated in the battles fought for Syria and Lebanon, where, following the separation of Syrian regiments, the “Oriental Legion” was renamed “Armenian Legion” ("Légion Arménienne")\textsuperscript{22}.

\textsuperscript{21} Պարթեւեան Ս., կոչ. հատ., էջ 13.
According to the definition of the legionnaire lieutenant Vahan Portuguese: “The “Armenian Legion,” as armed forces, was, in the full sense of the word, the first Armenian force, which had been created, after centuries, on the basis of state principles”\(^{23}\).

On October 30, 1918, the Moudros Armistice signed between Great Britain and the Ottoman Empire ratified the capitulation of Turkey, and according to the 16\(^{th}\) clause the Turkish forces should be evacuated from Cilicia. On the 17-19 December, 1918, the “Armenian Legion” stepped into the desirable land of Cilicia\(^ {24}\) to superintend and to defend the strategic strongholds, the Armenian-inhabited towns of Adana, Aynatap, Marash, Urfa and Hadjn. As a result, about 120.000 Armenians deported from Cilicia during the Armenian Genocide, returned to their native homes, hoping that, under the protection of the British-French forces, they would restore their interrupted life in Cilicia. However, the British (on November 1, 1919) and the French (on January 18, 1920) regiments departed from Cilicia\(^ {25}\) “delivering the Armenians to their merciless enemy”\(^ {26}\).

In 1920, the Armenian soldiers and the Armenian people offered a heroic resistance in Marash, Sis, Pozanti, Urha-Edessa, Aynatap (intermittently during 314 days) and Hadjn (struggle for existence during 8 months) against the Kemalist hordes, but the number of victims was exceedingly high.

With the French-Kemalsit Treaty signed in Ankara on October 20, 1921, France officially confirmed its retreat, leaving Cilicia under Turkish domination\(^ {27}\) and leaving, at

\(^{23}\) Forgotten Heroes, p. 4.
\(^{24}\) Սահակյան Ռ. Գ., op. cit., p. 118.
\(^{25}\) Forgotten Heroes, pp. 3, 7, 8.
\(^{26}\) Քէլէշեան Մ., op. cit., p. 594.
\(^{27}\) Forgotten Heroes, p. 11.
the same time, for the Ottoman Empire a large quantity of arms, ammunition, outfits, etc.

The withdrawal of British and French troops from Cilicia compelled the Armenians to emigrate again. The historian Leo has written in this regard: “Cilicia was being emptied of Armenians as was emptied Armenia itself.”

Twenty years after the heroic battle of Arara, France delivered also to Turkey the last stronghold of Cilicia, the Sandjak of Alexandrette, found until then under French protectorate.

According to Missak Keleshian’s definition: “France lost its prestige in the East. After leaving Alexandrette to Turkey, in 1938, France was compelled to evacuate Syria and Lebanon in 1946 under very shameful conditions. What a pity for the old noble France!”

Although the efforts exerted for the liberation of Cilicia failed in the end, nevertheless, the significance of participation of the volunteer Armenian-American youth in the military successes of the “Oriental Legion” (“Armenian Legion”) was also undeniable.

Thus, during the First World War and the following years, which were disastrous for the Armenian people, the Cilician Armenians, together with the rest of the Armenian community of the US uniting all their intra-communal (intellectual, financial, public and party) resources, supported the cherished enterprises aiming at the defense, liberation and rehabilitation of the native cradle and its people by diplomatic, political, military and human means.

Translated from Armenian by T. H. Tsoulikian

---

28 Պարսամյան Վ. Ա., Հարությունյան Շմավոն Ռ., Հայ Ժողովրդի պատմություն, Երևան, 1979, էջ 438:
29 Քէլէշեան Մ., op. cit., p. 651.
30 Ibid., p. 650.
Armenian historian, philologist Emma Kostandyan (1934 - 2014) is one of the prominent Armenologists of the second half of the 20th century and beginning of the 21st century. She has written about two hundred articles, historical and literary studies, monographs and reviews.

Kostandyan’s research fields of study were multifarious including the most important problems of Armenian history: socio-political thought, national liberation movement, cultural life. She also researched remarkable pages of the life and activity of prominent figures of the Armenian Apostolic Church of the 19th century.

Among her works a valuable study is dedicated to prominent enlightener, specialist in Armenian folklore, eminent scholar, pedagogue, a prominent figure of national liberation movement. Garegin Srvandztyants. In 1971 E. Kostandyan defended her Candidate dissertation, "Public and political activity of Garegin Srvandztyants" and in 1979 published the monograph dedicated to the educational, publicist and political activities of G. Srvandztyants. The author studied the great contribution of Srvandztyants to the spiritual and cultural life of Western Armenians, his social and political activities, including contacts with prominent figures of the Armenian national liberation movement, as well as his views and approaches to ancient and early medieval history of Armenia. The works by Srvandztyants also have a great scientific and political value about the ethnography of Western Armenia. E. Kostandyan’s book about Garegin Srvandztyants was republished in 2008.

E. Kostandyan’s book, “Garegin Srvandztyants. The Life and Activities”, contains an introduction, three chapters, list of primary sources and the used literature. In the first chapter, the author presents the life of G.Srvandztyants, his educational-scientific activities. In the second chapter, the author scientifically analyzes interesting information about G.Srvandztyants and Western Armenian national liberation movements. The third chapter touches three problems: 1) Social and political views of Garegin Srvandztyants, 2) Bishop G. Srvandztyants and several issues of early medieval history of Armenia, 3) Demographic processes in Western Armenia in the 70-80s of the 19th century according to G. Srvandztyants.
In the first chapter the author presents in details the first articles\(^1\) by Srvandztyants, which were published in "Artsvi Vaspurakan" ("The Eagle of Vaspurakan") magazine: "Burial vaults of ancestors", "Patriotism and Homeland", etc. E.Kostandyan also presents the years of his study (1857-1860) at the "Zharangavorac" Seminary, Archimandrite degree (1867), Bishop degree (1886) and other valuable events.

Speaking on educational activity of Garegin Srvandztyants, Kostandyan noted that it consisted of two spheres - publishing and pedagogical. In the first field, the author appreciated cooperation of Srvandztyants with the periodicals: "Krunk Hayots Ashkharhi\(^2\) ("Crane of Armenian world"), "Artsvi Vaspurakan\(^3\), "Artsvik Taronoy\(^4\) ("The Eaglet of Taron"), "Meghu Hayastani" ("The Bee of Armenia"), "Masis", "Pordz" ("Experience"), "Arevelyan mamul" ("Eastern Press") and others. And in the second field, the author highly appreciates the works of educational ideas and programs of Garegin Srvandztyants. E.Kostandyan tells about several schools in different regions (Mush, Manazkert, Taron, Van, Karin) of Western Armenia that had been opened by Srvandztyants' efforts.

Srvandztyants’ following works are analyzed in the book: “Sahak Partev the Great and the fall of Artashir Arshakuni\(^5\)”, “Shushan Shavarshana” (its subject is related to the battle of Vardanants), “Grots-brots” ("Literary and folk"), “Hnots-norots” ("Of old and new", contains materials about Movses Khorenatsi), “Manana” ("Manna"), “Hamov-Hotov” ("With taste and aroma"), “Toros Akhbar” ("Brother Toros") etc.

Among Srvandztyants’ works the most famous are "Grots-brots", “Hnots-norots", which are known for their creative uniqueness. The first contains interesting material about ethnography and archeology. Noteworthy is information about pre-Christian beliefs, rituals, ethnographic tradition. Its one section

\(^{1}\) Ibid, p. 22.
\(^{2}\) Մեսրոպ Մաշտոցի անվան Մատենադարան, Կաթողիկոսական դիվան, թղթ. 193, վավ. 139.
\(^{3}\) "Արծուի Վասպուրական", 1861, N 1.
\(^{4}\) «Արծուիկ Տարոնոյ» 1863, N 2.
\(^{5}\) "Գարեգին Սրվանձտյանց. Կյանքը և գործունեությունը", էջ 48.
contains a variant of the epic tale known as Mheri dur or Sasuntsi Davit\(^1\). Kostandyan considering this part noted that Garegin Sr vandztyants was the discoverer of the first history of national epics. Sr vandztyants noted that Krpo (from Arnist village of the Mush Valley) told the legends. Sr vandztyants appreciated the feats of Davit and important historical events connected with him. Manuk Abeghyan mentions the remarks by Sr vandztyants on Sev Qar (Black Stone), Tsovasar (Sea mountain), Maruta sar (Mt. Maruta) in his great work dedicated to "Sasuntsi Davit" epic\(^2\).

Appreciating the great importance of the patriotic national epic Mkrtich Emin (1815-1890), Sedrak Mandinyan (1844-1915) and other Armenologysts gave it a high appraisal.

In the sphere of comprehensive study of the Armenian Question and national liberation movement, life and activities of the prominent clergymen of Western Armenia, the next valuable work by E.Kostandyan was dedicated to the spiritual, public, political, literary and philosophical activities of prominent clergyman, Catholicos of All Armenians Mkrtich Khrimyan (Khrimyan Hayrik/Father, Mkrtich I, from Van, 1820 - 1907)\(^3\). In 1999 E. Kostandyan defended her Doctoral dissertation, "Mkrtich Khrimyan: the public and political activities". The monograph, which was highly appreciated, has been published in 2000 and republished in 2008.

On the basis of archival documents, press, memoirs and scientific literature, E. Kostandyan elucidated stages of the life and activities of Mkrtich Khrimyan, emphasized his role in public and political thought in the context of the Armenian Question and national liberation movements.

M. Khrimyan was consecrated as a bishop in Echmiadzin (1868), and Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople (in 1869) by the National Assembly of Constantinople. Mkrtich Khrimyan struggled for representing all Western Armenians’ interests and adding the number of provincial deputies in the National Assembly. Hoping for a diplomatic solution to the Armenian Question, Khrimyan headed the Armenian delegation to represent the will of the Armenian people at the Congress of Berlin (1878 ). Upon his return Khrimyan recited the following message at the Cathedral in Constantinople: “Dear Armenian people. Could I have dipped my paper ladle in the heriseh\(^4\)? It would have become wet and stayed there. There, where guns talk and swords make noise, what significance do appeals and petitions have? And I saw next to the Gharadaghian, the Bulgarian and other delegates, several brave [men], blood

---


\(^2\) Աբեղյան Մ., Երկեր, հ.Ա, 1966, էջ 333.

\(^3\) Կոստանդյան է., Մկրտիչ Խրիմյան: Հասարակական-քաղաքական գործունեությունը, Երևան, 2000:

\(^4\) A traditional Armenian stew-like meal made of meat and whole wheat berries.
dripping from the swords hanging at their sides. I then turned my head, as if I was looking for the brave men from Zeitun, Sasun, Shatakh and other mountainous areas. But where were they? People of Armenia, tell me, where were those brave souls? Should not one or two of them have been next to me, so that showing their bloody swords to the members of Congress I could have exclaimed, "Look, HERE ARE MY IRON LADLES! They are here, ready!".

On 26 of September, 1893, Mkrtich Khrimyan was consecrated as Catholicos of All Armenians (1893-1907). He expanded energetic activity for the alleviation of the poor condition of villagers, limiting the arbitrariness of the Turkish beastly officials. In 1895 the Catholicos went to Petersburg to present the Armenian Question in the Russian Royal Court. He condemned the massacres (1894-1896) that officially were sanctioned by Sultan Abdul Hamid.

In her book Kostandyan also describes Khrimyan’s new construction works: Synod Building, Museum, Matenadaran in Echmiadzin, etc.

For her fundamental achievements in the sphere of the study of the history of the Armenian Apostolic Church, E. Kostandyan was awarded the "St. Sahak-St. Mesrop" medal of the Armenian Apostolic Church.

In 2003 she published her third monograph, "Constantinople’s daily newspaper «East»". She in detail elucidated a number of problems related to the daily newspaper "East", showed its role in public and political life of Western Armenia, showed its contribution in the field of Armenian journalistic culture and mass media.

E. Kostandyan's next study is "Essays of the cultural and public-political life of the history of Western Armenia" (the 80s of the 19th century).

Then the bibliography of the "Artsvi Vaspurakan" magazine (1855-1856, 1858-1864) was compiled and published by E. Kostandyan.

In 2013, a collection of articles, "Armenological Studies", was published by E. Kostandyan, which indicates the whole course of her research work. In the introduction of this work, Director of the Institute of History, Academician of NAS RA A.Melkonyan wrote: “Emma Kostandyan merited the general love and respect of the Armenologists and held her honourable place among Armenian historians”.

1 Ruth B., Loving Father to all generations http://www.armenianhouse.org/khrimyan-hayrik/loving-father.html
2 Համալսարանյան կարմիր կարտեզ, Երևան, 2003:
3 Համալսարանյան կարմիր կարտեզ, Արևմտահայ մշակութային գործունեություն: (19-րդ դարի 80-ական թվականներ), Երևան, 2005:
4 Համալսարանյան կարմիր կարտեզ, "Արևմտահայ մշակութային գործունեություն: (1855-1856, 1858-1864թթ.), Երևան, 2006:
E. Kostandyan also desired to finish and publish a monograph dedicated to the prominent clergyman and scholar Maghakia Archbishop Ormanyan's (1841-1918) public-political and scientific activities. Thanks to the efforts of the Institute of History of RA NAS, the work was completed and published posthumously (2015).

The work, "Episodes from the life and activity of Maghakia Archbishop Ormanyan", consists of introduction, two parts, list of sources, used literature, names and place names1. The first part of the study includes the problems, which reflect scientific articles that had been published by Kostandyan. The second part includes the author's unpublished materials. E. Kostandyan in her study based on the documents, press, memoirs and scientific literature, elucidates specific issues dedicated to the social, political, cleric and research activities of the theologian, Armenologist, historian, philologist, publicist and public figure of the national conservative movement, Maghakia Archbishop Ormanyan. The author in the study briefly presented his biography, in detail narrating his ecclesiastical ideas, historical views, lectures, religious, political, educational (in Gevorgian Seminary and Armash) and patriarchal activities.

Presenting historiographical views of Ormanyan, Kostandyan highly appreciated the role and importance of his three-volume work, "Azgapatum", in the Armenian spiritual value system. Kostandyan writing about the Christian period of the history of Armenia, noted: "The monumental study contains the two millennia of history of the Armenian people, since Apostle Thaddeus until the first decade of the 19th century, Matthew II of Constantinople2".

She also described Ormanyan’s valuable research on the discovery of the Armenian script by Mesrop Mashtots. Kostandyan presents the appraisal by the great clergyman of the period of activity of Mesrop Mashtots, Sahak Partev and Vramshapuh, as well of the creation of the Armenian alphabet by Mesrop Mashtots and the process of opening national schools and educating children.

Under the sub point, "Hovhannes Odznetsi Catholicos according to Maghakia Ormanyan appreciation", the historian emphasizes a high rating given by Ormanyan to diplomatic and political capabilities of the Catholicos Hovhannes Odznetsi and his creative work.


---

1 Կոստանդյան Է., Դրվագներ Մաղաքիա արք. Օրմանյանի կյանքից ու գործունեությունից, Երևան, 2015:
2 Ibid, p. 29.
In a separate sub point, she expounded Ormanyan’s views on "The Defender of Homeland" organization’s ideas, concepts of status improvement of schools, colleges of Karin as well his patriotic activities in Tortum, Sper and other districts of Western Armenia in the spiritual leadership capacity of Karin (1880-1887).

Along with socio-political and pedagogical activities of the spiritual leader, Kostandyan evaluated Ormanyan's role in educational life of the Etchmiadzin Gevorgian Seminary and Armash.

The section devoted to Ormanyan's Patriarchal activity presents special interest. Kostandyan notes that the most important issue of Ormanian's Patriarchal activity was the assistance of Armenians, which had survived the massacres. The newly elected Patriarch decided to assist the needful\(^1\). The Patriarch cared for not only orphanages and colleges, but also for the population of various locations of Western Armenians, who were subjected to various disasters. He also struggled against the law (on 12 of June, 1903) of the Tsarist government on confiscation of Armenian church property. He asked top spiritual institutions (the Cilician Catholicosate, Jerusalem Armenian Patriarchate, Akhtamar’s Patriarchal Vicar) of Western Armenians at ecclesiastical meetings to appeal to the Russian Tsar to abolish his decision about the Armenian church. We would like to emphasize that on this matter more details are described in the work, including the resolution of their demand: in 1905 the Tsar published a decree reopening Armenian schools and returning the properties of the Armenian Apostolic church.

Relationships between the Patriarch Ormanyan and Cilician Catholicosate, Jerusalem Armenian Patriarchate, Akhtamar’s Patriarchal Vicar are also described thoroughly in the study.

E. Kostandyan’s numerous research works have been published in academic journals of Armenia, the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic (Artsakh), as well as the Armenian Diaspora. Her monographs are widely cited in Armenological research circles. Kostandyan is one of the authors of academic publications of *The History of Armenia* of the New period\(^2\), as well as of many other corresponding books. She reviewed numerous researches and regularly participated with reports in Republican and international conferences, as well as delivered lectures in military units of Artsakh.

*Translated from Armenian by*

*S. E. Chraghyan*

---

\(^1\) Ibid, p. 247.

\(^2\) Հայոց պատմություն, հ. III, լև Ա, Բ, Երևան, 2010, 2015:
HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY
AND CARTOGRAPHY
THE ARMENIAN FLAG IN THE INDIAN OCEAN IN THE 17TH-18TH CENTURIES

Balayan K. L.
President of “AYAS” nautical research club
Captain of “CILICIA” sailing ship

Penetration of Armenians into India and the Far East had started since the pre-Christian times. We find information on the regular visits of Armenians to India and the military aid Armenians showed to India in Cyropaedia by Xenophon (430-355 BC)\(^1\).

Already in the 12th century the Armenian seafarer-merchants had a trading colony in Canton\(^2\). The next wave of the resettlement of some Armenian groups took place in the 17th century when the Armenians deported by Shah Abbas’ order not only founded the city Nor Jugha (New Julfa) in Iran, but also spread farther, to the east, rapidly becoming part of the leading participants of the barter and trade of the region and started to play an important role in the sea trade of the Indian Ocean and the western part of the Pacific Ocean. They created one of the largest trading networks of the world, and not only the local authorities but also the European countries had to reckon with it at least for two centuries.

And all that system with its merchants, ship owners, captains, ships, storehouses and agents was managed and ruled from Nor Jugha with its population of only 30 thousand. Due to their intellect and respectful attitude towards the locals the Armenians had a free access to all the ports of the region.

Armenians had considerable privileges in almost all the ports. Europeans tried to use that fact for their own purposes. Practically all the European East-Indian companies had been created with the Armenians’ direct participation or help. In its correspondence the English East-Indian company confessed that the main part of trade between the East and India was in the hands of Armenians.

---


\(^2\) Барсегов Ю.Г., Филиппины в морской торговле армян, Анив, 4(19), 2008.
The Europeans being constantly at war with each other had divided the spheres of their influence. For example, the English, French and Dutch were banned access to the important strategic port of Manila in the Philippines which was under the Spanish rule.

The same English were forbidden to visit the port of Pondicherry which was under the French rule. The Spanish, in their turn, were banned access to the ports which were under the English rule, such as Madras and Surat.

As a proof we can offer several messages sent from Fort Saint George to London by an official of the English East-Indian company on February 28, 1711. It was mentioned in the letter that: “Armenians... have an exceptional trade with Manila”\(^3\). It was clarified that the Armenians of Madras “at this moment dominate over the most profitable routes - at least half of the private trade of India with Manila, China and Pegu”\(^4\). And then: “The trade with Manila is conducted by the Portuguese, Armenians and Moors and no European of our religion can go there”\(^5\).

The French sources mention the same: Francois Martin notes that besides the Portuguese only “the Indian merchants and Armenians most of whom have settled in Madras and are busy with with large trade, so they have the right to enter Manila”\(^6\).

In that situation Armenians, besides conducting their own trade, also took up the responsibilities of intermediaries both between the Europeans, and between the Europeans and locals\(^7\). The privileges, high social standing, the ability to conduct negotiations, the knowledge of the local languages and traditions, the age-long experience of communicating with different nations, the wide network of agents and the fact of being informed resulted in a situation where the European companies persistently invited Armenians as partners and used their relations and influence.

---

\(^3\) Records of Fort St. George. Despatches to England. 1701-1702 to 1710-1711, Madras, p. 47


\(^6\) L’Inde et les nations Europeanes en Asie au commençement du XVIII-e siecle, par Francois Martin, fondateur de la ville de Pondichery (Pierre Margry, Relations et memoires inedits, p. 125).

However, constant hostilities between the European countries made it extremely complicated to carry out free trade.

Europeans had developed the so-called “Letter of marque” - privateer patent system. The owner of the patent had the right to capture the enemy vessels and their load. Thus, the countries at war were trying to break the trade ties of the enemy and their economy. The “patented” captains had to share the trophy with the country granting the patent. In England, for example, even joint stock companies were established for the purpose of building and arming privateer ships and shareholders of those companies were ship owners, admirals, members of Parliament and even representatives of the royal dynasty.

Of course very often the captains who were granted patents not always adhered to the laws, rules and limitations. Whenever possible they robbed their allies. It is evident that through privateers the state companies such as the English East-Indian company, also got allies that were not enemies, which were, however, a very efficient tool for the struggle against commercial competitors. Examples are numerous. The merchants, ship owners and captains had to put up with the situation.

One of the measures taken by the merchants was that they obtained the documents given by the representatives of different European countries. Another common habit was to have flags of various countries on board and use one of them according to the situation. And it worked!

The change of the flag was used not only by the merchants scared of the privateer attack, but by the Europeans themselves.

For several centuries Armenians used their flag outside of their Motherland (where during several centuries the kingdom had ceased to exist) and that flag was recognized both by the local authorities and by Europeans.

The Europeans themselves widely used the possibilities and advantages of the Armenian flag. According to the current international Maritime Law a ship can have one state flag established by law. The flag shows to whom ship belongs. Ship with no flag is considered to be a pirate ship and is subject to arrest.
The Armenian cargo ship the *Quedagh Merchant*, was taken over by the privateer William Kidd (1645-1701) near Malabar Coast (West coast of India) in 10 leagues\(^8\) far from Cochin in the Indian Ocean, in 1698.

He subsequently sailed the *Quedagh Merchant* to the Caribbean. Meanwhile, the British crown, which held part of the interests in the goods on that ship, declared Captain Kidd an outlaw pirate. Kidd ended up facing charges back in England, while he had already set the *Merchant* ablaze off the coast of what is the Dominican Republic today\(^9\).

---

\(^8\) The league was a linear unit used by medieval Europeans for sea travel (2.29 km to 4.57 km) (see: Trade, Travel, and Exploration in the Middle Ages: An Encyclopaedia, New York, 2000).

The discovery of the shipwreck in 2007 made international headlines. A museum on the legacy of the ship was established in the Dominican Republic in 2011.

Besides the main flag, in the territorial waters of foreign countries the ship has to raise a second flag as well - the **Courtey Flag** - a flag of courtesy which is raised as a sign of respect towards the country the ship is at the moment. That flag is temporary and is not considered to be the “flag of the ship”.

The ban to change the flag was approved only by the 1982 UN Convention on the Maritime Law of the Sea. In any case the ship must bear the flag of an **existing** country.

In order to understand the situation we must clarify what was going on at that time in the Indian Ocean and who would benefit from raising the flag of a non-existent kingdom.

Armenians and other local ship owners suffered a lot from constant wars between Europeans. This circumstance made them turn to various measures, including the change of the flag according to the situation. The change of the flag was a unique expression of neutrality, of avoiding being drawn into some others war\(^\text{10}\).

The Europeans also took advantage of the idea of changing the flag. But their aim was to hide the identity of their ship when entering the ports closed before them. And at that moment they remembered about the Armenian flag… - “**Manilla under Armenian Colours is a profitable Voyage**”\(^\text{11}\).

The Europeans had gone further. Not only evidence of using the Armenian flag had been preserved. They even went as far as changing the clothes. The Europeans dressed in the Armenian traditional costume in order to be taken as Armenians and to penetrate into the port closed before them.

As mentioned by Yuri Barseghov: “Because of the hostility with the English, French and Dutch, the Spanish could not conduct trade with India. Armenians played the role of intermediaries. They agreed and operated with each other, helped them when the Spanish sent their load on board the Armenian vessels or when the Spanish came to India establishing companies with Armenians and dressing in Armenian traditional costume for safety purposes”\(^\text{12}\).

\(^{10}\) Барсегов Ю.Г., Дело королевского пирата Кидалла, Анив, 3(6), 2006.

\(^{11}\) Lockyer C., An account of the trade in India, containing rules for good government in trade, price courants, and tables, with descriptions of Fort St. George, Acheen, Malacca, Condore, Canton, Anjengo, Muscat, Gombroon, Surat, Goa, Carwar, Telichery, Panola, Calicut, the Cape of Good-Hope and St. Helena, London, 1711, p. 15.

\(^{12}\) Барсегов Ю.Г., Филиппины в морской торговле армян, Анив, 1(22), 2009.
Or as follows from the correspondence of the East-Indian company dated August 31 and September 2, 1734: “Taking into account the fact that we will never be able to conduct open trade with this port /Manila/ and we always conduct trade under somebody’s name, we found that it is important to take all the precautions not to cause doubt that the load belongs to you, respectable members of Administration, and that is the reason why we changed the packaging and sent it as an Armenian product and addressed it to Armenians”\(^{13}\).

Francois Martin meant the Moors and Armenians that had the right to enter Manila. The situation is clarified by a witness of later time (when the English and French were already allowed to visit Manila - Galaisiere), who had visited the Philippines in the second half of the 18\(^{th}\) century. He wrote: “The Mogols and Moors, as the Spanish call them, are very bad seafarers and none of them tries to go to Manila, and if somebody dared to try to take such a trip, he would probably never get there”. Manila would never have any Indian product for its galleons if it relied on the Moors. Usually these trips were undertaken by the French, English and Armenians\(^{14}\).


\(^{14}\) Guillaume Joseph Hyacinthe Jean Baptiste, Voyage to the Indian Seas, A. Le Gentil de la Galaisiere, Published by Filipiniana Book Guild Manila, 1964.
We should note that this was written already after the ban for the English and French to visit Manila was lifted. It becomes obvious in whose hands the main volume of trade with Manila was concentrated before lifting the ban.

The Armenians had created a wide branched trading network which included the sea routs of the Indian Ocean and the western part of the Pacific Ocean, branching to the main centers of European trade. Together with it the upper strata of authorities of all the eastern countries that accepted the Armenian flag \textit{de facto} were involved in the Armenian trade.

Up to the present day in marine practice such concepts as “accepted criteria”, “marine tradition”, “marine customs” are used, which have not been approved by any official law but have been preserved everywhere for centuries having the status of unwritten law.

In the practice of international relations there exists the concept of “\textit{International tradition}” which represents rules of universal behavior of countries in international practice which are legally binding. The international tradition is formed as a result of the long use of the unwritten law by the countries, as a result of recurrence in similar situations, as a result of its silent recognition by the overwhelming majority of countries. All this wholly concerns the practice of use of the Armenian flag as well.

When the need to regulate the status of having flags matured, it was carried out by the 1982 UN Convention on the \textit{Maritime Law}.

\textit{Translated from Armenian by S. E. Chraghyan}
CIVILIZATIONAL FACTORS OF ARMENIAN SEA TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION IN THE 17TH CENTURY

Eduard L. Danielyan*

Prior to the great geographical discoveries international trade relations had been developing within the boundaries of the known world or æcumene [1] in the Eastern hemisphere, via land, river and sea routes [2]. Participation of various countries in the international trade depended on availability of raw material sources and product lines.

Armenia had been involved in international trade since ancient times, given its important strategic location between the East and West and its civilizational developments [3, pp. 203-227]. As far back as the Neolithic and Chalcolithic, obsidian had been exported from the Armenian Highland to Mesopotamia and regions of the Eastern Mediterranean [4, p. 46]. In the Early Bronze Age Sumerians made use of copper mined in the Armenian Highland [5, pp. 21-25; 6, էջ 140]. In the Bronze and the Early Iron Ages metallurgy in Armenia allowed exporting processed metal products to the countries of the Orient. With high appreciation of Armenia’s contribution in the world civilization, David M. Lang wrote in his book Armenia: Cradle of Civilization: “The ancient land of Armenia is situated in the high mountains... Although Mesopotamia with its ancient civilizations of Sumeria and Babylon, is usually considered together with Egypt as the main source of civilized life in the modern sense, Armenia too has a claim to rank as one of the cradles of human culture... Again, Armenia has a claim on our attention as one of the principal homes of ancient metallurgy, beginning at least five thousand years ago ...” [7, p. 9].

Existence of trade relations of the Armenian kingdoms with Mesopotamia, including the Persian Gulf basin, and Mediterranean countries, are corroborated by references to Aratta² in the Sumerian epic of the 3rd millennium BC [8], as well as to

---

1 A paper presented at the international conference The Discovery of the Quedagh Merchant organized by NAS RA Institute of History and “ANAHIT” Association (October 5, 2010).
2 Doctor of History, Noravank Foundation consultant.
2 L. N. Petrosyan proposed Armenian Highland as the location for Aratta, comparing it to the name of Ararat [9, p. 123; cf. 10, pp. 68-70 and 11, pp. 29-32].
Armanum, Hayasa and Nairi, correspondingly, in the Akkadian, Hittite and Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions of the 3rd and 2nd millennium BC. It has been testified by the Egyptian, Mittani, Kassite and Assyrian seals and seashells of that period discovered in archeological excavations on the territory of Armenia [12, ᴭ64-65; 13, ᴷ43-44].

City of Susa (the ancient capital of Elam, and later the winter quarters of the Achaemenids) in the Persian Empire [14, III, 140, V, 49, 53] and the Lydian capital Sardes in western Asia Minor were connected by the Royal Road that passed through southwestern regions of Armenia [14, V, 52]. From ancient times Armenia was connected with lands of Mesopotamia through waterways as well. Herodotus (c.484 BC – c.425 BC) provided information on navigation from Armenia to Babylon by Euphrates and Tigris rivers: “The city (Babylon – E.D.) is divided into two portions by the river which runs through the midst of it. The river is the Euphrates, a broad, deep, swift stream, which rises in Armenia… the Tigris has its source in Armenia” [14, I, 180, V, 52]. Herodotus describes: “The boats which ply on the river and go to Babylon are round, and all of skins. They make these in Armenia, higher up the stream than Assyria. First they cut frames of willow, then they stretch hides over these for a covering, making as it were a hold; they neither broaden the stern nor narrow the prow, but the boat is round, like a shield. They then fill it with reeds and send it floating down the river with a cargo; and it is for the most part palm (date palm – E.D.) wood casks of wine. Two men standing upright steer the boat, each with a paddle, one drawing it to him, the other thrusting it from him…When they have floated to Babylon and disposed of their cargo, they sell the framework of the boat and all the reeds. The hides are set on the backs of asses, which are then driven back to Armenia, for it is not by any means possible to go upstream by water, by reason of the swiftness of the current. It is for this reason that they make their boats of hides and not of wood. When they have driven their asses back into Armenia, they make boats in the same way” [14, I, 194].

Armenia’s strategic location in Western Asia had secured an important role for it in the global trade, especially in the Silk Road international system that has been prominent since long ago. Known for its urban development traditions, Armenian kingdoms experienced an upturn distinctly during the reigns of Sarduri I (845 BC – 825 BC), Ishpuini (825 BC – 810 BC), Menua (810 BC – 786 BC), Argishti I (786 BC – 764 BC) and other kings of the Kingdom of Ararat (Urartu) or Van, the Ervandians (VI – III cc. BC) and the Artashesians, particularly, Artashes I (189 BC – 160 BC), king of the Kingdom of Great Armenia, and especially Tigran II the Great (95 BC – 55 BC), King of Kings of the Armenian Empire. Capital cities Van (as well as Erebuni - the present capital Yerevan), Armavir, Artashat, Tigranakert, as well as other newly built cit-
ies (in Artsakh, Goghtan and others) also named after Tigran II the Great confirm the high level of the Armenian architecture coming since antiquity. Activities of Tigran II the Great, emanating from millennia-long civilizational developments, expanded over most of the Western Asia that was incorporated in the Armenian Empire [15, էջ 3-12]. Tigran the Great took the control over the Silk Road portion from the borders of India to the commercial ports in Cilicia Pedića, Syria and Phoenicia [16, XIV, 5, 2].

The early medieval Armenian educational and scientific system attached much importance to geography and cosmography. Ashkharhatsuyts (Geography) of the 5th century, authored by Movses Khorenatsi and later continued and edited by Anania Shirakatsi (Anania of Shirak) in the 7th century, informs about navigation on Indian, Greek (Mediterranean), and Vrkanits (Caspian) seas. Ashkharhatsuyts data on natural resources and ethnic composition of India [17, pp. 266, 274, 308-310] confirm the existence of Armenian-Indian relations since old times. In his Cosmography Anania Shirakatsi provides interesting information about navigation by the stars. He writes that the stars called Yerknibever (Pole Star) and Sayl (the Wain) in Ursa Major constellation were visible pointers for the seafarers [17, էջ 96].

Along the Silk Road passing through Armenia such cities as Jugha, Nakhijevan, Karin, Manazkert, Dvin flourished in early Medieval Ages, as well as Ani, capital of the Armenian Bagratids in the 10th-11th centuries [18, էջ 70-71; 19; 20], which were large centers of science, education and culture, crafts [21] and commerce.

Navigation among Armenians developed intensively in the 12th-14th centuries, when the Armenian Principality and later the Kingdom of Cilicia became a maritime state with navy and commercial fleet that was involved in the sea trade system of the Mediterranean [22; 23, էջ 400]. Cilician Armenia was a sea gateway to the European ports for the Silk Road coming from China and India. It also introduced progressive changes to the international maritime law.

A number of European countries used to take advantage of Jus naufragii (Jus litoris) which allowed the lord of a territory to seize the cargo, crew and passengers washed ashore from the wreck of a ship along its coast. This law was also exercised in coastal countries of the Eastern Mediterranean. As Yu. Barseghov mentions, the Byzantine Empire had issued decrees in 1290 and 1320 protecting the shipwrecked Barcelonans, France did the same in 1227 and 1461 for Italians, and later for the Flemish, Dutch and Brabantians, but these were most of the times to no avail and it was impossible to prevent robbery [24, էջ 100-101]. In Cilician Armenia the struggle against Jus naufragii was more profound and persistent.

In 1184 Mkhitar Gosh condemned this practice in his Datstanagirk (The Law Code), warning to keep away from that “if it happens that our nation possesses the
Yu. Barseghov noted that from partial restrictions of the 10th-11th centuries to international agreements and conventions of the 19th-20th centuries, it took a millennium to eliminate the *Jus naufragii*. As the researcher notes in this regard, the clauses of Armenian *Datastanagirk* compare favorably to similar legislations of other countries not only by predating them chronologically, but also in terms of progressive contents [24, c. 95-98,103].

The king of the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia Levon II the Magnificent (1198-1219) struggled against piracy and applied great efforts to eradicate the *Jus naufragii*. First time the rejection of *Jus naufragii* took the form of an international legal standard in 1201. King Levon abandoned then the “right of shipwreck” in relation to the Republic of Venice, as he did earlier for the Genoese [24, p. 105]. Application of this legal standard in Cilician Armenia was further developed during the reigns of Hethum I (1226-1269) and Levon III (1270-1289) [26, pp. 106, 110, 126; 24, pp. 105-106]. Cilician Armenia was a law-abiding and reliable partner in sea trade, which is corroborated by numerous references in commercial documents signed in the European and Middle Eastern ports of the Mediterranean.

Armenian seafarer merchants also actively participated in the “Manila trade”, establishing business relationship with the Portuguese in the Indian Ocean, especially after the discoveries of Dias and Vasco da Gama. Interestingly, back in the 16th century the Portuguese poet Luís de Camões wrote in his *The Lusiad: or, the Discovery of India*: “And those who cultured fair Armenia’s lands, Where from the sacred mount two rivers flow, And what was Eden to the Pilgrim shew,” referring to the Biblical Paradise, sacred Mount Ararat and headwaters of Euphrates and Tigris rivers [27, p. 118].

The role of Armenians in the “Manila trade” grew in the 17th century. Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, a French merchant and traveler, states that at the time “there was no type of commerce that Armenians were not involved in” [28, vi, pp. 158-159, Appendix, pp. 76-77; 29, c. 73-78], whereas François Martin, the Commissary of the French Government mentions that other than the Portuguese, “Indian and Armenian merchants were allowed access to Manila” [30, p. 125]. English documents recorded in 1711-1714 in Madras indicate that the Armenians controlled half of the Indian private trade with Manila and China. Having thoroughly studied the participation of Armenian seafarer merchants in the “Manila trade”, Yu. Barseghov has come to a conclusion that in practice, only Armenian merchant ships had access to Manila, because England, France and Netherlands most of the time were at odds with Spain. At the same time, the English, French, Dutch, Portuguese and Spanish
made use of services provided by the Armenian merchants. Records made at Fort St. George of Madras indicate that vessels flying Armenian colors traveled from Madras, Surat, Bombay, Calcutta and other ports to Manila. Khoja Minas, Khoja Stepan Mark, Hovhannes Markar were among the owners of the ships traveling between Surat and Manila [31, p. 169; 29].

During the Ottoman–Persian Wars of the 16th-17th centuries the demographic and economic situation in Armenia deteriorated due to both destructive Ottoman raids and the “great deportation” forced by Shah Abbas I of Persia, when the ancient Armenian economic and cultural center Jugha and some other settlements were devastated. In order to enrich his treasury, Shah Abbas embarked on turning the direction of Western Asian trade toward Persian Gulf [32, էջ 325]. Out of his own interests, he awarded privileges to the Armenian merchants deported from Old Jugha to New Jugha, which was granted a right of autonomy. The problems related to New Jugha have been thoroughly studied by Leo, A. Hovhannisyan, L. Khachikyan, H. Papazyan, V. Baiburtyan1, Sh. Khachikian and other researchers.

After establishment of New Jugha, using the silk trade routes the Jugha merchants’ or khojas’ capital [34] penetrated, on one hand, through Caspian-Volga basin waterways into Russia and further to Europe, and on the other hand, through Iran into India. In both cases sea shipping played an important role.

In the 16th-17th centuries the sea trade from Baku and Astrakhan was controlled mainly by Armenians [35, էջ 442; 36, c. 274; 37], and was further boosted owing to Armenian merchants of New Jugha as a result of conclusion of the 1667 and 1673 Russian-Armenian trade agreements2.

The first signs of competition between the Armenian merchants and European companies surfaced when the Russian Empire, aiming to protect its domestic markets, revoked English East India Company’s privileges of maintaining connection with Iran through Russia. In effect, the monopoly to use this route for international trade remained in hands of the Armenian merchants. Meanwhile, Spaniards and Italians competed with the Dutch and English, whereas the neutral political stance of the Armenian merchants rendered an opportunity to cooperate with different parties.

1 V. Baiburtyan, in his studies of the New Jugha Armenian community’s role in the 17th century trade relations between Iran and European countries deliberated also on the previous periods, particularly the Armenian merchants’ silk shipments in 1580 from the Persian Gulf to Spain and Portugal via oceanic routes [33, էջ 31-33]

2 Sh. Khachikyan revised the traditional view that the Armenian Trading Company of New Jugha was the signatory of the 1667 agreement, and came to a conclusion that Stepan Ramadanski and Grigor Lousikov who signed the agreement were authorized representatives of the New Jugha self-governing bodies [38, էջ 24-25]. Her investigations of genealogical trees of the Armenian nobility settled in New Jugha deserve a special attention, particularly those of Aghazarian family, later named Lazarian, descending from son of a Nakhijevan native Manouk [39, VII]
Armenian-Dutch trade relations were most successful, leading to strengthening of the Armenian Diaspora community in Amsterdam which is known for its great cultural achievements, particularly in Armenian printing. For instance, thanks to the efforts of the Vanandetsi family, in 1695 the *Sharaknots* (Armenian Hymnals), *Hamatarats Ashkharhatsuyts* (The World Atlas), *History of Armenia* by Movses Khorenatsi and other publications were printed [32, էջ 616-617]. The role of Jugha Armenians' capital in the national matters has been remarkable over the centuries. Covering numerous Armenian centers in Iran and India, Armenia, Russia, Italy and elsewhere in Europe, this capital had much greater significance than that of mere benevolence. Several centuries of development of the Armenian scientific, educational and cultural cause among the Armenian communities in India eventually led to maturation of a plan (in the late 18th century) devised by Armenian patriots of Madras for liberation of the Motherland, both Western and Eastern Armenia.

According to Constandine Jughayetsi’s late 17th century textbook *Askharhazhoghov girq*, Armenians were involved in artisanship and commerce in dozens of Indian trade and crafts centers [32, էջ 335, 337, 447; 38, էջ 11]. The use of “maritime loan” was widespread in the Indian sea trade, information about which has been preserved in relation to the Armenia khojas’ capital [38, էջ 161-167].

The English, French and Danish East India Companies initially availed themselves of the opportunities provided by Armenian commercial methods and trade relations, especially in India. They made huge profits as Armenians initially tended to rent European vessels. The 1688 agreement between Khoja Kalantar and London traders’ company guaranteed the rights and privileges of the Armenian merchants in India. Over the time Armenians bought and built their own ships, thus becoming competitors to the European merchants. For instance, two high-class merchant ships of Hovhan and Hovsep Markarians, “New Jerusalem” and “Sancta Cruz” fell victim to piracy [40, էջ 62-69]. Yu. Barseghov remarked that the centuries-long history of Armenian sea trade is also a dramatic saga of a struggle against European piracy, as the Armenians promoted progressive principles of establishment of free seafaring and open seas policies [41, էջ 35-42].

The fate of “Quedagh Merchant” is similar to those of Armenian merchant ships fallen victim to piracy [42, էջ 70-73]. Discovery and study of its wreckage off Catalina Island, Dominican Republic [43; 44, pp. 47-49; 45] is a valuable contribution to the assessment of the Armenian legacy in the world history of merchant shipping.
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ARCHAEOLOGY
In studying the history of Armenia, the discovery of the classical Armenian settlement Avan designated a chronological link between the monuments of the Bronze Age (Shengavit) (4th-3rd millennia BC) located in the territory of Erevan, those of the periods of the Van (Erebuni-Erevan: Arin-Berd, Teishebaini - Karmir-Blur) (6th-7th centuries BC) and the Haykazun-Ervanduni kingdoms (6th-3rd centuries BC) on the one hand, and on the other hand, the late antique period (Arin-Berd, Karmir-Blur, Hushablur, Tsitsernakaberd, etc.) (2nd century BC - 3rd century AD) and further. It is an important link for the study of the cultural and historical continuity of archaeological sites on the territory of Erevan.

Thanks to political independence the Armenian kingdom in the epoch of the Artashesian (a branch of the Haykazun-Ervanduni dynasty) experienced significant social and economic and cultural rise in the period of the reign of Artashes I (189-160 BC) and in particular that of Tigran II the Great (95-55 BC). In the period of the reign of the King of Kings Tigran the Great Armenia turned into the strongest state of Western Asia, becoming one of the highly developed countries of the ancient world. On the basis of its traditional culture, Armenia, since ancient times characterized by the unity of the Armenian language throughout the country, creatively adopted the material and spiritual impulses of Hellenism.

At the present stage of the archaeological study of such multi-layered monuments of Armenia as its ancient capital cities and the major cities of Armavir, Ervandashat, Artashat, Tigranakert in Agdznik, the walled city of Tigranakert in Artsakh, Dvin (urban-type settlement or fortress-sanctuary), large ancient settlements Mokhrablur, Kartchaghbyur, Shirakavan, and others, the interpretation of each new discovered monument is important for the creation of an extensive and objective historical and cultural panorama of the era in the chain of previous and subsequent developments of material and spiritual culture.

The ancient settlement of the period of the Artashesian was found in 1980 in the north-east of Erevan, in the territory of the modern urban district Avan-Arinj, within the boundaries of the village Avan previously located here, which in written sources was for the first time mentioned by an Armenian historian of the 7th century Sebeos.

The archaeological study of the monument (table 1) revealed two major cultural layers with a total capacity of more than three meters, chronologically reflecting different...
periods of the settlement (table 9). Judging from the data of the stratigraphic pits, the lower layer, with a capacity of 0.5 m, which lies on the subsoil with a three-meter mark from the current surface, represents the Bronze Age culture of Armenia. The layer contains a variety of obsidian artifacts - inserts of composite sickles, knife-like plates, stone cores, and a fragment of a bicornuate hearth stand related to the cult of the bull and fire. Particularly expressive is an oval sickle insert with flat retouch, characteristic of the 3rd millennium BC, found also in the 2nd millennium BC. The ceramic material, marked in particular with a characteristic fragment of a thick-walled black-glazed vessel with a brown lining, is interesting not only because of the brown horn-type hearth stand with an unglazed surface, dating back to the beginning of the 2nd millennium BC, but also because of the finds of fragments of flat mobile hearths with the ratio of the vertical sides to the bottom diameter of 1:3, the tradition of making which can be traced up to the antique period. A white round discoid paste bead with a diameter of 3.1mm was found as well. The thickness of this cultural layer, growing to the bank of the river Getar gradually decreases at the foot of the flank of the hill (table 2).

The cultural layer, dating back from the 2nd century BC to the 1st century AD, which in some places reaches the power of over two meters, is separated from the above-mentioned Bronze Age layer by a small sterile interlayer. At the same time, in the main excavation sites, located in the northern, southern and western parts of the studied area of the settlement found were construction remains of structures, accompanied by a typical for this time rich archaeological material (tables 7, 8).

In the first, northern excavation site with an area of 250 square meters, two building horizons were discovered (table 9). The one of a later period contained remains of the wall foundation, made of several rows of ragged stones (basalt and tuff) and attached with clay mortar with the method "medius" with two-testaceous masonry, i.e. the wall bases are with a double-sided lining with intermediate backing (table 4, Fig. a, b; tables 10, 11).

The glass bead in the form of a teardrop, discovered in contact with the lower layer and the subsoil, finds its analogies in Artashat and Dvin, dating back to the 2nd-1st centuries BC. According to a coin - Parthian drachma of the late 80s- the first half of the 70s BC (table 15, a)3, the jar-burial (tables 16, 31) in the lower building horizon is dated no earlier than that time4.

The archaeological material of both building horizons presented mostly by fragments of ceramics and building remnants is distinguished by its uniformity, which indicates a relatively narrow chronological interval (2nd-1st centuries BC - the first half of the 1st century AD), uniting the periods of construction. It should be emphasized that such uniformity of the ceramic material is characteristic of many Armenian monuments of this era, which complicates a more precise dating of the layers. G.A. Tiratsyan emphasizes this in connection with the stratigraphy of Armavir: "The repeatedly

3 In the reconstructed legend of the coin may be read: Arsakes Theopator Euergetus (table 17).
4 Խաչատրյան Ժ., Սիսիանի դամբարանը (մ.թ.ա. 1 դ. երկրորդ կես), Երևան, 2009, աղ. XIV, 10:
observed uniformity and homogeneity of the archaeological material from the upper horizons of the Hellenistic layer to the lower ones makes such task very complicated.5

The second excavation site with an area of 450 square meters was situated in the south of the studied area of the settlement, 20m from the artificial mound crossing the bottom of the hill (table 12). The cultural layer of the classical period decreases here, reaching a capacity of about one meter.6 The excavations of the cultural layers of this period have revealed the wall foundations, built of roughly axed tuff and basalt debris (table 5, a, b).

At the same place were found three toroidal bases made of orange tuff. One of the bases is distinguished by the accuracy of its hewing and correct proportions (table 13). Such a base was found near the first one. Toroidal bases of this type starting from the 2nd century BC are widely spread in the territory of Armenia. They are known from the excavations in Artashat, Armavir, Dvin, Mokhrablur, Shirakavan, Beniamin and other monuments.7

In the northwestern part of the settlement in the ruined areas were found several more bases of toroidal type, different from the above-mentioned findings with roughness of surface treatment and materials - tuff in dark colours.8

The third - western excavation site with a total area of 100 square meters, near the left bank of the dry riverbed at the edge of the present pond, contained a good view of the wall foundation line, crossing it from north to south. The remains of this wall, which was revealed as a result of soil loss caused by the pond water, the level of which changed frequently, was traced for over 50 meters. The partly preserved width of the foundation reached 1.2-1.3m, narrowing to 0.7m and a little deviating from a strict straight line.

Excavations have revealed damaged collapses of the foundations and rich ceramic material; the cultural layer having the power of about 1 meter. The sterile surface is fixed at a depth of 1.2m. The cultural layer of the ancient period can be traced directly from the surface, acquiring a character of ceramic collapse at a depth of 0.2m and sharply differing from the layers of the southern and northern excavation sites by

5 Тирацян Г. А., Культура древней Армении. VI в. до н.э. - III в. н.э. (по археологическим данным), Ереван, 1988, с. 85. See also Гаспарян А. Г., Хачатрян А. К., Армавир VII р. г. Культура, археология, архитектура, Ереван, 1974, т. 79-80:
6 The Bronze Age stratifications are presented by occasional finds of obsidian artifacts directly in contact with the subsoil, which is explained by the morphology of the terrain.
8 About toroidal bases see Пичикян И., Традиции Востока в древнеармянской архитектуре, Второй международный симпозиум по армянскому искусству, Сборник докладов, Ереван 1981, т. 1, с. 258-261; Ibid. Торовидные базы (происхождение, хронология), Культура и искусство народов Средней Азии в древности и средневековье, Москва, 1979, с. 57-61.
the level of richness with ceramic material, wherein not differing by the characteristics of
the material itself (various types of dining room, kitchen and household utensils). This
layer with a capacity of 1m decreases to around 1.2m, forming a dense, as if a molded
mixture of ceramic residues, osteological material and river sand.

The wall foundations revealed by the excavations, the architectural material
discovered on the surface, as well as general observations made throughout the
preserved area of the settlement, viewed ubiquitously, especially in the ruined areas,
the traces of construction activity point to a continuous development and architecture of
the territory. Dwellings obviously having flat and vaulted wooden ceilings may have
adjoined the main walls. The roof rested on wooden support-pillars, standing at the
toroidal and simplified disc-type bases. Built by the method of bicornuate technique, i.e.
with two-sided lining, the wall foundations could carry the laying of mud-bricks or other
building material with clay daubing, representing the traditional methods of construction.
At the bases of the foundation drainage outlets in the form of rectangular openings were
made for sewage disposal (table 6, a, b). Separate bases were strengthened from the
outside, with the second row of stone masonry.

The material culture discovered during the excavations, is represented by a rich
collection of various ceramics, the analysis of which indicates the forms characteristic of
the monuments of Armenia of the ancient period (Armavir, Artashat, Hatsavan,
Oshakan, Mokhrablur, Kartchaghbyur, Dvin, Martuni, Shirakavan, Beniamin, Gandzak,
etc.). This is a set of household, dining-room and kitchen utensils - different pythoi,
flasks, pitchers, bowls, pialas, cups, plates, dishwares, vessels with prominent outlets,
pots, flat-bottomed brazier-hearth, lamps, etc. (tables 29, 34, 45).

With particular variety distinguished are the reconstructed forms of jars, revealing
differences in surface treatment as well (tables 40, 41). To cutlery samples belong large
jugs - oenochoe, the necks of which have rims with outlets in the form of a trefoil having
a rounded or pointed shape (table 40, fig. 4, 5). The main trends characterizing the
material culture of Armenia of the ancient period, traditional and Hellenistic, are again

9 During the study of the 1st northern excavation site a fragment of a ceramic water pipe was discovered. If this finding
is dated by the ancient period it may be possible to suggest that it was an indicator of the existence of a water supply
system in the Avan settlement. The pipe diameter is 18 cm., the wall thickness is 0.8cm. A small widening of the tube
towards its base is noticeable. The surface is light brown. In its shape the fragment of the pipe of the Avan settlement
resembles those from the ancient settlement of Garni, as well as from Artashat (Аракелян Б. Н., Гарни II, Ереван,
1957, с. 54, рис. 22; Խաչատորյան Ժ. Ա., Արտաշատ, էջ 117, նկ. 39, 1).

10 Flasks are referred to the ancient Eastern forms of ceramics. In their form, principles of painting and, finally,
chronologically flasks of the Avan settlement are similar to the analogous vessels discovered in all the ancient
settlements of Armenia. These vessels have a rounded, flattened (up to the half of the 1st century AD inclusively), or
(later) a globular body (table 39). The flask surfaces having bright colors are as a rule painted with dark and bright
concentric circles (table 65). In the first half of 1st century BC there were also flasks with a globular shape of the body,
with the well-polished surface covered with a thick red engobe and which persisted in the 2nd century BC as well.
(Խաչատորյան Ժ. Ա., Արտաշատ II. Մատյանի համայնքաշարժիչ, Երևան, 1981, էջ 121-123; Тер-Мартиросян
Ф. И., Фляги как торговая тара, Проблемы античной истории и культуры, т. 2, Ереван, 1979, с. 409-414.). The
collection of fragments of the flasks of the Avan settlement is presented by their both types. The simultaneous existence
of these two types of flasks in the upper horizons of the monument emphasizes the chronological framework of the
existence of the settlement.
clearly traced in the specifics of the design of these vessels. In particular, a variety of one-handed jugs with longitudinally emarginated handles, rims in the form of a trefoil and globular bodies dominate in the ceramics of the period of the Kingdom of Van (Ararat-Urartu). These vessels served as the basis for the development of this type of ceramics in Armenia until the late Middle Ages. In Avan, in particular in the upper horizons of the settlement, a fragment of the outlet of a small oenochoe decorated with discoid moldings in two points of the curve of the rim, perhaps in imitation of metal samples, was discovered (table 40, fig. 5). A typological parallel was found in Garni\textsuperscript{11}. This is a vessel with a brown, polished surface, decorated with a wide red stripe in the upper half of the body. The Avan oenochoe differs from the famous red-polished samples in the grey colour of the crock surface.

In the Greek world this type of pottery had widely been spread since the beginning of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BC, dating back, as we see, to the ceramics of Crete of the 9\textsuperscript{th}-8\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC. Researchers perceive the Greek influence in those samples of oenochoes of Armenia, the outlet part of the rims of which has a round shape\textsuperscript{12}. In the same samples, which have a pointed outlet, the influence of the prototype of the period of the Kingdom of Van is perceived. The pitchers-enochoes discovered in Avan illustrate the combination of deep Armenian traditions and the Greek influence.

A fragment of the side of the body of a large closed vessel (tables 43, 44), the light brown surface of which was well glazed, polished and covered with rich paintings (table 66) can presumably be attributed to the collection of pitchers found during the excavations of the Avan settlement. Only the polychrome painting on fragments of vessels from Armvir shows a certain affinity to it\textsuperscript{13}.

In the typological sense we can single out the fragment of a black-polished pitcher with a straight neck, going down to the horizontal shoulders with a wide, extending from the neck, flattened handle, the lower edge of which, bent at a right angle, is as if glued to the surface of the shoulder. This form of handle suggests imitation of metal samples. The same conclusion can also be referred to the shape of the large pitcher, the fragment of the neck of which, with a bent, L-shaped profiled rim has preserved traces of the red engobed polished surface.

A separate group is formed by large two or one-handed pitchers with bright orange crocks and surfaces covered with yellowish-greenish plastering (table 401-3). They find analogues in Artaashat, which date back to the beginning of the new era\textsuperscript{14}. In Avan fragments of two vessels were discovered as well, one of which is slightly larger than the other. A third vessel, typologically close to the first two, differs in that it has two symmetrical flattened handles directly extending from the rim. The outer flattened

\textsuperscript{11} Хачатрян Ж. Д., Гарни V, Античный некрополь, Ереван, 1976, табл. XXIII, 1.
\textsuperscript{12} Тирацян Г. А., Культура древней Армении, с. 119.
\textsuperscript{13} Мартirosian A. A., Аршагикинили, Ереван, 1974, рис. 23а.
\textsuperscript{14} Խաչատրյան Ժ. Դ., Արտաշատ II, տաբ. XI, 1:
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surface of the handle is covered with painting with thin red lines. Fragments of similar vessels were discovered in the ancient settlement of Kosh\textsuperscript{15}.

In the collection of ceramics of the Avan settlement a special place is held by fragments of small elegant jugs differing in the thoroughness of making and high quality of surface polishing. We can single out the fragments of necks of two thin-walled jugs with complex profiled rims, one of which has a red, and the other a black-polished surface (table 637).

Two fragments belong to the light brown pitchers with elongated necks adorned with small-ribbed profiling of the surface - *cannelures* (table 636). Another fragment presents a small jug with a straight elongated neck and a bent rounded rim. The surface of this jug is covered with a light pink coating (table 636). In the variety of methods and forms of surface treatment of pitchers and their ornamentation we can single out two fragments of vessel walls, the ornament of which was done with the method of polishing - local technology having a long tradition in Armenia: applying a polished ornament was widespread since the Late Bronze Age (table 71-3).

The handles of pitchers also provide certain information about the techniques of ornamentation (table 62). In one of them the ornament in the form of alternating oblique shaded segments is applied to the surface, in another case, the ornament of sunflower seed-formed type (table 42) is placed in the hollow - at the bottom of the groove passing along the outer surface of the handle. The depth of the groove is 0.5cm and the width of the handle is 2.5cm.

We should especially mention the discovery, for the first time confirming the fact of branding ceramics in Armenia, evidenced since the days of the Kingdom of Van (table 621). It is a handle of a small brown jug which has an imprint of a rectangular stamp depicting a dog (table 252).

A separate group of the household ceramics of the Avan settlement are pythoi which are conventionally divided mainly into three types (tables 32, 33-35, 69).

We should also mention the discovery of the fragment of a large brown-clay two-handed pythos (the thickness of the crock - 1.3cm), the swollen globular body of which was painted in red, with traces of polishing. It is decorated with a broad ornamental belt in the form of circularly repeated groups of at least three inscribed red-linear chevrons, with a descended top and at the top adjoining the red encircling stripe with a thickness of 1cm, beautifully standing out against the light brown unpainted background of the vessel surface (table 32).

There were discovered also cranial bones from jar-burials with traces of trepanation operations (table 28).

A special place in the ceramic material of the settlement under study has a hand

\textsuperscript{15} Оханян С. У., Шамириман аник-ічіріш сарнардивчоцуваны ыяшындабы. Патрия археологияхи ыылымчылыгы. 1989, 2, ҕ. 217, ып. VII, 7:
churn, reused as a vessel for the inhumation burial (table 301; table 312). In the vessel, together with the remains of a decomposed skeleton various items were revealed. The character of the items - beads and children's bracelets - allows us to conclude that remains of a little girl were buried in the churn. The churn is a pythos with an egg-shaped, little elongated body. The neck is lost at the base of the neck. At a height of 37.5 cm from the bottom there is a through hole, designed with a small protruding ring-shaped outlet with a diameter of 4 cm, retreating from the surface of the vessel for 1 cm, designed to test the readiness of the oil and for the outlet of the fluid, formed as a result of churning. The surface of the Avan churn is light brown, well-smoothed and polished.

As the excavations of monuments showed, hand churns were known in the Armenian Highland since the Late Bronze Age, and existed later as well. According to ethnographic data, hand churns of the same form are presently used in the rural areas both in Armenia and in the neighboring regions.

A considerable number of the ceramic fragments discovered during the excavations are pots made both on the potter’s wheel and hand-fashioned (tables 36-37; 70-71). Some of the vessels are decorated with incised ornament motifs of wavy, comb-shaped or sunflower seed-shaped type. We found two intact vessels belonging to dinnerware and functionally designed, obviously, for the storage of vegetable oil.

A special group is formed by vessels with a draining spout, which are considered to be vessels for milk (table 38; table 64). As a rule, they have a bloated body with a wide neck and a thickened, outwardly bent rim. The spout designed in the form of a trefoil is attached under the vessel’s rim. The diameter of the neck of such vessels reaches 26 cm. The surface can have different shades - from red to tan, and it is usually covered with engobe and polished. In Avan there was discovered a fragment of such a pitcher with a bright red high gloss polished surface, enlarged size, close to the famous vessel from Armavir.

In Armenia, drinking bowls with a wide, outwardly bent rim should be referred to deeply traditional forms of ceramic production dating back to the Kingdom of Van epoch. Cups-bowls of the Ervanduni and Artashesian periods are the characteristic form of ceramic production, occurring in a wide range of the monuments under study (Jrarat, Berd, Norashen, Argishtikinili, Kartchaghbyur, Hatsavan, Oshakan, Garni, Armavir,

---

16 The vessel was laid vertically in the immediate vicinity of the wall foundation in the western part of the excavation site. The burial in a hand churn, found also in the ancient cemetery of Oshakan in a similar (in shape and size) vessel, allowed the reconstruction of the missing pieces of the Avan churn.

18 Թիրացյան Գ. Ա., Культура древней Армении, табл. XXXVII.
Artashat, Dvin, etc.)\textsuperscript{19}. In the Avan settlement cup-bowls represent one of the most common types of dinnerware as well. We can often see bright red samples, which, like the black ones, are distinguished by the high quality of surface polishing. Some samples are painted near the rim, often from within, and sometimes from the outside, with black concentric \textit{ovolos} against a red background (table 67). In some cases the oval pattern is replaced by an ornamental plant belt.

Functionally also, obviously parallel to the preceding, one of the most common forms of dinnerware in the classical Avan settlement are hemispherical cups - the so-called \textit{Megara type} - combining borrowed forms with the local tradition of surface treatment (table 55\textsubscript{2}). The cups are mostly covered with polychrome painting of dark concentric \textit{ovolos} against a light background, groups of which are embraced by double semi-circular belts of black and red. The \textit{ovolos} are combined with the floral motif that occurs on its own, completely ousted the previous one. There are some samples painted from within with solar ornaments. The cups are also decorated with lattice ornaments, sometimes covering the outside of the vessel as well. A separate group is formed by egg-shaped cups, richly decorated with polychrome painting of the external surface (table 55\textsubscript{1}). The Avan findings complement the known collections of data of ceramic types, introducing their original features into the elements of painting (table 68).

To one of the most common types of ceramic dinnerware in the classical Avan settlement belong \textit{bowls} as well, differing in their diversity and sizes (tables 46-54; 72-79). The form of the vessels themselves, as well as the modeling of the rim and periphery reveal connection both with the Armenian traditions, and with the features characteristic of the Hellenistic world. In addition to the above-mentioned bowls connected with the deep tradition of shaping of the local ceramic production, there are also those whose shape is directly borrowed from Greek pottery. Excavations revealed fragments of such a vessel, allowing to fully reconstruct its shape. It is an elegant deep cup-bowl, having a hemispherical body with a circular tray (table 57), turning at the top (with a gentle curve) into short sides with a winding modeling and rounded, slightly curved inward rim end (table 48\textsubscript{1}). From the outside the transition line of the body into the rim is marked with a shallow circular groove. The form of the cup-bowl is borrowed from the Greek ceramic production of the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BC. Analogues are known, for example, among the red-lacquered ceramics of the Northern Black Sea coastal area of the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries BC\textsuperscript{20}. Vessels of this type have been found in northern Bactria\textsuperscript{21}. In Avan another fragment of a cup-bowl of a similar shape, but of a larger size was discovered. Bowls close in shape are known to us based on the materials of excavations in Artashat\textsuperscript{22}.

\textsuperscript{19} Կարապետյան Ի. Ա., Հայաստանի նյութական մշակույթը մ.թ.ա. VI-IV դդ., Երևան, 2003, էջ 40, աղ. 26: 

\textsuperscript{20} Археология СССР, Античные государства Северного Причерноморья, Москва, 1984, табл. СXXXVII, рис. 61.

\textsuperscript{21} Археология СССР, Древнейшие государства Кавказа и Средней Азии, Археология СССР. Москва, 1985, табл. CIX, рис.16.

\textsuperscript{22} Խաչատրյան Ժ. Դ., Արտաշատ II, նկ. 28, 9, նկ. 37, 1:
Of particular interest is a *fragment of a painted vessel*, analogues of which are extremely rare in the ceramic material of Armenia of the ancient period (table 55). Until now only seven samples have been known. Among them two intact vessels and four fragments were found at different times during the excavations of Armavir. Another piece of such a vessel was discovered in Artashat. G. Tiratsyan who first published all the known samples, describes them as flat-bottomed vessels with uniformly expanding walls, elongated body, low, not wide neck and slightly bent rim. The vessels are thick-walled, of uneven peculiar baking, made of poor sedimentary clay having an admixture of sand and small pebbles. These massive heavy vessels, resembling in their form a vase for flowers, are notable for their two-colour painting. The surface is covered with a thick layer of dark red paint and is polished. The Avan find is presented by a fragment of the board section of the body with a preserved segment of the lower belt made with a yellowish-whitish paint. The fragment was discovered during the study of the third, western excavation site. The discovery of this fragment allows to prolong the dating of the vessels of the type under study from the 4th-3rd centuries BC (Armavir, Artashat) to the 2nd-1st centuries BC, which apparently had a cult purpose.

One fragment belongs to the thin-walled *amphorisk*. Its bottom with a pointed end was found. The surface is polished, light brown (table 63). The fragment of the handle with a characteristic ledge at the edge belongs to a small kantharos-type vial with a light brown polished surface. There are numerous and various finds of simple moulded *lamps* of light brown, reddish and dark brown, greyish-brown and black colours (tables 61, 84).

We should especially mention the extensive collection of wide flat-bottomed dishes with a low circular tray and low ledge protuberant from the outside (table 56). The surface of the dishes is covered with red-brown engobe followed by finishing with a polishing technique. They are made from good sedimentary clay on a potter's wheel. The elegance of form, the high quality of surface treatment, the brightness of its colouring, evoking a feeling of festivity, certainly satisfied the tastes of certain layers of society. That is why it was normal to find the dishes in the most important center of ancient Armenia - in its capital cities, Armavir and Artashat, in Garni - the summer residence of Armenian kings, in a number of settlements (Mokhrablur, Dvin, Shirakavan and Avan-Arinj) situated close to the most important international trade route.

A significant place in the ceramic material of the Avan settlement is also occupied by fragments of large massive *portable brazier-hearths* with a flat bottom and wide,

---

23 Тирацян Г. А., Об одной группе расписных сосудов из Армавира (Армения), Советская археология, 1971, 2. с. 246-249.
24 Նախշքարյան Ա. Ֆ., Հայաստանի հելլենիստական ժամանակաշրջանի գունազարդ խեցեղենի զարդամոտիվները (Թեկնածուական ատենախոսություն), Երևան, 2003, էջ 52.
25 These dishes imitate the samples of the so-called models of "Pergamon ceramics".
26 Խաչատրյան Ժ. Դ., Արտաշատ II, էջ 110-111, նկ. 37,8, 9,14,15. Քոչարյան Գ. Գ., Դվին III, էջ 48:
vertically spaced sides (tables 58-59; 80). Such hearths were known in the Armenian Highland since the 3rd millennium BC. Perhaps they were used for heating of dwellings\textsuperscript{27}. However, the complete absence of soot on the interior surface rather indicates their use as stone-bakings for a type of bread called "karehats" ("stone-bread")\textsuperscript{28}. The brazier-hearths had a round (oval) or a rectangular shape. One fragment presents the upper part of a ceramic furnace - \textit{tonir}. The ready-made products - grain and flour, could be stored in large and medium-sized pythoi, in the walls or bottom of which ventilation holes were opened for the preservation of products. For baking bread pastilles flat-bottomed brazier-hearths could be used. The bread was baked in clay tonirs, a fragment of one of which was found during the excavations.

Summing up the general results of the study of the ceramic material from the excavations of the classical settlement Avan, it can again be emphasized that the presented collection of the items of ceramic production illustrates the continuity in the development of ceramic art in Armenia for millennia, revealing, on the one hand, traditional local basis and on the other - elements infused in the Hellenistic period, - a conclusion repeatedly noted by researchers. There is no doubt that many ceramic samples were products of the local pottery industry\textsuperscript{29}. A prerequisite for its prosperity was the existence of local natural resources - excellent clay and river sand necessary for the manufacture of quality products and most importantly - the long traditions of Armenian ceramic art.

A number of finds illustrate the existence of another kind of artisan production - weaving. These are diverse and numerous round clay \textit{spindle whorls} - heads of wooden rods - spindles for wool yarn (table 85\textsubscript{2}). The yarn was used for embossing fabrics. For this purpose vertical weaving looms were used, the plummets of which were found during the excavation of the settlement (table 85\textsubscript{1}).

In the Avan settlement were found stone mill tools - grinding stones, with the help of which grain milling was done for getting flour (table 83\textsubscript{1-3}). The main type of mill used by the residents of the settlement was the so-called boat-shaped grinding stone, revealed as a whole and in fragments. A classical grinding stone of this type, found in the settlement, is made of porous basalt and is comprised of a massive lower stone, having a slightly concave, oval shape resembling a boat; and of the upper rubbing stone also having an oval shape, with flattened lower and protuberant upper surfaces. Grinding stones of a similar design are characteristic of a wide range of ancient societies and were used for thousands of years. A statue is known depicting the process of grain grinding, found during the excavations of monuments of the dynastic Egypt. In Armenia, the stone grinding stones were used from ancient times until the end

\textsuperscript{27} Կարապետյան Ի. Ա., Հայաստանի նյութական մշակույթը մ.թ.ա. VI-IV դդ., էջ 42-43, աղ. 29, 5:
\textsuperscript{28} Տեր-Մարտիրոսով Ֆ. Ի., Կերամիկա Էլլինիստիկյան Արմենիան իս պատմական սուբյեկտ, Ավտորեфերատ դիսսերտացիա կանդիդատի պատմական գիտություններ, Երևան, 1984, էջ 15.
\textsuperscript{29} The excavations revealed potter’s tools - \textit{stone polishers} for smoothing and surface treatment of the products on a potter’s wheel (table 86). They have various forms - round, oblong, triangular; different sizes and are made of different materials - tuff, gravel, sandstone, limestone.
of the first millennium BC. In the settlement another type of grinding stone was discovered, reflecting the process of evolution of improvement of this ancient tool, set in motion by a lever. As mentioned by B.N. Arakelyan, such grinding stones appeared in Armenia in the 4th-3rd centuries BC, and existed along with the archaic ones30. A longitudinal cavity was made in the upper stone of the grinding stone for securing in place the horizontal, wooden arm, operated with one hand (table 83, fig. 3). This increased the working surface of the base on which one could move the upper stone along an arc within the boundaries of the semicircle. This led to a noticeable facilitation of the working process, a better quality of grinding and increase of working efficiency. Later this evolution led to the appearance of high-performance tools for grain grinding - circular millstones. The millstones, as well as the boat-shaped grinding stones and those with lever control, similar to the Avan finds, were found, e.g. during excavations in Artashat. They are typical of other monuments of Armenia of the classical period as well31. A grinding stone with a longitudinal tray for the lever was found in the Avan settlement during the study of the southern excavation site.

It is possible that to the tools for processing agricultural products also belonged the item made of porous basalt in the form of a truncated cone with a small central hollow in the upper surface, which could be used as a *mortar* for grain peeling and pounding and other household purposes (tables 601-2, 834).

One of the important artisanal works of the settlement was blacksmithing, the products of which were discovered during excavations, along with numerous finds of waste products. These were primarily objects made of iron, presented mainly by a collection of a variety of *knives*. The collection of *knives* includes five fragments and two intact objects. It should be noted that knives close in their form were found, in particular, during the excavations of ancient Garni32. Also *scissors, bars* and a *fragment of a nail* (table 81) have been found. The fragments of *scissors* should be referred to household objects made of iron (table 812). The former was found in a destroyed jar-burial where the silver drachma of Alexander the Great was found (table 15, b). The blade has a round shape. The end has no sharp edge and is also rounded. In Armenia finds of scissors close in their form belong to the inventory of jar-burials discovered in Garni, Artashat and other monuments. Another fragment of iron scissors was discovered in the cultural layer and differs from the former in the form of the blade having a straight back, round edge and pointed end.

Two bars, one of which has a square section and a preserved length of 6.6cm (table 811) refer to the collection of iron objects. They are most likely hefts of arrows or darts. It should be noted that the iron rods with a square cross-section are characteristic

30 Аракелян Б. Н., Арташат 1, Ереван, 1982, с. 30-32. Հայկազագայն ի., Երկանքի առաջացումը ըստ Գառնիի պեղումներից հայտնաբերված նյութերի, Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, 1964, 1, էջ 264-274.
31 Հայկազագայն ի., op. cit.
32 Аракелян Б. Н., Гарни II, с. 47-48, рис. 12 а, 126.
of hefts of this type of weapon. Long hefts of arrows were discovered in the monuments of the Ervanduni era. For example, in the settlement of Norashen arrows (darts) with a heft length of 7.5cm were found33.

All of the above-mentioned items of iron were discovered during the study of cultural layers of the settlement and are the crafts of local blacksmithing (table 82). The development of this type of craft in the settlement is evidenced by numerous finds of iron slags and wastes of the processed iron ore.

Unlike the iron objects, many of which were found during the excavations of the premises near the wall foundations, bronze products were found mostly in the inventory of burial places. Their collection includes a variety of simple female ornaments and toiletries - bracelets, rings, earrings, hair clips. Besides, a bronze fibula and a small bronze bell were found (tables 26-27).

The bronze bracelet with a curved back belongs to the inventory of the infant jar-burial, for which a vessel-churn was used. The dimensions of the longitudinal and transverse diameters of the bracelet are 3 and 4 cm. The preserved end of the bracelet is flattened and cross decorative incisions can be detected. As can be seen, the ends of the bracelet were stylized as snake heads. Judging by the small size, the bracelet belonged to a child. The design of the end of the bracelet in the form of snake heads is associated with the early tradition of jewelry production of ancient Armenia. The second child bracelet from the same burial has a more simplified form - it is round, without a curve in the back, with ends slightly going behind each other. The third bronze bracelet was found in a room with a toroidal base in the cultural layers of the southern excavation site. It is made of a circular in the cross-section bronze wire and has a regular round shape. In the aforementioned infant jar-burial a collection of bronze earrings of fine bronze wire of circular cross-section, as well as a bronze ring were discovered.

 Bronzes pins for adorning the hair and clothing were found during the excavations of the premises of the northern and southern excavation sites; three items were found. They are made of bronze rods with a circular cross-section. Pins found in the Avan settlement are on the whole identical to the finds in other monuments of Armenia, sometimes revealing differences in the design of ends. It should be noted that in addition to the metal hairpins, bone pins with shaped heads were used as well. Such a bone pin was discovered in the Avan settlement as well (table 267).

A bronze fibula was found there, as well - a fastener in the shape of a lyre (table 261). It has a semi-circular shape with a wide back - a flattened oval cover sheet. The fibulas are considered a certain social indicator as they were clothing accessories of city-dwellers, as were fasteners for securing the capes - chlamydes34. They were used by ordinary residents of urban type settlements as well, along with button-fasteners. Bronze fibulas have been found in a number of Armenian monuments of the Hellenistic period, but they are relatively rare. Fibulas with leaf-shaped oval sheets are

33 Կարապետյան Ի.Ա., Հայաստանի նյութական մշակույթը մ.թ.ա. VI-IV դդ., աղ. 40:
34 Խաչատրյան Ժ. Դ., Գարնի V, Անտիչն անզեկություն, Երևան, 1976, է. 117-118.
characteristic of the Ervanduni epoch.\footnote{Կարապետյան Ի. Ա., Հայաստանի նյութական մշակույթը մ.թ.ա. VI-IV դդ., էջ 79-80, աղ. 51, 8-9:}

Objects made of silver are represented by two \textit{earrings in the form of crescents} (table 26, fig. 2). They have identical shape, but different sizes. The bigger earring has a nominal diameter of 2.5cm, the smaller one - of 2cm. The rings belong to the inventory of the pair of jar-burials (table 14), discovered at one of the foundations of the northern excavation site (table 3). In the same inventory a silver coin was found - the abovementioned Parthian drachma of the 80s-70s BC.

To toilet ware belong two \textit{stone buttons} functionally similar to the fibulas described above (table 26, fig. 4). Light gray (gravel) and black stones with a dense structure served as the material for their production. The surface is well-polished.

\textit{Products made of bone} are represented by several items, among which there is a bone pin with a shaped head, teardrop-shaped beads - from red deer teeth and amulets - talismans made of phalangeal bones of limbs of small cattle.

The \textit{bone hairpin} was part of the decoration of the head, could serve to secure the high hairstyles. The rod circular in the cross-section (with a diameter of 0.4cm) has an artistically shaped head in the form of a figure of a biconical shape, placed between two discoid bases with a diameter of 0.5cm. The end with the point is lost.

The \textit{collection of beads} represented mainly by the inventory of jar-burial (tables 20-24) is particularly diverse. The beads of the Avan settlements vary in the material they are made of. Beads of carnelian, agate, onyx, black stone (jet), glass, glass and clay pastes different in composition and color, as well as bone - teeth of red deer, have been found. In the production of beads the finest gold and silver foil was used. The shape of the beads is diverse as well - spherical, barrel-shaped, prismatic, oval, cylindrical, biconical, round - discoid, tear-shaped, etc.

A considerable amount of gild round beads of transparent glass has been found. They may be considered the most numerous (together with glass beads) material in the collection. The beads belong to the inventory of two jar-burials [in the damaged one - 47 beads (table 19), and in the churn - 83 specimens]\footnote{Алексеева Е. М., Античные бусы Северного Причерноморья, с. 27-33. Е.М. Alekseeva uses the terms "beads with inner gilding" and "gilded beads" as synonyms.} The beads found in the churn are mainly of the same type, of a circular, slightly flattened shape, with a diameter of 0.3cm. A small number of these beads has a brighter metallic coating - perhaps here gold was replaced with silver. The beads from the destroyed jar-burial (with the drachma of Alexander the Great and the gem with an image of a dog) (table 25\textsuperscript{1}) vary in size - larger ones, having a diameter of 0,7cm and smaller ones, with a diameter of 0,45cm and 0,3cm. In Armenia, such beads were known from the Ervanduni period and continued to exist until the first centuries AD.

A special place in the collection is occupied by the beads with "eyes", which in addition to the aesthetic values had a symbolic value. One can rather confidently assert
that from the earliest times "oculate" beads had been associated with solar symbolism, keeping the meaning of a talisman and having protective properties. The theme of "the eye," as the expression of the properties of a talisman, had been known since the earliest times and was widely used in the production of beads at different times, taking a special place in Armenian ethnography, where the eye was associated with the sun (cf. արեգ/արեգակ - areg/aregak where areg means sun, -ակ(n)/eye)37. We should also point out the bead-pendants from the burial in the churn made from red deer teeth. In Armenia the deer had been associated with sun worship since the earliest times. The tooth of the deer had to be endowed with the function of a talisman.

There were discovered also sacral objects (tables 87, 88, 89).

A number of finds testify to the development of wine-making in the ancient Avan settlement. This is primarily a bath-tank to gather grape pulp after secondary, extra grape squeezing on a stone winepress (table 60-3-4). A similar type of tuff bath was found in ancient Dvin, as well as in urban areas of Arnavir38. There the stone winepresses were opened. The Avan bath sample was discovered at the damaged section of the cultural layer, not far from the wall foundations of the northern excavation site. The bath-tank is made of black tuff and has the shape of an irregular tetrahedron.

It should be noted that the traditions of wine-making, rooted in Armenia from the Eneolithic epoch39, reached the times of the Avan settlement, and continued there for centuries, as evidenced by traces of the winery dated to the 3rd-5th centuries AD and further.

The studied and dated archaeological material of the Avan-Arinj settlement of the period of the kingdom of Great Armenia of the Artashsian epoch discovered as a result of excavations, constituted the basis of the exposition of the ancient period of the Museum of History of Erevan.

Translated from Armenian by
S.E. Chraghyan

38 Տիրացյան Գ. Ա., Կարապետյան Ի. Ա., Արմավիրի 1977-1978 թթ. Պեղումները, Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, 1979, էջ 251-254: Քոչարյան Գ. Գ., Նոր նյութեր Դվինի հելլենիստական բնակավայրի վերաբերյալ, Լրաբեր հասարակական գիտությունների, 1990, 2, էջ 100-101:
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Sacral objects: phalangeal bone of a sheep (goat) limbs. Avan-Arinj (pitcher burial), 1st century BC.
PHILOSOPHY AND LAW
The works of David the Invincible (Anhakht) contain analyses not only of the traditional problems of philosophy - problems of ontology, gnoseology, logic, ethics, esthetics, but also questions concerning cosmogony, mathematics, medicine, biology, grammar, psychology, musicology and so on. However, among all the problems, the questions of logic occupy, by their significance, a peculiar place in the works of David the Invincible. We mean that not only do we find the Armenian philosopher’s interpretation of Aristotle’s “Prior Analytics” and “Categories” and of Porphyry’s “Introduction”1 extremely interesting, but also while considering philosophical questions he treats them first of all as a logician, puts forth his understanding of logical methods and ways, by means of which he analyses the object of his research. That refers, in the first place, to David the Invincible’s “Definitions of Philosophy”. And so one may state with certainty that the main content of the Armenian philosopher’s theoretical heritage is his logical conception, his study on logic.

Unfortunately, not all of the Armenian thinker’s works have come down to us, neither are the ones that have come down to us unimpaired. That circumstance, of course, makes it impossible to obtain a full idea about the scientific interests and conceptions of David the Invincible. However, those which are available indisputably testify to the breadth of his interests and depth of his consideration of problems dealt with, to the fact that the science of logic intensively developed in the Armenian reality during the 5th and 6th centuries.

The high level of analysis of problems of logic, the statement of questions and their creative solutions by David the Invincible testify to the fact that he had his logician predecessors in Armenia, that the science of logic had its traditions in the Armenian reality still long before the appearance of David’s works. To that fact testify also the extremely rich and the so supple composition of concepts. The categorical apparatus of the science of logic in David’s writings expressed in ancient Armenian with ease and grace. David’s works signify an important stage in the development of the Armenian logical-philosophical terminology.

Treating the subject of logic David the Invincible agrees neither with the opinion of the Stoics, who maintain that logic is a part of philosophy, nor with the opinion of the Aristotelians, who maintain that logic is a tool of philosophy. Following the Platonists David the Invincible founds a thesis that logic is both a tool and a part of philosophy. At

1 Դավիթ Անյաղթ, Վերլուծութիւն («Ներածութեանն» Պորփիւրի /համահավաք քննական բնագիրը, թարգմանությունը Ս. Ս. Արեւշատյանի): Երևան, 1976:
the same time he indicates in what respect logic serves as part of philosophy and in what as its tool. When logic serves to prove the existence of real objects, then it is a part of philosophy, and when it acts as rules of thought, then it serves philosophy as a tool\(^2\).

In essence, Aristotle’s attitude as to the main thing in logic, i.e., demonstration, is fully supported by the Armenian logician\(^3\). Although David the Invincible closely links logic with philosophy, consequently it mainly bears a gnoseological nature, none the least the Armenian thinker never doubts that the forms of thought, operations of the mind are studied by means of a special science, by logic. Regarding the task of the latter, the investigation of division, definition, demonstration and analysis, David scrutinizes the question in respect of the sequence of those logical means. In doing so, one feels his tendencies to explain the place and role of logical categories in knowledge with respective analogues in the everyday working activity of people, tendencies towards a materialistic interpretation of logical categories\(^4\).

On the other hand, scrutinizing the sequence of the investigation of logical categories, David the Invincible states that investigation must be realized from the simple into the complicated\(^5\).

David the Invincible has an idea about the nature of such a relation between the general theory and the particular, thus, speaking in today’s language, the former is the metatheory of the latter. Such, first of all, is philosophy with regard to other sciences and in particular to logic\(^6\).

In the works of David the Invincible logic comes into play also as a theory of argumentation. One of the characteristic peculiarities of all the works of the Armenian thinker is revealed in the statement of his views in the form of argumentation, and while arguing he displays some or some other features of argumentation. He examines, in particular, the rule of the refutation of the opponent’s thesis (the method of opposition and the method of equality in disputation), the nature of the antithesis of the thesis to be proved, and also of all the possible arguments in favour of the antithesis, the conditions in which they resort to an authoritative opinion and so on.

A number of problems referring to the logical theory of concepts is examined in the works of David the Invincible, such as types of concepts, specificity of such concepts which are investigated by philosophy, interconnection and inter-conditionality of the categories _genus_, _species_, _difference_, _proper sign_, _accidental sign_.

According to David the Invincible’s viewpoint, the division of concepts into genera and species has a relative character, the one and the same concept may appear in

---
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3 «Մեկնութիւն «Ստորոգութեանցն» Արիստոտելի», կերարատ է էած Յ. Մանանդեան, Ս.-Պետերբուրգ, 1911, էջ 17:

4 Դավիդ Անյաղթ, 1980, էջ 45:

5 Ibid, p. 114.
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some relations as a species, in others as a genus. Such a connection, according to his interpretation, conditions their joint study. The problem of property takes up much space in the works of David the Invincible. However, the most interesting thing in the theory of concept, in our opinion, is David the Invincible’s study on definition, and also division. Not accidentally did the Armenian philosopher entitle his chief work otherwise than “Definitions and Divisions of Philosophy.”

Setting himself the aim of analyzing the nature, the essence of philosophy, David the Invincible resorts to an all-sided examination of the definition and division of the concept of philosophy. And to accomplish the projected task the Armenian thinker makes the very logical means of definition and division an object of investigation.

David the Invincible subjects the analysis of the following problem referring to definition: what is definition; the distinction of definition from means resembling definition; genesis of definition, structure of definition; perfect and imperfect definitions; number of definitions of philosophy; validity of a given number of definitions of philosophy; sequence of definitions of philosophy; whom those definitions are established by.

The indicated problems are not of the same order. The first five of them refer to definition itself as logical operation and hence it has an all-logical nature. The remaining four questions refer to the definition of a definite phenomenon, namely philosophy. However, in order to solve the second task, David the Invincible undertook to create his own system of definitions, on the basis of trying to understand anew all that had been created by the science of logic.

While examining the problem of definition David does not avoid possible objections which he calls “very strong and hard to solve.” To them belongs the self-reflectiveness of definition both as a logical operation in general and also as a definition of categories. From David’s interpretation of a given problem it ensues that while defining, in essence, we have to do with a set, which contains itself as an element of that set. He also remarks that a logical situation with definition is by far not a unique case in the theoretical-cognitive difficulties of knowledge. As an analogous example he points out mathematics. David the Invincible sees the solution of a problem in the formulation of the logical rule that not everything said regarding the conjunction of two objects (or the object and its property) may be confirmed about each of those objects.

David the Invincible made up his mind to work out formal rules, which might make it possible to distinguish correct definitions from incorrect ones. Relevant here is the rule that in definitions words and the defined are in reverse dependence. When the quantity of words in a definition is increased, the defined are decreased, and vice versa, when

---

7 Դավիթ Անյաղթ, 1980, էջ 186.
8 Ibid, p. 137.
9 Ibid, p. 44.
10 Ibid, p. 76.
the quantity of words is decreased, the defined are increased\textsuperscript{11}. By that rule, David the Invincible, in essence, spreads the property of the reverse dependence between the extent and content of concept on definition, or in other words, tries to understand anew the nature of the structure of definition through the view of the interrelation of extent and content of the defined and defining concepts. And that also means that he indicates the connection between the structures of concept and definition, which enriches our knowledge in relation to both the former and the latter.

The examination by David the Invincible of the rule forbidding negative definitions creates the possibility not only to ascertain the relative action of that rule but also to precisely outline the boundaries of its application\textsuperscript{12}. That is possible to formulate as follows: if all the species of a given genus except one are defined, then it is possible to give it a negative definition pointing out that it does not possess the properties of the other species of the given genus.

David considers the reversibility of a defining concept in relation to a defined concept an important condition of perfect definition\textsuperscript{13}. That is the rule which, later in the history of logics was called the rule of proportionality.

Describing the types of definition (as to genus and distinctive sign, as to subject and aim, as to both, et al), David the Invincible starts from the idea that the cognitive meaning of every type of definition and their applicability depends on the concrete tasks of definition, on the sphere of its application, on the character of the object the concept about which is defined.

Highly interesting are those considerations which David the Invincible expresses about the question regarding the interrelation between the name of an object and the definition of the concept about the object, about the genesis of definition, about the bases on which definition is built, about requirements regarding the plenitude of definition, about the interrelation between definition and means replacing definition, about the cognitive significance of definition, and so on.

David the Invincible analyses six definitions of philosophy, However, his contribution to the history of scientific thought consists not in the fact that he suggested new definitions (or a definition) of philosophy, but in the fact that (a) relying on the definitions of philosophy given by Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle, he creates a system of definitions of philosophy demonstrating that not any one definition, taken separately, could display the essence of philosophy; (b) he reached the idea of definition through contrariety. According to David the Invincible the singular and the particular “anti-define each other”\textsuperscript{14}, he characterizes the particular as the undefined singular, and the singular as the definite particular. In another connection the Armenian thinker observes that species and genus, mutually correlate, and when defining the genus it is necessary to

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid, pp. 46-47.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, p. 182.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{14} Մատենադարան, ձեռագիր N 1716, է. 116p:
define also the species, for the study on genus and species is the same thing. Summing up his system of definitions of philosophy, David the Invincible emphasizes that on the whole the beginning and the end are linked. For the Armenian thinker the question is not only about the requirements of interconnection of concepts in the system of definitions, but also that interconnection is the unity of contrarieties; (c) David the Invincible proceeded, in particular, from the position that in order to know an object it is necessary to study it from all sides, in its connections and interlacings with other objects, and that implies the necessity of different definitions for the one and the same object; (d) he also stated that different definitions for the one and the same object may have different cognitive significance, and consequently, when creating a system of definitions, they must be classified beginning with the more important moving towards the less important, which acts as a peculiar manifestation of the principle of subordination; (e) while creating his system of definitions of philosophy, he constantly had recourse to argumentation and enriched the art of argumentation; (f) David considered definition in close connection with division; (g) David explained the origin of the indicated categories by the working activity of people, their real relations, considering the former (categories) as mental reflection of the latter; (h) he thought over, in his own way, all the main things which had been created by logical thought in the domain of investigated categories enriching the studies on logic, on definition and division of concept.

From his teaching on statement, those fragments of David the Invincible’s theoretical heritage have come down to us which refer to the theory of inference. In spite of the fragmentariness of Armenian thinker’s considerations reaching us, it is still possible to conclude David’s creative approach regarding the logical theory of statement. A number of his ideas preserved their freshness even for our times. Pertaining to those ideas is the problem of the interrelation between the logical and its linguistic expression. As a particular manifestation of the given problem, David the Invincible analyses the definite article and shows that it plays one role in grammar and another in logic. With the help of the latter David the Invincible distinguishes statements according to their quantity. According to his interpretation statements without the definite article are tantamount to particular while with the definite article they are tantamount to general statements.

From the viewpoint of development of ideas in the history of logic, the interpretation of some logical connectives by David the Invincible is not devoid of interest. First, some of his expressions leave no doubt that the Armenian logician accurately realizes the role of the logical connective conjunction in the process of judgement, argumentation. More important, in some cases of his interpretation of common linguistic expressions the conjunction (in Armenian “և”, in English “and”, in Russian “и”) does not always fulfil its standard function. So, in one case David joins two simple statements by means of “and”, the first expressing authentic knowledge, the
second unauthentic\textsuperscript{15}. That means also that the indicated statements are at different levels in cognitive thought, and from that viewpoint the commutativeness regarding their relation in the structure of a compound statement is uncertain. Since commutativeness is one of the characteristic peculiarities of conjunctive statement, then it may be supposed that the case of the connective “and”, examined by David the Invincible, is not a usual content of conjunction.

The idea that the property attributed to the totality of objects (object and property) is not always possible to attribute to the object (to the property) each taken separately, and vice versa, the property attributed to objects taken separately, is not always possible to attribute to the totality of those very objects, is in essence used by David the Invincible to elucidate the question about conjunctive statement and also to solve the procedure of obtaining conjunctive statement from simple ones or from the decomposition of conjunctive statement into simple ones.

Neither did the Armenian logician leave out of his field of vision the examination of the cognitive role of connectives expressing varieties of disjunctions, negations as well\textsuperscript{16}.

David the Invincible regards the essence and tasks of inference in close link with cognition and its forms. The correct understanding of its nature, according to the Armenian scholar, serves as a means to refute skepticism and agnosticism. He reveals the meaning of syllogism both for knowledge of the surrounding reality and for self-knowledge\textsuperscript{17}.

David notes five types of inference - demonstrative, logical (=dialectical, in the ancient Greek sense), rhetorical, sophistical, poetical (=mythical)\textsuperscript{18}. The basis of that classification is the relation of statements in the structure of inference to truth. He investigates the nature of syllogism, its premises and terms.

The analysis of the Aristotelian syllogism, realized by David the Invincible in the 5th-6th centuries, is not only interesting as it is from the viewpoint of David the Invincible’s logical conception in the aspect of those new logical ideas which we notice in the Armenian logician., but also as an answer to some yet unsolved questions in the history of formal logic. We mean in particular the so-called “truthful form of the Aristotelian syllogism”. Jan Eukasiewicz distinguishes the latter from the traditional syllogism, for Aristotelian syllogism has the form of implication, and as such it is a proposition. And a proposition must be either true or false. While traditional syllogism represents a number of statements, which are linked with conclusion by means of the

\textsuperscript{15}Մատենադարահատ, ձեռագիր N 1716, էջ.101 p:
\textsuperscript{16}«Մեկնութիւն «Ստորոգութեանցն» Արիստոտելի», էջ 112; Մատենադ., ձեռ. N 8 132, էջ. 213 p:
\textsuperscript{17}Դավիթ Անյաղթ, 1980, էջ 305:
\textsuperscript{18}Դավիթ Անյաղթ, Մեկնութիւն ի «Վերլուծական» Արիստոտէլի /համահավաք քննական բնագիրը, մանաբանության, բարբառագրության և որոշակիության տարեգիրը, Երեւան, 1967, էջ. 40:
word “consequently”. According to that interpretation, traditional syllogism is not a proposition in form.

It should specially be noted that Jan Łukasiewicz has in view the contemporary texts of the “Analytics”. However, it is known that those texts as well as the other writings of Aristotle have undergone different changes and additions. The texts which are the subject of David’s interpretation are doubtlessly much nearer to the Aristotelian original ones.

The Armenian thinker stresses, first of all, that the Aristotelian definition of syllogism spreads over all kinds of syllogisms, and that Aristotle gave the definition of syllogism in general. The examples produced by David as illustrations of Aristotle’s understanding of syllogism do not correspond to Jan Łukasiewicz’s interpretation of Aristotelian syllogism. From Jan Łukasiewicz’s viewpoint they must be characterized as traditional syllogisms. As for Jan Łukasiewicz’s supposition that Aristotelian syllogism was, until Alexander, always expressed in the form of implication and the transformation of Aristotelian syllogisms from the form of implication into the form of inference is probably conditioned by the influence of the Stoics; there is no ground to extend it also over David the Invincible. First, David the Invincible’s view regarding that question, by the statement of David himself, differs from that of Alexander’s. Maintaining the thesis that Aristotle defined every syllogism, syllogism in general David the Invincible especially notes that the interpreter of the “Analytics” Alexander wrongly interpreted the Aristotelian understanding of syllogism. Second, David expresses his negative attitude still sharper towards the conceptions of the Stoics in general and towards the interpretations of syllogism by the Stoics in particular. He mercilessly criticizes the “Stoics” clumsy construction of syllogisms. Finally, and this circumstance should necessarily be underlined with all clarity, David the Invincible’s analysis of the Aristotelian definition of syllogism is textual: he moves from word to word commenting on every one of them separately and all the consequences resulting from the given word and its position in the definition. By such an approach and by the indicated attitude towards Alexander and the Stoics, David the Invincible could not deviate, to any extent, from the form of the Aristotelian syllogism either. Hence there is all the required ground to regard the forms of syllogism in David the Invincible’s interpretation most adequate to the “true form of the Aristotelian syllogism”.

While criticizing the Stoics’ conceptions of the nature of syllogism, David the Invincible expresses a number of ideas which certainly represents interest to understand the development of ideas in the history of formal logic. The Armenian logician analyses the inference of the relations of equality and of inequality. David perceives the deficiencies in the Stoics’ conceptions in the fact that they take the minor
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20 Аристотель, Соч. в 4-х томах /т. 2/ с. 15-18.
21 Դավիթ Անյաղթ, 1980, էջ 321:
22 Նույն տեղում, էջ 326-327:
premise twice and drop out the major one. In David the Invincible’s opinion, the indicated inferences can assume a correct form if the corresponding rule of inference, in the form of a general premise, is introduced into their structure - (things that are equal to one and the same thing, are also equal to one another; the one which is greater than the major, will be significantly greater than the minor). Thus, David imparts a more strict form to the Stoics’ inferences. However, David does not suggest any similar demand for the Aristotelian syllogism, he does not consider that the axiom of syllogism in the form of a general premise should appear in it. It is possible to suppose that the difference in David’s approach to Aristotle and to the Stoics is conditioned by his fine understanding of the specific peculiarities of Aristotle’s logical system, on the one hand, and the Stoics’, on the other, from the viewpoint of the formalization of their logical systems. David’s assumption of the possibility of replacement in the expression of the universal quantifier by equivalents in meaning by other expressions while analyzing the Stagirite’s conceptions is an evidence to his weaker demand from the viewpoint of formalization concerning Aristotelian syllogistic than his demand suggested while analyzing the Stoics’ logical constructions.

David the Invincible has also a number of interesting and fruitful ideas which include; the problem of sequence (if Aristotle’s conclusion of syllogism contains new knowledge in comparison with premises, so in distinction from that, according to David’s interpretation, the Stoics have identity of conclusion and premises in some syllogisms); conditions of validity of inference; cognitive meaning of concrete varieties of inference; question about perfect and imperfect syllogisms; direct inferences (in that connection David’s attempt to distinguish a concrete-object peculiarity from an abstract one in predication is of particular interest, for the purpose of differentiation, in some cases, between a valid reversibility of statement and an invalid one); conversion of syllogism, and so on.

In his writings David the Invincible investigates also the problem of demonstration, its types, and following Aristotle, he prefers deductive demonstration, placing it, because of its cognitive significance and certainty of inferential knowledge, higher than inductive demonstration, and also analogy.

The Aristotelian laws of thought are not subjected to special analysis by David the Invincible. However, the whole context of his investigations shows what an important significance does he impart to the demands originating from the laws of identity, of contradiction and of the excluded middle? For all that the demands of the laws of identity in David’s interpretations, in essence, are directed against the relativism of Cratylus; he combines the logical content of the laws of contradiction and of the excluded middle with the gnoseological tasks of the discovery of truth.

Some of David the Invincible’s works bear such an important significance both for the history of logic and for that of philosophy that, being a scrupulous textual analysis of

23 «Մեկնութիւն «Ստորոգութեանցն» Արիստոտելի», էջ 73:
24 Ibid, pp. 44-45, 71.
a number of the sections of Aristotle’s works, they give us the possibility to restore the real picture of the Stagirite’s studies and their place in the development of the ideas of logic and philosophy.25

On the whole, David the Invincible’s study on the subject of logic, on the forms of thought, is one of the important pages of the ancient period of the history of logic, and the world history of logical studies would have suffered without due regard for all that has come down to us from the Armenian thinker’s theoretical heritage.

---

REMARKS ON THE METHOD OF RECONSTRUCTION

Gevorkyan H. A.
Academician of NAS RA

Reconstructive activity is a necessary component of the work of the historian, archaeologist, anthropologist, social philosopher, when he re-builds another reality, another society, another culture as a whole and tries to place in this wholeness - 'rationally', cogently, coherently - the given particular facts\(^1\). It can be said that any fact - event, deed, cultural monument, and so forth - is not an historical, cultural, social etc. phenomenon in itself, until yet it is incorporated in an integrity: much like the case of a stone, not even a carved one which gets its value, purposefulness, its immanent meaning when the restorer defines and finds its position in the wall of a ruined castle and places it there.

Besides the traits which are common for the reconstructions used in the field of the humanities, there are also peculiar features characteristic for each branch of it. Below I shall begin by considering the problem of reconstruction in historical studies, i.e. the historical reconstruction in a proper sense\(^2\), and shall focus on the case of reconstruction in the field of the history of science as the form most of all objectivized, alienated from the knowing subject; then I shall pass to the specific case where science, viewed in its historical perspective, displays its relationship to the humanities, similar to the other forms of culture. And after that I shall dwell on the key problems of reconstruction in cultural studies.

Historical memorials embody in objective, substantial forms certain ideas and concepts, practical aims, ideals of morality, art and knowledge; as a result of human activity and as a creation of human hands, reason and emotions they are bearers of definite ideal contents. Hence, the task of the historian is to reveal these contents and to conceive them - to 'read' them off - in their own language.

A parallel with art would discover an important trait of scientific knowledge and the peculiarities of its historical reconstruction.

A work of art always supposes a unity of the substantial form and the ideal contents: paraphrasing the well known aphorism, in the case of art it is important not only what is said (expressed) but how it is said, too. The lines, colors, sounds, words

---


\(^2\) As to the field of general history, a more or less significant role is ascribed to historical reconstruction in different theories of the philosophy and methodology of history. The extreme approach supposes that written history is wholly a construction by the historian. Noteworthy are the conceptions developed in traditions of John Dewey's pragmatism (see Dewey 1938: 232-239), in the American schools of constructivism and presentism (J.H. Robinson, C.L. Becker, C. Beard, L. Goldstein et al.).
are not mere means for the incarnation of a feeling, emotion, idea; they themselves in their unrepeatable combination form the work of art as the very one, unique incarnation of that feeling, of that emotion, of that idea. And the latter ones, in their turn, become indeed aesthetic feeling, aesthetic emotion, aesthetic idea only when they are embodied in lines, colors, sounds, words.

All this turns out to be very important for the historical reconstruction of works of art: we need not only and not mainly to know, what was portrayed in the painting which reached us in damaged form, and what story related the poem which we know only in fragments; no, we need to contemplate and to hear them in colors and stanzas: only then will they appear before us as works of art, in the very sense of the term, and be of aesthetic value, and not merely a knowledge about them. It is impossible to imagine an historical reconstruction of memorials of art, exactly as works of art, in other way - by translating them into contemporary, known, understandable, intelligible for us forms of expression and representation. (Of course, such a transfer - description and retelling, - though not being an historical reconstruction, may be useful for acquainting us with a work of art.)

But the reconstruction of the history of science seems to be of quite a different kind. In the reconstructions of the evolution of science it is supposed that in every historical period science contains, in abstraction, all the previously obtained knowledge and by its form also it is more perfect: its language and theoretical structures are quite able to give us an adequate account and understanding of the knowledge of past epochs. This model has a solid ground in a certain aspect of modern science when it manifests itself as objective knowledge, i.e., as knowledge, which in an ideal case is alienated from the knowing subject, from the historical-and-cultural conditions of its formation. Present-day science as the outcome of previous evolution is considered to be a logically organized, systematic whole comprising the past states and results in a condensed, or, as German philosophers would say, in aufheben form. Therefore it is thought that the logical organization of present-day science itself proposes to the historian of science the logic he must discover in the history of science, - the logic substantiated in the succession of scientific ideas, conceptions, theories, which are arranged on the vector-arrow oriented towards present-day ideas, conceptions, theories. This brings to the idea of the acceptability and even necessity of a logically corrected history when, in particular, any fact is disregarded if it does not fit to be placed on the vector-arrow oriented to the present state of science. There is another consequence too - the translation of historical memorials of science into the language of contemporary science, the understanding of past ideas, conceptions, theories in the key-note of present-day science, of its ideals. So in this case, unlike the reconstruction of works of art, we think we have the right to represent the knowledge of the past epochs in our contemporary forms of knowledge and in our contemporary language of science, even if we have got our testimonies of the past knowledge from the fragments.
of another context written in another language. The idea of *diachronous* wholeness of science lies at the basis of this viewpoint.

Thus, what was thought to be quite unacceptable in the case of reconstruction of works of art appears to be a quite legitimate, even routine way of work for the historian of science. This procedure, which is analogous to the translation of a literary work from one language into another, can be applied to historical reconstruction of science, in the hope that no damage is done to the reconstructed memorial of science. This procedure seems natural for the historian of mathematics who retells ancient writings in contemporary language, puts the problems, proofs and solutions in modern symbols and formulae, supposing that for mathematics it is the contents of knowledge that is important, and not the language, not the system of recording the knowledge. But in this field already, in the history of mathematics, the first difficulties arise: the divergence of the language used in the reconstruction from the language of the historical data results in the discrepancy of the constructed picture and understanding. This concerns, primarily, the period of the beginning and shaping of any mathematical theory and/or discipline until it becomes autonomous. It may be called the period of *pre-history* of a given mathematical discipline, and the reconstruction of it, if done by the same procedure, turns out to be diversiform, always controversial; because in these cases the historian of science distinguishes and picks out from the syncretic whole what he is interested in, but what was not distinguished definitely in the consciousness of that historical time. Let's take an example: the pre-history of the ideas of infinitesimal calculi. The rudiments of the methods of this calculi and of its basic concept - infinitesimal - may be sought and revealed in Antiquity, beginning from Zeno, but - by picking these rudiments out of other contexts. One can get them by a particular interpretation of Democritus' atomism. Then, mathematical infinity is the subject of chapters 4-8 of Book Three of Aristotle’s "Physics" but of course in another context: the science about nature, Aristotle claims, deals with quantity, movement and change, and their description is bound up essentially with the concept of continuity, defined through the concept of infinity, namely, infinite divisibility. By these physical considerations and in the context of his *physics* Aristotle examines infinity in general and mathematical infinity in particular. And, lastly, infinity is considered in Euclid’s "Elements", i.e. in the context of geometry. Geometrical models are typical of Archimedes' consideration and application of the methods of infinitesimal.

All these cases, of course, do not yet contain the infinitesimal calculi in its strict sense; nevertheless just this calculi prescribes now to the historian the goal and the vector of his research, for the sake of which he thinks he has the right to carve up and

---

3 Here is an example: “If we want to understand the Egyptian fraction calculation as they understood it, we must introduce fractional denotations which would not resemble ours - with numerator and denominator, but would be based on Egyptian denotations,” notes the well known historian of science, B.L. van der Waerden, in his *Ontwaken de Wetenschap* (Waerden 1935).

4 Such an interpretation was given by S.Lourié in a special investigation (Lourié 1935).
to extract from philosophical, physical, geometrical contexts some chosen fragments and to put them upon the historical vector-arrow oriented to the infinitesimal calculi.

More it concerns the historical reconstruction of the empirical science. Physics in its strict sense, as a natural science based on experiment and carrying out its proofs in logico-mathematical language, begins from the works of Archimedes and of the Alexandrean school. However here the 'experiment' is understood peculiarly and differs from the experimental-empirical basis of modern science originating from the Scientific Revolution of the 17th century. An apparent case is the example of Archimedes' mechanics. In the Alexandrean school too the 'experiment' took the form of mechanical models to which perceptual geometrical images could be applied and thus the transition to mathematical language became possible. As to "Physics" of Aristotle, the fragments of which are used in reconstructing the prehistory of ancient mechanics, this work of Aristotle, even by its subject, differs from what is called physics as a natural science. Aristotle's "Physics" comprises his learning on the most general principles underlying the nature; it would correspond, in the later history of science, to philosophical reflection upon nature: that is the domain of science where "hypotheses are invented". So it was not accidental that the founders of the new, empirical science, the science about nature, rejected Aristotle's physics. (And only later the consciousness came again that the science about nature cannot avoid philosophical reflection upon the principles underlying the nature.) Nevertheless the historian of science, composing the pre-history of ancient mechanics, picks out from the context of Aristotle's "Physics" the fragments which he thinks to be the initial rudiments of that mechanics. As a result, the wholeness of physics in the Aristotelian sense, of course, is damaged. But the historian of science has some reasons for such a destructive work: already in Antiquity, during the shaping of the ideas of the mechanics of Archimedes and of the Alexandrean school, such a reconstruction really had taken place, i.e., a selection and re-interpretation of Aristotelian physics was done, having in view the ideal of mechanics as a natural science.

The discrepancy between the picture, constructed in this way, and its original was fully understood in the cases when this discrepancy turns to non-adequacy. In

---

5 Thomas Kuhn relates how he discovered for himself the difference between two approaches to Aristotle. At the beginning, "like most earlier historians of science, I approached these texts knowing what Newtonian physics and mechanics were. Like them, too, I asked of my texts the questions: How much about mechanics was known within the Aristotelian tradition, and how much was left for seventeenth-century scientists to discover? Being posed in a Newtonian vocabulary, those questions demanded answers in the same terms, and the answers then were clear": Aristotle and Aristotelians had still known little and in many cases were wrong. This is natural. "But was it conceivable that his errors had been so blatant?" Then the consciousness came that the very approach to these texts must be different: "For the first time I gave due weight to the fact that Aristotle's subject was change-of-quality in general, including both the fall of a stone and the growth of a child to adulthood. In his physics, the subject that was to become mechanics was at best a still-not-quite-isolable special case..." "Lessons learned while reading Aristotle have also informed my readings of men like Boyle and Newton, Lavoisier and Dalton, or Boltzman and Plank" (Kuhn 1977: xi-xii. Italics mine. - H.G.). By these considerations Kuhn thinks it is a mental aberration to suppose that the ideas of modern
particular, to have the full panoramic view of scientific evolution the historian has to present all the variety of ideas, conceptions, theories of every historical epoch, and not only those which were due to arrangement on the vector-arrow oriented to present-day science. Then, the historical approach leads to an historical understanding of the very concept of science, of its form, contents and scope, as various in different epochs and different civilizations. But this change of viewpoint not at all means to consider science placed simply in historical-and-cultural context. It means to consider science as a phenomenon of culture, with such characteristic traits of any cultural phenomenon as the individuality, the uniqueness and, therefore, the transiency in historical space and time. So to this change of viewpoint corresponds the transition from the prime idea of diachronous wholeness of science to the idea of synchronous (F. de Saussure would say better - idio-synchronous) integrities in the history of science. As a result, the reflection upon it and its reconstruction cannot use direct translation, but must be mediated by its interpretation.

In particular, considering the history of science in Western civilization from this point of view, the historian will avoid the destructive approach to syncretic integrity of the pre-history of a scientific discipline or theory. In this case Aristotle's physics will not be considered as an episode in the chain binding it with the mechanics of Archimedes and of Alexandreans and, then, with the beginnings of modern physics. On the contrary, the rudiments of the future mechanics in Aristotle's "Physics" themselves will be considered as an episode in the integrity' of that physics - in the sense Aristotle meant to ascribe to this term. Similarly, the historian of science dealing with the Middle Ages will pay attention to medieval learning as a whole, comprising the trivium and quadrivium, and to their relation to philosophy and theology. Just the 'seven liberal arts' formed the medieval learning, let not identical in meaning with present 'scientific knowledge' and all the more with 'science' in the traditional English sense of the term - as 'natural science'. But the historian of science can show that the position and the functions of the 'seven liberal arts' as a whole in the system of medieval culture are of such a kind that will allow it to be represented as a corresponding parallel to (but not identical with) scientific knowledge in the system of culture of modern times.

This last viewpoint could be thought to exclude and replace the former one as not correct, not adequate. However I think they are not extreme alternatives but complementary kinds of reconstruction, each of them having its own relevant cases and

physics ensue from Aristotle's physics. Such an approach cannot be taken without reservation. Particularly, it is impossible to avoid the fact that in the evolution of ideas such a re-interpretation and re-construction had really taken place.

6 Thus we come to the viewpoint widely shared, though variously, in the philosophy of history (O. Spengler), of language and culture (F. Boas), in the methodology of science (T. Kuhn) of our century.

7 Saussure 1966.
domain of applications and its own restrictions. And each of them in its applications must have in view the limitations put by the other one.

Thus, the history of science cannot reject the narratives in which contemporary theory prescribes to the historian the goal and the vector of his research, thus determining the search and selection of historical facts and their arrangement. As I noted above, such treatment of historical realities is not the 'invention' of historians of science, it has an objective analogue in the historical evolution of science itself: every new scientific phenomenon (idea, conception, theory), after it has established itself in science, post factum gathers around itself the facts of the historical past, re-interpreting them and placing them on the vector-arrow directed to that phenomenon.

As to the second viewpoint which avoids the destructive approach to syncretic integrities and considers science as a cultural phenomenon, there are cases when it is the only possible way to present, illustrate, demonstrate to us an historical fact, the individuality, uniqueness and transiency of which cannot be overcome. Here is a striking example. There were several medieval Armenian pharmacopeias which were in use even up to the 19th century, especially due to their phytotherapeutic information. The most famous was the medical encyclopedia by Amirdovlat of Amasia, compiled in the middle of the 15th century. A strict set of parameters is used here in description, indications, directions for preparation of drugs, instructions for use etc.; characteristics corresponding to these parameters are used as well in descriptions of diseases. In accordance with tradition ascending up to Antiquity, the basic classification parameter is the 'nature' of stuffs, i.e., their composition according to four elements - water, soil, air, fire, in different but fixed quantitative proportions, and four kinds of attributes - damp, dry, cool, hot - in different degrees. Let it be that from the contemporary point of view, in the context of present scientific theory, all this is 'naive' and 'false' but at one time it composed a closed theoretical system, described in the best way the existing medical and pharmaceutical facts and was valid, so to say, inherently. It was also, in a practical respect, a coherent system of measurement through which a quantitative estimation of qualitative characteristics of stuffs was given and thus well grounded recommendations were made concerning the preparation and use of drugs and the procedure of treatment. Its translation and adaptation to the language of contemporary medicine and pharmacology is simply impossible and meaningless. But if the historian of science

8 A similar case of the complementarity of two approaches we shall come across below.

9 Here are two striking examples. Though cybernetics came into existence in 1948 when Norbert Wiener's book appeared, but to make a full history of it, historians begin their narrative from some ideas (teleology, man-machine problem etc.) developed in ancient Greek philosophy and in science and philosophy of the last four centuries. Similar is the case of mathematical logic, which in a strict sense, was shaped at the border-line of the 19th-20th cc. but is considered as developed from the propositional logic of the Stoics. This peculiarity of historical reconstruction, which seems to be of epistemological interest only, has general significance. The fact that every generation re-writes history anew, is not only the result of discovering new data and of the development of the methodology of historical research, but largely because of this factor. There are, however, limitations which prevent this reconstructive activity from becoming a kind of free construction.
rejected on this ground these theoretical constructions as imperfect and/or false, he would deprive himself of the possibility of even understanding the facts of scientific interest contained in them.\(^{10}\)

So here we had an illustration of a case when a text of the history of science demonstrated itself as a memorial of culture; in this case the analysis of its language and the reconstruction of its meaning requires an approach specific to cultural studies. That is what is discussed below.

There is no need to discuss here that the representation of the plurality of cultures through the plurality of languages cannot be considered as an analogy, as a mere useful parallel. It has an essential character and is confirmed by the fact of the integrity of language and culture in the Boasian concept of ethnology, in Sapir's and Whorf's ethnolinguistics, in the writings of Kroeber, C. Kluckhohn et al., the founders of the contemporary American cultural anthropology.\(^{11}\) That is why, without entering into details, in connection with the method of historical reconstruction, I shall dwell on some characteristics of language in this trend of cultural studies.

The abstraction of the language from the wholeness of culture, which is practiced in linguistics, does not work in cultural studies.\(^{12}\) For anthropology and ethnology, culture is an integrity, a syncretic whole, and hence, language is a manifestation of it: not even a mere part of culture, but a constituent in which culture realizes itself.

Two remarks on these assertions.

Through the abstraction of language from the wholeness of culture linguistics gains the chance for essential use of the methods of the exact and natural sciences, thus transferring from the scope of the humanities to the scope of science, meanwhile anthropology persists to remain a branch of the humanities; the applications of the methods of exact and natural sciences, if and when possible here, remain auxiliary means, not touching the very essence of cultural studies.

The second remark concerns the notion of wholeness, as it is applied to language and culture. The nuances of this notion are displayed by F. de Saussure in the following way. Every language, he states, is an individual, closed system with a characteristic

\(^{10}\) These assertions about the independent value and intrinsic validity of theoretical constructions developed in another (different from modern science) system of ideas and concepts, being very important in the cultural aspect of the history of science, do not in the least imply an epistemological equivalence of them to the theoretical constructions of modern science based on experiment and carrying out its proofs in logico-mathematical language. Of course, cultural studies show the remarkable adaptability and conformity of the systems of concepts (and of institutions) equally of every culture to natural and social environment. But the idea of the epistemological equivalence of them to science becomes possible when science is considered merely as one of the instrumental-and-operational means for that adaptation and conformation. There are many and different manifestations of this idea, beginning with Bergson's motto 'Instinct and intellect are two different and equally beautiful solutions of one and the same problem', and up to conceptions equalizing science to metaphorical world-constructions. In all these cases the practical instrumental-operational aspect of the origin and function of science is exaggerated and the peculiarity of science - the objectivation and alienation of knowledge and its products from the knowing subject - is quite ignored.


\(^{12}\) Cf. Lévi- Strauss 1965: ch. IV.
structure, i.e., with an inner coherence and coordination of components comprising the system. Of course, there are certain constant principles permanently present in transitions from one language to another; languages being unique by their inner structures, of course, are comparable and distinguishable by certain common parameters - language universals, types of oppositions inhere in them etc. But this kind of comparability is external, it does not reveal the essential characteristics of a language: the living image of a language is given by its inner structure. This opposition of internal to external correlates to the opposition of the synchronous approach in linguistics to the diachronous. Meanwhile the former approach regards the relations of the co-existing various components in a whole and, thus, studies them in the form as they are perceived by one and the same "collective mind" (the bearer of the language), - the latter approach regards the relations between similar elements in a succession which is not perceptible by one and the same "collective mind"; the facts belonging to different language systems (and subsystems) are grouped and classified according to an abstract pattern put on them.

Almost in the same terms F. Boas characterizes the notion of wholeness of culture and two methodological approaches in cultural studies. In ethnology all is individuality, he states; we have to study each ethnological specimen individually, in its history and in its medium. Similar phenomena, belonging to different cultural integrities, cannot be classified in one group. Because, although the outward appearance of two phenomena may be identical, yet their immanent qualities may be altogether different: therefore arguments from analogies of the outward appearance are deceptive.

Boas does not doubt in the least the equal scientific value of the comparative method, i.e. the method of classification of phenomena, belonging to different cultural wholes, in abstractions of classes for the sake of deducing laws; this method has been productive for elaborating comparative psychology, evolutionism in mind and society, represented by the works of Tylor and Morgan, etc. But different is the case of ethnology, he states. What is remarkable in his assertions concerning ethnology, is the idea that a single phenomenon, the individual, gets its meaning and value when it is placed in a whole, and in this integrity it becomes a prospective subject of cultural studies. "The art and characteristic style of a people can be understood only by studying its productions as a whole," Boas notes. And the example he gives definitely clears up this important nuance: in the ethnological collection of the Indian tribes' museum the musical instruments cannot be classified and arranged by their types (string instruments, flutes or drums). We want a collection of them arranged according to tribes, together with all the other implements of a tribe. Because "the character of their music, the only object worth studying, which determines the form of the instruments, cannot be understood from the single instrument, but requires a complete collection of

13 Saussure 1966.
14 These statements one can find in Boas' "The Principles of Ethnological Classification", "Anthropology" and other writings (in: Stocking 1974).
the single tribe..."15. Indeed, let's have in view that the distinguished, individual existence and self-development of music as an art form, relatively independent and separated from (and abstracted from) rites, customs, social life etc. (and their material implements), takes place in other societies; it is not characteristic of societies of the Indian tribes’ type.

So if we, as yet non-critically, accept the aforementioned conception of language and culture, we will come to two different kinds of the method of historical reconstruction, according to the two approaches in cultural studies.

One of them, which results in arranging individual facts or events (empirical data) in class-type and law-like generalizations, has its own heuristic value for historical reconstruction: such generalizations allow to find the place of each historical and cultural phenomenon in the constructed classification table and in the evolutionary development regularity, and thus to reconstruct (to foresee and define), through comparisons and analogies, individual facts and characteristics as vacant links in the chain. The periodic table of elements and the periodic law would give an illustration (though simplified) of the work of this kind of reconstruction. The best demonstration of the heuristic resources of this kind of historical reconstruction would be the classical theories of the philosophy of history: narrative history presents the historical facts or events not yet dissected by the reflective mind and in succession and relations, as if independently given to the historian; meanwhile the philosophy of history aims to represent history conceived through a certain principle and reconstructed in a pattern according to that principle. In this way missing details, traits, characteristics etc. are appended by interpretations, and thus the picture of historical phenomena is accomplished. This is the way of writing the philosophy of history by Voltaire as a synopsis of human culture, and by Hegel - as a process of self-realization of the idea of freedom. This is the way of writing history itself by Spengler and Toynbee, with their paralleling of whole fragments of the history of apart standing epochs: of Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and Modernity, of their civil history, history of the arts and sciences.

This kind of reconstructions in historical studies, and in cultural studies equally, in its extreme cases, (a) presents a "logically corrected" picture of history and culture, and (b) the individual historical and cultural fact appears in it as an illustration, manifestation, demonstration of the underlying general pattern.

In the pervading mood for denial of metaphysics a negative attitude towards this approach in historical and cultural studies predominated. The main objection comes to the point of validity of conjecturing the principles, categories, patterns which lie under this kind of reconstruction. On the other hand, however, the rejection of this approach results in the discarding of not only metaphysical conjectures, but also of any effort of theorizing. So the question is whether such a perspective of evolution towards the narrative and descriptive character of historical and cultural studies is acceptable. Is it possible a reflective knowledge, be it that of the historian's, the ethnologist's, the

15 In Stocking 1974: 62.
linguist's, etc., free of inherent tacit premises, categories, ideas, ideals, values etc.? Just they are explicitly formulated and used in theoretical constructions, in elaborating patterns, i.e., the map put over empirical and observational data. Most scholars use them implicitly, covertly in their historical, cultural, linguistic etc. studies, despite the overt general propensity for immediate knowledge, i.e., for gaining knowledge not mediated by conjectured principles, categories, patterns. But many of them, Kroeber and C. Kluckhohn in particular, are proponents of explication of those principles, categories, patterns. Even Bidney, keenly criticizng Kroeber and Kluckhohn for their apprehending "culture as a logical construction of the anthropologist" (Bidney 1996: xli), was not content with the predominating absolute cultural pluralism in cultural studies as a result of the disregarding of the philosophical systematization of cultural history and metaphysical concepts and norms. But, he states, anthropology must rise above the descriptive stage of empirical science, and for this purpose, "comparative studies of cultures and their values must be made with a view to demonstrating universal principles of cultural dynamics and concrete rational (i.e. not philosophical-metaphysical - H.G.) norms capable of universal realiza"16. And, again, Bidney, who, among other ethnologists, had severely criticized the traditional concept of evolutionism, discusses in his "Theoretical Anthropology" the possibility of supporting the concept of evolution, proposing a "theory of emergent evolution" founded on explicitly re-defined principles. This conception of evolution "involves a synthesis of opposites, the principles of continuity and discontinuity, dependence and independence, common elements and qualitative novelty... The theory of emergent evolution which I propose synthesizes all three principles by limiting the role of each in relation to the others"17. Special attention must be paid to this point: the classical conception of evolution could not contain the notion of the emergence of a principally new phenomenon; in the "logically corrected" picture of history and culture, as I stated above, the individual historical and cultural fact appeared as a mere manifestation of the underlying general pattern. Similar considerations must be expressed concerning the historical-comparative method which also fell into disgrace as a consequence of the progress in cultural studies. As to the sphere of history and linguistics, the historical-comparative method and the corresponding historical reconstruction, though in revised and improved forms, have never been abandoned completely.

So it must be stated that no study has succeeded in avoiding the task of theory construction, making assumptions and generalizations, explicit formulation of principles, categories etc., of course, together with a readiness and willingness to improve and re-define them in accordance with empirical evidence.

Now we have a starting point for the presentation of the problem of reconstruction corresponding to the other approach: the approach typical of contemporary cultural (as well as linguistic, social, historical) studies, the approach oriented to integrated

wholes - not yet dissected by the reflective mind - in which a cultural (linguistic, social, historical) phenomenon occurs.

The best introduction to this kind of reconstruction would be the considerations of Ernst Cassirer concerning the task of the historian (and of the philosopher of history) but describing equally well the methodological approaches in cultural and linguistic studies. (Let's state also that historically the ideas of neo-Kantianism, and of German philosophy and methodology of science and of the humanities in general, have had a great impact on the formation of contemporary cultural studies.)

The first thing that must be said is that, according to Cassirer, man lives not in the "world in itself"; he lives in the "human world", objectivized from his individual existence, thought, feeling, - in the "human world" mediating his relations and interaction with the "world in itself". Man, Cassirer states, "has no separate individual being - he lives in the great forms of social life - in the world of language, of religion, of art, of political institutions. He cannot live his own life without constantly expressing it in these forms. He creates verbal symbols, religious symbols, mythical and artistic images - and it is only by the totality, by the system of these symbols and images, that he can maintain his social life - that he is able to communicate with other human beings and make himself understood by them"18.

The single forms of culture in their task of "building up a common world of thought and feeling", i.e., "the universe of culture", "do not follow a preconceived and predetermined scheme, a scheme that may be once and for all described in an a priori way of thought"19. The uniqueness of the "forms of culture", of these "systems of symbols and images", i.e., their divergency in space and time, calls for a corresponding to it reconstructive activity as the specific trait of historical studies. This divergency characterizes also the relation of the system of symbols and images of the historian to that of the historical reality he studies. The task of the historian consists not in translating the system of symbols and images of historical reality into the language of his own symbols and images. The task of the historian consists in reconstruction, in the re-building of another life, diverse in space and time, which has found its external expression in forms, symbols, material things. This task becomes feasible because of the method specific to history. In the English version of the lecture "The philosophy of history", delivered at Yale University, the term interpretation is used to denote this method, but its German correlate is given as historisches Verstehen - "historical understanding", and the task of the historian is called historical hermeneutic,20 It is important to note that Cassirer's interpretation as historical understanding is not at all in

18 Cassirer 1979: 137. It is worth noting that David Bidney refers to Cassirer in a very favorable context: 'The cultural process is not reducible to psycho- biological processes simply because culture is a product of human creativity expressed in a world of symbolic forms - a thesis formulated from a neo-Kantian point of view by the philosopher Ernst Cassirer in his classic 'Philosophy of Symbolic Forms" (Bidney 1996: xxxix).

19 Cassirer 1979: 72-73.

20 Cassirer 1979: 129, 139. The translation of Versteken and its derivatives as interpretation in certain contexts became the ordinary use of the term.
fact an irrational (or, at least, non-rational) concept of Verstehen used by the 'philosophers of life', G. Simmel and W. Dilthey. Cassirer’s historical hermeneutic, and historical reconstruction, is a method rationally explicable and rationally applicable. Specifying historical knowledge, it does not in the least stand in opposition to scientific knowledge. It is described in the following way. The empirical basis of historical studies consists of special kind of physical objects - historical documents and historical monuments which are given to the historian as material things: written characters, inscriptions, colors on a canvas, statues, buildings etc. "But in all these material things the historian sees something quite different. This material becomes for him, so to speak, transparent. He does not study it for its own sake... What he finds in it is the testimony, and as it were, the revelation of past human life. He cannot immediately understand this life. All he knows about it are only single and scattered fragments. But here his real task begins. He has not only to collect these fragments, he has to complete them and to synthesize them; to bring them into a coherent order, to show us their unity and consistency... This intellectual and imaginative synthesis is what we call history - just as much as the synthesis of particular material phenomena in space and time according to general laws is called natural science"21.

This ‘intellectual and imaginative synthesis’ is well illustrated by an analogy with the deciphering of an unknown written text in an unknown language. And this analogy also demonstrates the essential difference between Cassirer’s historical hermeneutic and the other conceptions of Verstehen which contrast it to rational ways of comprehension and associate it with irrational intuition, with empathy as the only means of conceiving the alien cultural world.

Of course, this conception of reconstruction requires some reservations concerning the understanding of historical reality and of the place which historical monuments occupy in it. Historical monuments as material things, of course, acquire their meaning when they are placed in an historical-cultural whole, but historians would hardly agree that these monuments are merely means of historical comprehension, as if a medium through which the true history, the real life exposes itself. And the forms of culture - language, myth, art, religion, science etc. in which the life of man proceeds turn out to be as if the only genuine historical reality, the true history. Meanwhile, despite these assertions, historical monuments are for the historian not merely a medium, some transparent things only, through which true historical reality exposes itself, but an essential part of that reality; and when their systematic wholeness is restored, it belongs to historical reality given in the reflective mind, as well as the forms of culture embodied, materialized in them and exposed through them. Indeed, we have a twofold, or rather, two-faced, reality here.

This conception of historical hermeneutic with its rational core is in consonance with Gadamer's hermeneutic and the tradition it created and, in general, with

21 Cassirer 1979: 136-137.
phenomenological and hermeneutical trends connected with the names of Heidegger, Ricoeur, Derrida, et al.

The concept of interpretation, the central concept of the studies in these traditions and trends, is well illustrated by opposing it to the traditional logical analysis of language. In his "Philosophy in the Twentieth Century" A.Ayer, with a feeling of perplexity, narrates the conception of Heidegger, especially its metaphysical part with which the key questions of truth, existence, temporality etc. are connected (Ayer 1984: 226-230). I should describe the situation in the following way. The polysemy of words and expressions, the images associated with them, the metaphorical nature of language, the possibilities of its non-uniform understanding and interpretation in a cultural milieu - all this is the very core of the philosophical essays of Heidegger. But Ayer, being a philosopher of linguistic analysis, in the history of philosophy is interested in the rational reconstruction of thought, and his linguistic analysis discloses the logically explicable semantics of language. Here somewhere an indistinct border-line lies between the two kinds of language analysis: hermeneutics ("archaeology of language") and logical semantics. Ayer, a prominent philosopher, certainly understands Heidegger, but refuses to recognize the legitimacy of his way of philosophizing: for the analytical philosopher the polysemy of language, métaphores, the images, associated with words and expressions in their use, only obscure the meaning of words and expressions and can lead to mistakes and misunderstanding of speech/text. For Heidegger, on the contrary, these peculiarities of language individualize the texts representing the memorials of philosophy, science, culture, and in the polysemy of words and expressions, in the images associated with them all the sacramental essence is hidden.

The potentialities of this method of reconstruction of meaning may be well demonstrated by the example of Heidegger's "Parmenides" (Heidegger 1992). It deals with a problem of seemingly narrow interest - the meaning of 'truth' in Parmenides' poem and its understanding in different cultural contexts; but as a result we have here a unique interpretation of ancient Greek thought and of the evolution of philosophy.

This method of the reconstruction of meaning is not restricted to the limits of the humanities. The memorials of science, as phenomena of culture, also can be read, understood, interpreted in this way. The best evidence of it is given by J. Derrida in his analysis of E. Husserl's 'The Origin of Geometry', in which he 'returns' the origin of geometry to the world of language, culture, history (Husserl 1996).

REFERENCES
DEMOGRAPHY
AND GOVERNANCE
The theological, literary, religious and musical rich heritage of the great Armenian thinker, poet, musician-composer, historian, political and ecclesiastical figure Nerses Shnorhali (1100-1173) was highly appreciated by literary critics, musicologists and prominent representatives of other spheres of intellectual culture. Incidentally, his poetical works, Armenian liturgical chants (շարական -sharakan), riddles were more often studied and evaluated than his prose works, including “Encyclical Epistle”. Meanwhile, it is one of Nerses Shnorhali’s exclusively valuable prose works which has theological, historical, public, social and political importance. According to M. Abeghyan: “This great writing of Catholicos Nerses is a very important historical document by its content, as well as a valuable literary work”. Referring to the purpose of the work, M. Abeghyan notes: “...he writes not only for the purpose of admonition, but also of teaching”. This remark is very essential for the right interpretation of its content and directivity. In 1995, Matenadaran named after M. Mashtots published the original of “Encyclical Epistle” with an extensive Introduction by E. M. Baghdasaryan who analyses and evaluates Nerses Shnorhali’s admonitions and exhortations as divine commandments addressed to spiritual and secular figures, and all the other classes of

---


3 Աբեղյան Մ., op. cit., p. 153.

society, emphasizes their significance for his time and later in the context of social, religious and political developments. According to E. M. Baghdasaryan it has had moral and educational significance for many generations and at the same time it is “an extremely important historical source for the coverage of numerous complex problems of that time, a highly appreciated linguistic monument in Armenology”⁵.

It should be noted that in some cases the literary source under study was mostly evaluated as a work reflecting the historical situation and social and religious developments of the 12th century, in which “the faults and defects and shortcomings relating to the life, state and occupation” of different social groups (religious figures, princes, merchants, artisans, peasants) “...were strongly criticized, thus, in “Encyclical Epistle” were exposed, in fact, the defective sides of the feudal society”⁶. Meanwhile, the provisions characteristic of the modern theory of public administration - the dominance of law containing universal and lasting value, justice, right choice of managerial personnel, mostly are singled out in this valuable work⁷. It was written in 1166⁸ when the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (1198-1375) had not been founded yet, thus in his work the role of the church in the field of regulation of the Armenian social and political and cultural life is also highlighted in conditions of absence of Armenian centralized power (Kingdom). At the same time, we believe that in the light of essential truths of the Christian faith “Encyclical Epistle” expresses criteria which inherently are universal for the behaviour of man and leader.

In this regard it is noteworthy that in the collection of articles (dedicated to the 800th anniversary of Nerses Shnorhali’s death) by famous researchers of the Institute of Literature named after M. Abeghyan, Matenadaran named after M. Mashtots and Yerevan State University, academician Victor Hambardzumyan emphasized: “by the force of artistic reproduction of actual events of life Nerses Shnorhali achieved such

---

⁵ Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 7:
⁶ Cf. Հակոբյան Գ., op. cit., p. 74.
⁸ In the period of the Armenian Princedom of Cilicia (1080-1197).
great universal generalizations as the new understanding of the concept of human being and the development of new behaviour towards the nature..."^9. In the same collection outstanding philologist V. S. Nalbandyan noted: “The problems of intellectual and moral education of the society and human being also occupied thoughts of the personality and poet who was deeply concerned with the political fate of the nation”^10.

Of course, in “Encyclical Epistle” the possible negative phenomena in the sphere of religious and secular activities are also pointed out, which always accompany people in almost all historical times in various forms. Nerses Shnorhali admonishes to refrain from them. Let’s pay attention to one of his admonitions: “I beg you to be cautious and keep your hands clean from diseases which are harmful and bring a curse upon you person”^11. Thus, he presented his vision of man and leader (without the above-mentioned deficiencies), according to different layers of society and religious and secular officials, which dominates in the content of “Encyclical Epistle” (or “General Epistle”). Perhaps, besides the historical and theological value this is another reason that since the day of its creation it had numerous publications - in Saint Petersburg (1788), Constantinople (1825), Venice (1830 and 1873), Ejmiatsin (1865), Jerusalem (1871), Antelias (1977)^12, Yerevan (1991 - journal “Գանձասար”; 1995 «Գիտություն» հրատ), New York^13.

In this article we attempt to discuss the peculiarities of man and leader created in “Encyclical epistle” especially that the role of man, as a creative being and leader (ruler) is huge in the socio-economic, religious, scientific and technical and political development of every country.

An image in fiction is usually created through the use of the methods and resources of psychological analysis, dialogues, actions of the literary hero, depiction of his behaviour and appearance, etc. The hero is often viewed as a collective image, to some extent as an abstract and idealized personality in the vision of the author of the literary work. In his first message addressed to the Armenian people Nerses Shnorhali specifically draws both the religious and secular image of man first of all as a social being, and a believer, worker, subject, and then, as a leader. Unlike the traditional

---

^9 Ներսես Շնորհալի (հոդվածների ժողովածու), էջ 7:
^11 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 91:
^12 Ibid, pp. 6-7.
methodology and toolset of image creation, the image of man and leader is formed with two fundamental peculiarities in Nerses Shnorhali’s work:

- first of all it is real, corresponding to certain principles and requirements, devoid of defects incompatible with social and religious life: as such, the image is not so much a record of the fact, but an expression of a desirable, thus a potential personality;

- secondly, the method of constructing the image is a preaching with fundamental religious and philosophical provisions, which is more substantial and influential than the sensory description of a literary image.

By the way, before proceeding to the critical analysis of man and leader created by N. Shnorhali, its lasting significance should be emphasized not only in the fields of devotion to the Christian faith, right construction of human relations, but also those of effective management of spiritual and secular life, establishment and strengthening of statehood. In that respect today and in the future as well, the image of man and leader created and in fact anticipated by Nerses Shnorhali may be actual and demanded. As such one he considers everybody: hermits and holy fathers of monasteries, bishops, priests, princes, warriors, citizens, farmers and women. Among them he distinguishes leaders since man may be a subject or a leader, as Nerses Shnorhali says: “... priors and those they lead…”14.

MAN IN NERSES SHNORHALI’S VIEWS

On the whole, according to Nerses Shnorhali’s religious and philosophical interpretation the following should be typical for man as divine commandments:

- infinite fidelity to the Christian faith, thus also to the true idea given from above,
- justice, fair treatment in various and complicated situations during all his activity,
- decency and honesty in human and labour relations,
- morality in the way of living and working activity,
- kindness towards the surrounding world and people,
- patriotism and commitment to the entrusted work,
- high responsibility for the performance of his duties.

14 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 101: “General Epistle”, p. 44.
It should also be added that as researchers of his poetical works testify: “To the greatest human virtues Shnorhali attributes power, courage and bravery, praising them in works written in various genres and content”\(^{15}\).

Nerses IV Shnorhali believes in high responsibility for the duties and commitment to the Christian faith by his own example; being ordained Armenian Catholicos (1166-1173) in a time when our nation, according to his words, “not only refuses to submit itself to and obey the judgement of divine laws, but also sits in unjust judgement upon the judges of the church... with logs in its eyes, with malicious slander and unbridled mouth, always sees the mote of transgression”\(^{16}\) in their behaviour, “because in this time of evil and diverse multiple authorities it is impossible to walk everywhere, to all parts of the world and preach the word of God like the holy apostles”\(^{17}\), “does not presently have a royal capital and assembly”\(^{18}\).

Nerses Shnorhali objectively felt all the obstacles that could hinder the realization of his mission. But because of the complicated reality in his words: “To deny the flocks their chief shepherd, to deprive them of his care, and to neglect them even while the sheep are being ravished by wolves is a sign of unfaithfulness”. And such was his judgement: “So that we shall not be completely fruitless before you, we, along with our bishops and vardapets, are determined to remind you in writing of that which was commanded by in the Old and New Testaments. Thus we resemble the great apostle Paul who not only proclaimed the Gospel in his travels through foreign lands..., but even while in bonds strengthened his disciples”\(^{19}\).

It is noteworthy that Nerses Shnorhali’s admonitions for human behaviour, according to social classes, thus differentiating and concretizing for them the content of the admonitions. The city dwellers, merchants and ns were admonished to live “with rectitude and with pure civility,” not to sell their “goods deceitfully”, but “with justice and rectitude sell the work” of their hands... \(^{20}\). Do not despise the peasants as ignorant ones\(^{21}\).

Nerses Shnorhali admonished the farmers and the people in general not “to corrupt the divine temple of your souls”, “not get drunk on wine brings debauchery and

\(^{15}\) Ներսես Շնորհալի (հոդվածների ժողովածու), էջ 17:

\(^{16}\) Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 59: “General Epistle,” p. 16.

\(^{17}\) Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 60:


\(^{19}\) Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 62, “General Epistle,” p. 18.

\(^{20}\) Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 156, “General Epistle,” p. 78.

\(^{21}\) Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 157:
foolishness and causes... iniquity, strife, vile words of disrespect and murders...”22. In relation to religious figures - monastic clergy, holy fathers of monasteries, bishops, priests, it is especially emphasized that they should “be modest and pious”, differ from secular people by their behaviour and way of speaking, moreover, be an instructive example for them, be trusty to the Christian faith (“do not extinguish the light in the lamps of your faith...23 do not for the sake of the love of material things separate your souls from the warmth of the fire of Christ’s love”24). The following observation of Nerses Shnorhali has the strength of an aphorism: “...now no one is ignorant in choosing between the bad and the good; people can nevertheless become ignorant by their own will”25. Addressing the priests, N. Shnorhali warns them: “None of you should prefer the blindness of ignorance to priestly study because of indolence or worldly preoccupations”26.

Giving importance to kindness and the desire to overcome ignorance through hard work, Nerses Shnorhali emphasizes the need of being righteous: “... Do not love some with special favors and cut off and ignore others, providing to some in excess of their needs and not satisfying the basic needs of others... and the distribution of food should be according to the amount of each one’s work, in greater or lesser degree. Do not abandon, as no longer necessary, the elderly and the disabled who expanded the time of their youth and the strength of their bodies in service to the church”27.

These provisions have already developed into modern social philosophy, which are extremely essential for modern public administration. Particularly, importance is rightly given to the fair remuneration for work, its connection to the quantitative results of the work. Besides, not only the need for social protection for the old and disabled is emphasized, but also that of the continual evaluation of their earnings. This issue is still topical today; different generations should not be contradistinguished, especially for opening vacancy, but instead, an effective policy of combining experience and youth should be followed.

22 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 158: "General Epistle,” p. 81.
23 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 75: "General Epistle,” p. 27.
24 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 75:
26 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 129:
For the class of bishops the pure image, modesty, hospitality, kind and fair behavior, self-restraint, temperance, not being a lover of money, disinterestedness should be special.38

Human virtues and rules of behaviour emphasized by Nerses Shnorhali should indisputably be characteristic of civilized people of all classes regardless of their nationality, place in society, quality of life, so let us once again emphasize their universal nature – as the most important criteria of the human image.

A LEADER ACCORDING TO NERSES SHNORHALI

According to the modern theory of management the leader is a person who is able to influence the behaviour of people and their groups by his potential abilities. Official is different from leader: with the authority delegated to him with force of law he has an opportunity to influence the behaviour of people and their groups. Certainly, lucky is the organization or group the head of which is also leader. Below we will discuss the perception of a leader who combines the features of official and leader in one personality.

Nerses Shnorhali refers to insatiable careerists of all times when he considers it as a sin against "the laws of God" to become a leader by dishonest means: "Let no one, motivated by the sin of wilfulness, seize, by bribing the elders, the priory of the monastery without the timely examination and permission of the prior".39

Nerses Shnorhali’s following admonition is directed to the realization of the position held and a high degree of responsibility by leaders and officials of different levels: "I beg you to remember and recognize in wisdom the rank which you bear, its dignity and obligations, where it began and why it was established, and what who commanded to be done by those who established it (he refers as to those who appoint to a position and as well as the problems assigned). Thus, a manager, taking the role of a leader by honest means, should commit himself to the performance of his duties with high responsibility since his actions can be decisive for the fate of the organization, individuals and even the country. Extensive powers - high responsibility; in modern terminology this is the first criterion for the behaviour of the leader, according to Shnorhali.

30 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 102, “General Epistle,” p. 45.
The next criterion refers to the selection of personnel, according to the chapter entitled “To the worldly princes”: "Do not appoint evil and iniquitous officials and governors over your country, lest you be judged by God together with them because of the injustice they commit. Rather select righteous and judicious men to govern the people who will not abandon the many prescribed royal rights of the meritorious for small bribes or themselves steal or interfere or take more than what is commended, for both are unjust before God" 31. Thus, for human resource policy importance should be given to the following features of the appointed people - kindness, honesty and justice, behaviour free of corruption risks. Indisputably, these principles of Nerses Shnorhali for personnel selection are true for all times.

The following profound admonition of Nerses Shnorhali suggests a complete system for organizing the work and material stimulation: "Do not enslave people who are under your rule, as though they were animals which are by nature servants to man, to harsh, unremitting labor... not even giving them food. Instead, with a sweet forgiveness and with sweetness and without delay, fill them with abundant food during their work and pay them enough so that they can support their humble homes and children and pay the royal taxes" 32.

Nerses Shnorhali’s commandment referring to tax collection is noteworthy: “... do not act unjustly toward the obedient, applying heavy and burdensome taxes that they cannot bear, but judge each one by the law and according to the measure of his strength...” 33. The last two commandments also emphasize the importance of the leader’s kindness, justice and knowledge of work during the performance of his duties.

Nerses Shnorhali’s next commandment contains essential components for assessing the work of the subjects and if need be, for fairly punishing them: “Do not judge anyone unrighteously, but make honest judgments, that you may by judged by God mercifully and not with severity. Do not judge for bribes or with bias for one side or, on account of hatred and vengeance, or show partiality toward one out of pride and vindicate the unjust in court or pervert the rights of the just, lest you make yourselves responsible for the curse of the laws of God because of these things” 34.

According to modern understanding, social responsibility towards the human settlement and surrounding society was also highlighted in “Encyclical Epistle”. The

32 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 144, “General Epistle,” p. 70.
33 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 142, “General Epistle,” p. 69.
34 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 143, “General Epistle,” p. 70.
following admonitions of Nerses Shnorhali addressed to princes are directed to that: “Do not deprive any human being and do not torment the poor and homeless...”; “Do not ignore the rights of widows and the poor when they cry before you because of those who exploit them. Rather do justice for the orphan and give rights to the widows”\textsuperscript{35}. He considered appropriate to follow the example of righteous people, who “for they deprived no one and they hurt no one, nor did they steal anyone’s belongings, and they were neither unjust nor deceitful to anyone. From their honestly acquired estate they fed the hungry, they clothed the naked, they received guests, they filled the needs of those in need”\textsuperscript{36}.

It should be emphasized that especially for the behaviour of leader N. Shnorhali repeatedly gives great importance to the need for justice and honesty: “Again we say this concerning the falsehood and deceit about which Christ taught, that whatever is evil is from the devil, and although it is harmful to all men, it is more so for the great and powerful. The little ones are powerless... and the great have in their hands the ability to do what they want imperiously, while despising the law”\textsuperscript{37}.

Probably as in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, as well as now people often complain that it is difficult to rule justly, without shady actions, according to Shnorhali’s definition: “To rule without depriving”. His answer to such viewpoints is topical today and will stay such in the future as well: “It is not impossible to rule without iniquity, but within reach, even pleasant, for those who have love and wish to pursue it, this we testify before God as bondsmen for all. For if anyone cleans his house of oppression and collects only rightful tribute, it will seem less burdensome and more profitable as well, than many unjust acquisitions... for any unjust acquisition, however small, burns like fire and corrupts the many that are lawful; acquiring things unlawfully will bring cursing and bitterness from the oppressed and the poor and the curse of God shall enter into the house of the oppressors. On the other hand, into the house of the just-free of extortion and with concern for the hungry - both the blessing of the poor and the blessing of God enters secretly, and multiplies the little he might have”\textsuperscript{38}.

One of Nerses Shnorhali’s profound admonitions and exhortations concerns the development of a friendly and healthy social and psychological environment in the team: “...If you approve of our counsel, establish this as a rule for everyone who serves you. For

\textsuperscript{35} Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 143-144, “General Epistle,” pp. 69-70.
\textsuperscript{36} Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 145-146, “General Epistle,” p. 71.
\textsuperscript{38} Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 148, “General Epistle,” p. 72.
if a man desires to stay in your service, he will serve you with loyalty and without deceit. However, let whoever wants to quit your service, ask openly and without fear for permission from you, do not forbid it with scolding and violence, but respond persuasively to him whom you would prefer to say; and to others give permission with kindness and pay whatever is due to them. And when they see these considerations coming from you, they will change their minds stay, or if they go, will quickly return to you.”39

The last admonition of the Catholicos addressed to the worldly princes is also very didactic: “We also give you another command: do not be vengeful or vindictive... but be tolerant and patient according to the commandment of Christ toward all who sin against you”40.

The renowned diplomat and writer of the Renaissance Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) wrote the genius book titled “The Prince” covering the state management basics41. In that famous work the types of states and governments are discussed and recommendations are given on the government of state, conquest of new countries and cities, establishing relations with the subjects, leading military affairs, etc.

More than three centuries before the great Italian, Nerses Shnorhali with his admonitions and exhortations, suggested provisions of management for different levels that are most complete, humanistic and universal. In different theories of leadership developed in the 20th century42 the same criteria are highlighted in the behaviour of the leaders that have been preached for generations as divine commandments by Nerses Shnorhali.

Translated from Armenian by
S. E. Chraghyan

40 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Թուղթ ընդհանրական, էջ 152, “General Epistle,” p. 75.
41 See Макиавелли Н., Государь. История Флоренции, М., ЭКСМО, 2010, с. 7-87.
Prior to the Armenian Genocide of 1915, permanently, and during several hundred years sometimes slowly and sometimes rapidly, the process of ethnic cleansing in Western Armenia had already taken place; the Ottoman Empire’s anti-Armenian demographic policy had been put into service for its realization in Western Armenia.\(^1\)

In the second half of the 16\(^{th}\) century the Ottomans defeated the Turkmen tribes and occupied Western Armenia. The administrative and demographic policies of the Turkish Sultans was stipulated by the national, political and economic interests, and was distinguished by instabilities and constant changes.

By the 1530s Erzrum (Karin), Sebastia, Kars, Van, Diarbekir (Amid) and Akhaltskha eyalets (administrative divisions or provinces in the Ottoman Empire) were formed in the territory of Western Armenia.\(^2\) What was the demographic situation in Western Armenia during the period from the end of the 15\(^{th}\) to the first half of the 17\(^{th}\) centuries?

The comparison of different sources definitely shows that despite the unfavourable for the Armenians demographic processes, which occurred in Western Armenia during the preceding period the country was in major part inhabited by the indigenous Armenian nation, but gradually new alien ethnical groups appeared and settled in separate provinces.

Thus, at the end of the 16\(^{th}\) century according to a Turkish tax list, "The Great Book of Gyurjistan Vilayet\(^3\)\), the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of 1250 settlements of Cehlder (Akhaltskha) province had Armenian or Georgian names, or their names were widely spread among the Armenians and Georgians, i.e. the province was inhabited by Christians. Muslim names were rather scarce\(^4\).

---

\(^{1}\) Melkonyan A.A., Tendencies of demographic policy of the Ottoman authorities in Western Armenia (16\(^{th}\) century-beginning of the 20\(^{th}\) century). - The Main Issues of Western Armenia’s Claims (International research and practical Conference, Cyprus, Nicosia, April 18-19, 2008, pp. 101-116. Մելքոնյան Ա., Հայաստանի պատմության և ժողովրդագրության հիմնահարցեր, Երևան, 2011, էջ 401-411:

\(^{2}\) Administrative division of the Ottoman Empire. For details see: Birken A., Die Provinzen des Osmanischen Reiches. Wiesbaden, 1976.

\(^{3}\) Vilayets - chief administrative divisions or provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

According to Hakob Karnetsi, in the first half of the 16th century the major part of 23 districts of Karin-Erzrum region were inhabited by the Armenians exclusively. The fact that the northern provinces of Erzrum (which had suffered most from the consequences of the undertakings of the Ottoman government that populated the regions with Muslims and had mixed population) nonetheless, were principally populated by the Armenians, and the number of Turks was minor. But this situation did not last long.

With the aim to introduce the Ottoman administrative machine in Western Armenia and subject to taxes the local Armenian population of Baberd, Sper, Tortum and other districts in the north-western part of Western Armenia, the Turkish bands destroyed hundreds of Armenian settlements in Upper Armenia (Bardzr Hayk) and Tayk putting to the sword tens of thousands people.

Over 50 thousand Armenians were forced to convert to Islam rather than the physical destruction. The cases of massacre and forced Islamization became more frequent since 1512, with the beginning of the long lasting Turkish-Persian War. "...Sacking, demolishing and destroying in general from Kars and Ani and the shores of Lake Van to the valley of Mush, Khnus and Alashkert, Diatn and Kamuray, Batnots and Payazet, the whole country was burnt and destroyed, the women and the children were driven away as captives... and the country turned to desert so that only the fortresses remained intact in the territory from Erzrum to Erevan", - an eyewitness author wrote.

In order to establish a complete hegemony over the homage nations the Sultan's Government started the process of populating the conquered lands with Turkic and Iranian language speaking (mostly the Kurds) tribes.

Just after concluding the Persian-Turkish Peace (1639) in 1643 the Turkish authorities violently carried out general census of the population in Erzrum province. Collection of taxes and violence were so brutal that the Christians of some districts of the province "converted to Islam out of fear".

Ghukas Inchichyan, historian and geographer at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries witnessed about other cases of forced Islamization in the, "tired of the violence and deprivations (the Christians - A. M.) in general adopted Islam." Population of Berdagrak "was of Armenian origin, yet most of them converted to Islam and very few stayed dedicated to Christianity", - Ghukas Inchichyan wrote.

The process of forced Islamization of the Christian population was accompanied by destroying and demolishing of the churches or turning them into mosques. In 1662...

---

5 Հակոբ Կարնեցի, Շինուած Կարնոյ քաղաքին, Մանր ժամանագրություններ, XIII-XVIII դդ., հ. II: Ղազարերը Պ.Ա.Հակոբյան, Երևան, 1956,էջ 550-551:
6 Koch K. Wanderungen im Oriente während der Jahre 1843 und 1846. Weimar, 1846. Տաշեան Յ., Հայ բնակչությունը Սև ծովէն մինչեւ Կարին, Վիեննա, 1921,էջ 3-20:
7 Մանր ժամանագրություններ, հ. II,էջ 566:
8 Ibid, p. 554.
9 Ինճիճեան Ղ., Աշխարհագրութիւն չորից մասանց աշխարհի՝ Ասիոյ, Եւրոպիոյ, Ափրիկոյ և Ամերիկոյ: Մասնակից. Ասիա, հտ. Ա, Վենետիկ, 1806,էջ 93:
Roman (Greek - A. M.) and Armenian churches were destroyed and demolished or turned into mosque, and every Christian wore black cap by the sanctions of the Ottoman authorities.10

In 1723 over one hundred Armenian villages were burnt to ashes in Sper, a northern district of Erzrum province, many Armenians were captured, they were forcibly converted to Islam, those who refused were killed.11

The new calamities of the lasting Turkish-Persian War were added to all these. In 1730s, the army of Nadir Khan invaded Kars and Ardahan provinces and forcedly took around 6 thousand Armenians to Persia."... And captured the Nariman province, Javakhk, Chldr (Chelter) and Ghayi Ghulu, which were all our nation, and drove the men and women, the elderly and youth to Khorasan, and they were six thousand as we heard," Abraham Cretatsi (Cretan) wrote.12

In order to imagine the disastrous demographic shift, which took place in the period of approximately one century in the same state, a simple comparison of the taxation lists "The Great Book of Gyurjistan Vilayet," which represents the status by the end of the 16th century, and "Chelder Eyalet Jaba Defter," which refers to the end of the 17th century and the first thirties of the 18th century, will show the obvious fact that during this period the number of settlements in eyelet had rapidly decreased.

During one century or a little more the number of settlements in Javakhk was reduced from 352 to 142, i.e. about 2.5 times. If formerly there were more than one villages having the same name with definitions "Upper" or "Lower", and "Big", "Medium" or "Small", then a part of those villages was not mentioned at all, whereas the others were indicated as one village per name.

"The fruits" of such policy appeared in the historical Daranaghi province - Kamakh as well. The appearances that occurred there may be noticed in the following lines by Gh. Inchichyan: "The population of the province flourished, especially Armenian and Turkish, the latter in the major part have Armenian origin,"14 i.e. Armenians who were forcibly assimilated. According to the same author, the Islamic flood was so strong that a part of the local Armenians had to leave and to settle in the Mountains of Tekir Dagh.15

Tortum province is one of the Western Armenian provinces, which most probably underwent forced Islamization in the period under study. The existing ruins of 120 churches and 10 monasteries are the evidence of massacres, deportations and

10 Մանր ժամանակագրություններ, հ. II, էջ 567.
11 Ատրպետ, Ճորոխի աւազանը, Երևան, 1934, էջ. 110. Մատենադարան, ձեռ. No. 6332, p. 552:
12 Աբրահամ Կրետացի, Պատմություն, Երևան, 1973, էջ 67:
14 Ինճիճեան Ղ., op. cit., p. 123.
15 Ibid.
devastation of the province\textsuperscript{16}. Nevertheless the majority of the population, which are called "keskes\textsuperscript{17}”, having half Armenian and half Muslim nature did not differ from the other Armenian population. Most of them even did not speak Turkish well; others did not know Turkish at all. Some others spoke a mixture of Turkish and Armenian\textsuperscript{18}.

An original ethnic and religious situation occurred in the mountainous Hamshen province, which was situated between the Pontic mountain chain in the south and the Black Sea to the north. The Turkish hegemony was catastrophic for these places as well. The population suffered political and religious suppression; extremely high taxes were established for the Christian population. Under the influence of all these serious ethnical and religious transformations took place. Gh. Inchichyan wrote about all these, "Initially the population living in these lands were of Armenian origin, yet at the end of the 17th and in the beginning of the 18th centuries the population of the villages in neighbourhood were Islamized due to violations and grave taxes..."\textsuperscript{19} Others, especially in 1708 through 1710, in order to avoid violations left the province and settled in Trabzon, Baberd and elsewhere\textsuperscript{20}.

Yet, such forced Islamization or assimilation, according to assertion of the same author was unable to change the Armenian description of the province, "but yet there are still Christians among them, whose villages still survive, and there is a church still standing there, though they have no priest of their own... ". From time to time a priest from the neighbouring villages came to their village to conduct religious rites. As for the Armenians who converted to Islam and had already become "Turks", "... they speak Armenian until now, use the names given by the godfathers and godmothers, keep the fast, and other rites and Christian rules, go to church, etc.: others are "keskes" by the faith, and only pretend to be "Turks"... ")\textsuperscript{21}.

Notably, while in the most of Western Armenian provinces, such as Kiskim, Tortum, Sper, Erznka, etc., the major part of "keskeses" gradually lost nearly all elements of their national identity, the Armenians of Hamshen ("Hemshin") falsely showing that they were "Muslims," in fact had remained devoted to their national roots for the centuries.

In fact, the major part of "keskeses" in Hamshen did not differ from the other Armenians living there. Most of them even did not speak Turkish well or did not know Turkish at all. Some others spoke a mixture of Turkish and Armenian.\textsuperscript{22} One could meet a lot of "keskeses" having Armenian names and surnames, which had the Turkish ending "ogly", such as Kirakosoghly, Petrosoghly, Grigorogly, etc.\textsuperscript{23}.

\textsuperscript{16} See: Տաշեան Յ., op. cit., pp. 77-79.
\textsuperscript{17} Կես (kes) in Armenian means half.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, pp. 78-82.
\textsuperscript{19} Ինճիճեան Ղ., op. cit., p. 396.
\textsuperscript{20} Տաշեան Յ., op. cit., p. 34:
\textsuperscript{21} Ինճիճեան Ղ., op. cit., p. 396.
\textsuperscript{22} Տաշեան Յ., op. cit., p. 78-82.
\textsuperscript{23} When the travelers asked them about their nationality they answered "Islam", a reply, which does not include any information about the nationality. According to information of Carl Koch, a German author of travel notes of the 40s of the 19th century, the only term to indicate the nationality in Turkey was "Osmanli" (K. Koch, op. cit., pp. 57-59).
One of the secrets of surviving of the main features of Hamshen Armenians' national identity is stipulated by the geographical environment. The Armenians lived there in mountainous and dense wooded areas. They were involved in subsistence farming, animal husbandry, gardening, apiculture, and partly in agriculture. The beeswax from Hamshen was especially well-known. The Sultan government was gathering the notable part of taxes from the province for this product: 2000 okas (a unit of weight used in Turkey, equal to about 2.75 pounds or 1.24 kilograms) annually. In fact, on the condition to pay specific taxes, the province of Hemshin, like some other mountainous communities, such as Sassun, Zeytun, Mokk, had obtained a half-dependent status. "A state under two masters, one of which was also Armenia," one of the sources informs.

Notably, under such conditions, the Armenians of Hamshen had little relations with the neighbouring Turks, Lazes, Greeks, as well as with Christian Armenians. Gradually the phenomenon of distinguishing from the outer world and establishing their own identity for surviving - "Hamshinian", i.e. proud highlanders - was formed in this way. Actually, in this case the fact of being "keskes" did not pave the way for transforming them into Turks, but this was a strong defensive shield against the encroachments of the authorities upon their national identity.

Thus the Armenians of Pontus-Lazistan in general and the Armenians of Hamshen in particular preserved their specific identity not only during the Armenian Genocide (Mets Eghern) of 1915, but also after it and till present, often secretly, and from time to time openly opposing to the Turkish authorities by their primordial Armenian character.

Along with forced Islamazation, assimilation and forced displacement, the Ottomans started another "initiative", damaging the ethnical description of Western Armenia. From the beginning of the 16th century, aimed to establish a military and political buffer against its rival country - Safavid Iran, the Turkish Sultans encouraged the inflow of Kurds into the Armenian Highland from the southern and south-western regions of the Empire. By the beginning of the Persian-Turkish War in 1515, with the support of Edris, one of the Kurdish tribal chiefs, Sultan Selim the Great had conquered the Kurds of Amid-Diarbekir and those living in the territories to the south from it. In return of his services Edris received the right to rule in those regions and forced his nomadic kinsmen to move to the territory of Erzrum province.

In 1635 Sultan Murad organized another migration of Kurds. Assisting to the wish of the Kurdish tribes to migrate, he organized a mass and great inflow of Kurds into Erznka and Derjan provinces. Speaking about appearing of the Kurds in Derjan, which most probably took place during the 17th century, the Armenian authors testified that "The Kurds living there (in Derjan - A. М.), were called wearing clothes made of skin." At the same time an inflow took place into Basen and Alashkert provinces as well.

---

24 Տաշեան Յ., op. cit., pp. 78-82.
26 Ինճիճեան Ղ., op. cit., p. 97.
The abovementioned ethnical processes became stronger in the middle of the 18th century. While initially the Kurds moved to the north only during the summer months to graze their numerous herds in the alpine meadows, now with the permission of the Ottoman authorities, they settled here in the Armenian villages. The Armenian population was obliged to keep during the whole winter not only the Kurds and their families, but also their numerous livestock. This odd privileged system, provided to the Kurds by the Sultans was known under the term "kishlakism". As a result of such policy the number of Kurds grew, particularly in the provinces neighbouring to Byurakn ("Bingyol") mountains.

The mass inflow of the Kurds resulted in migration of the Armenian population from Western Armenia, as well as in the processes of their assimilation to Kurds. Thus since the 18th century on the northern slopes of Mndzur (Dersim) mountains where the Kurdish element was stronger and the Armenians living there were separated from Erznka, Kghi, Derjan and other neighbouring Armenian communities, the partial assimilation to the Kurds had been noticeable among the Armenians living there. The inhabitants of villages there, "... all have preserved their native language in some distorted (a mixture with Kurdish - A. M.) form,"27 - Andranik, the author who was familiar with this region, wrote.

In 1878, Poghos Natanyan, whom N. Varzhapetyan, the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople had sent to carry out a statistical census of the Armenian population of the Armenian provinces in Western Armenia, paid special attention to assimilation of the Armenians of Guzu[n]jan, a western region of Erzrum province, with Kurds. He noticed that in the villages there were "... not numerous Armenians mixed with the Kurds, they, being half Armenians, were assimilated to Kurds as a consequence of violations, and now they do not even know Armenian, yet they are aware of their Armenian origin."28 The same author informs that not long ago there were "villages, which were inhabited by many Armenians." The population of those villages unwilling to be forcedly assimilated with Kurds migrated to the neighbouring provinces, which were densely populated with Armenians.29 Selyan, another Armenian author believes that "Ghzbashes of Ghuzujan..., who till our days (1895 - A. M.) are defeating the Ottoman armies are not Turks, but they are rather close to the Armenians."30

It is due to mention that the major part of the local Armenian population here very often pretends to be Muslims, and sometimes even Lazes, in order to avoid the violence of Lazes. It is not a mere chance, that sometimes they are called Armenian-Lazes and not "keskeses". There were such Armenian-Lases in Sper, Baberd, Kelkit31, and those

27 Անդրանիկ, Դերսիմ, Տփղիս, 1900, էջ 149:
28 See: Նաթանյան Պ. Վ., Արտոսր Հայաստանի կամ տեղեկագիր Բալուայ, Քարբերդու, Չարսանճագի, ճապաղջուրի և Երզնկայու, Կոստանդնուպոլիս, 1883, էջ 159.
29 Ibid.
30Սելյան, Տաճկա-Հայաստանի ազգաբնակչությունը, «Մուրճ», 1895, N 7, էջ 959: 289
31 Ancient form of the name Kilkit is Armenian hydronim Գայլ գետ (Gajl get).
provinces of Western Armenia, which were neighbouring the settlements of Lazes who lived in the Pontic Mountains and their slopes.

However, during the 15th-18th centuries, as a result of forced Islamazation, migration, intentional inhabiting by Turks and Kurds, the number of Muslim population noticeably grew in Western Armenia. Nevertheless, even under such conditions, the population of Western Armenia was predominantly Armenian at the beginning of the 19th century. It is enough to mention that in those days there were 978 Armenian villages and 14 cities in the territory of Erzrum province, where over 400,000 Armenians lived, of which 308,000 were rural and 93,000 urban population.

After the 1828-1829 Russian-Turkish war, 75,000 Western Armenians, who were mainly from Erzrum province, preferred to migrate rather than to live under the Ottoman power, and settled in the Transcaucasian regions, which had passed to Russia. Notwithstanding the fact that the number of the Armenians who migrated from Erzrum province was about 9.6 thousand families, and the ethnical characteristics of the province noticeably changed, yet this administrative unit remained one of the areas with numerous Armenian populations. The migrants from other Western Armenian provinces moved to East and South-East and settled in the villages neighbouring to the Russian Empire.

The anti-Armenian demographic processes deepened during the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. After the 1853-1856 Crimean war, the news about the returning of the eastern regions of Erzrum province and Kars, which were occupied by the Russians, to the Turks caused a new wave of migration of the Western Armenians. Many thousands of Armenian inhabitants of Erzrum, Kars, Alashkert and Daruynk (Bayazet) migrated to the Transcaucasian regions, which had passed to the Russian Empire. Most of them settled in the village of Talin (in Eastern Armenia), as well as in the coastal regions of the Black Sea, in the North Caucasus and elsewhere. Four thousand families settled in the territory of the present Stavropol Krai.

At the same time, a great number of highlanders from the Caucasus, especially after suppression of their leader Shamil, flew to Western Armenia and occupied the emptied Armenian settlements. By the active efforts of the Ottoman Government the major part of the highlanders (they are known by the collective name of Lezghins or Circassians) were placed in some districts of Western Armenia, in particular, in Basen.

The anti-Armenian initiatives of the Ottoman Government became even stronger at the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries. Thus, as a result of this policy, by the beginning of the First World War, and as compared with the beginning of

32 Մելքոնյան Ա., Էրզրում (Պատմաժողովրդագրական ուսումնասիրություն), Երևան, 1994, էջ 115-117:
36 Մելքոնյան Ա., Հայաստանի պատմության և ժողովրդագրության հիմնահարցեր, Երևան, 2011, էջ 410:
the 19th century, the population of Erzrum province reduced from about 400,000 inhabitants to 150,000, at the same time the number of the settlements was reduced from 992 to 391,\textsuperscript{37} i.e. by 60 percents. Notably, the most affected territories were Bayazet, Alashkert, Basen, Sper, Erzrum provinces, which were neighbouring the Russian Empire, and where the Hamidian massacres were of extremely massive character and great scale migration to Eastern Armenia and other Transcaucasian regions took place\textsuperscript{38}.

Thus, since the 16th - 19th century, prior to the Armenian Genocide the process of ethnical cleansing in Western Armenia had already taken place. The cases of massacres of the Armenian nation in Western Armenia during that period are also the facts of genocide in the Ottoman Empire.\textsuperscript{39} And what is more, the United Nations Resolution of 1948 describes genocide not only as acts committed with intention to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such, but also the acts aimed at forced assimilation, forced conversion of the religion, deliberately inflicting on the group’s conditions of life aimed to displace people forcedly and deportation from their motherland and other such acts. That is to say all the occurrences which took place in the Ottoman Empire during the period from the 16th century till the years of the Armenian Genocide (1915-1923).

\textsuperscript{37} Մելքոնյան Ա., Էրզրում, էջ 113-117, 158 and Ա-Դո, Վանի, Բիթլիսի և Էզրումի վիլայեթները, Երևան, 1912, էջ 226:
\textsuperscript{38} Մատենադարան, Մկրտիչ Խրիմեանի արխիվը, գ. 101, փ. 1, 137, 248; գ. 102, փ. 639; գ. 103, փ. 429:
\textsuperscript{39} Safrastyan R., Ottoman Empire: the genesis of the program of genocide (1876-1920), Yerevan, 2011.
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Hamlet Petrosyan’s essay elsewhere in this volume explains how Azeri destruction of Armenian monuments and the physical elimination of that minority population from the territory was fundamentally necessary to the rewriting, the inventing, of a new history for Azerbaijan, or a new myth about its origins and development. It needs to be emphasised that this recourse was not only facilitated by the Communistic and religious policies, which Azerbaijan translated early in its young statehood in 1918 (chronologically equivalent to its also young nationhood.) It is inspired by, if not copied from, a plan developed a few years earlier by Young Turk ideologists strongly influenced by late romantic intellectual ideas from Germany on creating homogenized racially pure nation-states, with one language, one ethnicity.1

Methods of Destruction of Armenian Historical Monuments in Turkey2

Once the Young Turk ideologists decided to rid the Armenian homeland of its native population, the logical consequence of this decision was to complete the Genocide by removing forever any association of the Armenian people with the territories on which there remained physical traces of their past. Thus, the name “Armenia” was completely dropped from all Turkish maps and documents. When “Armenia” inadvertently surfaced in textbooks or popular literature, like airline maps, the publications were confiscated and destroyed. The Turkish government has gone to great lengths to efface all traces of Armenian civilization on its historical lands.

In the late 1950s, Turkey, already a member of NATO, systematically changed the names of towns, villages, hamlets, and rural areas in the eastern provinces in order to eliminate any Armenian place-names but also to guarantee that, in the future, the centuries-old nomenclature familiar to Armenians and other minorities to be dispensed with would be forgotten. As Turkish historians continue to revise the past, newer generations of Armenians will be hard pressed to find the localities inhabited by their ancestors.3 In all parts of the former Ottoman Empire under Turkish control, except Istanbul, which had a high tourist profile and an important Armenian community, destroying all Armenian cultural remains or depriving them of their distinguishing national features has persistently continued the Genocide. Armenian churches, as witnesses to national life, represented intolerable embodiments of the historic Armenian presence on these lands. Religious monuments of the victims are a great embarrassment to the perpetrators of genocide. The greater their number, the more difficult is the campaign of disinformation. For this reason, all Armenian monuments were and are threatened. In the past few years, in view of efforts to join the European Union and appease outspoken liberal elements within and outside Turkey, some authorities, often in what appears a haphazard manner, have rehabilitated or allow the conservation of certain monuments. The most important so rehabilitated or conserved are the tenth-century Church of the Holy Cross on the Island of Aght’amar, though it was converted into a museum rather than a house of worship; the excavation and partial restoration of the walls of the city of Ani, even most recently mentioning in part its Armenian identity on signs; and the total restoration of the Church of St. Kirakos in Diyarbakir, a local initiative with some Armenian financial support.4 But these acts have not put an end to the continued confiscation of Armenian property. Neither has it stopped what was seized a hundred years ago from being used for new Turkish development rather than indemnity or the return pure and simple of such property to its rightful owners. The most recent sensational instance is the building by Recep Tayyip Erdoğan of his new megalomaniac presidential residence, Ak Seray or White Palace, on Armenian lands taken by the Ataturk regime in early 1921, and the use of the family of exiled Ohannes Kasabian’s estate in Ankara as the presidential residence until this year.
Below, the major ways are enumerated by which Armenian churches and other properties suffered, and still suffer, destruction, ruin, or neutralization.

1) Wilful destruction by fire or explosives of churches, civil buildings, and homes during the period of the Genocide, 1915-1917.

Nearly every Armenian region was affected. During the years 1915–23, some 1,000 Armenian churches and monasteries were levelled to the ground while nearly 700 other religious structures were half-destroyed. The city of Van is a good example. Four years after the Genocide the historic city was completely gone, except for a few ruins such as those of one Armenian church. Today, there is another city of Van located about two miles away from the historic one. It is a brand new and very large city—but it is not the old historic one where Armenians, Kurds, Greeks, and Turks lived together for centuries. Not far from Van, about an hour’s drive away in the mountains, is Varag one of the 429 monasteries mentioned above—a place of pilgrimage because it preserved a fragment of the True Cross on which Christ was crucified. Parts of the seven churches and chapels of the complex still stand in an urban context, but it is privately owned by a Turkish family, sometimes open for tourist but lacking even a caretaker to prevent further vandalism.

2) Deliberate post-genocide destruction of individual monuments by explosives or artillery.

Near the Armenian Turkish border in a mountainous area is the small tenth to eleventh-century monastery of Khtskonk with five little round churches. It is located in a remote area where there is virtually no habitation. Much of the monastery was dynamited over the years and now only one of the churches remains. That solitary eleventh-century church was also dynamited pushing out all the walls, but the traditional inner concrete core, of which all Armenian churches were made, held the church up and it is still erect today but there is no way to tell how long it will remain standing.

3) Destruction by wilful neglect and the encouragement of trespassing by peasants.

It is well known that the finely cut stones used on the facades of Armenian churches make perfect prefabricated building material. Not far from the Turkish Armenian border is the church of Tekor/Digor built in the fifth century, which once contained the oldest Armenian lapidary inscriptions, dated around 480. It was abandoned in 1906 and struck by an earthquake soon after. Though in ruins, it was still massive and impressive. By the 1970s there was little left and during our visit of 1999, there were only fragments, chunks of masonry walls. When one visits the Armenian Church at Soradir near the Iranian border, a little village populated with Kurds, one sees how the villagers made use of the finely cut stones from the facades of Armenian churches for their houses and in walls; the same is true nearly the whole of modern habitations around the Monastery of St. John the Baptist at Mush. This is common practice all over the Armenian Highland.

4) Conversion of Armenian churches into mosques, museums, prisons, sporting centres, granaries, stables, and farms.

Villagers also use the same church of Soradir as a storehouse for feed or hay for their animals. At Kars, the largest city before you get to the Armenian frontier, there is the tenth-century Church of the Holy Apostles—one of the jewels of Armenian architecture. After the Genocide it was converted first into a museum open to visitors. It had display cases filled with liturgical objects from some of the Armenian churches in the area. Today, there is no museum. The building was converted into a mosque in 1999.

5) Destruction by failure to provide minimal maintenance.

All remaining Armenian churches in Turkey are endangered by this neglect. The two best examples are the Church of Aghtamar and the Cathedral of Ani. The Church of Aghtamar served as the headquarters of a Catholicos, one of three before the genocide, who was resident on the small island in Lake Van. From there he administered to all the Armenians around the lake where there were scores of villages and literally hundreds of churches. On the island there was not only the Church of
the Holy Cross but also the cells for the monks, a school or seminary, and a large resident population of mostly clergy. Today there’s nothing left of that compound, just the church, which is itself unique in the Christian world. Built in 915-921 by the Armenian king Gagik Artzruni, its entire stone façade was carved in bas-relief with scenes from the Old Testament. It was a showpiece in the capital of his kingdom. Furthermore, unlike most Armenian churches the inside was entirely painted from floor to ceiling with frescoes of Gospel scenes. The church itself, because it is on an island, has not been damaged as much as other churches. Although in the 1950s and 60s it was used for artillery and gun practice when a Turkish battalion was stationed on the island. Even though the church has stood for more than a thousand years, the roof, made of volcanic tufa stone, had a whole strip missing for more than 25 years. Protests were made for years to the Turkish Department of Antiquities and other agencies of the Turkish government to do something about it before the dome falls in or rain and moisture totally destroy the remaining frescoes. There been a very problematic and hasty recent restoration as a propaganda piece, which is a museum for the large numbers of western tourists.

The Cathedral of Ani is the second example of failure to provide care. Ani was the medieval capital of Armenia and is located in Turkey right on the present border with Armenia. The cathedral was built in 989-1001 and uses structural devices that predated by a century and a half similar elements used in Gothic architecture in European—pointed arches, clustered columns, and emphasis on height. The cathedral had not been used for centuries and Ani had been abandoned as a city around 1500. For years Armenian authorities and individuals, mostly non-Armenian art historians, complained to the Turkish government to do something about the fissure in the northwestern corner of the cathedral. The dome had fallen in long ago, probably due to earthquakes, but the gap in the northwest corner may cause an entire wall to collapse. The Turks have done nothing to repair it even though their very active Department of Antiquities has been made aware of the problem and has repaired the wall fortifications. After the 1988 earthquake in Armenia a whole corner of the church fell down but the Turks totally ignored this while paying attention to other later Islamic constructions of Ani. Aghtamar and Ani, the two most important tourist attractions in all of Eastern Turkey, have received some attention in the past decade mostly because of the profit from ever increasing tourism to these structures built through the patronage of Armenian kings, and to show European Union countries that Turkey cares for minority monuments.

6) Demolition for the construction of roads, bridges, or other public works.
A good example of this is the eleventh century Church of the Holy Savior in Ani. It is sliced in half. Some local reports say it was struck by lightening, other accounts suggest it was half demolished to make way for a new road, but there is no where for a road to go at Ani. In any case, it was destroyed, the remaining half needs to be propped up if it is not to collapse. In Istanbul, Armenian cemeteries, schools, and church property have been demolished or damaged to make way for roads, bridges, and other public works.

7) Neutralizing of a monument’s Armenian identity by effacing its Armenian inscriptions or its crosses.
Once you do this, you can call the monument anything. Who can tell? What does the average tourist know of the difference between Armenian or Seljuk Turk? Even in Istanbul, Armenian inscriptions have been erased from at least one important community building.

8) The intentional reattribution of buildings, especially of monuments of touristic importance, to Turkish, usually medieval Seljuk, architecture.
The most notorious examples are the tenth century churches of Aght’amar and Kars, which ironically were built well before the Seljuk Turks even entered history. At the cathedral of Kars, for example, one used to be able to read an inscription that said, “Apostle Church Cathedral, built by Abbas, the Bagratid Armenian King of Kars…” and included a beautiful statement with dates,
origin, etc. But nowhere is the word Armenian found on that tourist plaque today and when visitors read Abbas (a traditional Arabic name), they have no way of knowing that he was an Armenian.

9) The insidious restoration of a site, not to what it was when Armenians built it, but to how it was transformed centuries later by Turkic or Turkoman conquerors.

An example of this is at the city of Ani with its most impressive walls, among the most extraordinary medieval fortifications anywhere in the world. Probably because of tourism, Turkish archaeologists have started to rebuild these walls. Unfortunately, they are restoring them following their conception of how they should look, that is to say without any suggestion of their having been Armenian–Christian walls and without consulting non-Turkish authorities. For instance, one can see from photographs taken a few decades ago that parts of the walls had crosses worked in stone on them. Will these crosses be restored or ignored? Also, in restoring monuments in Ani, Turkish specialists choose to restore monuments not with their original Armenian design, but as they were altered by later Turkic and Mongol occupiers.

10) Finally, to the nine points enumerated in an earlier article,5 another can be added:
The mania for the search of supposedly buried Armenian gold in and around the foundations of churches using metal detectors.

This practice, encouraged by the authorities, often leads to digging under the structure, causing its eventual collapse.

Today Turkey continues its genocidal policy by allowing this destruction while carrying on the pretence of being a model member of the international community through its subscription to various national treaties on the protection of minority rights and monuments. A partial list of such agreements signed by the Turkish government includes:

A. Articles 38 to 44 of the 1923 revised peace Treaty of Lausanne, which deal especially with the guarantee and protection of minority rights. Yet Turkey has consistently violated its provisions, as foreign observers have regularly reported. In Istanbul until 1998, repairs on existing Armenian structures required government permission, which was not always granted. Even today, though some permission is given, it is far from generalised. Rebuilding and expansion is not tolerated, and church and community property is often sequestered by invoking the right of eminent domain. In the past two decades the threat of taxation of minority churches and charitable institutions has been invoked. With such an attitude in Istanbul, the very visible and touristic former capital of Turkey, is it not naive to expect that monuments in the relatively deserted interior of Turkey will be cared for? And despite the highly publicised “reforms” that Turkey used as bait for a date to be admitted into the European Union, Armenian charitable foundations, despite the new reforms, are not allowed to inherit, or in some cases even own property as are equivalent Muslim charitable foundations.

B. Turkey subscribed and approved the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of the United Nations Charter recognising, among other points, minority cultural rights.

C. In 1965, Turkey signed the 1954 Treaty of The Hague on the Preservation of Cultural Monuments during the time of War.

D. On 7 January 1969 Turkey signed the International Treaty for the Preservation of Cultural Monuments, which includes clear provisions for the care and preservation of minority cultural buildings.

Many have suggested that UNESCO, with a vast section devoted exclusively to the preservation of historical monuments, should play an active role in the safeguarding of at least those edifices of recognised importance to the general history of art. But UNESCO cannot engage in conservation
unless the government ruling the area in which the monument stands invites it to intervene. Furthermore, many experts have cautioned about the possible adverse effect of UNESCO’s overt concern with Armenian monuments. The Minority Rights Report on Armenia, while detailing Turkish violations of international covenants on minorities concludes:

We would like to see the Armenian monuments in eastern Turkey better cared for, although we would warn any Western government (or UNESCO) from pressing the Turks on this matter, a course of action which would only hasten the destruction of the monuments that remain.6

**Protection of the Historical Monuments of Minorities**7

On November 16, 1972 the General Conference of UNESCO adopted its far-reaching "Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage." The Convention has now been ratified by 191 states.

The work carried out under UNESCO's World Heritage Convention in Venice, Abu Simbel, and Angkor is well known to everyone interested in the great monuments of world culture. Less known are the thousands of missions UNESCO has sent to each of the member countries working with their governments on professional programs of preservation and restoration of humanity's common cultural legacy. The UNESCO register of protected monuments grows yearly, as does its geographical outreach.

The young Republic of Armenia is proud to be part of the Convention. In 1996 the medieval monastic complexes of Haghpat and Sanahin, nestled high in the mountains, was placed on the register, and in 2000 the Monastery of Geghard and the Cathedral and Churches of Etchmiadzin and the site of the Church of Zvartnots.8 As UNESCO's cultural rescue net spreads wider, so too does the public's understanding of the importance of these monuments to humanity's creative past. This in turn has raised the interest and appreciation of the world's inhabitants toward cultural monuments everywhere.

The General Conference of UNESCO has every reason to boast about the unqualified success of the Convention on World Culture. Yet, there is still a grey area that has not been directly or adequately addressed by UNESCO and the Convention, namely, the preservation of cultural monuments of minority populations. No where do the articles of UNESCO's Convention on World Culture address the question of the cultural property of a minority or property which once belonged, or in some cases legally still belongs, to the population of another state. No article directly forbids a member state from taking deliberate measures against cultural monuments in their own country, specifically those of minority or foreign cultures.

The 38 articles of the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage are either ambiguous or contradictory on this point. The fifth paragraph of the preamble reads: "Considering that the existing conventions demonstrate the importance, for all peoples of the world, of safeguarding this unique and irreplaceable [cultural] property, to whatever people it may belong...." (emphasis added) This is a clear statement by the framers of the Convention that the cultural heritage of minorities was also to be protected.

Yet, the articles of the convention make clear that it is the "individual State Party to the Convention that identifies and delineates the different properties situated on its territories (Articles 3 and 4)." … "The States Parties undertake to give their help if the States on whose territory it [a cultural monument] is situated so request (Art. 6/2)." This notion is reinforced in Article 11/3: "The inclusion of a property in the World Heritage List requires the consent of the State concerned," and Article 11/6: "Before refusing a request for inclusion the [World Heritage] Committee shall consult the State Party on whose territory the cultural or natural property in question is situated.” Twice
more the Convention underlines that it is the State that is the initiator of a request for protection. "The World Heritage Committee shall receive requests for assistance by States Parties with respect to property situated in their territories (Art. 13/1)." Or again, "Any State Party to this Convention may request international assistance for property of outstanding universal value situated within its territory (Art. 19)."

Nowhere do the articles address the question of cultural property of a minority or which once belonged, and in some cases legally still belongs, to the population of another state. In this respect Article 6/3 is interesting: "Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to take any deliberate measures which might damage the cultural and natural heritage situated on the territory of other States Parties to this Convention." Surely the reference is to times of war. But no article specifically asks each State Party not to take any deliberate measures against cultural monuments in its own territory, specifically those of minority or foreign cultures.

The question has been raised before, both at the General Conference and to auxiliary organization such as ICOMOS. It should be brought up again with the hope that a commission will be empowered by this body to investigate how clearer provision can be drawn up for the protection of the cultural heritage of minority populations.

Fortunately, we have many splendid examples of State Parties carefully protecting minority cultural property. In Germany, numerous Jewish synagogues have been restored and opened as museums, often in localities where Jews no longer reside. In Israel, both the Dome of the Rock and the Holy Sepulchre, among the most important monuments for Muslims and Christians, are jealously protected by a Jewish State. In the United States sacred American Indian burial grounds have been returned to their rightful owners and restored to the their original state. The Armenian government invited Iranian authorities in the late 1990s to help restore the famous eighteenth century tiled Persian mosque, now a major tourist attraction in the centre of the capital Erevan and used a functioning house of worship for the large Iranian and Muslim population in the capital.

The Armenian Monastery of Haghpat, a World Heritage monument on the territory of the Republic of Armenia has already been mentioned. Yet, if one were to ask a specialist of medieval architecture to name the most important monuments of Armenian heritage, Haghpat would come after the earlier Church of Aght'amar and Ani, the capital of medieval Armenia, with its splendid tenth century cathedral. Both of these monuments are today in the Republic of Turkey. They need protection and care and should be on the World Heritage list.

Thus far, these and hundreds of other monuments of Armenian cultural heritage have been abandoned to the elements and the abuse of local villagers. A broad agreement is necessary to protect such orphaned monuments, an agreement sanctioned by the United Nations through UNESCO. Armenian cultural monuments are scattered in various parts of the world, from China and India to Europe, Africa and the Americas. This is not a unique case. Think of Greek and Roman cultural heritage scattered everywhere in the Mediterranean region, or of Chinese monuments throughout Asia, or Jewish monuments nearly everywhere in Europe. The General Conference needs take up the matter of minority monuments so that in the new millennium there will be a convention to protect and restore any monument, in the words of the Preamble, ‘to whatever people it may belong.’

**Denial and Destruction**

Shortly after such an appeal was made by the Armenian Republic in Paris, indeed already before it, in piecemeal fashion, one of the most remarkable monuments of Armenian culture was totally and wilfully destroyed with a daemonic determination to leave not a trace: the medieval graveyard with its 10,000 sculpted stone crosses at the abandoned city of Julfa on the Arax River—since 1923 part
of the newly created, now former, Autonomous Republic of Nakhichevan part of the Republic of Azerbaijan, but separated from it by a strip of Armenian land, one of Stalin’s Machiavellian exploits in typical Communist fashion of divide and rule. But latent and aggressive chauvinism was turned loose with the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, which had until then provided a strong controlling influence on inter-communal and inter-ethnic conflicts among Soviet republics. Fuelled by the aggressive Turkic ideology of its linguistic and ethnic cousins in the Turkish Republic, and the loss of a war against the indigenous Armenian population of another one of its Autonomous Republics, the Mountainous Karabagh or Artsakh as it is known in Armenian, Azerbaijani authorities took their revenge out on helpless and innocent monuments belonging to what they constructed to be the country’s enemies.

In the last days of the Soviet Union during Mikael Gorbatchov’s more liberal policies, the parliament of the Karabagh voted to become independent of Azeri tutelage and be united with Armenia. The Azeri’s retaliated with pogroms in Sumgaït, the industrial suburb of Baku and other cities with Armenian populations, and soon sent the army to occupy Karabagh with a long siege of the capital Stepanakert. The David and Goliath war dragged on, with Goliath not only driven out of Karabagh but also losing the surrounding provinces—including the tiny strip that separated it from Armenia. In May 1994, as Karabagh fighters reinforced by the Armenian army utterly routed the overwhelmingly larger and better equipped Azerbaijani Army and marched virtually unhindered toward Baku, the Azeri’s sued for a ceasefire arranged by Russia. With no Armenians left in Baku, or elsewhere—and after destroying or converting all Armenian public buildings and churches—there remained little trace of the Armenian civilization that had flourished already for two millennia before the Tatars, as they were called until the twentieth century, trickled into the south Caucasus in the eleventh century.

What remained was the imposing cemetery with thousands of monolithic stones, nearly two meters in average height, inscribed and decorated in high relief. The graveyard on the banks of the river that had made the ancient Armenian city of merchants and craftsmen rich and famous was itself destroyed and with it all surrounding Armenian towns and villages by the Safavid Shah of Persia in 1604-5 during the interminable wars against the Ottoman Sultans. The population was literally forced into exile in Persia; a few thousand from the hundreds of thousands who driven from their ancestral lands made it to Isfahan, the new capital, with the belated and self-serving benevolence of Shah Abbas, who wanted them to continue running his silk trade and through their craft skills help embellish his new seat of authority. They were given unused land on the other side of the river from Isfahan and allowed to found their own Christian Armenian city, which they quickly called New Julfa, and which ultimately supplied nearly all the important Armenian merchants controlling much of the international trade in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

In a few days in December 2005, the Azerbaijani army systematically toppled whatever cross-stones were still standing, in this cemetery, a barren and uninhabited backwater, which remained as hallowed, though abandoned, ground for four centuries. The stones were then pulverized with jackhammers, pickaxes, and sledgehammers, loaded onto large gravel trucks, hauled a few hundred meters to the banks of the Arax River and dumped into the river forever. But this was still not enough to cover the trace of the crime and its memorial victims—the whole area was asphalted over and made into a firing range for the army. This operation was partly photographed and filmed from the opposite Iranian bank. The material was quickly presented to UNESCO in Paris by various delegations and sent to the international press. A publication with a DVD of the operation was published and widely distributed. But there was no general outrage, no major rebuke, but only a bending before the tyranny of petrodollars. In an act of cynical irony, UNESCO’s Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage on 17 November 2010 inscribed the art of the Armenian cross-stone on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
In the following year in another disorganized attempt to redeem its reputation as protestor of the world’s culture it allowed a photographic exhibit of Armenian khach’k’ars in its Paris headquarters inaugurated on 15 June 2011, but insisted that photographs of Azeri destruction be removed as well as photos of the now empty site of that largest of all cemeteries of khach’k’ars.12

President Ilham Aliyev and his sycophantic nationalists insist, with enraged conviction, that there were never indigenous Armenians in any part of Azerbaijan—having learned their lines and methods of negationism from their Turkish cousins. The rewriting of history, this newly created narrative of Turkic presence from the beginning of time, is taught as the official history in the Turkish Republic’s school system. This attitude has been encapsulated in a short segment from a long and eloquent article, which has just appeared in The New Yorker article quoted above:

As İsmet İnönü, the President of Turkey from 1938 to 1950, said, “Our duty is to make Turks out of all the non-Turks within the Turkish country, no matter what. We will cut out and throw away any element that will oppose Turks and Turkishness.” The state cut away Armenians from its history. At the ruins of Ani, an ancient Armenian city … there was no mention of who built or inhabited it. In Istanbul, no mention of who designed the Dolmabahçe Palace, once home to sultans. This policy of erasure was called “Turkification,” and its reach extended to geography: my grandfather’s birthplace, known since the days of Timur as Jabakhchour (“diffuse water”), was renamed Bingöl (“a thousand lakes”). By a law enacted in 1934, his surname, Khatchadourian (“given by the cross”), was changed to Özakdemir (“pure white iron”).13

The refusal to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide in Turkey, and the cultural genocide in Azerbaijan and Turkey, has been in part driven by two major forces: 1. the creation of an ethnically pure Turkish nation-state by killing those who are considered undesirable or assimilating them, and 2. the fear of giving up the riches acquired by the seizure of their property and possessions. Will the centennial commemoration of the first massive crime against humanity in modern times in this fateful year 2015 inspire the Turkish authorities to accept the genocide committed by their direct ancestors and with the aid of other nations and international organization oriented toward the establishment of international justice and to provide the appropriate reparations to the descendants of the victims? Or will the base motives of the industrial-financial complex and power-politics continue to manipulate the people through tacitly supporting the perpetrator’s sophisticate and well funded policy of negationism and denial?

1 For a discussion of the process in last years of the Ottoman Empire under the Young Turk regime and in the first years of the new Turkish Republic, see Uğur Umit Üngör, The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913–1950, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
3 In December 2014, the Turkish governor of Van province decided to revert to original place names, publishing lists of hundreds of changes of towns and villages.
4 The fascinating narrative of how this happened is recounted by the writer whose family was from the city, Raffi Khatchadourian, “A Century of Silence,” Letter from Turkey, The New Yorker, January 5, 2015.
5 Kouymjian, "When Does Genocide End?,” pp. 8-9.
7 Much of the information below is contained in an unpublished position paper prepared by the author for the Foreign Minister of Armenia, Vartan Voskanian, who was scheduled to deliver a speech at the UNESCO Assembly in Paris in 1999. He was unable to attend because of tragic circumstances in Armenia, but his appointed delegate spoke to the issue.
On the cemetery and its history see: Jurgis Baltrušaitis and Dickran Kouymjian, “Julfa on the Arax and Its Funerary Monuments,” Armenian Studies/Études arméniennes: In Memoriam Haïg Berbérian, D. Kouymjian, ed. (Lisbon, 1986), 9-53; Argam Ayvazyan, Jula (Julfa) (Erevan, 1984), with short summaries in Russian and English with 107 illus.; idem, Naxijewani vimagrakan zarangut’iwne (The Lithographic Inheritance of Nakhidjevan), vol. I, Jula (Julfa) (Erevan, 2004), a corpus of 1,161 khach’k’ar inscriptions with line drawings and photos recorded before the vandalism of the site.


On 26 June 2011 Le Monde published a devastating reader’s commentary on the exhibit (available online), by Haroutioun Khatchadourian, herein a short excerpt: “Quelques heures avant l'inauguration, des employés de l'Unesco ont retiré les légendes des photographies des Khatchkars, légendes qui précisaient leurs localités, ne laissant que les étiquettes comportant les dates. Ces mêmes employés ont aussi supprimé une carte historique indiquant l'emplacement des différents Khatchkars avec des explications détaillées. Il est vrai que cette carte empiète sur deux États voisins, la Turquie et l'Azerbaidjan, qui s'acharnent, depuis un siècle, à supprimer toutes traces d'Arméniens de la mer Méditerranée à la mer Caspienne. Aucun officiel n'était présent à l'inauguration et la direction ne fournît aucune explication. Par ailleurs les drapeaux de l'Unesco et celui de l'Arménie étaient retirés. Alors, pourquoi une telle attitude et quelles sont ces fameuses valeurs défendues par cette institution internationale ?”

THE ARTSAKH INDEPENDENCE PROCESS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE USSR COLLAPSE

Manasyan A. S.
Corresponding member of NAS RA

The whole process of the origin of the Karabakh (Artsakh) movement\(^1\), as well as of the collapse of the USSR proves that these two phenomena are in need of deep analysis of their motives also conditioned by external factors\(^2\). CPSU General Secretary M.Gorbachev’s idea that the whole society is in need of serious reforms with the slogans of glasnost (publicity) and perestroika (reconstruction) was acceptable to all but extreme conservatives. The danger of collapse of the social system was real. But the West, the experts of which had probably calculated its inevitability, encouraged Gorbachev, praising the “courage of the great reformer”\(^3\). It resulted in making him a Nobel laureate (October, 1990) after Sumgait (February, 1988) and Baku (January, 1990) atrocities. However, the positive attitude of the West towards Gorbachev’s perestroika was evident from the very beginning.

The next important fact for understanding the inner political life of the USSR is related to the national question. And it was this very national question that became the explosive for the possible breakup of the USSR.

The experience of the last decades had already shown that all those unfair deeds that the Bolshevik party did in determining the boundaries of the national states became delayed-action mines. The previous history had also shown that it was possible to put the very explosive in action mostly in Nagorno Karabakh, not only because in the 1920s the biggest injustice was committed against the Armenians of Artsakh in the most cynical way. It was well known both to the political leaders of the upper rank of the country and outside its borders that the native Armenians of Artsakh from time to time had risen the question of the correction of that injustice\(^4\).

\(^1\) It was a result of the 70-year resistance of the Artsakh Armenians against artificially-formed Azerbaijan’s anti-Armenian policy.

\(^2\) Մանասյան Ա., Ղարաբաղյան հակամարտությունը ԽՍՀՄ տրոհման համատեքստում, 21-րդ ԴԱՐ, թիվ 4 (62), 2015, էջ 47-77:

\(^3\) It is known that Margaret Thatcher “discovered” M. Gorbachev as a new kind of politician of the Soviet Union during his visit to London in December 1984. Thinking that he was the man the West could cooperate with, she left especially for Washington to let the US government know about it. It was the time when Gorbachev was not the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee yet.

\(^4\) The Bolsheviks included Nakhijevan and Nagorno Karabakh into Soviet Azerbaijan under different statuses with consideration to please Turkey and to make it the torch-bearer of Islamic revolution in the East (this is an official but apparently not the only point of view). Plunder of the Armenian lands was committed immediately after the Armenian Genocide. Instead of being punished for the crime of the genocide the Turks received peculiar “awards”. The Armenian Genocide and “granting” Turkey and Soviet Azerbaijan with the Armenian lands as a political bribe have
And so, Karabakh was one of the most painful issues, and it is natural that if there was a plan to disintegrate the Soviet Union, it would be logical that Mountainous Artsakh (Nagorno-Karabakh) to become its "launch pad". We say: *if there was a plan to disintegrate the USSR*. But it would be strange if the West, "carrying the burden of human progress", did not have an aim or plan to remove the Soviet Union, proclaimed as "evil empire", from the historical arena. The core of discussions should be the implementation of the plan rather than the question of the existence of such a goal. In that sense the history of Karabakh movement provides exclusive material.

It turns out that since the well-known April plenary session of 1985 up to December of 1991 all the events had been taken as skillfully designed steps to remove the USSR from the arena.

It was at the starting point of the breakup of the Soviet empire and the transition process to a new economic and political order as well as during the period of encouraging an atmosphere of publicity and reconstruction slogans that the European Council adopted the Resolution on a political situation to the Armenian question on June 18, 1987. It was beyond doubt that this document would find some resonance among Armenians, and, of course, among Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh. Although the Resolution of the European Council was not particularly about Karabakh, objectively, it also became a message to the Armenians in Artsakh.

The West and the Nagorno Karabakh movement in 1988-1989

The position of Europe and the USA towards the Nagorno Karabakh movement in 1988-1989 can be described as a period of evident sympathy. Moreover, "Resolution on the situation in Soviet Armenia" of the European Parliament, adopted on July 7, 1988, openly described all the events taking place at that time:

"*The European Parliament,*

...
A. having regard to the recent public demonstrations in Soviet Armenia demanding that the Nagorno Karabakh region be reunited with the Republic of Armenia,

B. having regard to the historic status of the autonomous region of Nagorno Karabakh (80% of whose present population is Armenian) as part of Armenia, to the arbitrary inclusion of this area within the Azerbaijan SSR in 1923 and to the massacre of Armenians in the Azerbaijani town of Sumgait in February 1988,

C. whereas the deteriorating political situation, which has led to anti Armenian pogroms in Sumgait and serious acts of violence in Baku, is in itself a threat to the safety of the Armenians living in Azerbaijan.

1. Condemns the violence employed against Armenian demonstrators in Azerbaijan;
2. Supports the demand of the Armenian minority for reunification with the Socialist Republic of Armenia;
3. Calls on the Supreme Soviet to study the compromise proposals from the Armenian delegates in Moscow suggesting that Nagorno Karabakh be temporarily governed by the central administration in Moscow, temporarily united to the Federation of Russia or temporarily placed under the authority of a “presidential regional government”;
4. Calls also upon the Soviet authorities to ensure the safety of the 500,000 Armenians currently living in Soviet Azerbaijan and to ensure that those found guilty of having incited or taken part in the pogroms against the Armenians are punished according to Soviet law;
5. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the Government of the Soviet Union.

On November 19, 1989 the United States Congress passed the unanimously approved Joint Resolution N 178 by the Senate and the House:

“101st CONGRESS 2d Session S. J. RES. 178 JOINT RESOLUTION
To express United States support for the aspirations of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh for a peaceful and fair settlement to the dispute.

Whereas the people of the United States have strong historical and cultural ties with the people of Armenia;
Whereas the 80 percent Armenian majority in the region of Nagorno-Karabakh has continually expressed its desire for self-determination and freedom;

8 On July 7, 1923 the “Autonomous Region of Nagorno-Karabakh” was established and in 1936 it was renamed the “Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region”.
Whereas the current status of the region of Nagorno-Karabakh is a matter of concern and contention for the people of the Armenian and Azerbaijani Soviet Republics;

Whereas the Soviet Government has termed the killings of Armenians on February 28-29, 1988, in Sumgait, Azerbaijan, “pogroms”;

Whereas continued discrimination against Karabakh Armenians and the uncertainty about Nagorno-Karabakh have led to massive demonstrations and to unrest that is continuing to this day in this area;

Whereas the people and government of the Soviet Union initially responded to the outbreak of violence in Nagorno-Karabakh with the positive step of creating an interim Special Administrative Committee to stabilize the situation;

Whereas the Administrative Committee has proven ineffective because its mission has been undermined by a number of factors, including organized violence against Armenians, Jews, and other ethnic groups, and blockades of Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenia, and Georgia;

Whereas the three-month blockade, theft and damage of goods in transit to Armenia have crippled the work of Armenians, Soviets, Americans, and the entire international community in rebuilding after the tragic December 7, 1988 earthquake in Armenia;

Whereas the Government and people of the United States strengthened their commitment to Armenia by assisting in the immediate relief effort and the overall reconstruction of those areas affected by the earthquake;

Whereas the United States maintains its resolve to assist the Armenians as they rebuild from the earthquake; and

Whereas the United States supports the fundamental rights and the aspirations of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh for a peaceful and fair settlement to the dispute over Nagorno-Karabakh: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should-

(1) continue to support and encourage the reconstruction effort in Armenia;

(2) urge Soviet President Gorbachev to restore order, immediately reestablish unrestricted economic and supply routes to the people of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, secure the physical safety of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh from attacks and continue a dialog with representatives of Nagorno-Karabakh regarding a peaceful settlement;

(3) promote in its bilateral discussions with the Soviet Union an equitable settlement to the dispute over Nagorno-Karabakh, which fairly reflects the views of the people of the region;
(4) urge in its bilateral discussions with the Soviet Union that an investigation of the violence against the people of Nagorno-Karabakh be conducted, and that those responsible for the killing and bloodshed be identified and prosecuted; and

(5) express the serious concern of the American people about the ongoing violence and unrest which interferes with international relief efforts.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State.

Passed the Senate November 19 (legislative day, November 6), 1989.\textsuperscript{10}

This Resolution bore an obvious seal of caution. The West was trying not to throw a shadow on Gorbachev, even if it was for outright criminal acts. This was even reflected in their attitude towards the Sumgait genocide. It seemed that "the official West", which did not lose the opportunity of speaking on behalf of democracy, had to consistently condemn the crime as, by the way, it was done by the progressive social forces throughout the world. But it was obvious that the Western state and political figures fell behind the public opinion in their countries. They were closely following the assessment that would give official Moscow to the Sumgait massacre, in order not to outpace it and not to give a more rigorous assessment. From this point of view the attitude of official Washington was characteristic. In the Resolution adopted by the US Congress on November 19, 1989, in support of Artsakh movement Washington vividly presented its attitude ("not to outpace Moscow") about the assessment of Sumgait crime. The first part of the preamble of the Resolution ("Whereas the Soviet Government has termed the killings of Armenians on February 28-29, 1988, in Sumgait, Azerbaijan, "pogroms") was more than a transparent record of the very caution. Official Washington left the political qualification of the crime at the disposal of Moscow\textsuperscript{11} in order not to put Gorbachev at risk by more severe assessment. At that time there was no need to present Gorbachev as a leader with whose connivance was committed the genocidal crime in Sumgait\textsuperscript{12}.

Artaksh in the USSR disintegration project. Assigning new content to the inviolability of the borders of the Union republics.

The US Congress passed its Resolution only when the Kremlin had already expressed its view which was formulated in the TV programs devoted to the problem by the experts of the Centre in the following way: in order to remove the autonomous region from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR it was necessary to get the consent of Baku, because according to Article 78 of the Constitution (fundamental law)

\textsuperscript{10} http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c101:S.J.RES.178.ES:

\textsuperscript{11} And the latter by means of the General Secretary of the CPSU resolutely refused to describe the incident as genocide, despite the obvious fact that it could not get any other qualification.

\textsuperscript{12} At that time the Armenian political circles in Stepanakert and Yerevan were inspired by the document adopted by the USA Congress in which on behalf of high democratic principles the latter gave hope to the Artsakh Armenians. But the Congress did not condemn the head of the country for not preventing the massacres of Armenians in Sumgait which he was obliged and could do.
of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the territory of a Union Republic might not be altered without its consent. By the way, according to the laws adopted on the basis of the Constitution of the USSR, it also referred to the borders of the autonomous region\textsuperscript{13}, as well as to the self determination of its state-legal status out of the USSR legal-political field (actually, in view of possibility of the dissolution of the country). Neither Baku nor any union supreme structure had any authority to change the boundaries of the autonomous region without its consent.

It seemed that the situation was presented on behalf of the law and according to the legal terminology. But such argumentation testified to the principal change in the behavior of the Center. Before that dozens of changes of the borders of republics and autonomous formations had been made without assigning serious legal sense to Article 78 of the USSR Constitution on the sovereignty of republics. Everything was determined by the Politburo of the CPSU whose decisions were obligatory also for the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. And there were nearly two dozen suchlike cases registered about the internal borders in the practice of the USSR\textsuperscript{14}. But in case of Artsakh the Center laid down "real legal" content in Article 78 of the Constitution, when it had been known that there was no active connection between the Soviet Union's internal political life and the Constitution. It was obvious that by that step the Center made "legitimate" an illegal and, practically, unacceptable decision forced upon the Artsakh Armenians, thus closing the ways of reviewing it legally. In fact, the Center presented "inviolable" illegitimate borders of the Azerbaijan SSR. But such an approach did not refer only to the borders of the Azerbaijan SSR. It sounded as an approach to assign a new quality to the sovereignty of the Union republics and stimulated as their, as well as the centrifugal forces' activization.

During 1989 for the political agenda was prepared the law of the USSR "Concerning the procedure for secession of a Union republic from the USSR" which was passed on April 3, 1990\textsuperscript{15}. And later on, in December 1990, the project of a new Union treaty appeared on the agenda in accordance with the same political line of the extension of real political sovereignty or the rise of self-government of republics initiated by M. Gorbachev.

It is important to note that the West, in different ways, but delicately, encouraged the steps of the CPSU General Secretary. At the same time the West with reserved accents supported the Karabakh movement. The formulations of the 178 Resolution adopted by the US Congress on 19 November, 1989 show how that they were put there with great caution. Congress urged the leaders of the USSR «over the dispute over

\textsuperscript{13} See in details: Манасян А., Карабахский конфликт. Ключевые понятия, Ереван, 2005, с. 6, 37.

\textsuperscript{14} For a list including 23 suchlike cases see: Статус Нагорного Карабаха в политико-правовых документах и материалах. Библиотека центра русско-армянских инициатив. Ереван, 1995, с. 93-96.

Nagorno-Karabakh to promote an equitable settlement, which fairly reflects the views of the people of the region. The compilers of the document, of course, instead of those words could recall the mandatory principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples according to the international law, because the expression reflected in the text actually called for respect for the right of self-determination of the people of the region. They could just formulate the call the way it was, but avoided to point out the principle of self-determination as a means of solving the problem. In 1989 this could be perceived by the overloaded with the like problems, multinational USSR, as a direct call to break up the country which at that time would not be appropriate. Not only the above mentioned 178th Resolution but also all the documents adopted by the Congress in 1988-1991 the analytical eye should not only look for delicacy, but also calculations and prudence.

The political hypothesis that has been put forward and grounded here is the following: already in 1988 the West was pursuing the realization of the program of dissolving the Soviet Union into Union Republics, which, from now on, we shall call the "Basic program".

We qualify it a political hypothesis only because numerous documents and facts related to that program have not been declassified or remain unrevealed. The proposition of our hypothesis leads on the one hand to events, political decisions and important documents of 1988-1991 and on the other hand to the disclosure of their interrelations and compatibility with the events that took place in the USSR.

It was not a secret that the formulation "disintegration according to the Soviet republics" would find its supporters in the capitals of the Union republics. So, it was not difficult to calculate that allotment the Union republics with actual sovereignty had a powerful charge of dissolving the USSR. Among possible ways it was the shortest, most efficient and, finally, the least costly way of dividing the Soviet Empire into parts.

Not a single case of the processes taking place in the USSR during 1988-1991 contradicts the offered hypothesis, they just directly confirm it.

Those analysts and political figures, who accuse the CPSU General Secretary of consciously dismantling the Soviet Union, undoubtedly proceed from the presumption that M. Gorbachev knew about it and acted according to that plan. We are also inclined to that viewpoint, because of the very specific steps of the head of the country towards the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. It is important to note that his intention to divide the country into Union republics is vividly emphasized in the events around

16 "By the time the United States acting in favor of the population of Nagorno Karabakh was ultimately in the interests of the US government, which was primarily aimed at destruction of the Soviet Union from within. The adoption of such decisions on Karabakh in fact was the result of it: However, these arguments confirm that for the implementation of such a policy the United States had to be correctly informed not only about the present situation of Nagorno-Karabakh but also its past (Փաշայան Հ., Ղարաբաղյան հիմնախնդրի քաղաքական փաստարկները ԼՂԻՄ կազմավորման և Ադր. ԽՍԽ կազմից դուրս բերման շրջանի փաստաթղթերում (1923-1989 թթ.), 21-րդ ԴԱՐ, 4 (56), 2014, էջ 46-48)."
Artsakh. But the issue also has another side. Could the General Secretary realize such a large-scale operation alone? There is no doubt that M. Gorbachev had ideological allies among the members of Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU who supported him in this question.

Another side of our hypothesis should also be underlined. And it is that the breakup of the USSR should be disguised under other programs and slogans. They could have a character of theoretical groundings of the Soviet socialism's democratization, as well as promising slogans of social and economic rise of the country. All the exhortations around the provisions of publicity, reconstruction and acceleration should perform their role in it.

Artsakh (Karabakh) in the USSR disintegration project. Karabakh confrontation as a tool for raising the sovereignty of republics.

Today we can already understand why the West had to support the Artsakh movement and M. Gorbachev's initiatives simultaneously. Artsakh fulfilled the role of the first charge to put the whole process into motion.

At first there were only promises and "pinky hopes" given to the leaders of the movement. But when on February 20, 1988 the Karabakh Soviet of People's Representatives in full accordance with the USSR Constitution passed a resolution for reunification of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region (NKAR) with the Armenian SSR and sent a letter of request to the Centre, the latter immediately refused. It was followed by the Sumgait genocide (26-29 February, 1988) planned and organized by the Azerbaijani authorities. But all these anti-Armenian actions and brutalities did not stop the Artsakh movement.

The steps taken by the Centre obviously aimed at delaying and not solving the problem. The "Basic Program" was realized on the political background which was the result of different confrontations taking place not only around Artsakh but also in different parts of the USSR (Fergana, Novy Uzen etc.). The Karabakh issue was the most important among others, because it directly referred to the sovereignty of the republics.

The rejection of the Artsakh Armenians' demand on the "basis" of Article 78 of the Constitution by the Centre inevitably had to lead to giving real legal content to the "written on paper" sovereignty of the republics. It took the legislature two years to adopt the law on "resolution of issues connected with the secession of the Union republic from the USSR"17, which was the next step for implementation of the "Basic program".

Retroactive adoption of this law is sometimes presented as a step to prevent the collapse of the USSR. It is done on the ground as if the Union republics would not dare to secede from the Soviet Union because the law authorized the autonomous units and nations that compactly appeared in those union republics to decide for themselves the question of their status, after the withdrawal of the Union republic from the USSR. Autonomies were given the right to choose between three possible options - to

secede from the Soviet Union along with the republic, stay in the USSR or to decide their own national-state status including the right of declaring themselves as independent states. It was the recognition of the self-determination right of peoples of autonomous formations or reaffirmation of already recognized right, enshrined in law. At first glance it seems that the republics having autonomies under their power really would not make a move to secede from the Soviet Union because of the threatening danger of their split. But subsequent events showed that the law was aimed at splitting the country into republics. A number of countries (for example, the Baltic republics, Armenia, Moldova) did not have autonomies and without hesitation could take the step of withdrawing from the Soviet Union, thus launching the process of its splitting.18

Just eight months after the law was adopted, in December, 1990 the head of the country introduced for discussion by legislative powers a proposal about restructuring of the Soviet Union in the form of a project of the new Union treaty. For the president the stir around the new Union treaty, as his opponents believed, in fact, was to keep the country in a new backdrop. Moreover, according to that not complicated plan the internal divisions of the Union republics the autonomies with their borders and quotas in supreme legislative organs would undergo no changes since any change could mix up all the calculations. According to M Gorbachev’s opponents all the proposals about the restructuring of the USSR included in the agenda in 1991 were aimed at deepening the commotion of the country rather than helping it to come out of shock. It was the way of putting the "Basic program" into motion.

In 1991 the failure of the program could be linked with Nagorno-Karabakh, which persistently insisted on its withdrawal from Azerbaijani SSR and reunion with Soviet Armenia. Hence it becomes clear why the conclusions of the Commission of National policy and interethnic relations headed by Tarazevich made in the summer of 1989 underwent several transformations during the discussions in the Center. There was a suggestion that even if the NK Autonomous Region did not come out of the Azerbaijan SSR, so at least the “Special administrative status” which had been introduced on January 12, 1989 should be strengthened. But on November 28, 1989, the Center introduced to the Supreme Council the resolution project submitted for the elimination of the “Special administrative status”, which was adopted.

In the spring of 1991 the country stepped into the phase of immediate realization of disintegration. M. Gorbachev put the renewed Union issue to referendum. It was not difficult to guess from the formulation of the question "Do you consider necessary the preservation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics in which the rights and freedom of an individual of any nationality will be fully guaranteed?" put to referendum that it cast doubt on the necessity of preserving the Soviet Union. The Baltic republics, Armenia, Georgia and Moldova boycotted the referendum displaying their determination to withdraw from the

18 As subsequent events showed, these republics demonstrated irreversible determination on independence in 1991.
USSR (excluding Georgia the other countries had no national autonomous entities, which allowed them to avoid the dangers of the law adopted on April 3, 1990). The referendum on preserving the Soviet Union did not give the desired results for the "Basic program". The 76 percent of Soviet citizens having participated in the referendum voted in favor of preserving the Soviet Union. If the President of the USSR did not have another intention, then the results of the referendum would turn into the most powerful legal guarantee for the preservation of the USSR.

Artsakh (Karabakh) as the main obstacle of the "Basic program". Punitive "Operation Ring"

The main events aimed at destroying the USSR into republics took place in Nagorno Karabakh in 1991. This is about the brutally realized "Operation Ring". NKAR remained the number one factor in the failure of the "Basic Program" of dissolving the USSR in 1991. The question was not only associated with international resonance, that was acquired by the Artsakh (Karabagh) problem; there were also other circumstances, and the most important among them was the just joint decision of the Armenian SSR Supreme Council and the Artsakh National Council on the "Unification of the Armenian SSR and the Mountainous Region of Karabakh" adopted on December 1, 1989.

The Center was against the resolution, even though it was obvious that it was impossible legally to qualify the decision about Reunification as illegal. Two national state structures of the USSR with the well known right of self-determination had adopted a decision which fully corresponded to the international law on peoples free self-determination. It is no coincidence that after demonstrating its negative attitude toward the joint decision the Centre continued to induce the Armenian authorities to review it and to "restore the former constitutional order". These appeals and orders were direct evidence of the lawfulness and legitimacy of the decision.

It turned out that the most stubborn force resisting the “Basic program” was Nagorno-Karabakh which appeared in the centre of attention of international circles. That is why in 1991, when the process of disintegration of the USSR was close to its pitch, M. Gorbachev tried to eliminate the "Karabakh obstacle" punitively. And the problem was not confined only to the region. Shahumyan region adjacent to NKAR and Armenian villages of the Khanlar region (sub-district of Getashen) - territories of Central Mountainous Artsakh (Nagorno Karabakh) would also become main obstacles for the implementation of the “Basic program” in case of the disintegration of the USSR.

19 In April-August, 1991, the Soviet Interior Ministry troops and OMON (Special Forces) violently realized the punitive-terrorist "Operation Ring" against the peaceful Armenian population and their defenders. Shahumyan region, Getashen and autonomous region’s 24 villages were brutally emptied. S. Achikgyozyan, T. Krpeyan (National Hero of Armenia), M. Shahnazaryan, A. Karapetyan, V. Nazaryan, Zarzand (Hrach) Danielyan and their supporters died heroically.

20 From the Sumgait massacres an image of a conflict was formed in the international public consciousness, where Stepanakert acted in the name of law and justice, whereas Baku acted in the name of violence and genocide.

21 On July 26, 1989, the People’s extraordinary session of the Shahumyan region appeared to the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Council to discuss and positively resolve the issue of including the region into NKAR. At the same time the
because they had already expressed their will to unite with the NKAR. Any precedent would be unacceptable for the authors of that “program”. The violent process of emptying Artsakh in 1991 became the only way to move forward according to the “Basic program” both for the Soviet Center and genocidal Azerbaijan supported by the former.

It is important to note that the "Operation Ring" implemented against Artsakh in 1991 does not get any other rational explanation out of the "Basic program". Punitive action had to start from the weakest point. These were the Armenian villages of the Khanlar region outside NKAR. The experience of previous years had already shown that the Azerbaijanis were unable to do it on their own. The Armenian self-defense groups fought selflessly because they were defending their Homeland, their ancestral lands and their homes. That is why "breaking all the rules," the head of the country placed the Soviet army forces at the disposal of the Azerbaijani side for emptying the Armenian villages of Getashen sub-region (Getashen, Manashid, Buzlukh).

It is known that the Soviet army and Azerbaijani OMON used violence and cruelty for the deportation of the Armenian population of those villages in April and May, 1991. On July 4, 1991 M. Gorbachev inexplicably abolished the emergency state in Shahumyan region. Politicians, experts, journalists and observers were unaware of his intentions (there were published articles in the press criticizing that decision). Lifting the state of emergency actually meant that the OMON members dislocated in Azerbaijani villages could freely attack Armenian villages. In May 1991, "Operation Ring" expanded also to the south of NKAR, namely to Hadrut and Berdadzor sub-region of Shushi region.

session appealed to the USSR Supreme Council to take the solution of the problem as well as the security of the citizens under its control. Naturally, in both cases the answer was negative.

On January 14, 1991, the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Council adopted a decision on the liquidation of the Shahumyan region and forcibly joining it to Kasum-Ismailov region (Geranboy, ancient Armenian Goran in northern Artsakh occupied by Azerbaijani aggressors). It was clear, however, for the people of Shahumyan that it was something written on paper that did not have any effect on their moods and with NKAR reunification decisiveness.

The observers of the organization “Memorial” stated the participation of the Soviet army and interior troops in "Operation Ring" in the following way: "In general, they not only did not prevent the deportation of the inhabitants, but also helped the Azerbaijani OMON in carrying out forced deportations. There was a kind of division of "labor": the military blocked the village, and OMON acted in the village. (See, Мемориал: Хронология конфликта. http://www.memo.ru/hr/hotpoints/karabah/Getashen/chapter1.htm#_VPID_2)

Here’s how the events have been described by a witness, Russian writer Inessa Burkova: “May 6, 1991. Both the soldiers and OMON who returned to the village robbed, burnt the houses. Men taken as hostages were immediately beaten to death. A Russian captain tried to intercede. Azerbaijani OMON man cut: "You are paid - shut up!" He walked away, spitting. There was again firing from machine guns, rifles. The old men huddled - they were under fire. The dead fell down. Others crawling out of the houses, barely alive, waited for their death. A sick grandmother was killed in her bed. 50 years old Melsik Soghomonyan was killed. He was a driver. He frequently went to Khanlar - Getashen. He was known by many people. Some Azerbaijani-policeman cut him into pieces in bed with an ax". //http://sumgait.info/ring/seda-vermisheva/karabakh-deportation-6.htm.

In May-August of 1991 were emptied Armenian villages of the Hadrut region [Qaring, Banazur, Karmrakar, Saralanj, Arevshat, Karaglukh and border villages in the Shushi region - Yekhtsahogh and Hin (Old) Shen].
"Operation Ring" might put an end to the existence of the Armenian autonomous region, if Artsakh Armenians suffered from panic and massively abandoned their Homeland till August. But it did not happen. On the contrary, people would not leave their faith and they resisted the violence the way they could. There is one more fact worth being mentioned. The events taking place in Artsakh were in the center of attention of the free thinking intelligentsia of the Soviet Union and the world community. Many Russian intellectuals - parliamentarians, writers, journalists not only protected the rights of Artsakh Armenians to live on their ancestral land with their speeches and presentations on mass media, but also personally tried to prevent or protect the rights of the civilian population in the hottest places if necessary. Finally, there are many cases when Russian soldiers, disregarding the instructions given from above, assisted the Artsakh Armenians in different ways. These were the soldiers who acting according to their conscience were trying within the limits of their service’s possibilities to soften the cruel nature of this policy. Many of them perceived and qualified the steps of the Center as anti-Russian and anti-state.

M. Gorbachev failed to eliminate the "Karabakh obstacle" until August 1991, when the referendum was to be held on the renewed union. But, there was no referendum scheduled for August 20.

“Deputy Foreign Minister of Armenia Shavarsh Kocharyan has commented on the 25th anniversary of the military operations of Azerbaijan against the civilians of Nagorno Karabakh, called “Operation Ring.” The comment reads as follows, “25 years ago, on April 30, the launch of another state terrorism by Azerbaijan against the Armenian people was heralded. This was the elimination of the Armenian population in northern Artsakh and deprivation of their Motherland. This operation that has been approved by Azerbaijani authorities up till now has one legal assessment: crime against humanity. The atrocities committed in the sidelines of “Operation Ring” carried out by Azerbaijani militia with the participation of the Soviet Army have deserved adequate assessment by the international community: international human rights organizations, legislative bodies of the USA and the RF, and by relevant resolutions of the EU. Anyway, Azerbaijan did not decline its policy of racism and Armenophobia, the latest demonstration of which is the April aggression of Azerbaijan against Nagorno Karabakh and the atrocities accompanying it. Azerbaijan showed by its power politics adopted just from the beginning military rhetoric and brutality typical for terrorist organizations why self-determined Nagorno Karabakh Republic can never be part of Azerbaijan.”

The August Putsch (Coup) in the context of the Soviet Union’s collapse. The last efforts of the Center to eliminate the Artsakh (Karabakh) "obstacle".

On August 18, when the head was having a rest in Paros, a coup took place in Moscow. Till now the August Coup has not received clear political assessments. It is not clear why the senior figures who were concerned about saving the Soviet Union failed themselves the referendum of the salvation of the USSR. The only significant step of

the “putschists” was the failure of a referendum to save the Soviet Union. And so many other questions have been without answers in connection with the August Coup (Putsch) so far.

But all the questions get convincing and even complete answers in the context of the "Basic program" of the USSR collapse. From that point it becomes clear the overt sympathy of the Soviet leader for the Azerbaijani side which had implemented a genocidal act, particularly taking into consideration that Nagorno-Karabakh had not already been the main engine of the dismantling the country (without Karabakh the collapse of the USSR since the mid-1990s had become irreversible) and hampered the implementation of the program of splitting the country into republics the main goal of reconstruction. This was manifested not only in "Operation Ring" when the 23rd Division of the Soviet forces located in Gandzak (Kirovabad) was put at the disposal of the Azerbaijani authorities, but also after the August Putsch, when the union institutions had already been paralyzed. This time M. Gorbachev, in fact, having lost his competence and authority in governing the country did everything in order for Baku to get more weapons and ammunition for resolving the issue to its own benefit.

After the August Putsch in 1991 The USSR entered the final phase of dismantling. Returning from Paros to Moscow M. Gorbachev hastily put down his mandate of General Secretary of the CPSU on 24 August, and in November announced his decision about leaving the CPSU27. On August 30, the Republic of Azerbaijan declared its independence.

Following the collapse of the USSR, the former Soviet nation-state entity known as the Nagorno Karabakh Autonomous Region (NKAR) as well as the Shahumian region merged to form the Nagorno Karabakh Republic (NKR), with the capital city of Stepanakert. NKR declared its independence on September 2, 1991, in full compliance with the fundamental norms and principles of the international law28.

On September 6, M. Gorbachev as the President of the country signed a document recognizing the independence of the Baltic republics.

The "Basic program" was fully revealed on December 16, 1991 when the European Council in the name of Ministers of the European Union adopted in the form of declaration a political decision on the recognition of the newly independent states within the borders of the former Soviet republics in the former Soviet territory. The document stipulated the general position of the countries of the European Union:

"In compliance with the European Council’s request, Ministers have assessed developments in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union with a view to elaborating an approach regarding relations with new States.

27 It was obvious that the reason for leaving the ranks of the CPSU was not the riot having taken place on the weekend in Moscow. Such a decision needs years or at least months.

In this connection they have adopted the following guidelines on the formal recognition of new states in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union:

“The Community and its member States confirm their attachment to the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris, in particular the principle of self-determination. They affirm their readiness to recognize, subject to the normal standards of international practice and the political realities in each case, those new States which, following the historic changes in the region, have constituted themselves on a democratic basis, have accepted the appropriate international obligations and have committed themselves in good faith to a peaceful process and to negotiations.

Therefore, they adopt a common position on the process of recognition of these new States, which requires:

– respect for the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the commitments subscribed to in the Final Act of Helsinki and in the Charter of Paris, especially with regard to the rule of law, democracy and human rights;
– guarantees for the rights of ethnic and national groups and minorities in accordance with the commitments subscribed to in the framework of the CSCE;
– respect for the inviolability of all frontiers which can only be changed by peaceful means and by common agreement;
– acceptance of all relevant commitments with regard to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation as well as to security and regional stability;
– commitment to settle by agreement, including where appropriate by recourse to arbitration, all questions concerning State succession and regional disputes.

The Community and its member States will not recognize entities which are the result of aggression. They would take account of the effects of recognition on neighboring States.

The commitment to these principles opens the way to recognition by the Community and its member States and to the establishment of diplomatic relations. It could be laid down in agreements29:

The expression “all frontiers” needs to be explained: The Declaration would not apply this emphasis if it meant only the borders of the Soviet Union Republics, the independence of which the European Union was going to recognize. Being aware that the borders of the republics and that of the current autonomies had often been established by controversial decisions and considering undesirable more conflicting agitation around territorial issues during the USSR collapse, for avoiding "new headaches" and ensuring the peaceful nature of the USSR disintegration, Europe in its Declaration underlined the inviolability of all borders taking into account not only the borders of the Union republics, but also the borders of all the national units, the so-
called *internal borders* of republics. Undoubtedly the West has chosen the most optimal way to avoid complications and new conflicts.

Subsequent events showed that the West has conscientiously followed the principle adopted on December 16, 1991. This approach was demonstrated in a special persistence in the Karabakh conflict settlement process, which reflected in the language, key concepts and understandings that the West used for shaping diverted from the reality image, which today impedes searches of the problem’s solution. Since 1992, when the conflict appeared to be under the auspices of the OSCE, the West connects the solution of the problem with the return of the seven regions “around Nagorno Karabakh” “occupied” by the Armenians to Azerbaijan. In such a wrong formulation, which passes from document to document, by saying *Nagorno Karabakh* the Western experts understand the former Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region. This “play” around the geographic and administrative-political names became a source of many misunderstandings. The Artsakh Armenians were “accused” of “occupying” territories “around Nagorno Karabakh”, when it is obvious that the Artsakh Armenians did not leave the borders of the geographic Nagorno-Karabakh and did not occupy territories around it\(^\text{30}\). They have gone beyond the borders of the former Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region and, as the result of the Artsakh Liberation War, liberated the territories (part of Artsakh) which according to the decision of the Caucasian Bureau of 1921 should make up part of the autonomous region.

According to the **CONSTITUTION OF THE NAGORNO KARABAKH REPUBLIC:**

“We, the people of Artsakh:
- filled with the spirit of freedom;
- realizing the dream of our ancestors and the natural right of people to lead a free and secure life in the Homeland and to create;
- showing a firm will to develop and defend the Republic of Nagorno Karabakh formed on September 2, 1991 on the basis of the right of self-determination and proclaimed independent by a referendum conducted on December 10, 1991;
- as a free, sovereign state of citizens with equal rights, where a human being, his life and security, rights and freedoms are of supreme value;
- affirming faithfulness to the principles of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of the Nagorno Karabakh Republic adopted on January 06, 1992;
- recalling with gratitude the heroic struggle of our ancestors and present generations for the restoration of freedom, bowing to the memory of the perished in a war forced upon us;
- fulfilled with the power of unity of all Armenians of the world;
- reviving the historic traditions of statehood in Artsakh;

\(^{30}\) Moreover, Azerbaijan itself continues to occupy northern territories of Artsakh and Nakhijevan.
- aspiring to establish good-neighborly relations with all peoples, first of all with our neighbors, on the basis of equality, mutual respect and peaceful co-existence;
- staying faithful to the just world order in conformity with universal values of the International law;
- recognizing our own responsibility for the fate of our historic Homeland before present and future generations;
- exercising our sovereign right,
for us, for generations to come and for those that will wish to live in Artsakh, adopt and proclaim this Constitution.

**Article 1.** The Nagorno Karabakh Republic, Artsakh, is a sovereign, democratic state based on social justice and the rule of law.

2. The Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Artsakh Republic designations are the same...

**Article 142.** Till the restoration of the state territorial integrity of the Nagorno Karabakh Republic and the adjustment of its borders public authority is exercised on the territory under factual jurisdiction of the Republic of Nagorno Karabakh"31.

The political decision adopted on 16 December, 1991 by the Council of Europe on behalf of the EU Ministers of Foreign Affairs was the unveiling of the disguised “Basic program” of the disintegration of the USSR, which existed at least since 1985-1986. It was a program for the implementation of which the General Secretary of the CPSU, at the same time the first and last President of the country did every possible thing.

As it is noted: “Liberated from the constraint to safeguard Gorbachev, President Bush used his Christmas address to the nation to announce the United States' recognition of all former Soviet republics. President Bush divided the new states into three categories: - first, the US recognized Russia and announced support for Russia's assumption of the USSR's seat as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council - second, the US recognized the independence of Ukraine, Armenia, Belarus and Kyrgyzstan and, in view of bilateral commitments made to the US, agreed to establish diplomatic relations with them and sponsor those not already members to membership of the United Nations - third, the US recognized as independent states the remaining six former Soviet republics - Moldova, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Georgia and Uzbekistan - but foreshadowed the establishment of diplomatic relations only when we are satisfied that they have made commitments to responsible security policies and democratic principles, as have the other states we recognized today (President Bush's televised address, 23 December 1991). In Nagorno-Karabakh the use of force has overtaken the issuing of statements and decrees as this predominantly Armenian enclave tries to break free of Azerbaijan. On 22 May 1992 the EC issued a statement, to ‘condemn in particular as contrary to [CSCE] principles and commitments

31 http://www.president.nkr.am/en/constitution/fullText
any actions against territorial integrity or designed to achieve political goals by force (EC Press Statement, Brussels, 22 May 1992)”32.

Thus Azerbaijan has also been recognized within the borders of the former Az. SSR contrary to the fact that by Constitutional Act of the Azerbaijan Republic “On restoration of state independence of the Azerbaijan Republic” (Release date: 18.10.1991) [Article 1. Invasion, on 27-28 April, 1920, of 11th Army of RSFSR in Azerbaijan, annexation of the territory of Republic, overthrow of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic - subject of international law is regarded as occupation of independent Azerbaijan by Russia. Article 2. Azerbaijan Republic is a successor of the Azerbaijan Republic which existed from 28 May, 1918 to 28 April, 1920. Article 3. Treaty on formation of the USSR dated 30 December, 1922 is illegal from the moment of its signing, with regard to Azerbaijan…]33 it resigned its right as the legal successor to the Azerbaijan SSR34 and proclaimed itself as the legal successor to the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic which existed from 28 May, 1918 to 28 April, 1920 without actually approved or recognized frontiers35.

The shadow of the "Basic Program" on the post-Soviet developments

The international community "inherited" a few conflict issues in post-Soviet territory, including the Artsakh (Karabakh) problem. The settlement of a conflict of an international armed confrontation character appeared under the OSCE auspices. The great powers have remained faithful to the main thesis of the "Basic Program" accepting the "territorial integrity" of the former Soviet republics (including Azerbaijan), as a precondition for the conflict resolution, and recognizing the Republic of Azerbaijan within the former Az.SSR borders. The fact that according to acting international treaties

---

33 http://legalacts.az/En/document/3/15146
35 At the end of May, 1919 President Woodrow Wilson during his meeting with A. M. Topchibashev (Chairman of the Azerbaijan Republic’s delegation to the Paris Peace Conference), concluded: “The status of Azerbaijan could not be resolved until the perplexing Russian question had been settled” (Hovhannisian R.G., The Republic of Armenia, vol. I. The First Year, 1918-1919, London, 1971 p. 291). As notes Sh. Avakyan, “The Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan of 1918-1920 was never formally recognized by the international community, and by the League of Nations, in particular. The League not only refused to officially recognize the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan, but also its application for membership...” (“Frontier disputes with the neighbouring States did not permit of an exact definition of the boundaries of Azerbaijan” [League of Nations: An Extract from the Journal N17 of the First Assembly (Geneva 1920, page 139), see: Avakian Sh., Nagorno Karabagh Legal Aspects Fourth Edition Yerevan 2013, pp. 10-11, 39]). The uncertainty of artificial Azerbaijan’s “state frontiers” was due to its aggressive policy, particularly, towards the Armenian territories.
Azerbaijan was the only one among the former Soviet republics not having the right to secede in the Az.SSR, was ignored. They also ignored the fact about the formation of the Republic of Nagorno Karabakh from the point of view of the international law as well as the fact that since 1989 the political, economic and administrative control of Baku has been actually missing in Nagorno Karabakh. Moreover, they ignored the statements of the West (which in 1988-1989 supported the Artsakh movement) about bringing the issue to a solution that will "truly reflect the views of the people of the Region". Finally, they ignored the fact of the genocide and deportation of Armenians committed by the Azerbaijani authorities in Eastern Transcaucasia.

In the case of settlement of the Karabakh problem, fundamental principle of the free self-determination of peoples artificially has been opposed to the principle of "territorial integrity" or has been equalized with it, although the former historically, logically and legally has priority over the latter.

It was clear that if Baku managed to break the resistance of Artsakh and continue the genocidal policies against the population of Nagorno Karabakh in 1991-1994, the West would not go beyond a few formal "condemning" statements. But it turned out that without the Soviet aid and direct participation in hostilities Baku not only failed to subdue NKR which had already declared its independence, but also suffered many defeats and was forced to sign the cease-fire protocol in Bishkek with Stepanakert and Yerevan. The Karabakh confrontation got an international armed conflict character, and its settlement, due to geopolitical interests in the region, appeared at the crossroads of global power centers. Since 1992 all the projects proposed to the parties of the conflict settlement have been under the shadow of the “Basic program”.

The fact that the self-determination right of Artsakh people was recognized several times (and not only by Baku from the end of November and the beginning of December, 1920), has been ignored. For the last time the right of the self-determination of Nagorno Karabakh was reaffirmed by the law "Concerning the procedure for secession of a Union republic from the USSR", on April 3, 1990.

The fact that no state by the name of "Azerbaijan" has come into existence in the region in accordance with the principle of self-determination of peoples, is ignored. The artificially-formed Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (which was founded by the Turkish troops led by Nuri pasha that invaded Transcaucasia), then Soviet Azerbaijan (which was founded by the Soviet Russia’s XI Red Army, evading the principle of self-
determination) and the present-day Republic of Azerbaijan have not come into existence according to self-determination acts. Moreover, the present-day Republic of Azerbaijan’s right of becoming a republic within the former Soviet Azerbaijan’s “boundaries” has been limited, on the one hand, by the Kars treaty\(^39\) and the forcible decision of the Caucasian Bureau (regarding Nagorno Karabakh)\(^40\) and, on the other hand, by the perfection of the legal formulation of the proclamation of the NKR, which took place before the admission of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the UN in March, 1992. These facts also indicate that the principle of "territorial integrity" is not applicable for the Republic of Azerbaijan and its implementation in relation to the latter is wrong - historically and legally. On March 30, 2016 President of the Republic of Armenia Serzh Sargsyan delivered a speech and particularly said: “There are frequent speculations around the word “occupation” in the context of Karabakh conflict. Without entering into the realm of history, I have to make a small observation here. Those that use the word ‘occupation’ often forget that Karabakh was a victim of occupation herself for 70 years. To all those who consciously or unconsciously use the word “occupation”, I would like to ask: but “what was Karabakh’s annexation to Azerbaijan in 1921, thanks to Stalin if not occupation? After receiving this generous gift, Azerbaijan... created such unbearable conditions that the people of Nagorno Karabakh were the first to rise up immediately after the emergence of the first signs of weakening of centripetal Soviet power. Was it because of a happy life? The protests of 1988 were so powerful that the beginning of the collapse of the USSR is commonly associated with the Karabakh Movement. The initial occupation was the very cause of the conflict. Hence, Nagorno Karabakh has nothing to do with the notion of territorial integrity of the present-day Azerbaijan. Armenians had firsthand experience of Azerbaijani’s policy of complete depopulation of Nagorno Karabakh from Armenians. There was indeed the bitter precedent of Nakhijevan - another region populated by Armenians. In addition to driving out the Armenian population, the precious cultural legacy of the Jugha cross-stones was barbarically destroyed in 2005. Not even a tiny piece, not even a crumb of that marvelous medieval treasure survived. The whole region has been cleansed of Armenians and all traces of Armenian culture. Anyone who nowadays views Nagorno Karabakh in the context of Azerbaijan’s territorial integrity is implicitly endorsing the cruel Stalinist policy of \textit{divide et impera}, a policy that inflicted deprivation and grief upon

\(^{39}\) The ancient Armenian region of Nakhijevan by the Kars treaty was violently “transferred” to the Azerbaijan SSR not as a territory belonging to it, but under its “protection”. In 1991 by the act of resigning its right as the legal successor to the Az.SSR Baku also lost its "claim" to having Nakhijevan as a territory under its "protection".

\(^{40}\) The Armenian SSR Supreme Council according to the decision of February 13, 1990, recorded the illegal nature of the Caucasian Bureau’s decision. The “theorists” of Azerbaijan often “criticize” the idea used by the Armenian authors about the legal solution of the problem by the Caucasian Bureau on July 4, 1921 and the illegal one on July 5. The Azerbaijani “theorists” claim that the same decision-making body cannot be treated as competent, on the one hand and incompetent, on the other hand. Moreover, reference is made as if at that time there were no other competent bodies. The Baku’s "experts" ignore the following counterargument, that even if the Caucasian Bureau is treated as a body “competent” for such a decision, then we will be forced to reckon with the fact that the decision of July 4 was taken without infringing the regulations, whereas the next day, on July 5 there were serious violations of the regulations. In fact, it was not accepted, because it neither was discussed, nor voted.
millions of families. This logic is alive as we speak. It has reached the ridiculous point of not allowing foreign citizens with Armenian origin to enter into Azerbaijan. Regardless of whether Armenians are citizens of the United States, Russia, or any other state, they are banned from entering Azerbaijan. At the same time, they are promising to ensure the security of Armenians if Karabakh becomes a part of Azerbaijan. Why, on earth the people of Karabakh should believe this? We confronted a situation in which our neighbor’s perception of negotiations is far from the modern understanding of this word...”41.

***

Artsakh owing to the patriotic devoutness of the best sons and daughters of the Armenian people gave a crushing response to all the injustices and violences perpetrated by aggressive Azerbaijan and defeated the latter42 in the Artsakh Liberation War of 1991-1994.

*Translated from Armenian by S. E. Chraghyan*

---


42 The Armenian forces struck a powerful counterblow to aggressive Azerbaijan in the four-day war (April 1-4, 2016) as well.
The alleged “argument” of the Azerbaijan’s territorial claims to the Republic of Nagorno Karabakh (NKR) (Artsakh Republic) and the Republic of Armenia (RA) is as if the Armenian population always constituted minority in the khanates of Erivan (Yerevan) and Nakhichevan (Nakhijevan) before their joining to Russia and increased only in the 1828 - 1830s resulting from the resettlement of the Armenians from Persia and the Ottoman Empire. The President of Azerbaijan, gambling upon the fact that on the 19th century maps compiled by the Russian authorities there are many Turkic-language toponyms in Eastern Armenia (in the territory of the Armenian Oblast and Artsakh1), declares Armenia part of a fictitious “Western Azerbaijan”2. Thus, artificially formed (from mid-1918 with the Pan-Turkic purposes) “Azerbaijan” [with the stolen name from Iranian Azerbaijan (known since ancient times as Atropatene in Greek, Atrpatakan in Armenian and Āturpātakān in Middle Persian) has deployed a widespread aggressive propaganda campaign in this direction.

Making use of documentary sources, it is seen that prior to the Russo-Persian war of 1804-1813, the indigenous Armenian population constituted the majority both in the khanate of Yerevan and in Artsakh3. That is confirmed by well-informed officials P. Kovalensky4 and P. Tsitsianov5. The mandatory resettlement of the groups of Armenians from the khanate of Yerevan to Georgia had been effected on the initiative of Tsitsianov. During the first Yerevan Expedition of the Russian Army (1804) 11.100 households of the Armenian population along with the Armenian administration [the

---

1 Чобанян П., Демографические перемещения и топонимия Восточной Армении в первой трети XIX века, Բանբեր հայագիտության, 2015, 3, с. 212-220.
3 Չոբանյան Պ.Ա., Հայ-ռուս-վրացական հարաբերությունները ԺԸ դարի երկրորդ կեսին, Էջմիածին, 2006, էջ 198-202:
4 «Акты, собранные Кавказской археографической комиссией» («АКАК»), т. 1, Тифлис, 1866, с. 118.
5 According to his report (December 30, 1804) to the Tsar about the population of Artsakh (Karabakh) before the invasion by Aga Mamed Khan (i.e. 1795) there were up to 40 thousand households of Armenians only. P. Tsitsianov notified that he intended “to take away from Mustafa, the Khan of Shirvan all Karabakh residents escaped there from the advancing Aga Mamed Khan whose number reaches 8000 households” (see: «Всеподданнейший рапорт князя Цицианова Его Императорскому Величеству от 22 мая 1805 года за № 19». «АКАК», т. II. Тифлис, 1868, с. 703 (http://www.runivers.ru/bookreader/book9487/ #page/1/ mode/1up)).
Melik and the Haryurapet (Sotnik) of Yerevan] were removed from the Ararat Valley with the purpose of weakening the khanate of Yerevan. At the time when Persia sent a large army there, which also resettled a part of Armenian population to Persia under the pretext of the pro-Russian position of Armenians. Thus, the number of the Armenian population in the territory of the khanate of Yerevan appeared to be in a decline, because of the aggressive demographic policy of conquering states.

The foreign domination left its distortive traces also in the original system of Armenian toponyms. During the Persian domination along with continued use of the Armenian proper toponyms, in relation to Armenian settlements, with some exception, were also artificially applied alien forms of the names which were borrowed by the Russian military and civilian administration in conditions of the Russian-Persian wars in the first half of the 19th century. Such an approach was demonstrated also during the registration of the Artsakh (historically the 10th province of Great Armenia) population for taxation in 1823.

Study of the initial Armenian layer of toponyms, scrutiny of the original sources and documents, including the descriptions of 1823 and 1832-1833, revealing the causes of toponymic changes, their registration at the time of the domination of the Russian Empire, expose the present-day Azerbaijani falsifications thus removing their alleged, so-called “arguments” for historical and political speculations.

The “Description” of 1823, hastily compiled after the escape of Mekhti Guli Khan, was the first extended registration of Artsakh’s towns and villages and has become a benchmark for further mapping of the territory. The “Description” also reflects the situation which shortly emerged in 1804-1822, i.e. a vigorous unlawful redistribution by Mekhti Guli khan of the lands belonging to the Armenian Meliks (hereditary Princes) of Artsakh among the alien Muslim beks.

A study of the “Description” reveals a number of essential circumstances:

1. The “Description” was compiled without visiting Artsakh’s towns and villages and making lists in situ, but on the basis of the data presented by the khan’s officials, beks and village seniors, That was all mentioned in the “Description” itself, in the Introductory Word addressed to the Shushi City Court: “In our lists the maafs (in Persian free of taxes-P.Ch.) are marked only on the basis of the data provided by the mahalbeks and kendhuds, the village seniors, of which not all can be considered valid”

2. Some settlements were registered in the “Description” as estates of Muslim beks, contrary to the fact that a decade earlier and, generally, for centuries they had been in the possession of the Armenian Meliks and monastic complexes.

---

6 Evidence on preceding censuses (1805, 1812) see: “AKAK”, VI, p. I. Tiflis, 1874, p. 836 (http://goo.gl/SrLnD). Work on compiling “Description” were carried on after the escape of Mekhti Guli-Khan to the territory of Persia (November 1822), and lasted to early April 1823, i.e. were mainly conducted in winter months, a very short period, which had crucial negative consequences.

7 See.: «Описание Карабагской провинции, ...», p. 3.

8 E.g., the center of the Armenia’s liberation struggle, the famed village of Angekhakot (where in 1698 took place the meeting of the Armenian Meliks with the aim of discussion of the liberation of Armenia) in Syunik (in the
3. Extremely distorted Turkic and Persian translations of the Armenian root toponyms contained in the “Description” create a false impression about the ethnic composition of Artsakh/Karabakh of that period thus having a negative influence on the number of Armenian toponyms in maps. E.g. the proper Armenian toponym Berdazor (Berdzor), which is well known from the Armenian “Geography” - “Ashkarhatsuyts” (the 5th-7th centuries), in a distorted translation is presented in the “Description” as Kaladarasi.

It is common knowledge that the Treaty of Turkmenchai allowed passage from one side to the other, however it was not the principle of forming the Armenian Province (Oblast) which was really created on the basis of the regions (khanates) of Yerevan and Nakhijevan9, as well as the Ordubad (Vorduat) district by the decree of Tsar Nickolas I on March 21 1828, i.e. the Armenian ethnic name had been used as the name of the province prior to the repatriation and resettlement of a part of the Armenian population. It means that the Russian government had known quite well that it was a part of Armenia with its indigenous Armenian population.

The 1832/33 census is very important for the study of history, and of the demographic picture of Artsakh in particular. Examining the census data reveals the following facts:

1. The influxing Muslim population was distributed in the plain part of the Karabakh Gubernia, where the alien nomads pitched their tents. In the mountainous parts of Artsakh, i.e. on the territory of the Armenian Melikdoms (Princedoms of Dizak, Varanda, Khachen, Jraberd, Gyulistan) the absolute majority of the population liable to pay taxes to the treasury, were Armenians (90 – 95%).

2. In many proper Armenian settlements mentioned with the names in Turkic and Persian versions, lived only Armenians, and not a single Muslim.10

3. According to the 1832 - 1833 census, the number of the Talish district population paying taxes to the state treasury constituted 657 of male Armenians; not a single Muslim was registered. In the province of Jraberd there were 572 Armenians and 5 Muslims in all.11 The number of population paying the state taxes in the province of Khachen was 1095 male Armenians and 42 Muslims. In the province of Varanda, one of the largest, the correlation of tax payers was as follows: 5351 Armenians and 543 Muslims. Evidently, the increase of Muslims in the province of Varanda took place within the period of 1823 – 1833.
4. The absolute majority of the Armenians were registered also among those who paid taxes to the landowners. E.g., within the district of Talish there was not a single Muslim paying taxes to landowners. In the district of Khachen were 540 Armenian males and 71 Muslims, while in the district of Varanda 870 Armenians and 68 Muslims.

5. The analysis of the census materials shows that in 1823 - 1832 there took place essential demographic changes. In Karabakh province, including a considerable part of the Kura-Arax (Eraskh) interfluve (except Gandzak and the areas to the west of it), the number of the new Turkic dwellers increased at the expense of more than 50 temporary nomads’ camps which had been exempt from state taxes and populated by Muslim settlers subordinated to the family of Mekhti Guli Khan who had brought them to those territories.

6. In the 1832 - 1833 census materials also a note is made about the year of population migration to this territory, thus showing the primary time of Muslim migration (mostly in 1827).

7. In 1867 - 1868, at the time of another administrative division of Transcaucasia (when the new Elizabetpol province had been formed) Karabakh was included into a new province, with its former interior districts which were extended and renamed\textsuperscript{12}. As a result of toponymic changes the number of Armenian district names (at the beginning of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century there were registered the city of Shushi, Dizak, Varanda, Khachen, Gyulistan, Jrbard, Jevanshir and Jebrail) had diminished. The whole territory of Artsakh was presented within the provinces of Shushi, Jevanshir and Jebrail\textsuperscript{13}. While in the “Description” of 1823 the toponym “Jevanshir” spread only within the limits of a territory to the north-east of Dizak, where of 32 settlements pointed out, only 3 were villages, and 29 were temporary nomadic camps, after the expansion it included all northern provinces of Artsakh. Shushi mainly included provinces of Varanda and Khachen, while “Jebrail” - the southern part of Artsakh.

Although from the mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century Armenia was divided by the Ottoman and Persian Empires, the main population in Western Armenia and Eastern Armenia remained indigenous Armenian people until the Armenian Genocide (1915). Alien administrations used Armenian toponyms either translating or distorting them. The reason of the survival for the millennia-old Armenian toponyms was viability of the princely system and spiritual authority, as well as Armenian cultural and historical heritage.

A wide use of the Turkic-language distorted forms of toponyms in the official documents of the Russian Empire, in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century was conditioned by the military-political situation and compilation of descriptions on the basis of the data provided by

\textsuperscript{12} See: Առաքելյան Գ., Գանձակ-Ելիզավետպոլի ժառանգությունը 19-րդ դարում, Երևան, 2003, էջ 10:

\textsuperscript{13} Makar Barkhudarians noted that Jabrael and Jevanshir were the names of Armenian Princes (see: Մակար եպս. Հարխուդարեանց, Աղուանից երկիր և դրացիք։ Արցախ, Երևան, 1999, էջ 374).
the representatives of the newly invaded nomadic tribes while often disregarding the original Armenian toponyms. That is why ascribing of the invented and distorted Turkic-language "toponyms" to preceding historical periods by the present-day Azerbaijani falsifiers is unscientific and unacceptable.
ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE
One should think the destiny of this manuscript-beauty sleeping in a carved sarcophagus-binding was surprising. If for one thousand years (no less) it could be so well preserved, as it has been opened only several times - so clean are its pages, so amazingly soft is its non-deformed color of the wonderful parchment, there is not a single trace of a burnt or dampness - the constant witnesses of those misadventures and scrapes to which the overwhelming majority of the Armenian handwritten monuments got.

L.A.DURNOVO

One of the most precious pearls of medieval Armenian art, the Etchmiadzin Gospel, is, perhaps, the most known manuscript not only in the collection of Matenadaran after Mesrop Mashtots of in Yerevan (where it is stored under the N2374), but also in all richest handwritten heritage of medieval Armenia. The special place which this manuscript has in history of the medieval Armenia art is due to a whole range of circumstances. Among them are uniqueness of the monument in which have united the Gospel decorated with painting which in 1989 noted its millenary anniversary, the carved ivory binding of the 6th century and simultaneous four final miniatures; high art level of the miniatures (of both the basic Gospel, and the final ones) and the reliefs of the bindings; their antiquity, and that is why also a rarity of illustrative types represented by them of not only Armenian, but also of all early Christian history of arts. And finally, perfect safety of all components of the monument.

And it is no wonder that namely this manuscript prior to the others drew attention of the first researchers of the Armenian miniature who have addressed to a rich handwritten collection of Etchmiadzin Patriarchy and namely this one among hundreds of others, has been named after the depository itself. The manuscript represents Four Gospels written in large yerkatagir (majuscule). Like the majority of the Armenian manuscripts of the early period, it has rather large format: 34 x 27,5. It is written by large yerkatagir on a thin and light well manufactured parchment.

Not only handwriting of the scribe is good, but also all composition of the page in a whole – successfully found, artistically experienced proportions of the columns and distances between lines.

There is little data preserved on the history of the manuscript. Memorable record of the Gospel informs of the time of its creation, year 989, the place – Monastery
Noravank (Bgheno) in Syunik, in the area Vayots-Dzor (near the city Goris), and also names of the scribe (Hovhannes) and the donor bishop Stepanos¹.

From the record made almost two hundred years later, in 1173², we learn, that at that time the manuscript was in the monastery of St. Stepanos in Maghard, where it remained up to the middle of the 19th century, when it was taken therefrom to Etchmiadzin by the Patriarch (then he was still a bishop) Makar (1885-1891)³.

The state of this ancient manuscript is surprisingly perfect. Impurity of the pages is minimal and it has not affected the painting itself; paint layer drop outs are insignificant: the color tonality has preserved freshness and clarity, that is accounted not only for high quality of the used paints, but also laying on the painting of a thin, hardly traceable layer of a transparent varnish.

For the first time hand of a researcher touched the Etchmiadzin Gospel at the beginning of 80th of the past century⁴. For these more than 100 years history of the manuscript studying has passed rather great and dramatic way, beginning from the fact that this monument was defined as Syrian and dated by the VI century. Such assumption was stated in 1891 by J. Strzygowski⁵, the outstanding representative of the Viennese school of Art studies, the same person who was the first among the European historians of art to estimate value and contribution of the medieval Armenian architecture to the treasury of world architecture. The fact that Armenian book painting was not studied at all, the heritage of which was unknown to its initial researchers, gave birth to an opinion that painting was not yet known in Armenia during this period. 20 years later when J. Strzygowski learnt about other decorated Armenian manuscripts he reconsidered the initial point of view and has admitted possibility that initial miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel were pieces of art of an Armenian master of the X century who reproduced, however, the earlier Syrian sample. In addition, 10 years later F. Macler,

---

¹ The Etchmiadzin Gospel, Matenadaran № 2374, fol. 227, 231. Գարեգին Ա կաթողիկոս Յիշատակարանք ձեռագրաց, հատոր Ա, Անթիլիաս, 1951, էջ 155-156;
² Matenadaran № 2374, fol. 8v, 9.
³ Գարեգին արքեպ. Յովսէփեան, Մի էջ հայ արուեստի և մշակոյթի պատմութիւնից, Հալէպ, 1930, էջ 20;
⁴ The first studies on Etchmiadzin Gospel – the articles by A.Uvarov (А. Уваров, Эчмиадзинская библиотека, “Труды археологического съезда в Тифлисе”, Тифлис, 1882) and V.Stasov (В.В. Стасов Армянские рукописи и их орнаментация - “Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения”, 1886, июль) - in fact, were confined with description of the manuscript. For more detailed information about the history of the Etchmiadzin Gospel study, see S. Der Nersessian, “The Date of the Initial Miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel” in the “Etudes byzantines et armeniennes”, Louvain, 1973, pp. 533-558; Дрампян Р.Г., Армянская миниатюра и книжное искусство, Очерки по истории искусств Армении, М.-Л., 1939, с. 8-14 и Изучение армянской средневековой живописи, “Известия АН Арм. ССР”, № 6, 1946 by the same author; В. Н. Лазарев, История византийской живописи, М. 1947, т. I, с. 309. Н. Г. Котанджян, Цвет в начальных миниатюрах Эчмиадзинского Евангелия, “Древнерусское искусство. Рукописная книга”, вып. 3, Москва, 1983, с. 283-284.
having studied parchment of the initial miniatures, came to the conclusion that it was made in the 10th century, i.e. simultaneously with date of the manuscript creation.\(^6\)

The major milestone in history of the initial miniatures studying were researches carried out by S. Der Nersessian\(^7\) and K. Weitzmann\(^8\), issued in the same year where they, independently from each other, proved the Armenian origin of the miniatures and dated (them with the 10th century. Such conclusion became possible at the beginning of the 1930s due to the fact that by that time the circle of the monuments which were included into the scientific reference was widely extended.

Further the Etchmiadzin Gospel repeatedly became the subject of the scientists attention, both national and foreign, by whom it was considered from the various points of view. Among these pieces of work it is necessary to especially note C. Nordenfalk's research which has become classical. It was devoted to taking shape of the canon tables in late antique and early Christian manuscripts,\(^9\) where the Etchmiadzin Gospel serves as one of the key monuments on the basis of which the author comes to the conclusions and the main thing - for finding out of an early prototype of the decorated Christian codices.

The decorative cycle of the Etchmiadzin Gospel consists of fifteen miniatures united in one quire, placed, according to the early Armenian tradition, at the beginning of the manuscript, prior to the text. These are following miniatures: nine canon tables – two with Letter of Eusebius (fols.1r,1v), seven ones - with canon tables (fols. 2r, 2v, 3r, 3v, 4r, 4v, 5r), representation of Tempietto (i.e. small temple, fol, 5v) and five figure miniatures: Christ enthroned between the apostles Peter and Paul (fol. 6r), portraits of evangelists (paired, on two folios, fols. 6v, 7r), Virgin and Child enthroned (fol. 7v) and the Sacrifice of Abraham (fol. 8r).

Artistic design of the manuscript refers to one of the earliest types of the illuminated Gospel. Principles of decorative adornment of codex were laid in early Christian period, and yet at that time illumination consisted of two basic parts – from a cycle of figure miniatures and series of folios with ornamentally decorated arch constructions, in Armenia it received the name "khoran" designation of which was decorative designing of the so-called canon tables\(^10\).

---


\(^{7}\) Der Nersessian S., op. cit.


\(^{9}\) Nordenfalk C., Die spatantiken Kanontafeln, Goteborg, 1938.

\(^{10}\) These canons were compiled by Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea in the 4th century, who having divided the gospel texts into sections and numbered them anew, compiled summary digital tables. It is considered that manuscripts supplied with such canons, appeared as early as in the lifetime of Eusebius, for it is known that emperor Constantine requested him to compose 550 codices of the Holy Scripture for the temples erected by him. See: Ebersolt J., La miniature byzantine, Paris et Bruxelles, 1926.
Canon tables represent decoratively interpreted architectural motive borrowed by the early medieval artists from antique calendars decorated with painting, medical treatises etc.\textsuperscript{11}

To the symbolical meaning of these architecturally-ornamental constructions which are one of the major parts of decorative system of the Eastern Christian handwritten Gospel, is devoted the whole section of the Armenian church literature - symbolical interpretation of canon tables belonging to various authors from the 7th to the 17th centuries.\textsuperscript{12} The earliest of them is attributed to Stepanos Syunetsi and it could be quite known to the artist of the Etchmiadzin Gospel. As in these interpretation colors and decorative elements of each canon table are indicated together with their symbolical sense it would be seductive to think that these interpretations served as specific guidance in art practice of the miniature masters. Indeed, some elements mentioned by Stepanos Syunetsi, occur in the canon tables of the early Middle Age Armenian manuscripts (including the Etchmiadzin Gospel). But not all the ones. In addition these "instructions" are too common, conditional and insufficiently clear. An impression arises that Stepanos Syunetsi’s Interpretations were based on some certain manuscripts, up to date or of earlier period which are unknown to us. And, probably, here we deal with the reverse phenomenon: both Syunetsi and other interpreters composed iconographic pattern not so much for artists than they generalized and interpreted already available types of canon tables. It was especially actual in the early Middle Age period, during the epoch of Stepanos Syunetsi: it was necessary to "legalize" decorative system of canon tables, majority of the elements and the idea of which by itself were borrowed from antique sources.

To the symbolical meaning of these architecturally-ornamental constructions which are one of the major parts of decorative system of the Eastern Christian handwritten Gospel, is devoted the whole section of the Armenian church literature - symbolical interpretation of canons of the consent belonging to various authors from the 7th to the 17th century.\textsuperscript{12} The earliest of them is attributed to Stepanos Syunetsi and it could be quite known to the artist of the Etchmiadzin Gospel. As in these interpretation colors and decorative elements of each canon table are specified together with their symbolical sense it would be seductive to think that these interpretations served as specific guidance in art practice of the miniature masters. And really, some elements mentioned by Stepanos Syunetsi, occur in the canon tables of the early middle age Armenian manuscripts (including the Etchmiadzin Gospel). But not all the ones. In addition these "instructions" are too common, conditional and insufficiently clear. An impression arises that Stepanos Syunetsi’s Interpretations were based on some

\textsuperscript{11} C. Nordenfalk, who devoted the above mentioned fundamental study to the artistic design of canon tables in late antique and early Christian manuscripts, proved that among extant examples, peculiarities of the Eusebius prototype are most exactly reproduced in the Etchmiadzin Gospel.

\textsuperscript{12} The publication, translation and study of these texts (which have no analogs among works of other East Christian authors), are given by V. Ghazaryan (Ղազարյան Վ., "Խորանների մեկնությունը", Երևան,1995).
manuscripts, up to date or of earlier period which are unknown to us. And, apparently, here we deal with the reverse phenomenon: both Syunetsi and other interpreters composed iconographic schemes not so much for artists than they generalized and interpreted already available types of canon tables. It was especially actual in the early Middle Age period, during the epoch of Stepanos Syunetsi: it was necessary to "legalize" decorative system of canon tables, majority of the elements and the idea of which by itself were borrowed from antique sources.

Meanwhile the meaning of the canon tables, as it seems to us, is in their purely art aspect. Canon tables opened by themselves the manuscript and their function was to prepare the reader for perception of the world of the Holy Scripture emotionally. It is possible to compare the system of canon tables arcades to a temple where the reader enters through a portico (canon table with Letter of Eusebius, placed on the first page and it doesn’t have its pair on the opposite page) and, moving through rows of arcades (canon tables on both sides of the two-page opening), comes nearer to a sanctuary - Tempietto.

This analogy, undoubtedly, is conditional but dynamics of emotional perception of the reader opening the manuscript and thumbing through its page after page is in many respects similar to the sensation of a man entering a temple.

Semantic visual contents of the Tempietto with which the first part of a cycle comes to the end, is differently interpreted by researchers. Going from an architectural prototype, as well as canon tables, it is interpreted either as canopy over the tomb of Christ or as a construction over a grotto where he was born. But at all distinction of interpretations, principle semantic meaning of the Tempietto as a sanctuary and as a fountain of life remains invariable. Tempietto finishes by itself a decorative part of a miniatures cycle and prepares the spectator for perception of the basic, actually its illustrative part, which first scene - Christ on the throne between apostles Peter and Paul - is located on the same two-page opening. On the following two two-page openings portraits of grouped in pairs evangelists, the Virgin and Child enthroned and Sacrifice of Abraham come into view.

Such selection of the scenes is not casual. Its semantic value was convincingly revealed by S. Der Nersessian: the cycle opens with the image of the "hero" of the book, Christ between the disciples, further go portraits of the evangelists and, at last, two last scenes “summarize contents of the book and symbolize two basic origins of the Christian religion and doctrine: praying Virgin and Child – the symbol of its human essence, and sacrifice... - symbol of the Crucifixion and Salvation”.13

Studying of the Armenian book painting monuments of the X century has revealed presence of two illustration types of the Gospel during this period. One of them tends to the narrative interpretation, the other - to symbolical.14 If in the first ones the artists

13 S. Der Nersessian, op. cit., p. 551.
14 For details see: Ն. Քոթանջյան, Ծղրութի ավետարանը 974 թ., Երևան, 2006 (in Armenian, Russian, French).
represented sacred history in a number of separate, the most important events (and in details adhering to the messages of evangelists), in the second one they aspired to embody the content of the Christian dogma not in concrete episodes but in several condition-symbolical scenes.

A series of figure miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel concerns with this second type.

The ideological and semantic programme of these miniatures was expressed in perfect artistic expression, and that distinguishes our monument among other manuscripts and makes it one of the outstanding phenomena of not only Armenian, but also of all the medieval art.

Prior to passing to consideration of the Gospel separate miniatures, let’s mention a number of art-constructional peculiarities which are common for the cycle in a whole. Majority of images represents by itself arch design and has a configuration close to a square; their sizes fluctuate from 25 to 26,5см in height and from 24 to 25см in width. Compositions are formed with arcades resting on columns, intervals between which are filled depending on the contents of the miniatures, either with the text of Letter of Eusebius or digital tables of canons or images of Christ with apostles or evangelists. Unlike these images two last miniatures - the Virgin and Child and the Sacrifice of Abraham, - located on the same two-page opening, have other design: here scenes are confined in rectangular frameworks in the size 22x18см, formed with three multi-colored strips.

Images are placed in the centre of the page, leaving enough wide fields of clear parchment round itself, the width of fields being various on all four sides: the widest is the bottom margin, the top one is a little narrower, then comes the external one, and at last the narrowest is the internal one (as if doubling at the expense of the margin of the adjacent page of the two-page opening).

Beginning his work the artist first of all built arcades and rectangular frameworks, using a compasses and a ruler, putting mark ups by slight forcing. Techniques of the master differ by freedom and precision. During his work he almost did not make any corrections. Beginning his work the artist first of all built arcades and rectangular frameworks, using a compasses and a ruler, putting mark ups by slight forcing. Techniques of the master differ by freedom and precision. During his work he almost did not make any corrections. Outstanding skill of the artist, a masterly spontaneity of his pictorial manner (unlike the more customary for book miniature small, detailed and careful working out of details) give the basis to think that he worked quickly and it took him no more than one-two days to create one miniature.

---

15 Interesting and on the whole convincing analogies between the miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel and architectural memorials of the same period are given by St. Mnatsakanyan (Ս. Մնացականյան, «989 թ. էջմիածնի ավետարանի» մանրանկարների ուսումնասիրության հարցի շուրջը, «Տեղեկագիր» ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ, 1, 1958 էջ 55-66), who notices likeness in the character of proportions, subject reliefs and decorative motives.
Art language of the Etchmiadzin Gospel miniatures reflects the stage in the medieval painting development when its graphic system as a whole had already formed. The features of the art language connect our monument with an Eastern Christian direction of the medieval painting for which the expressed decorative effect and flatness, love to bright and intensive, little nuanced color, activity of the linear origin, absence of interest to the volume-spatial aspect which impart the underlined conditional character to the image. But, on the other hand, there haven’t yet definitively vanished antique traditions in the art of the artist, on which were brought up the prototypes which served to it as samples. Moreover, this period has been marked by the revived interest to antiquity (that was especially apparently manifested in the art of Byzantium where in the 10th century developed the so-called. "The Macedonian Renaissance").

Reminiscences of Hellenizing art can be found out in treatment of variety of details, especially they are clearly traced in the image of flowers and birds implemented with exclusive freedom and spontaneity; plastic persuasiveness of accurately seized poses and movements of birds, amazingly keen color characteristic create sharply realistic images.

Other character of treatment we see in the images of the Virgin, Christ, apostles and the evangelists presented in frontal, motionless poses; their general convention and sketchiness, a stiff mimicry, absence of the individualized features and the drawing of clothes leveling the forms of a body - it all is typical for medieval art but is contrary to the realistic treatment of birds which holds lively communication with Hellenistic traditions.

At the same time some technique of Hellenistic painting, also borrowed by our master, has not been understood by him and they were used mechanically as, for example, technique of shading which gives a possibility to produce rounded character of a detail, at all inappropriate when imaging a rectangular plinth in canon tables of the Etchmiadzin Gospel.

But as a whole this way of treatment is not characteristic for graphic language of our miniatures which is defined first of all by relations of bright local colors and an active linear portrayal. Emphasizing the silhouette expressiveness of details, a contour outlining strengthens the flat-patterned character of the miniatures. And it should be noted that the artist uses lines of various colors - black, red, white, gold, - thus pulling together thereby the linear beginning with picturesque one and that also promotes integrity of the graphic structure.

Presence of various ways of treatment in pictorial system of miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel should be explained by peculiarities of the images laid in its basis which, in their turn, arose, apparently, as a result of the illustrated manuscripts use which were issued in art centers with various art traditions.

It would seem, connection of diverse art traditions should have broken stylistic integrity of the Etchmiadzin Gospel miniatures. Meanwhile it has not occurred. And it didn’t occur because art traditions of early prototypes by that time had already been thoroughly processed and they acquired a certain stylistic integrity, as well as due to
exclusive pictorial talent of the miniaturist, his bold improvisational manner of execution in many respects connected with individuality of the artist and with his brilliant skill, which reached surprising freedom and high perfection. Especially it is possible to visually trace this improvisational manner of our master by the images of capitals of columns among which there are no two absolutely identical ones. He reveals the form by means of linear drawing on freely laid patch of color, without preliminary outlining. At the same time the silhouette of a local patch does not often coincide with the linear drawing but the artist even does not think of correction: his main concern is preservation of the general balance of a composition, and the noted "negligences" are compensated with rhythmically accurate alternations of the main shapes and patches of color, their harmonious interrelation.

All graphic means play an important role in creation of this perfect and expressive art harmony, but nevertheless special significance belongs to the color, distinguished by exceptional power of emotional influence. Here is how V.N. Lazarev characterized color image of miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel: "the charming light paints, testifying to the miniaturist’s subtle feeling of color, form refined gamut – laconic and bright, full of inexpressible in words charm".16

It is remarkable, that expressiveness and colorful elegance of the Etchmiadzin Gospel painting is reached by comparatively modest selection of paints, many of which do not shine out by big brightness. The gold which is not playing a considerable role in coloring of miniatures is also used rather elegantly. Intensity and sonority of painting is created here not by the absolute chromatic strength of the used paints but by the masterly arranged coloring, selection of color combination which displays the artist's exceptional painting abilities.

Shining clarity of colorful hues, strict rhythmic of chromatic components, decorative clearness of the color design - it all creates emotional atmosphere of celebratory joy and elevated solemnity which varies from a miniature to a miniature thus creating various emotional nuances.

Let's consider principles of the coloring decisions of the artist on some examples.

Let’s take the first canon table with Letter of Eusebius. In the stately scope of a wide medium-blue semicircle of the arched bow associated with colorful image of an evening firmament, mystery and majesty are felt. The refined nobleness of the colors combination calls for imagination of special magnificence, creates atmosphere of resplendent festive adornment, somehow strict and constrained. An unexpected emotional nuance introduces in the miniature the shiny shades of a rose-red bud animating a little strict restraint of an image.

Large in size, an intensive violet colour of Christ’s garment in the scene “Christ among apostles” subordinates to itself all other elements of color and defines the basic character of the graphic contents of the miniature, its majestic and charged atmosphere

---

16 Лазарев В. Н., op. cit., p. 99.
in which the dramatic character and internal strength are combined. Rose-red tone of the arch bow in contrast with the saturated and dense dark blue color of tympanum give an intense character to the general festivity of the miniature. These two color accents are supplemented with other patches: the orange-red pillow which heightened the tension and black columns with white drawings on it, bringing in the miniature strict, even slightly gloomy restraint. Color of the apostles attires plays a supporting role and does not influence the general character of the image. So, the compound content of this miniature symbolizing essence of Christ image, rich with emotional nuances, is created first of all by means of color.

Two pair portraits of evangelists shine out by a special lucidity and softness of emotional atmosphere. Solemn conviviality sounds in them easily and joyfully, due to somehow muffled color characteristic. Among the paints used here there are no bright active patches of red and violet color, giving a mysterious majesty to the image (as in the scene the Virgin Enthroned), there are not also black colors, giving to it austerity and strain (as in the scene “Christ between Apostles”). Here rose-red and golden-yellow colors of arcades dominate, and gentle semitones of apostles attires and easy shades of their blue nimbuses surrounded with the sparkling gold border, only strengthen enlightened character of the images.

The artistic perfection which has defined power of the imagery emotional influence of miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel, that high spirituality with which they are marked, stipulated, on the one hand, by exclusive endowments of the master who has decorated the manuscript, on the other – by presence of the developed art tradition.

**FINAL MINIATURES**

Four miniatures on two folios, sewn at the end of the manuscript, (and therefore they received the name of final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel) have been recognized by scientists a product of the Armenian art even later, than the basic illustrative cycle itself. Attribution of these miniatures done by J. Strzygowski\(^{17}\) at the end of the last century as Syrian, almost wasn’t disputed\(^{18}\) during more than half a century. In 1947 V.N. Lazarev in his comprehensive research "History of the Byzantine painting" resolutely denied this settled opinion. "There are all grounds, - he writes, - to attribute four attached miniatures in the Etchmiadzin Gospel of 989 not to the Syrian master of the 6th century as it aspired to prove Strzhigovsky, but to Armenian artist of the 7th-8th centuries", since, though there was not preserved any illustrated Armenian manuscript earlier than 887 but "old sources speak about existence in 7th-8th centuries

\(^{17}\) Strzygowski J., op. cit.

\(^{18}\) Besides the above-mentioned work by K. Weitzmann, where he expressed an opinion, that the final miniatures, were the work of an Armenian master, though not earlier than the 10\(^{th}\) century.
Kamsarakan school of a miniature and Tatev school in the 9th century”. Similarity to the Syrian manuscripts is explained by use of Syrian prototypes by the Armenian master.19

Proofs of the Armenian origin of the final miniatures was presented, a little later, by L.L. Durnovo, by revealing lines of a stylistic generality between them and lists of the Armenian churches of the 7th century (Lmbat, Aruch). She dated them by the “7th century if not earlier” and she made a very important logic conclusion that “they are not the first book miniatures on the Armenian soil as far as such high on skill products do not happen to be the first step”.20 Later this observation by L.A. Durnovo was supported and developed by S. Der Nersessian who, also having mentioned affinity of the final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel and samples of monumental painting of Armenia of the 7th century, she also underlined their appreciable stylistic difference from monuments of the Syrian painting and came to the conclusion, that it is – “a piece of work of an Armenian master of the end of the 6th century or, that is more probable, – beginning of the 7th century ”. 21 She also mentioned that the final miniatures are outstanding art pieces of the early Christian art, displaying system of illustration of the New Testament, which hasn’t reached us in other samples.

Four final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel are located on both sides of two folios and depict: The Annunciation to Zacharias (fol. 228r), the Annunciation (fol. 228v), Adoration of the Magi (fol. 228r) and Baptism (fol. 228v).

Probably, these miniatures made only a part of the initial illustrative cycle.22 Because of absence of other preserved monuments of that time there is no sense even to do the assumption of what the full cycle was like. But the tendency by which the artist was guided, selecting subjects for an illustrative cycle, is clear and by these four miniatures, as well as in the initial miniatures it is the tendency to symbolical thorough understanding of evangelical history.

The first of miniatures, The Annunciation to Zacharias is a very rarely illustrated scene, but, apparently, in the early Middle Age period there was practice of its inclusion into a cycle (as it can be seen in some Syrian manuscripts).

Assumption by S. Der Nersessian which is rather interesting and convincing, explains occurrence of this rare scene by its iconographic and semantic similarity to the Annunciation that gave the chance to place symmetrically these two scenes opposite each other both on pages of manuscripts and in the paintings of the temples apses.23 Here, however, there is no such combination, since miniatures are drawn on two sides

20 Дурново Л. А., Древнеармянская миниатюра, Ереван, 1952. Proofs on the Armenian origin of these miniatures and their propinquity to 7th century fresco-painting in Armenia are presented in greater detail and circumstantially in her last work: Очерки изобразительного искусства средневековой Армении, Москва, 1979, с. 157-171.
22 See: Дурново Л. А., Очерки изобразительного искусства средневековой Армении, с. 157
23 S. Der Nersessian, La peinture armenienne, p. 527.
of the same folio. Probably, the combination of these two scenes was practice of an earlier period; later, copying old samples and having borrowed from them the scene The Annunciation to Zachariah, artists of the VI-VII centuries had already lost the idea about the original principle of the organization of decorative ensemble and consequently these pair miniatures appeared not on the two-page opening but they followed one after another.

The Annunciation to Zacharias occurs in the temple interior, gold columns and arch of which are decorated by jewels. Zacharias is dressed in rich tunic (dodekakodon), bordered on the board by hand bells (verbetras). This unusual detail follows the description of the high bishop attire as it is given in the Bible24.

By the composition The Annunciation scene is similar with the previous one, with the only difference that the asymmetric architectural frame here is reversed.

In the scene of Adoration of the Magi the Virgin is presented in iconographic type of Hodegetria which was one of the most popular in Christian East, including Armenia, beginning from the 6th century25. (We will see the same type on the relief of the Etchmiadzin Gospel binding as well). One unusual detail of our miniature is of special interest: the Virgin holds in the lap not the Child himself but a shield with his image. A similar detail can be seen in a Coptic fresco of the 6th century in the twenty-eighth chapel of the monastery in Bawit26. This detail comes from antique practice of images on military boards and A.Grabar explains this formula by triumphal character of early Middle Age iconography27. It’s interesting that outstanding medieval Armenian figure Vrtanes Kertogh refers to the similar image (the end of the 6th - beginning of the 7th century) in his treatise "Against Iconoclasts", citing in the Homily of the Holy Cross: "When the king is absent also its portrait takes a place of the king, princes kneel down... if peasants see him, they also kneel down, meaning portrait of the emperor; they do not see in it a human being but what is depicted in it"28.

S. Der Nersessian considers that as a model for the Adoration of the Magi could serve an apsidal composition29. This assumption proves to be true by a strange, at first sight, a bow-shaped strip in the basis of the miniature which speaks how we think, by mechanical transferring to the composition of a miniature of the visually passively apprehended semicircle of apsidal wall and most likely - not by the artist of final miniatures himself but an author of an earlier prototype.

---

24 Exodus XXVIII, 4-39. See also Д.Д. Фрезер. Фольклор в Ветхом Завете, Москва, 1989, p. 486-487.
26 J. Clédat. Le monastere et le nécropole de Baouit - “Memoire de l'Institut fran5ais d’archeologie orientale du Caire”, XII, 1904, pi. XCVI, XCVIII.
28 Der Nersessian, Une apologie des images du septieme siecie, “Etudes byzantines et armeniennes”, p. 381.
29 S. Der Nersessian, La peinture armenienne, p. 529.
In the last scene, the Baptism, the semantic content is expressed especially complicated. Already the rare portrayal of Christ in the image of the Child should "underline, that the Baptism is a birth to a new life"\textsuperscript{30}. The miniature frame also bears symbolic-allegorical sense, where in a wide frame-border, between four portraits of evangelists placed in its corners, the motive of the bird standing in a gold bowl on a gold dish is repeated. This bird is a pelican and it is not accidental that it appears here. In the Middle Ages existed belief as if a pelican to revive his nestlings tears off its breast and allows them to drink their fill. Then becomes comprehensible the analogy made by iconographs between those who sacrificed themselves for the sake of the mankind by Christ and that bird. And the bowl and a dish on which there is a standing bird, make that analogy even more direct thus reminding about full communion vessels - attributes of communicating of apostles "blood and a flesh of Christ".

The unusual border of the Baptism finds a parallel in a simultaneous monument – the manual woven icon originating from Egypt and kept in the Museum of Arts in Cleveland\textsuperscript{31}. Thus, among final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel we have already two original iconographic elements, making them related with Coptic monuments and testifying to close contacts of Armenia and Egypt in the early Middle Ages.

Final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel are of exclusive interest not only by their singularity and originality of iconographic decisions (not having parallels in early medieval art), but, in not a smaller degree, by outstanding qualities of the painting itself. And though not all the four miniatures are equivalent in the artistic aspect, each of them distinguishes by clarity and a harmony of graphic forms, compositional equilibrium of elements and high perfection of coloring.

The compositional decision of three of them is unusual: they have no framings. Configuration of these miniatures is formed with color planes which forms are defined by the character of the architectural constructions creating an effective pictorial background for the figures. The fourth scene - the Baptism, - as it has already been said, is set in a border-frame.

All the miniatures stand out in convention and flatten character: the volume-spatial qualities of figures, things and architecture are a little notable in them. In spite of the fact that in the character of figures movements there is still noticed an influence of antique statuesque poses; in their inclination towards frontality there is already something from immobility of icon images and proportions themselves are far from "classical". Rather large heads give the figures a little bit heavy monumentality; persons with a hypnotizing gaze of big eyes stand out. There is soft enlightened humanness in them which is combined with a stateliness and spiritual concentration. These faces are not

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p. 530.

individualized, all the characters have the same original type, neatly characterized by L.A. Durnovo as purely-national.\textsuperscript{32} Considering characteristic features of picturesque and plastic treatment of final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel, we find out presence of two various art traditions on which their graphic language is based. So, in character of figures movements, in the tonal handling of color (in particular, folds of clothes), let it be even very simplified, in the absence of abrupt color and tonal contrasts there is felt the tradition of Hellenizing painting. At the same time aspiration to preservation of local definiteness of color, its dense and saturated tonality, general convention and flatness of the image treatment, interest to the linear principle point out strong communication of these miniatures with principles of the local eastern art.

From the synthesis of the two mentioned traditions the born pictorial style was on the one hand, characteristic for an epoch when process of formation of graphic system of early medieval arts had not yet fully ended, on the other, it was rather peculiar as within the limits of art language, general for the given historical period, final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel present a specific national variant.

Images form from relatively large compact forms confidently laid with dense sated paints. Working out of the particulars is not characteristic for the style of miniatures, there are almost absent completely ornamental motives in them. The painting itself testifies to the exceptionally free manner of brush-work, where the form was initially marked by contour drawing, and colors varied and specified in the course of work and that caused, to a certain extent, density and saturation of coloring. The latter as it has already been marked, is characterized by a combination of the sated colorful patches selection of which does not distinguish by a special variety: medium blue, green and orange are combined with ochre-goldish and red of several shades. There are also applied white and black tones. A very important role in the tonality of miniatures is played by the gold variously used and worked out with a transparent paint layer. Organically joining in color scale of the miniatures, it enhances the expressiveness of coloring thus enriching it with an extraordinary textual effect.

The color saturation of the final miniatures underlined almost by all researchers is reached not due to the power of color pigments (laboratory research has shown, that the majority of tones does not distinguish in brightness) but by the skill and color endowments of the artist. And it serves as one more acknowledgement of old truth: pictorial art with its coloring sonority is obliged not to absolute brightness of paints but to perfection of harmony.

One can boldly assure that in the graphic system of the final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel the main means of an embodiment of the figurative-emotional

\textsuperscript{32} “High-rising thick eyebrows; immense wide-open eyes, set near the bridge of the nose; with a mobile eye-pupil under the upper lid; a long, narrow slight aquiline nose with small nostrils; a large mouth, sometimes of somewhat non-descript outline; elongated downwards and almost proper oval of the face; accented fair complexion with light high color, ... is the peculiar type of always live Armenian face, created on real basis.” (Дурново Л. А., Очерки изобразительного искусства средневековой Армении, Москва, 1979, c. 167).
content is the color palette. Looking at the miniatures, the spectator first of all perceives color. Large planes of the sated tones fill the whole graphic field/space with dense and, in some parts even overloaded layer. The definiteness of a chromatic shade of these planes, their sizes and easily readable silhouette of the closed forms – it all together taken, subordinates other means of expression. Widely and freely laid layers of paints level the linear aspect and in this way they focus attention to the color of miniatures. Before one can manage to behold elements of the image, the eye plunges at once into element of colors and receives the first emotional charge.

The final miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel represent various episodes of an evangelical cycle and express, naturally, various figurative-emotional themes. At the same time they are united by the general idea of solemnity and majesty, sounding differently in each of them: magnificently and tensely in Adoration of the Magi, quivering and joyfully in the Annunciation, reserved and mysterious in Annunciation to Zacharias, it is quiet and balanced in the Baptism. And namely the color becomes a powerful device for the treatment of the major figurative idea in our miniatures. Its expressive immediacy even today preserves its power of artistic influence, delivering us not only the masterly handling of the evangelical text, but also the originality of the spiritualized creative person of the unknown artist who has created them.

MARGINAL MINIATURES

There is a number of marginal signs and even small scenes on the text pages of the Etchmiadzin Gospel. Once namely these inept and obviously late additions Strzygowski recognized as a work of the scribe Hovhannes. Meanwhile it is impossible to agree with it, first of all because without a special studying it is clear, that these marginal signs and images could not be initials: there wasn’t left room for them - they are squeezed between the text columns, even the lateral fields are narrow for them.\(^{33}\) Besides, - S. Der Nersessian\(^{34}\) also paid attention to it - marginal signs are placed near the beginnings of the chapters (though of not all ones). But the Gospel text in the Armenian practice began to be divided into chapters only from XI - XII centuries and every chapter then began to open with a decorated capital letter. Meanwhile, in the Etchmiadzin Gospel there are neither divisions to chapters nor decorated initials. Further, handwriting of chapters numbers, put down on the margins and handwriting of the text body considerably differ from each other.

It’s quite obvious that both the marginal scenes themselves which are an unskillful attempt to copy some images (sometimes from the Etchmiadzin Gospel itself, as for example, the scene of Adoration of the Magi) and the marginal signs (added in later

\(^{33}\) See: S. Der Nersessian, The Date of Initial Miniatures, p. 537. Weitzmann K., Illustrations in Roll and Codex. Princeton, 1947, p. 113

\(^{34}\) S. Der Nersessian, The Date of Initial Miniatures, p. 536.
centuries when it became usual - for liturgical needs - to divide the text into these chapters) have not any relation to the original artistic decoration of the manuscript, and it is a pity that they have broken exclusively harmonious and perfect beauty of a handwritten part of the Etchmiadzin Gospel in a number of folios.

THE BINDING

For the last 100 years unlike the miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel, which repeatedly drew attention of scientists, its binding was studied much less.35

Neither the main record of 989, nor the later postscripts speak of the binding, which seems strange taking into consideration the precious and rare enough material from which this binding is cut out. Possibly, it was not commissioned for the Gospel of 989 (the character of reliefs decorating the binding indicates a much earlier date) or it was adapted for it later (full coincidence of the sizes of the binding and the manuscript is hardly only a successful coincidence). Most likely both the binding and four final miniatures considered above were the survived parts of the early manuscript which came to decay or that is more probable, it was damaged for any reason by the end of 10th century. And then correspondingly to the size of the binding on hand was created a new manuscript decorated with a cycle of miniatures, executed according to art requirements of the time. And the survived illustrations of the old manuscript were filed to the new one as a precious relic.

As to the material itself from which the binding is made, stylistic character of its reliefs, and the iconography of the latter definitely enough specify time of its creation – 6th century.

During this period in Byzantium and in all Christian East carved ivory wares of various forms and purposes were spread enough: pyxides (boxes), episcopal pulpits, diptychs. Tradition of these works of applied art traced back to its sources to an epoch of Early Rome. Diptychs, i.e. two-leaved folding covered from the inside with wax on which the text was scratched, primarily served as an original official notice on election of consuls and emperors. And content of the reliefs, decorating these diptychs, was connected with the event: thus, on the consular diptychs usually circus scenes were depicted as the consuls were bound to commemorate the election by similar amusements. The imperial diptychs having an expressed triumphal character, which have been preserved in a small amount are of a special smartness. They have central large equestrian portrait of the emperor and the scenes glorifying him. Namely these,

35 Редин Е.К., Диптих Эчмиадзинской Библиотеки - Записки Русского Археологического общества, т. V, 1891; Кондаков Н. П., Иконография Богоматери. Пг., 1914, т. I, c. 216-218, рис. 139; Սփռյակին Ղ., Առաջին գրական թղթինքի տեսակները, էջ 19-23: We can mention here some other works, where the reliefs of that binding are considered: Дрампян И.Р., Э.М. Корхмазян, Художественные сокровища Матенадарана, Москва, 1976, p. 134; Степанян Н., Чакмакчян А., Декоративное искусство средневековой Армении, Ленинград, 1971, p. 17.34.
imperial diptychs, with their five-membered composition on each plate, with their idea of triumphalism also served as prototypes for diptych-bindings, in which they began to insert handwritten Gospels. The binding of our manuscript also refers to them. And though the secular content is replaced in the bindings with religious ones, it is difficult not to notice their genetic relation with imperial diptychs: the same five-leaved composition of the plates, the same large central portrait, the same idea of triumphalism and even - similarity of iconographic motives.

And so our binding represents two boards, with the size $36.5 \times 29.5$ см, each of them is assembled from five separate plates. These plates, the sizes and forms of which are stipulated by the sizes and the form of an elephant tusk and necessity of the most rational use of this precious imported material, have various length and width. In the concept of their composition represent by themselves that ultimate constructive logic in which basis is developed in details, a well thought over system developed not by one generation of masters. The top and bottom plates have the extended form and occupy all the width along the binding. Three others settle down on the middle row and the central one - the greatest - contains the main image. On the lateral plates the scenes appear in two decks. Junctions of the plates are diligently disguised with ornamental frameworks which separate the scenes.

At an identical composition selection of the subjects itself on the upper and lower boards differ: the upper board is devoted to the Virgin, the lower one - to Christ.

On the central plate of the lower board Christ-Emmanuil (the Infant Christ) is depicted on the throne with apostles Peter and Paul standing behind. On the lateral plates – four (by two over each other) scenes of the wonderful healings made by him of a man suffering from abnormal swelling of his body and an invalid at a pool by the Sheep Gates (on the left); of the enfeebled whom he ordered to rise and carry his bed, and of two frenzied (on the right). On the lower plate there is the Entrance to Jerusalem, on the upper – two flying angels uplift a laurel wreath with an equal-sided cross (it is identified with the person of Christ). This triumphal composition of an antique origin, usual for antique sarcophagi, was perceived by early Christian art and widely spread not only on the wares of small size plastic art, but also among reliefs of temples as we see it, particularly, in Armenia, on the facade of Ptghavank

The same relief with Ascension of the Cross almost exactly repeats on the upper board of the binding as well, where the Virgin-Hodegetria is depicted in the central compartment, flanked with two angels. This relief also has analogies among art works of monumental art of the 5th-7th centuries and it is especially close to the relief on stela from Talin$^{36}$.

$^{36}$ See: Лазарев В. Н., Этюды по иконографии Богоматери, Византийская живопись, Москва, 1971, с. 305.
On each side of the Virgin there are presented scenes from her life: Annunciation and Trial by the Water of Conviction (on the left), Nativity and Exodus from Egypt (on the right). On the lower plate – Adoration of the Magi.

Though Etchmiadzin diptych is the only preserved binding from ivory among the Armenian monuments, there is ground to suppose that in due time there were such bindings if not many, then at least, a certain amount. Vrtanes Kertogh testifies to it in the treatise against iconoclasts mentioned above: "When we see Gospels decorated not only with gold and silver but also bound in bindings from ivory and red leather and when we worship the Holy Gospel and we kiss it we worship not the ivory and red leather brought for sale from the barbarous countries but the word of the Savior written on parchment".

This evidence by Vrtanes is fortunately confirmed by the fact of the existence of the preserved till our days binding of the Etchmiadzin Gospel, and this confirmation in its turn calls still a greater confidence of reliability of his messages based on the real facts. It’s clear that this binding was not unique and casual.

Naturally, - it is also underlined by Vrtanes himself, - that "from the barbarous countries" (probably, from the African countries and from India) were exported not bindings themselves (with Christian reliefes) but only the material – ivory. And though this remark by Vrtanes yet does not allow asserting with all definiteness that this bone has been brought to Armenia directly from these countries in the form of a material, it appears that there are serious grounds for such assumption.

Another thing could be said with confidence: the binding of the Etchmiadzin Gospel cannot be attributed to the Byzantine monuments. The tendency to flatness, eastern type, character of the figures proportions with the big heads and hands, strongly differing from "classical" proportions of the Byzantine art - all it manifests the tendency, characteristic for an eastern master, always not indifferent at all to the expressiveness of the image let even it come out at the expense of its lesser refinement. We will also add to it presence among the scenes of the diptych some motifs which are alien to the Byzantine iconography (for example, "Trial by the Water of Conviction").

37 In the basis of this depiction lays an apocryphal legend originated in Palestine, which was proved by D V. Aynalov (Айналов Д.В., "Три древнехристианских сосуда из Керчи", "Записки Русского археологического общества", V, 1892, p. 204-208?). According to that apocrypha, the Virgin was tested in accordance with the Moses law (Old Testament, Numbers, 5). Anyone who was suspected to be unfaithful in matrimony, had to drink the so called “bitter water”, and if the water didn’t injure her, she would be pleaded not guilty. This very subject unknown to Byzantine art up to later times, comes across in a number of East Christian memorials of applied arts of earlier period.

38 S. Der-Nersessian, Une apologie, p. 381.

Along with expressed eastern character, there has been clearly reflected the time of their creation in the reliefs of the binding – that early period when the early art had not yet been processed into a harmonic mature medieval style. Live movements of the figures, emphasized dynamics of their poses and free modeling testify to strong dependence of our master on the artistic principles of the antique art.

It was said above that diptychs with a five-membered composition, to which also relates the binding of the Etchmiadzin Gospel, shine out with reasonable and accurate constructive logic. Not only the general composition was worked out where the central plate with the large figure represented on it unites around itself small-figure scenes but also the character of the relief - very flat, in accordance with utilitarian function of binding: it should not be too convex so that it would be convenient to take it in hands. Therefore the volume is revealed here by simplified modeling: details of images, in particular, draperies, are created by not only working out of volume forms, but also by graphic linear cutting method. The cutter draws a line, often leaving without working out volume aspects of the image. In some cases the engraving has purely graphic character thus forming an original texture and that introduces a decorative moment in the image and enriches volume processing with decorative-graphic expressiveness.

However now fourteen centuries later, relief expressiveness of the whole is created not only by means of volume revealing. Time has wonderingly refined and more accentuated the relief structure of the binding surface: protruding parts were rubbed off, the contrast between them decreased. Not only the master but also the subsequent generations of readers "have polished up" the binding with their touches; because of that the cold ivory was "spiritualized", as if having incorporated warmth of the hands holding it, as if it has turned alive and shone with a surprising warm hue.

It is difficult to overestimate art and historical value of the Etchmiadzin Gospel and its place in a cultural heritage of medieval Armenia. Uniting in itself three first class monuments, reflecting different time stages and different art forms, this manuscript allows solving a number of important problems facing the researchers of art culture of early middle age. At the same time it has considerably expanded the idea of book art of the early medieval epoch in general.

The remarkable ivory binding, into which the manuscript is confined, represents a great interest for history of art not only by its high art qualities of reliefs and originality of the iconographic features but also by the rarity of this kind of medieval small plastic art samples of which have reached up to now in a few specimens.

Even more important for history of Armenian (and all early Christian) art is the significance of four final miniatures. The very fact of their existence confirms written evidences of existence and a high level of development of fine arts in early Middle Age Armenia, in particular mural one. Peculiarities of iconography, uniqueness of compositional orders, originality of ideological rendering give a certain notion about an overall process of art of the handwritten book formation in the first centuries of its development and not only in Armenia. And high art qualities of the final miniatures of the
Etchmiadzin Gospel allow to put this monument abreast with such widely known early Christian manuscripts, as the Viennese Dioscorides, Codex Rossanensis and Rabula Gospel.

But nevertheless it is necessary to consider the illumination of the manuscript itself as the most valuable and considerable part of the Etchmiadzin Gospel, i.e. miniatures of the year 989. The exceptional artistic perfection of these miniatures noted in works of a whole range of scientists, allows referring them to the most outstanding monuments of the East Christian book painting.

The iconographic program of miniatures of the Etchmiadzin Gospel is not less interesting: canon tables, the closest to the early lost prototype and the cycle of figurative miniatures giving the original ideologically-semantic solution of illustration of the evangelical text.

All it puts the Etchmiadzin Gospel on an exclusive place in history of art of the medieval handwritten book.

Happily survived in a long chain of drama events of the country the Etchmiadzin Gospel, this remarkable monument of medieval Armenian art, is not only a brilliant evidence of the creative genius of the nation but also the proof of that exclusively high level which was reached by the Armenian art culture in the Middle Ages.

*English text revised by Garegin Kotanjyan*
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Note: The image contains ornate architectural designs and text in a script, likely of historical or religious significance.
Концевые миниатюры

FINAL MINIATURES
18 218º®ë (228µ)  
Äëàãîâåñòèå Çàõàðèè, ä. 228  
Annunciation to Zacharias (fol. 228v)
DETAILS FROM THE INITIAL MINIATURES
Letter of Eusebius to Carpianus, fragment (fol. 1v)

1st Table of the Canons of Concordance, fragment (fol. 2r)
2nd Table of the Canons of Concordance, fragment (fol. 2v)

3rd Table of the Canons of Concordance, fragment (fol. 3r)
6th Table of the Canons of Concordance, fragment (fol. 4r)

7th Table of the Canons of Concordance, fragment (fol. 5r)
Tempietto, fragment (fol. 5v)
Christ Enthroned Between the Apostles Peter and Paul, fragment (fol. 6r)
Evangelists Matthew, fragment from the miniature "Evangelists Matthew and Mark" (fol. 6v)

Head of the Evangelists John, fragment from the miniature "Evangelists Luke and John" (fol. 7r)
The Virgin Enthroned with the Infant Christ, fragment (fol. 7v)

Sacrifice of Abraham, fragment (fol. 8r)
ФРАГМЕНТЫ КОНЦЕВЫХ МИНИАТЮР

DETAILS FROM THE FINAL MINIATURES
Adoration of the Magi  (fol. 229r)

Annunciation  (fol. 228v)
Binding. The upper plate. Virgin Hodegitria with scenes from her life.

Binding. The lower plate. Christ Enthroned with scenes from his life.
Binding. The upper plate (the central compartment). The Virgin Hodegitria.

Binding. The upper plate. Detail from the Adoration of the Magi.
Binding. The upper plate. Detail from the Nativity of Christ and the Flight into Egypt.

Binding. The upper plate. Detail from the Annunciation and the Trial with the Water of Conviction.
Binding. The lower plate. Detail from Christ-Emmanuel.
Binding. The lower plate. Detail from the Healing of the Enfeebled and the Healing of the Two Demoniacs.
Binding. The upper plate. Detail from the Ascension of the Cross.

-binding. The lower plate. Detail from the Ascension of the Cross.
Fly-leaf of the manuscript.

 IDM ÉÇÀÔÀÍÈÖÛ PAGES OF TEXTS
[ Armenian text ]
Page with indexes of evangelical texts
(fol. 232)

Page with the indexes of evangelical texts
and the colophon of the commissioner
(fol. 232v)

Gospel according to St. Mark (15. 43-47; 16. 1-4), The Three Marys at the Tomb of Christ (12th century.), in the right and central marginals. (fol. 110r)

Colophon of the scribe (fol. 227r)

Gospel according to St. Luke (19. 27-37) (fol. 161r)

Colophon of the commissioner (fol. 230r)

Gospel according to St.John (19. 38-42; 20. 1-2), Mary Magdalene (12th century.), in the central marginal. (fol. 222v)

Colophon (fol. 231r)

Page with indexes of evangelical texts
and the colophon of the commissioner
(fol. 232)

Page with indexes of evangelical texts
and the colophon of the commissioner
(fol. 232v)

Page with indexes of evangelical texts
and the colophon of the commissioner
(fol. 232r)

Page with indexes of evangelical texts
and the colophon of the commissioner
(fol. 232s)

Page with indexes of evangelical texts
and the colophon of the commissioner
(fol. 232)
With his first works on, renowned Polish composer Krzysztof Penderecki became one of the most famous figures of the world avant-garde music.

At the beginning of the 1970s, in the Komitas State Conservatory of Yerevan, when listening to Krzysztof Penderecki’s work “St. Luke Passion” (for 3 voices, narrator, chorus & orchestra), composed in 1965, there spread whispers among musicologists that he had Armenian roots as well. Later it turned out that the information had a real basis: his grandmother was indeed Armenian. It is interesting to note his full name - Krzysztof Eugeniusz Penderecki, and his Armenian grandmother’s name was Eugenia, which means that as his second name Penderecki took his grandmother’s name: this probably proves their close spiritual connection.

Born in 1933 in the city of Dembitsa of Poland¹ Penderecki studied composition in Krakow - in the State Higher School of Music, where he taught from 1959, and from 1972 he was rector of that educational institution.

Penderecki is one of the greatest and brightest representatives of the Polish musical world and is both a composer and a conductor. As a composer he has always been distinguished by his modern thinking and innovation of composition. His works are notable for their sonoristics and coloristics of sound. Using unique and unusual effects, such as rhythmic declamation and noise techniques, Penderecki was able to achieve impressive expression. He is known to the music world also as an exceptional experimenter, and in creating his every work he combines musical instruments that previously were deemed incompatible, enriching the sound of the symphony orchestra, for example, connecting string and percussion instruments, or revealing new colour opportunities by the combination of orchestral register poles. Penderecki is also the author of jazz and electronic music.

Penderecki’s musical imagination is infinite. His works express fundamental human and universal ideas. In his own way Penderecki responded to the great

---

¹ Dembitsa is a city in the Podlaskie Voivodeship, Poland, located on the lower Vistula River.
tragedies that shocked mankind: he called one of his first orchestral works of 1960 “Threnody for the Victims of Hiroshima” (for 52 instruments), and later he composed also the oratorio “Dies Irae”, devoted to the victims of Auschwitz. Of his remarkable orchestral works are: “Polimorphie” (for 48 instruments, 1961), “Capriccio for the violin and orchestra” (1967), “Partita for the harpsichord, electric guitar, double bass and chamber orchestra” (1971), “Actions” - for a jazz ensemble (1971). He created also a number of works for the piano with the combination of different instruments.


Penderecki first came to Armenia in 2008 and it was indeed a historical event both in his life and in the musical life of Armenia. This is what he told about his roots to “Deutsche Welle”: “I have received a strong religious upbringing. My family was very tolerant. My grandfather was a German and Protestant. My father was a lawyer, Greek catholic, and played the violin. My mother was a strong believer and went to church twice a day. My grandmother was an Armenian. So, I have grown up among different confessions: that is the reason why I am so tolerant. I have written a lot of works that sound in old Slavonic texts. Unfortunately, I have not yet written any music accompanied by Armenian speech, but I am going to do it”2.

Penderecki considers Armenia his second homeland and for several years he has adapted his extremely tight schedule to the important music events in Armenia. He tries to be here as frequently as possible and to bring his active participation in the musical life of Yerevan. On November 22, 2013 the renowned composer celebrated his 80th birthday, on the eve of which he was awarded with the 1st class medal of the RA President for “Distinguished Service to Fatherland”. And in 2014, the jubilee 15th year of the international music festival “Yerevan perspectives”3 started with the concert series (from January 13-16) dedicated to the 80th anniversary of Penderecki. During the

2 "Deutsche Welle", Հովհաննես Իշխ անյան, Պենդերեցկին հայերեն խոսքով երաժշտություն կգրի, «Առավոտ», 2013, № 30:
3 It should be mentioned that the festival “Yerevan perspectives” has become a member of the European festival association since 2007, and in the whole world only 100 festivals are members of that association.
four concerts more than twenty of his instrumental, vocal, chamber and symphonic works were performed by the best Armenian and foreign musicians, during which the prominent composer acted as a skilled conductor as well. It was Penderecki’s third visit to Armenia: “My first visit here was in 2008 and I have to say that every time I come to Armenia with greatest pleasure. Of course this has an emotional side as well connected with the genes: my grandmother was Armenian”4, - Krzysztof Penderecki told the mass media.

Maestro told the correspondent of the “Aravot” newspaper that the String Quartet N3 named “Pages of an Unwritten Diary” he composed according to an Armenian theme. In his interview with the correspondent of NEWS.am the composer noted: “Now I am going to write a work based on the text of psalms which will be dedicated to the victims of the Armenian Genocide”5. According to the composer he is very enthusiastic about the Days devoted to him, which has become a tradition in our Armenia: “I perfectly remember all the festivals and the performance of my music with great professionalism. I hope it will be continual”6.

Krzysztof Penderecki expressed his admiration for Armenian musicians as well, especially pointing out the exceptional mastery of the Armenian choir “Hover”’s (the art

---

4 Սիրանուշ Հայրապետյան, «Առավոտ», 2014, Հունվար 13:  
5 The famous composer Penderecki about his work dedicated to the victims of the Armenian Genocide and about the Armenian musicians, NEWS.am, Style, 13 հունվարի:  
6 Ibid.
director and conductor, honoured art worker Sona Hovhannisyan) performance. His wife, President of the “Ludwig van Beethoven” fund Eljbieta Penderecki, gave her high assessment also to the Armenian Youth and Philharmonic choirs which often performs the Maestro’s works with great professionalism. The composer told the Armenian journalists about his Armenian roots. According to him, his Armenian grandmother, Mrs. Eugenia had moved to Poland from Iran, and they used to attend the Armenian church in Krakow together. In her turn Penderecki’s wife added that they are closely connected to the Armenian community in Poland and their daughter has Armenian eyes which will definitely pass from generation to generation.

On January 25, 2016 the Armenian State Youth choir celebrated the 10-year anniversary of its establishment. Krzysztof Penderecki was again in Yerevan on this occasion: “I first listened to the Youth choir two years ago. At that time I liked their performance of my symphony very much. Last year I was present at Sergey’s debut in Poland and I am convinced he has a great future: it is already evident now. “I am interested in young musicians because I am establishing a music center in Poland.” In 2015 he already hosted the choir “Hover” in his center, as well as in his house and showed them his Armenian grandmother’s photos. Armenian singers enjoyed unforgettable moments during concert tours in several cities of Poland. The composer said that he communicated with young musicians all the time since they have great enthusiasm.

Keeping his promise, at the beginning of 2015 Krzysztof Penderecki composed the “Psalm” dedicated to the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide (“Psalmus No.3 for Armenia”) for the choir and soloists. It was performed by the choir “Hover” and soloist Liparit Asatryan in a number of cities, including the famous Carnegie Hall in New York (watch video of the performance). Several other of his choral songs were also professionally performed by “Hover”: “Agnus dei”, “Missa Brevis”, “De Profundis”, as well as the choral song “Miserere” (together with the children’s choir “Speghani”).

In 2016 Krzysztof Penderecki and his wife visited the museum-institute after Komitas where his music was performed. After attending the exhibition halls with silent reverence they left original notes in the memorandum book. The Maestro confessed to the journalists that he had left his note in the form of music notes: it was a part from his work. He also mentioned that Komitas had made a considerable influence on his work.

7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Գոհար Հակոբյան, «Առավոտ», Հունվար 20, 2016:
“It is an amazing and unique phenomenon, when the composer is also a hero: and Komitas is just like that"\textsuperscript{11}, - said Penderecki in the interview with the correspondent of “Sputnik Armenia”.

It should be added that Krzysztof Penderecki has thrice received “Grammy” and twice “Emmy” awards, and he has also received many prestigious state awards of different countries.

\textit{Translated from Armenian

by S. E. Chraghyan}
“HOVER” CHAMBER CHOIR

Sona Hovhannisyan
Artistic director and conductor

“HOVER” (ՀՈՎԵՐ) chamber choir was founded in 1992. The choir was established on personal initiative without any sponsorship support. Right from its first appearances the choir presented an original type of Armenian choral music, open to any style and genre, closely connected with the art of European choral music. The choir gives principle importance to experiment and innovation and to the synthesis of various arts even while performing most traditional academic pieces. In 1996 “Hover” premiered Benjamin Britten’s “Canticum Misericordium” with the Armenian Philharmonic Orchestra (conductor K. Durgaryan).

In 1996 “Hover” issued its first CD - Ludwig Basili’s sacred choral songs. In 1997 the release of the CD was followed by participation of the choir in the International choral competition-festival in Arezzo (Italy) and a concert on the island of St. Lasarus, Venice. In 1996-1997 “Hover” premiered “St. John Passion” and “St. Matthew Passion” oratorios by J.S. Bach in full volume (conductor Z. Vardanyan).

In 1999 “Hover” participated in the choral competition-festival in Tours (France) becoming twice laureate of international competitions. During these years in its concerts “Hover” performed masterpieces of Purcell, Schütz, Brahms, Honegger, Poulenc, Hindemith, Britten, Stravinsky, Messiaen and other Western-European composers as well as a number of newly composed choral works by contemporary Armenian composers (A. Ghazaryan, V. Manukyan, A. Voskanyan) and works of the founders of Armenian choral art - Komitas and Yekmalyan.

During these years “Hover” presented its first staging of “Dance songs” by Komitas.

In the winter of 1999 “Hover” held a concert-performance under the name of “Christmas Carols” in combination with shadow play in the experimental theater “Being” (ԳՈՅ) (director A. Manukyan).
The year 2000 brought big success to “Hover”. The choir participated in the First World Choir Olympiad in Linz (Austria) and was awarded a Gold medal out of more than 300 choir-participants. This success was rewarded by a group of American Armenian music fans who helped “Hover” choir to realize their artistic projects. “Armenian Voices” and “Six Fables” CDs were recorded soon after.

In 2003 for the first time in the Armenian reality “Hover” appeared with an innovative genre initiative named “choral theater” by the critics. This was a choral staging of six fables by Vardan Aygektsi (music by S. Babatorosyan, director A. Manukyan). The “Six Fables” CD won the American “Music Awards” and “We’re all in this together!” prizes as “The Best Choral Performance”. “Hover” recorded monodic sharakans for VEM radio station and issued “The Way” CD album. Within the framework of the international festival “The perspectives of the 21st century” “Hover” performed S. Rostomyan’s symphony together with “London Sinfonietta” orchestra (conductor Diego Masson). The choir appeared with concerts in England and Scotland in collaboration with the Edinburgh choir conducted by Noel O’Reagan and hosted them in Armenia the next year, in 2004. Series of concerts in the United Kingdom ended by a concert in London dedicated to the annual anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Armenia.

From these years on “Hover” has been participating in concert programs with the Armenian Philharmonic Orchestra conducted by its Principal Conductor and Artistic Director E. Topchyan performing Requiems by Mozart and Cherubini, Stabat Mater by Pergolesi, Canticum Dolorosum by V. Sharafian, Missa by Buxtehude, Cantatas No. 157 and No. 150 by J.S. Bach, Stabat Mater by Poulenc, Missa de Lumine by D. Haladjian, Styx by Giya Kancheli, Requiem by T. Mansourian, Love Cantata by R. Amirkhanyan. In various years the choir also took part in stagings and concert performances of operas: “Il Barbiere di Siviglia”, “I Pagliacci”, “Madama Butterfly”, “Eugene Onegin”, “La Cavalleria Rusticana”, “Anouche”, “Artsvaberd”, “Fire Ring”, “Tosca”.

In 2005 “Hover” participated in the performance of A. Terterian’s 6th symphony in the open air concert at the Cascade monument (conductor R. Asatryan), and as part of combined choirs “Hover” performed Mozart’s c-moll Messe conducted by John Nelson and one year later Beethoven’s “Missa Solemnis”.

In 2006, 2007 “Hover” recorded a double CD of Armenian Divine Liturgy by Komitas written for male voices and an album of Komitas “Folk Songs”. The CDs were released in Germany through sponsorship of the benevolent fund of the Stanford
University: “The Flora Family Foundation” within the framework of the project of preservation of national values. A great number of copies of this album was distributed free of charge to the leading spiritual centers, universities, libraries, international organizations, information resource centers and churches through Kultur Aktiv e.V. Starting from this period the organizational and international issues of the choir were taken up by the manager of “Hover” chamber choir, A. Padaryan. Due to his efforts the choir’s recognition on the international arena has been continuously growing.

In 2006 “Hover” choir visited France to present the Armenian choral art within the framework of the days of the Armenian culture in France “Armenie Mon Amie”. During this tour “Hover” collaborated with the famous “Musicatreize” vocal ensemble (conductor Roland Hayrabedian).

In 2007 the choir presented “La Petite Messe Solenelle” by Rossini with the pianist S. Navasardyan (conductor S. Shahidjianian), as well as participated in the festivals of sacred choral music “Gaude Mater” and “Logos”, both in Poland. “Hover” collaborated also with a German choir from Hamburg, “Collegium Vocale” organizing 12 concerts of “Hover” around various cities of Germany.

In 2008 “Hover” hosted “Collegium Vocale” choir (conductor K. Trantow) in Armenia. A seminar dedicated to the Armenian sacred and secular music was organized in the town of Dilijan.

At the end of the same year “Hover” appeared in a concert in Dubai (the UAE), together with the Armenian Philharmonic Orchestra as part of a combined choir (conductor Brad Cohen).

The collaboration with the festival “Yerevan Perspectives” was fruitful. The festival gave the choir an opportunity to communicate with world-famous contemporary composers realizing Yerevan premiere performances of their works.

Conducted by Andres Mustonen the choir performed the “Styx” by Giya Kancheli featuring Gidon Kremer.

In 2008 the Russian liturgy “The Sealed Angel” by Rodion Shchedrin was performed. The next year “The David's Psalms”, “The Hymn to St. Adalbert” by Krzysztof Penderecki (conductor M. Klauza) and a number of sacred songs were performed. Then was performed “The Gates of Jerusalem” of Bronius Kutavičius (conductor by David Geringas).

In 2010 conducted by R. Shervenikas the pieces “The Canticle of the Sun” and “Jetzt immer Schnee” by Sofia Gubaidulina were performed. The appreciation given to “Hover” by Gubaidulina, Shchedrin, Kancheli, Penderecki, Kutavičius characterise the choir.
In 2008 the artistic director of “Hover” choir, Sona Hovhannisyan, was awarded a Gold medal of the Ministry of Culture of Armenia and in 2010 she was granted the title of the Honored Worker of Art. In 2009 “Hover” was awarded with the status of a State choir. Constant active cooperation with the Ministry of culture of Armenia has encouraged stable promotion of the choir. “Hover” continues to present new projects aiming at promotion of contemporary choral art by enriching the palette of the Armenian choral music. By subvention of the Ministry of Culture of Armenia a new theatrical choral performance, “The Parallel”, was implemented and recorded (music by A. Azizyan, director A. Manukyan) on the stage of the experimental theatre ԳՈՅ. The performance won “The Best Musical Project of year 2009” award in Armenia.

In May of 2010 “Hover” choir participated in Valery Gergiev's “Easter Festival” in Moscow with five concerts. In November “Hover” choir appeared at the competition-festival for professional choirs “Polyfollia” in France and also gave a special concert with famous virtuoso tabla performer Trilok Gurtu at St. Eustache Cathedral, Paris.

Starting from 2011 “Hover” has continued its activity as a member of the National Center of Chamber Music. It appeared with concerts at the competition-festival for professional choirs “La Fabbrica Del Canto”, as well as at “Teatro Dal Verme”, a prestigious concert hall in Milano.

In 2012 “Hover” chamber choir celebrated the 20th anniversary of its professional activity and was awarded a Gold medal of the Ministry of Culture of Armenia. It appeared in a joint concert with the world-famous Italian tenor, Andrea Bocelli (as part of a combined choir). In the same year the soloists of “Hover” choir were formed into a vocal ensemble which was called the “Armenian Voices”. The same year the ensemble appeared with concerts in Germany and France successfully performing in the “Cité de la Musique” concert hall. That year was also remarkable by the concert program “Bach & Beatles”.

Starting from 2013 the VivaCell-MTS company (General Manager R. Yirikian) has become the General Sponsor of “Hover” State chamber choir. This circumstance initiated a new, significant stage for the choir promoting its creativeness, presenting conditions for realization of its versatile ideas and projects in full volume attaching a higher level of quality to the choir activity. “Hover” took part in an innovative staging of “Anouche” opera (director S.Avetikian, conductor V.Mardirossian). The premieres of this performance were held in Sundukyan State Academic Theatre in Yerevan and in Paris.
“Théâtre Nanterre-Amandiers.” In the same year the “Armenian Voices” ensemble appeared with 4 concerts within the framework of the “Taiwan International Choral Music Festival and Workshops” held in Taiwan. In December the “Armenian Voices” appeared with a solo concert in “Le Quartz” concert hall in Brest (France) and performed “Noel Oratorio” by C. Saint-Saens together with the National Chamber Orchestra of Armenia (conductor Vahan Mardirossian). “Hover” also participated in the International festival of sacred choral music “Festival van Vlaanderen” in Mechelen (Belgium).


During all years of its professional activity “Hover” has given great attention to works of Armenian contemporary composers, among them E. Mirzoyan, E. Hovhannisyan, Y. Yerkanian, V. Adjemian, V. Sharafian, A. Boyamyan, A. Avanesov, A. Voskanyan, V. Manukyan, A. Azizyan, S. Babatorosyan, S. Aghajanyan, A. Ghazaryan and others.

On January 15, 2014 “Hover” choir appeared with a solo concert dedicated to the 80th anniversary of maestro Krzysztof Penderecki held at the national center of chamber music.

On January 30 it appeared at the Aram Khachaturyan concert hall in a concert dedicated to the memory of Artsakh hero Petros Ghevondyan. On February 11 and 13 “Hover” took part in the premier concert performance of “Tosca” opera by Puccini together with the Armenian State Philharmonic orchestra and the soloists. The event was held at the Aram Khachaturyan concert hall. On February 27 “Hover” took part in the concert evening commemorating Armenian prominent singer Lusine Zakarian held at the national center of chamber music.
During March-May of 2014 “Hover” appeared with a solo concert in the festival of compositional art named after R. Melikyan held at the national center of chamber music. (conductor - L. Yedigaryan), a concert held at the cultural business center (“Dom Moskvy”) of Moscow in celebration of the Holy Easter, participated in the annual Ester Festival in Moscow organized by its founder Valeri Gergiev (concerts were held in Dimitrov church of “The Assumption of the Virgin Mary”, in Moscow in the church of “The Holy Trinity” as well as at the rehabilitation center for children. The closing gala concert of the festival was held at Moscow Tchaikovski concert hall), then in the gala concert of “Hayak” cinema festival award ceremony held at the National Academic Theater of Opera and Ballet after A. Spendiarian. “Hover” had an appearance at Byurakan city in a concert for honoured guests of the “Yerevan Perspectives” international festival.

On 3 June at A. Babajanian concert hall “Hover” took part in a charity concert organized to raise funds for children affected by AIDS. On 18 June the “Armenian Voices” ensemble went to Tbilisi (Georgia) to take part in a concert-performance dedicated to the 300 anniversary of Sayat-Nova held at the Georgian state drama theater after Sh. Rustaveli.

On 21 June the First Channel of the Armenian Public TV organized a video-shooting of a program about “Hover” and its activity. On 24 June “Hover” had an open-air concert appearance within the framework of the “Fresco” festival of sacred movies. On June 28 it had a solo concert at the national center of chamber music within the framework of the project “100 concerts in memory of the Armenian Genocide” (conductor - N. Shishmanyan).

On 1 September “Hover” took part in the premiere performance of an open-air staging of the opera “The Fire Ring” by A.Terterian held in Shushi (Nagorno-Karabakh) in collaboration with the Armenian state chamber choir and the national academic opera and ballet theater orchestra (stage director - M. Sahakyan, conductor - R. Asatryan). On 26 September and 8 October it had two concert appearances at Aram Khachaturyan concert hall and at the National center of chamber music within the framework of the “Days of Komitas” festival dedicated to the 145th anniversary of the composer. On 12 October “Hover” participated in a concert organized on the occasion of the 140th anniversary of the Gevorkian seminary in Echmiadzin.

In November “Hover” had its solo recital at the national center of chamber music; participated in a jubilee concert dedicated to maestro Tigran Mansourian’s 75th anniversary held at the national academic opera and ballet theater after Alexander Spendiaryan, then took part in a concert in memory of the Armenian military leader Sepouh held at A. Babajanian concert hall.

In December “Hover” choir had its solo recital at the national center of chamber music, took part in the concert dedicated to the international day of choral art organized at Aram Khachaturian concert hall and then the choir members had an opportunity to meet a famous English film director Tony Palmer. The final performance of 2014 was
held on 9 December on the stage of the national academic theater of opera and ballet after A. Spendiarian within the framework of “Terterian Fest” international festival.

All concerts of “Hover” state chamber choir held in Armenia and abroad throughout 2015 were dedicated to the commemoration of the victims of the Armenian Genocide. The “Armenien Voices” ensemble continued its activity under the name of “Hover-septet”. In January they went to France to give concerts at “Théâtre Municipal de Rezé” (Nantes) and “Eglise de Saint-Valentin” (Guilers). In the same month “Hover-septet” participated in “MustonenFest” international festival in Estonia and Russia.

In 2015, on the 23rd anniversary of the choir activity, “Hover” released its seventh CD - “23 choir songs”, which comprised choral works by Komitas and contemporary Armenian composers. In February “Hover” took part in the recording of Gor Soudjian’s composition dedicated to the Armenian Genocide called “Separated”. The recording was done by “Brevis” studio. In March “Hover” choir appeared in the concert program of the mediaforum dedicated to the Centennial of the Genocide. In the same month “Hover” took Elżbieta Penderecka’s invitation to participate in the “19th Ludwig van Beethoven Easter Festival” in Warsaw, Poland. Concerts were held at the Royal Castle in Warsaw, at the “Church of Saint Cross” in Wroclaw, at the Castle of Lublin as well as at the K. Penderecki European Center for Music in Luslawice. The choir also had the honor to be invited at maestro Penderecki’s residence.

On 14 April “Hover” had a solo recital dedicated to the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide at the Komitas museum-institute. On 24 April, 2015 by subvention of the ministry of culture of Armenia “Hover septet” took part in the Armenian-Lithuanian ecumenical Liturgy held at the Vilnius Cathedral (Lithuania) in commemoration of the victims of the Armenian Genocide. It also participated in the public meeting dedicated to the Centennial of the Genocide held at the Cathedral Square. On 28 April “Hover” took part in a concert dedicated to the Centennial of the Genocide held at the National Academic Theater of Opera and Ballet after A. Spendiarian.

In early May “Hover” started its trip to the United States: it participated in the ecumenical ceremony dedicated to the Armenian Genocide Centennial held at Washington National Cathedral. The President of the Republic of Armenia, Serzh Sargsyan, Catholicos of All Armenians Garegin II, Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia, Aram I, members of several Christian confessions, ministers and other high-ranking officials were present.
On 8 May, 2015 a concert dedicated to the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide was held at the “Strathmore Hall” of Washington D.C. with the participation of “Hover”, the Armenian National Philharmonic orchestra and a number of prominent musician-performers. The choir presented pieces by Komitas as well as fragments from the “Requiem” by T. Mansouryan. The concert ended by combined performance of the song “Cilicia” (conductor - E. Topchyan).

On 9 May, 2015 Garegin II served a Holy Liturgy in commemoration of the innocent victims of the Armenian Genocide at the “Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception”.

The Divine Liturgy by M. Yekmalian-Kh.Meykhanejian was performed by “Hover” choir as well as by the Armenian Church choirs from various states of America.

On 10 May a Divine Liturgy was served at the “St. Mary” church in Washington. The Liturgy by M. Yekmalian was performed by the members of “Hover” and Kh. Meykhanejian’s choirs (conductor - Kh. Meykhanejian).

On 26 May, 2015 “Hover” choir took part in the concert commemorating the victims of the Genocide organized on the initiative of a world famous pianist Evgeny Kissin within the series of international concerts “With you, Armenia”. The concert was held on the Isaac Stern stage of the prestigious Carnegie Hall, New-York. The evening was remarkable by premiere performance of the “3-rd Psalm”, a piece by Krzysztof Penderecki composed especially for the event of the Armenian Genocide Centennial. The composer granted the exclusive right of the first performance to “Hover” choir.

On 27 May, 2015 “Hover septet” took part in the opening ceremony of the “Book Expo America” international exhibition in New York.

The choir’s progress was covered in the Armenian and international press. The chief music critic for “The New York Times” daily newspaper Anthony Tommasini wrote about “Hover’s performance, “…the impressive Hover State Chamber Choir, founded by Sona Hovhannisyan, who conducted the impressive 25-voice ensemble appeared in the rewarding first half of the program. Folk songs arranged by Komitas …were full of wistful lyrical turns and melting harmonies supported by earthy, steady bass drones. Some were fleet and jaunty with shouted rhythmic accents, though tinged with sadness.”

Rorianne Schrade wrote, “The wide-ranging “Waterfall Music” by Vache Sharafyan sounded fluent and impressive, the imaginative “Three Portraits of Women” (The Rainbow) by Tigran Mansuryan and a fanciful piece “The Little Prince and the Fox” by Anna Azizyan were performed among contemporary Armenian works. Internationally
renowned Polish composer Krzysztof Penderecki's “Psalm III” dedicated to the Armenian Genocide was presented in a World Premiere. It was a moving performance. His “Psalm III” is a stirring work, full of faith but also of anger….The Hover Chamber Choir performed it with tremendous expressiveness. The concert certainly opened some musical doors.”

On 6 June, 2015 “Hover” had a solo recital at the protestant church “Eglise Unie de Cannes” within the framework of “MIDEM” international music festival held in Cannes (France). The concert program included pieces by Armenian classical and contemporary as well as Western-European composers. Maestro Krzysztof Penderecki was present in person.

The same day “Hover septet” appeared at the closing ceremony of the day. The President of the Republic of Armenia, Serzh Sargsyan, ministers, Maestro Krzysztof Penderecki, Maestro Charles Aznavour and other honorable guests were present.

On 12 July, 2015 “Hover” participated in the opening ceremony of the “Golden Apricot Yerevan International Film Festival” accompanying the first live-action silent movie and on 14 July it recorded the Armenian national anthem at the public radio studio (arrangement by V. Babloyan and A. Manukyan)

On 8 August “Hover” appeared in the open-air concert together with the Armenian national philharmonic orchestra and the national chamber choir at the “Beiteddine Art Festival” (Lebanon). Mozart’s “Requiem” was performed. A famous violinist Sergey Khachatryan was also participating in the concert program (conductor - E. Topchyan).

August 26 was remarkable by premiere performance of the “Eternal Life”, a cantata for choir and piano quintet by Vache Sharafian. The concert took place within the framework of “The International Music Festival of Sion Valais” (Switzerland). The piece was dedicated to the Centennial of the Genocide.

On 14-20 September the choir appeared with two concerts at “Emilia-Romagna” festival at the philharmonic hall of Ljubljana (Slovenia) and at the “San Giacomo” church of Forli (Italy) as well as at the “Südtirol” festival at the famous “Santa Maria Assunta” church in the region Lana di Sotto of Merano (Italy).

On 28 September “Hover” participated at a gala concert held at Aram Khachaturian concert hall on the occasion of the Chrism Blessing ceremony. M. Ekmalian’s “Lord’s prayer” and Y. Yerkanyan’s “Hymn to the Saint Martyrs” arranged for choir and orchestra were performed. On 1 October “Hover” performed Vache Sharafian’s “Eternal Life” cantata for the first time in Yerevan within the framework of “The 9th international music festival”.

On 3 October “Hover” took part in the ceremony of celebration of the German Unity Day held at the German Embassy of Armenia. On the next day it appeared in Komitas festival with a concert at the national center of chamber music.

On 10 October “Hover” appeared at the “Florence” restaurant welcoming maestro Charles Aznavour during an official dinner. The president of the Republic of Armenia, the Catholicos of All Armenians and other honorable guests were present. On 16
October the “VivaCell-MTS” company celebrated the 10th anniversary of its activity in Armenia. The choir was happy to dedicate one of its most important solo recitals to this event.

On 29 October “Hover” took part in the concert in memory of Honored Artist of RA, choirmaster, teacher Emma Tsatourian on her 95th anniversary. The concert was held at the hall of the Armenian choir society. The next day “Hover” had a solo recital at the city of Goris.

On 7-11 November “Hover septet” appeared at the yearly sacred music festival “Les Sacrees Journees” in Strasbourg (France). Concerts were held at the “La Grande Sinagogue de Strasbourg”, “Chapelle Notre Dame à Ostwald” as well as “Cathedrale de Strasbourg”.

On 26 November “Hover” appeared at “Mezzo” club in a joint concert with “Michael Voskanyan and Friends” ethno-jazz group, and on 2 December “Hover septet” and “Hover” choir took part in the “Aram Khachaturian Festival”. The concert was held in Komitas museum-institute.

On 3 December, 2015, “Hover” had a solo recital within the series of yearly concerts organized by the “Center of Armenian Sacred Music”. On 11 December it had a short appearance at the opening ceremony of a personal exhibition of an Armenian painter, Gagik Chitchyan, held at the Museum of Contemporary Art. On 17 December, 2015 “Hover” appeared in a concert with the Armenian chamber choir and orchestra to perform Tigran Mansourian’s “Requiem” at the national center of chamber music (conductor - R. Mikeyan).

On 20 December “Hover septet” recorded a soundtrack for a theatrical performance “Pepo” to be played at the Sundukyan State Academic Theater (music by V. Sharafian). On 24 December “Hover” appeared at the Christmas festive concert together with the Armenian National Philharmonic orchestra.

“Hover” state chamber choir continues to present new projects aiming at promotion of contemporary choral art by enriching the palette of the Armenian choral music.
THE CULTURE OF ANTHROPOGENIC CAVES
WITH STONE DOORS IN ANCIENT ARMENIA

Shahinyan S. M.
Doctor of Architecture

There are lot of underground constructions in the Armenian Highland which are without natural tunnel gates, having only stone made doors. Those anthropogenic caves are called the caves with stone doors.\(^1\) Almost 100 of them could be found at the foot of Mt. Aragats.\(^2\) Those caves are considered to be of the medieval period, but as show researches it is possible to consider them to be much earlier than previously thought constructions.

1. Introduction

Based on the large amount of collected scientific material about rock-carved dwellings and anthropogenic caves in the Armenian Highland and Asia Minor, we can speak about the “cave culture”: architectural and engineering specificities, the daily life and relationship of the cave dwellers with a unique thinking and culture.

The surroundings of Mount Aragats have been repeatedly investigated by archaeologists, architects and naturalists, and since 1982 – also by speleologists. The speleological expedition of the Geographic Society of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences in 1982-85, 1989-90 and the expedition of the Armenian Speleological Center since 2002 have implemented voluminous works in this site discovering, studying and classifying rock-cut and cave monuments. Simultaneously, local geological surveys were carried out to provide the geological assessment of the location of the cave structure. Overall, more than 160 rock-cut structures and improved and used-by-man caves were discovered in the area from Talin to Ashtarak and then from Mt. Ara to Mt. Aragats area\(^3\). The caves with stone doors are rare rock-cut structures. This type of cave structures have compactly survived only in this area.

2. Stone doors and tunnels

The maximum size of the stone doors of caves in Aragatsotn region is 160cm x 130cm x 42cm, weighing more than 3 metric tons; the minimum size is 60cm x 40cm x 16cm. The stone doors are placed both lengthwise and crosswise, depending on the composition and structure of the rocks in the installation place. Stone doors are placed

---

\(^1\) There are from 500 to 3000 liter capacity pitchers for grain and some vine and oil products in just rock-cut and cave monuments.

\(^2\) Զարդարյան Ս. Մ., Հայաստանի քարանձավները, էջ 1, Երևան, 2005, էջ 60-103:

\(^3\) Զարդարյան Ս. Մ., Հայաստանի քարանձավները, էջ 60:
in frames and work like regular doors.

The frame is a plate with comparatively large cutting and made of a partially polished basalt, andesite and in rare cases hard tuff. In one corner of the plate, usually near the already installed stone doors, in the left side (where the entrance is located), a funnel-shaped pit was dug up to 50cm deep and up to 50cm diameter of edges. In both sides of the stone door there are hewed lugs adjusted to the funnels carved in the stone frame and firmly but still suitably enough to keep the mobility of the well settled door.

3. Methods

First, the tunnel was dug, and then the stone doors and separate polished pieces constituting the frame were taken in. Inside the cave, while in horizontal state, the plates with funnel-shaped pits were fitted on the lower and upper sections of the door and then placed vertically in the tunnel. Then the side plates of the door frame box were installed, one from each side. Then the door was reinforced with rock pieces, in rare cases using also mortar. In the last phase, the tunnel was laid, and small and large pieces of volcanic-fragmented rocks were disorderly filled over the surface section, thus covering up the structure.

The lower and the upper sections of the frame of the stone door is polished,
smoothed in the size of the segment of the door’s movement and ends by a low lug crossing the stone plate in its entire length and limiting that surface, which restricts the door’s movement and does not allow to open outwards. The rotation axis is put under slope to the direction of the stone door lugs, which makes the work of the door easier. Even a child can easily shut the door weighing hundreds of kilograms: My son Aren was only 8 when he could open and shut average size stone doors.

Inside, the stone doors are locked either by the entering edge under the door or by a lock. All doors we have come across or studied are opened only towards the cave so it is impossible to lock from outside.

There is a unique example of engineering solution of a lock in Seven-Door Cave, to the north of the Kosh village, in the vicinity of medieval St. Stapanos Church. Right on the left section of the frame of the entrance door (looking from inside the cave), three 12cm-13cm deep, 4.5cm-5cm wide and 36cm long parallel furrows are carved on the basalt plate in 5cm distance from each other. From the flank of the frame, in the middle of the plate’s cutting, a vertical penetrating hole is opened that crosses these furrows through the entire width of the plate. There is a 6cm-8cm deep, 5cm-7cm wide and 13cm long pit carved towards the hole. After locking the door from inside the cave, a pole made of a hard material (metal, stone, at least hard wood) is inserted into the penetrating hole so that it thrusts into the door pit. The parallel carved furrows play a role of windows, whence the watcher can see and make sure the shutter is well placed. This was how the doors were locked in past times.

On most of the stone doors, special pits were made on one or both sides to fix the door handle.

The funnel-shaped pits carved on the upper and lower plates towards the rotation axis are not necessarily carved only on the plates. We have come across several “foundation stones” that look square, similar to the stone for chopping up grains, which are still used in mountainous villages. Such mortar-like component of the frame with pits intended for the stone door lugs was used only for the lower section of the door; the surface of the upper section plate is smooth. In rare cases one can encounter doors with lugs smoothed only in the lower part. Stone doors processed this way have, as a rule, smaller than average size.

These carefully smoothed square or rectangular 18cm-20cm thick basalt doors are disseminated mainly on the slopes and at the foot of Mt. Aragats, as well as in quaternary lavas erupted from the volcanic mountains in the Lake Sevan basin or in the area of caves located in the contact of consecutive layers4.

---

A large number of caves with stone doors, about 60, have survived in the areas of Kosh-Avan and Sasunik-Ujan; there are another two, still used caves with large doors in Talin region and a few doors and ten door frames on the volcanic mountain slopes in the south and south-east of Gegharqunik marz. All these have been processed by the same principle and mainly for the same purpose - to lock the tunnel and cave entrances.

We came across the remains of the only ignimbrite tuff-made smoothed door in the vicinity of Karmrashen; however, I don’t think this can be a pattern. The caves with stone doors are built in a way that the doors can be locked only from inside, i.e. when there is nobody inside the cave, it is easy to enter the cave in case when the main stocks of food for the survival of a large group of people were stored there. On the other hand, the possibility of locking the stone doors only from inside directly points out that a person or a large group of people had the opportunity to get isolate themselves from the world for some ritual reasons. And there is not a single structure for defense or any construction detail that would indicate the necessity of confronting the enemy; hence the hypothesis that theft
was alien to the times of the origin of stone-door caves. It is possible to suggest that the native Armenians started to use this kind of cave constructions in the Armenian Highland since the 3rd-2nd millennia B.C.5

Here are descriptions of a few caves.

4. Results / Results and discussion

**Seven-Door Zagha**

Located to the north of Kosh village, 0.1 km north of St. Stepanos Church, in the right cliff wall of Vanadzor, approximately 30m high from the bottom of the ravine. The narrow corridor covered with basalt pieces leads to the hall. You can pass through the tunnel-corridor only if you bent or creep. The tunnel is laid with whole rectangular basalt plates with removed sharp lugs on the surface. Along both sides of the corridor, the vertical 10cm-12cm thick basalt plates laid without mortar are arched by similar plates that provide the ceiling of the tunnel. The engineering concept of the tunnel resembles a megalithic structure.6 Although the local people call this cave a Seven-Door Zagha, it has only two doors, one directly at the entrance and the other at the hall entrance. The dust, soil and sand accumulated during many years covered the door's foundation with a 20cm-25cm layer thus making the door nonoperational. The door was still working at least in 1987 when we were studying and measuring the cave. The frame of the stone door of the hall has three lengthwise hollows with another transverse hollow crossing these three. The transverse hollow is made on the surface that longwise fits in the door frame. Most likely, transverse hollow has been made to run the shutter, while the longwise crack-hollows played the role of “windows” to see how the shutter moved. The doors, like in all other caves, open inward.

On the north-east wall of the cave, a clay canal opens 2.5m-3m above the ground. The diameter of the mouth of the pipe is 23cm. How the canal conveyed water to the cave through the thick basalt layer with 15m cutting – is something still to be found out. The assumption could be that the pipe way was a natural hydrodynamic tunnel, and the ancient builders, after laying the clay pipe through the tunnel, have skillfully veiled the tunnel with some constructional trick still unknown to us.

The walls of the cave are laid with large pieces of basalt reinforced by lime mortar. In the southern and south-western part of the cave, under the wall, there are

---

5 Շահինյան Ս. Մ., Հայաստանի քարանձավները, էջ 67:
6 Թորամանյան Թ., Հայերեն ճարտարապետություն, Երևան, 1942: cf. Միքայելյան Գ. Հ., Սևանի ավազանի կիկլոպյան ամրոցները, Հայաստանի հնագիտական հուշարձանները, Հ. 1, Ա. հ., Երևան, 1968:
casks on two platforms for keeping fluid (probably vegetable oil or wine) and for dry food (grains). The first platform is 15cm-20cm above the bottom of the cave; and 4 cask mouths open here, while in the second platform, 120cm higher than the first one, 6 cask mouths open. The small cavity located at 6m depth from the tunnel entrance was perhaps another storage place.

The cave is one of the favorite places for the village children; they are frequent guests here. They often make fire, however the smoke immediately flows out through the cracks in the basalt cover.

*Bk’oyi Gegh Seven-Door Cave.* This cave is located in the right cliff wall of the Bk’oi Dzor ravine, 20 meters above the ravine’s bed, 1km to the northwest of the Ujan village, 100 meters to the north of the cave.

It is possible that the cave has received its name due to the number of its doors in the past.

The tunnel-passage leading to the cave is hardly passable; two nearly equal size doors are placed here, both can be easily opened and shut. Here, like in all caves with stone doors, the doors are locked from inside. The artificially laid part of the tunnel is totally collapsed, and most likely the remaining 5 doors were left under the landfall, as the local folklore says. The entrance of the tunnel is narrow and hardly passable. The narrow passage leads to the first door; opening this door you move on to the second door either creeping or half-sitting. Opening the second door, you appear in the cave hall. The distance from the entrance to the 1st door is 3 meters, and from the 1st door to the 2nd door - 2.5 meters. The hall is misshapen, the bottom is flat, and the ceiling is 2.4 meters high. There are cask-like pits in the corners of the cave, which are intended only for storage of grain food. There are no fired clay casks. There is an opinion that the cave was of ritual importance7.

---

7 Շահինյան Ս. Մ., Քարանձավները հայ ժողովրդի մտավոր և մշակութային զարգացման գործընթացում”, Էջմիածին, 5, 2003, էջ 55-75:
The stone-door caves are rare architectural, engineering and cultural monuments of the past that are now exposed to the danger of demolition. These caves are part of not only Armenian culture but also part of the culture of the Indo-European peoples in general. With the loss of these caves we will lose yet another possibility of seeing the past alive. Saving these caves must be the point of concern for all of us.
ON THE HISTORIAN OF VARDANANTS EGHISHE’S PERSONALITY ACCORDING TO NEW INTERPRETATIONS OF EARLY MEDIEVAL LITERARY DATA

Musheghyan A. V.  
Doctor of Sciences (Philology)

During the study or examination of the works of each prominent author of ancient Armenian literature the personality and identity of the author gain an exclusive importance along with the problem of discovering his exact epoch. Since the second half of the 19th century the hypercritical examination of philological and historical works by some researchers resulted in the unfounded and baseless revision and denial of centuries old traditional notions. Prominent authors (Agatangelos, Eghishe, Movses Khorenatsi) whose names had been pronounced with veneration were proclaimed as “forgers” of history. According to the revisionists, the above mentioned authors as if had lived in later centuries but “strived” to introduce themselves as contemporaries and witnesses of the events occurring in previous centuries in order to give their stories a more reliable and valid essence as well as for making themselves more outstanding1.

Who is Eghishe, the author of the history of Vardanants?  
“Story of the Saint preceptor Eghishe” is an old anonymous narrative preserved in the early literature. The anonymous biographer elucidates many interesting conditions referring to the life and asceticism of the preceptor Eghishe, the historian of Vardanants (“History of Vardan and the Armenian War”). Here the anonymous author presents Eghishe as a devoted servant of Saint Vardan: “The blessed preceptor Eghishe was a devoted servant of Saint Vardan and was faithful to him in divine and human ways; and he lived and was accustomed to piety and devotion to learning and he reflected upon every occasion when Armenians were endangered by Persians. He was familiar to wars and victories and persecutions to the church and merits and courage of Saint Vardan and those who martyred together for the sake of Christ’s faith and became worthy to a crown neglecting the delusions of Zoroastrianism and following the preachments of bishops, priest, their testimonies and commands. It was the battle of all of Saints where they fought against the tyrants and defeated them. The tyrant had arrogated against the holiness of the church. And he narrated all these in words and events relevant to them. The blessed Eghishe studied the lives of Saint Vardan and his soldiers and gave them a written form cautiously and in canonical ways of the church in order to make it proper for God and people”. “Since that day he became an ecclesiastic and undertook asceticism

1 The hypercritical approaches have been criticized in Armenology by Armenian historians and philologists. Particularly, A.Mousheghyan devoted a special monograph to the life and the epoch of the founder of the Armenian historiography Movses Khorenatsi and proved that he undoubtedly is an author of the 5th century and his classical "History of Armenia" is a product of the exceptionally fateful period of the historical biography of the Armenian people (Ա.Վ.Մուշեղյան, Մովսես Խորենացու դարը, Երևան, 2007).
and endeavored fasting and praying and the blessed Eghishe became the most powerful person and the winner of all, and he was living in a cave refining himself all the time and the cave was named after Eghishe and it was called Saint Cave of Eghishe and now it is honored to everyone and it is a witness of the Blessed Saint to all nations. And shepherds came and found the Saint outdoors; they saw a wonderful sign and proclaimed the name of the cave and the place in honor of the wonderful Blessed Saint. But he obviated wishing to be unknown and came to live to a cave near the beach in the district Rshtunik and this cave was also called the Cave of Saint Eghishe. And after a long while of asceticism and endeavoring in the first cave and scarce time in the other the Blessed Saint deceased in the second cave”. “Then some people came and found him deceased and they had been apprised by a vision that he was Christ’s servant as the vision of the saint should not be hidden, so that others would be admonished. He was considered to proclaim himself but then much study was done and it was proved and announced to everyone that this was Saint Eghishe who previously had been living in the province Mokk’ where they built his grave, the cave was altered into a grave and many healings occurred in this place.”

“And the ruler of Mokk’ heard of this and had white envy as the death of the blessed saint did not take place in his territory and he went to the saint’s grave with an excuse of treatment and created a lodge; every night having the saint as an advocate to God probably to deserve getting a part of relic of the blessed and make the first place of living also deserve God’s honor. But he scrupled to approach and take a part of the relic evidently for the fear of inhabitants of the province as well as the ruler of Rshtunik. And he stole a part of the healing relic like the woman in Evangeline, he cut the head and the hand of the corpse and run away from the province and there was a great outcry but it was pacified by the divine providence as God wished to award the saint’s first place of living too. And he brought the relic of the blessed saint and built a chapel near the first cave where he lived and required to honor that place more than the one where he had deceased and here the gifts of Christ’s philanthropy appeared by the saint hermit who lived in that place: all the maladies were cured and those who suffered from impure spirits were healed and everyone blessed the God and a festival was established in honor and praise of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit for ever and ever”2.

Judging by the content one can assume that Eghishe’s biography was recounted not too long after his death, anyway much more earlier then 9th century as Tovma Artsruni used this biography in his work: “History of Artsruni house”. He referred to the forgeries about the history of Vardanants done by Bartsuma3 who was a follower of the

2 «Սոփերք հայկականք», հ. ԺԱ., Վենետիկ, 1854, էջ 39-45:
3 According to Tovma Artsruni this Bartsuma belonged to the Nestorian schism. After being convicted at the council of Ephesus in 431 and being chased in Byzantine the Nestorians found a shelter in Iran and were patronized by the Persian kings for a long while. In the 430s they even occupied the patriarchal seat of the Armenian Church, namely Brqisho (Barqisho) and Shamuel (Samuel). This Bartsuma had committed a great deal of sanguinary crimes informing the Persian king Peroz against Armenian ministers with defamation. Pretending to make reparations he came to Armenia, to the provinces Arzruni and Mokk’ and asked Eghishe for his history not merely for reading but rather for censuring it.
Nestorian church. He quoted the following passage word by word: “And at that time the preceptor Eghishe lived in the district Rshtunik, near the beach where the deceased Eghishe, the saint of the God passed away and went to Christ. And coming back to the writings of the province Mokk’.” Unlike other prominent authors of the 5th century such as Agatangelos, Pavstos, Koryun, Yeznik (Yeznak), Gyut, Mambre Vertsanogh and others whose names are recalled in the works of authors of the same century, Eghishe who was the historian of Vardanants surprisingly is not mentioned by any prominent author of the 5-7th centuries. Even His Holiness Gyut and Ghazar Parpetsi do not mention Eghishe although the first made some citations from the history of Vardanants in: “Bishop Gyut’s paper to Saint Vache” and the second used greatly Eghishe’s the history of of Vardanants in the second part of his work “History of Armenia” (chapters 20-50) and at the beginning of the third part. This work was completely devoted to the rebellion period of Vardanants. He retold the whole content of Eghishe’s work and completed everything that he himself Ghazar had heard lately from Arshavir Kamsarakyan who had returned from the Persian exile and from other rulers. Parpetsi’s silence is not adventitious; he also used Movses Khorenatsi’s “History of Armenia” in the same way: without referring to the source. In spite of this it appears in the paper presented to Vahan Mamikonyan that Ghazar knew well the philosopher Movses and his enlightening books that were persecuting emptiness.

A historian of the 7th century Sebeos definitely mentions Eghishe’s history of Vardanants without mentioning the name “Eghishe” but from the given data it is not difficult to conclude that the Bagratuni bishop certainly meant the author of the history of Vardanants Eghishe from the 5th century. “Red Vardan” mentioned by Sebeos is the hero of the Avarar battle and the commander of the Armenian army. Afterwards, as his identity has been discovered Eghishe moves to the district Rshtunin and shelters in a cave near the beach in order to avoid the honor and worship.

---

4 Թումա Արծրունի եւ Անանուն, Պատմութիւն Տանն Արծրու նեաց, Երեւան, 2006, Բ. բ. էջ 93. Although Tovma promises to show Bartsuma’s instigations of Artsruni house, but he does not keep his promise
5 Մովսես Կաղանկատուացի, Պատմութիւն Աղուանից աշ խարհի, Երեւան, 1983, Ա. ժա. էջ 17-28 (այսուհետԿաղանկատուացի). Հմմտ. Եղիշէ, էջ 197-199. Gyut had been his Holiness Catholicos of Armenia since 461 which means that bishop Gyut had written the paper before it.
6 See details about this Ա. Մուշեղյան, Եղիշէ եւ Ղազար Փարպեցի' պատմիչ եւ վերապատմող. «Քրիստոնյա Հայաստան», 2004, հունվար Բ., թ. 2 (166)
7 Թուղթ առ Վահան Մամիկոնեան, էջ 202 - Դանիելյան, Հայաստանի քաղաքական պատմությունը և Հայ Առաքելական եկեղեցին (VI-VII դարեր), Երևան, 2000, էջ 70, ծան. 91). As noted E.L. Danielyan, “Red Vardan” mentioned by Sebeos is the leader of the rebellion of 451, the commander of the Armenian army Vardan Mamikonyan (see: Դանիելյան Է.Լ., Հայաստանի քաղաքական պատմությունը և Հայ Առաքելական եկեղեցին (VI-VII դարեր), Երևան, 2000, էջ 70, ծան. 91).
of laics. Tovma mentions Eghishe and his history of Vardanids with praise sometimes calling the historian a priest and sometimes a preceptor.9

Unlike Sebeos, Movses Kaghankatvatsi in his work “History of Aghuank” does not mention the name of Eghishe, the author of the history of Vardanants. However, the second chapter of the second volume where he describes that Vardan Mamikonyan’s legion moves to Aghuank and gives a victorious battle against the marzipan Sebukht at the riverside Kur near Khakhagh and then conquers Tchora Pahak and conspires with the Huns, are almost word by word abstracted from Eghishe’s history.10

The historian of the 13th century Kirakos Gandzaketsi also mentions Eghishe by name along with the main disciples of St. Sahak and Mesrop: “Their preceptors and teachers were St. Sahak and Mesrop and the main disciples were St. Hovsep and Hovhan and Ghevond and Sahak and father of history Movses and Mambre Vertsanogh11, his brother, Yeznik and Koryun, Saint Eghishe, philosopher Davit and Hovhannes, father Abraham, Ardzan, Mushe12, Khosrov, Ghazar and then Stepannos bishop of Sunik and Hropanos Samostatsi who considered writings beautiful and many others some of which having a degree of bishop and other leaders assigned by people”13. Then Gandzaketsi reflects upon the books translated and written by them including Eghishe’s “History of Saint Vardanants”14. A great deal of scholars assumed that the historian of Vardanants is Eghishe bishop of Amatuniq himself who is mentioned in the list of participants of the council of Artashat in 450. In the 16th place in Eghishe’s history it is written Eghishe bishop of Amatuniq15 and in the 17th place of Parpetsi’s history it is written Eghishe bishop16 of Amatuniq. This identification appeared even on the title page of 1823’s edition of Constantinople: “History of Vardan and the Saint martyrs, Ghevond and other priests. Created by renowned preceptor and archbishop of Amatuniq Saint Eliša who was the disciple of our blessed holy translators Sahak and Mesrop. Edited by the Father preceptor Andreas Narinean from Akn. 1823”.

Similarly, German theologian Welte calls Eghishe Eliša Amatuni right in the title of the article “About demon possession”: Elisaus von Amathunik uber die Bessenheit17. This article was printed in 1848 in a theological magazine published in Tuebingen. H. Gavrtyan also assumes that the historian Eghishe’s being a bishop is mentioned right in the history of Vardanants considering the relevant bishop Eliša Amatuni who has

9Թովմա Արծրունի, Ա., գ., Էջ 35 եւ Բ., բ., Էջ 93
10Մովսես Կաղանկատուացի, Բ., բ., Էջ 112-117: Հմմտ. Եղիշէ Վարդան եւ Հայոց պատերազմին, ի լոյս ածեալ բաղդատութեամբ ձեռագրաց աշխատութեամբ Ե. Տեր-Մինասյան, Երեվան, 1957
11Vertsanogh. New haykazyan dictionary includes the word Vertsanogh (inferred) and Mambre Vertsanogh under the same word (Նոր Բառգիրք Հայկազեան լեզուի, հտ. 2, էջ 813).
12Here after Mushe Ardzan is repeated.
13Վարդան Արծրունի, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, աշխատ.’ Կ. Ա. Մելիք-Օհանջանյանի, Երեւան, 1961, բ գլուխ, էջ 2;
14Վարդանայ Պատմութիւն Հայոց, աշխատ.’ Կ. Ա. Մելիք-Օհանջանյանի, Երեւան, 1961, բ գլուխ, էջ 28-29;
15Էջ 28:
16See Փարպ. դրուագ Բ. գլ. իգ., էջ 45;
17Welte, Theologische Quartalschrift, Tuebingen, 1843, S. 633-644.
signed the response to Mihrnerseh’s letter\textsuperscript{18}. However, it is improbable that this candidate is the historian of Vardanants as Eghishe has never been mentioned in Armenian literature as a bishop. Furthermore, the historian of Vardanants always willingly mentions that he has been a witness and participant of the events. Therefore, in this case he would not refuse to show that he was the Amatunyan bishop Eghishe like Koryun mentions in the Life of Mashtots “/…/ and the second Koryun (myself) /…/)\textsuperscript{19} or like Parpetsi writes about himself “/…/ I, Ghazar Parpetsi received the command/…/”\textsuperscript{20}.

Reflecting upon the question of Eghishe’s personality A. Garagashyan refuses multiple hypotheses made on that occasion and assures only the fact that Eghishe was a historian and bibliographer of the second half of the 7th century: “No one has ever said anything certain about Eghishe’s personality: some of the historians coming after him consider him to be a secretary of Vardan and his army, others consider him to be a bishop and others an hermit, and nothing is trustworthy. But it is certain that the history is written by Eghishe and not by an author of the second half of the 5th century. The language is free of the Hellenisms and does not have the character of a translated language”\textsuperscript{21}. N. Adonts has a unique opinion about this. He does not identify the historian Eghishe with the relevant bishop of Amatuniq merely because he considers Eghishe to be an author living later then the 5th century: “…there is no certain ground to assume that the historian Eghishe and the member of the same council (Artashat) Eghishe bishop of Amatuniq are the same person.

Can Eghishe’s manuscript be considered to be contemporary to the council of Artashat taking into consideration the Armenian translation of Philo?”\textsuperscript{22} Yervand Ter-Minasyan who has devoted many years to the examination of various questions concerning Eghishe’s personality and history of Vardanants decisively assures that the historian of Vardanants is known by many in the Armenian literature as preceptor Eghishe and has never been mentioned as a bishop: “The dedicatory of Eghishe’s history does not give the impression to be written by a bishop: it is more relevant to a modest preceptor. If the historiographer were a congregational bishop of the council of Artashat, he would somehow imply his contribution to it as he likes to mention that he was a witness of events”. And finally “all the historians indiscriminately call this author preceptor Eghishe and there is no basis besides the identity of the names to assume that he had a higher clerical category”\textsuperscript{23}.

\textsuperscript{18} Գաթըրճեան Հ., Հինգերորդ դարու չորս հայ պատմագրութեանց ժամանակը. «Հանդէս Ամսօրեայ», Վիեննա, 1887, թ. 1, էջ 9-12 (հրապարակվել է ետմահու):
\textsuperscript{19} Կորյուն, Վարք Մաշտոցի, հրատ. Մ. Աբեղյանի, Երևան, 1941, [ժթ.], էջ 74:
\textsuperscript{20} Փարպ., Դ. (Նախաբան), էջ 5:
\textsuperscript{21} Ադոնց Ն., Երկեր, հտ. Բ., Երեւան, 2006, էջ 133:
\textsuperscript{22} Տեր-Մինասյան Ե. Գ., Եղիշեի «Վարդանի և Հայոց պատերազմի մասին», Երևան, 1946, էջ 5-95.
Certainly, Yervand Ter-Minasyan is completely right excluding that Eghishe Amatuni is the historian of Vardanants. However, the identity of the historian Eghishe remains in question. This condition led to pointless hypotheses of certain scholars who represent him as a defalcator living in the 7th century that presumably had invented a false story based on the material of Ghazar Parpetsi’s history. However, now when my previous study “Who are Christ’s zealot officials?” completely affirms the validity of the preface of the assembly of Shahapivan (444/445) and consequently affirms its historical value, the court pastor Eghishe mentioned the last in the list of 8 pastors in the preface already appears to be an indisputable historical person. In the preface of other manuscripts he is called “Father Eliša’s” (genitive case, in nominative: Father Eliša) and therefore he is absurdly identified with Father Eghishe, bishop of Amatuniq known from Ghazar Parpetsi’s history. Thus, his original and exact title is “court pastor”. By the way, Gh. Alishan attaches the following notification to the name “Father Eghishe”: “Some people write: “Court pastor Eliša’s: what court’s pastor?” And immediately he answers to his question himself: “certainly Vardan’s”\textsuperscript{24}. Thus Alishan connects Eghishe directly with Vardan Mamikonyan from the council of Shahapivan where Vardan Mamikonyan was present as a senior nakharar with the marzpan Vasak Syuni. In this case there was perfect solidarity in the assembly and in the original of the preface there is no hint about any conflict and disagreement between Vardan and Vasak Syuni. Conversely, the unity of secular and religious officials is emphasized: “And bishops and a great deal of pastors, deacons and Christ’s zealot officials /…/ nakharars of the first marzpan Vasak and chiliar\textsuperscript{25} Vahan and makhan Vriv /…/ the first senior nakharars :the brave and vigorous Vardan Mamikonyan and Arshavir (Arshur) Kamsarakan and the Armenian commander of Rshtuniq Manachihr, Zeka Dimaksean and other nakharars came to the council by the command of the community and they considered the sacraments of the church. They were unanimous and convinced of the righteous laws and worship of Christ and this way they droveled unanimously\textsuperscript{26}.

Gh. Alishan’s word “դրան” dran (court) of Vardan is a haste assumption as well as a much undefined one. In that case how to understand the title “դրան երեց” dran yerets (“court pastor”). In old Armenian the word դոռն durn (genitive case դոռն drun) is a synonym to the word արքունիք arquniq (court), for instance : “And a person from the big city Rome whose name was Agatangełos received the command, /…/ he came to the court of Arshakuni under the reign of the brave and virtuous, strong and warring king Trdat”\textsuperscript{27}.

\textsuperscript{24} Ալիշան Ղ., Հայապատում, Վենետիկ, 1901, Էջ 159, ծան. 12:
\textsuperscript{25} In old Greek means a commander of a thousand men.
\textsuperscript{26} «Կանոնագիրք Հայոց», աշխ. Վազգեն Հակ ոբյանի, Երևան, 1964, ծան. Էջ 626 (henceforth Կանոնագիրք Հայոց), cf. ՄՄ ձեռագիր No 659, թերթ 233բ-236ա:
\textsuperscript{27} Ագաթանգեղայ Պատմութիւն Հայոց: Աշխատասիրությանբ Գ.Տէր-Մկրտչեան և Ստ. Կանայեանց, Էջմիածին-Տփղիս, 1911, 12:
Similarly Koryun writes about Mashtots: “[Mashtots] who was from the region Taron, the village Hatsekats, /.../ came and reached to the court of Arshakuni, great Armenian kings, lived in the court, was a servant and perpetrated the orders of the king. In these examples the word դոռն/ durn is used in the meaning of court. And at that time Aravan28 was the chiliarch of Armenia. In the study “Who is the chiliarch Aravan?” I showed that after the king Arshak II had been exiled to the fortress Anhush (368) Shapuh II appointed the chiliarch Aravan as the ruler of Armenia Magna. His seat was the Armenian court of Arshakuni. Here Mashtots served as a secretary29 and was ordained as pastor by the Catholicos Sahak30. Probably the court pastor Eghishe also performed the same work. In 444 the council took place in Shahapivan where the former Armenian Arshakuni kings’ court and camp were: “And came and gathered in command of the community to the assigned place Shahapivan which was the camp of Armenian kings by the time of the granted festival. And it was the 6th year that Hazkert31 was the king of Persia and Vasak Syuni was the marzpan of Armenia and Vahan Amatuni was the chiliarch and Vriv Khorkhoruni was the maghkhaz”32.

We have a similar testimony also in Pavstos Buzand’s history: “And the king’s army was in Shahapivan, in the original place of the army of Arshakuni kings”33. Shahapivan was situated in the district Bagrevand near Bagavan, not far from the district Tsaghkotn34. After the collapse of Arshakuni kingdom, in the 440s Shahapivan was an aspiritual and administrative centre of Armenia where was located the court and there Eghishe was a court pastor and maybe also court secretary who conducted the recording of the council, therefore his name is mentioned in the end after all the participants of the assembly as the composer of the inscription. This means that Eghishe’s title of a court pastor is really primary and reflects his current position in the assembly of Shahapivan at the Armenian marzpants’ office. Probably, he served there as a secretary like Mesrop Mashtots did at the time of the chiliarch. Therefore, he was

28 Կորյուն, Վարք Մաշտոցի, [Գ.], Էջ 36:
29 See Ա. Մուշեղյան, Ո՞Վ Է Առավան Հազարապետը. - ԳԱԱ «Լրաբեր Հասարակական Գիտություններ», 1983, էջ 7, էջ 67. Our conclusion about the chiliarch Aravan is included in the 2nd volume of “The History of the Armenian people” («Հայ ժողովրդի պատմությունը», հ., Պ., թերթ 1984, էջ 424, էջ 4). We identify the chiliarch Aravan with the Armenian minister Arrabanes mentioned in a manuscript of “Roman history” kept in Vatican. It is written by the 4th century Latin historiographer of Greek origin Ammianus Marcellinus. Aravan’s position was magister armorum (commander). Based on this we prove that the chiliarch Aravan is the commander Vahan Mamikonyan assigned by Shapuh II, Samvel Mamikonyan’s father and the brave commander Vasak Mamikonyan’s brother. In all the other manuscripts the name “Arrabanes” is deteriorated and written as Artabanes which led to scholars’ different distorted opinions.
30 Ադոնց Ն., Երկեր, հթ.Բ, էջ 189:
31 In other manuscripts «ի Ե. ամի թագաւորութեանն Յազկերտի Պարսից արքայի», Կանոնագիրք Հայոց, հ. Ա., էջ 628. Հուբ. ՄՄ� ձեռագիր No 659, թերթ 233p-236w:
32 Պատմութիւն Հայոց», հ. Պ., էջ 628. Հայոց Պատմութիւն Հայոց, հ., Հ. Հայոց Պատմութիւն Հայոց, հ., Հ., էջ 184:
the last to sign in the list of the preface of the Assembly mentioning his position: “Eliša’s: the court pastor’s”. There is no other way to explain why in the preface where only three great state officials are introduced: marzpan Vasak Syuni, chiliarch Vahan Amatuni and maghkhaž (head guards), Vriv Khorkhoruni Eghishe is mentioned with his modest official position: court pastor.

The condition that pastor Eghishe here is listed among the court officials served basis for identifying him with the author of the history of Vardanants. Certainly, the fact that the personality of the court pastor Eghishe is introduced as the famous historian for the first time can lead to certain doubts. But we refer these doubts not to this identification but rather to the question of how the above mentioned personality of the pastor Eghishe could be ignored by scholars in the long chain of philological discussion.

Kirakos Gandzaketsi considered just this Eghishe in the group of Saint Sahak’s and Mesrop’s main disciples along with father of history Movses, his brother Mambre Vertsanogh and many others. This group had been sent to Alexandria by St. Sahak and Mashtots in 437-38 when Eghishe should have been 19-20 years old like juvenile Movses Khorenatsi. Thus, at the council of Shahapivan, in 444/5 he was 24-25 years old and served as a court pastor in the Armenian marzpans’ office and in 449 (according to others 450) at the council of Artashat he was only 29-30 years old which is not a relevant age for a bishop. There is no doubt that Eghishe is a quite different person than Eliša bishop of Amathunik or Father Eghishe (according to Parpetsi).

Therefore, the author of the history of Vardanants is not the bishop Eghishe, participant of the council of Artashat, but the court pastor Eghishe, participant of the council of Shahapivan. Thus, the first authentic mention about this historical person and the future historiographer is henceforth indissolubly connected with the Church Council of Shahapivan, in 444.

The fact that, according to the above mentioned traditional biography, after finishing the history of Vardanants and other canonical writings Eghishe devoted himself to clerical life in the province Mokk’ leads to assumption that he was born there. And there are all the grounds to identify this Eghishe from Mokk’ with the court pastor Eghishe. The dedicatory or brief introduction of the history of Vardanants gives additional grounds for this as under its light the court pastor Eghishe’s personality is more clearly drawn as a historiographer, as well from the point of view of his age, acquired philosophical education and his occupied position. The book was “requested by the pastor David Mamikonyan”. After the battle of Avarayr, about in 445 the pastor David requests Mamikonyan Eghishe as equals to write the history of Vardanants.

The introduction is a kind of conversation with the person who ordered it. It is a report about finishing the recommended history: “I created the speech that you The Sagacious requested. You requested to write about the Armenian war where many...”

35 «Ով Քաջ» “The Sage “Is Translated By Y. Ter-Minasyan as «Ո՛՛Վ Առաքինի» “The Virtuous”. The last word exists in the Continuation: «Բազումք Առաքինացան», “Many became virtuous”. With the words “The Brave” Eghishe means the pastor Davit’s being sagacious and shrewd.
became virtuous. Here I annotated in these seven parts /.../36. Therefore, the introduction of the history of Vardanants was written in about 464 after composing and finishing the whole history just like the “preface” of the history by Agatangelos. The introduction uncovers the cordial relationship between former classmates who accompanied each other during the voyage to Alexandria and education when they studied philosophy and theology. They studied together, wandered in the high circuits of philosophy even higher than dangerous airs giving birth to storms that is far from schismatic influences. And now receiving this request-command the author who has survived the battle of Avarayr and is already 35-36 years old, who witnessed many episodes when some became heroes and others were humiliated, meets with the soar of youth the request of his friend who is no one else but the philosopher David the Invincible although the Y. Ter-Minasyan who has studied Eghishe skillfully does not consider this hypothesis to be fundamental. In this sense Kirakos Gandzaketsi’s above-mentioned testimony is very remarkable. Here Saint Eghishe and philosopher David are mentioned side by side as if to show their steady connection with the history of Vardanants as an author and a person who ordered it; who have worked together since the second half of the 5th century. Here Eghishe himself reveals the personality of the philosopher David with a great appreciation: “And you, the great, recognized by God, what else you would request if not the best? As it is known to me, to you and those who wandered in philosophy, this is a sign of heavenly love and not of worldly vanity”37. And he finished the introduction emphasizing his being the witness of events: “Thus, as we have received the request of the unenvying command of your kind nature, it is worth to start; although we are not willing to lament for the misery of our nation. Here without deferring we will reproduce with a tearful lament the various blows to which we ourselves happened to be witness”38.

Being unfamiliar with the personality of the court pastor Eghishe many scholars considered him to be Vardan Mamikonyan’s soldier or secretary striving to explain this way his presence in the maelstrom of the crucial events for Armenia and the Armenian nation. Eventually, it becomes possible to find the logical explanation to all this. Naming Eghishe we deal with an intelligent chancellery in the court preserved during the first period of marzpanate (marzpants nominated by the Persian kings) in Eastern Armenia. His competence about demeneaur of the Persian court and keshts (religious doctrines)39 and the reflection of diplomatic relations of Eastern Roman Empire in his work suggest that Eghishe associated with interior and exterior affairs of the

36 Եղիշե, Էջ 3:
37 Եղիշե, էջ 4:
38 Եղիշե, էջ 5:
39 Eghishe calls the chief mage of the province Apar Hamakden (omniscient) who “knew Ampartqash, he had studied Bozpayit and had both Pahlavik and Parskaden. As all these five are keshts they possess all the laws of magiarism but besides them there is the sixth one which is called Petmogn” (p. 143-144). We do not come across the above mentioned doctrines of Persian religion even in Yeznik Koghbatsi’s comprehensive work «Եղծաղանդոց» (“Refutation of the Sects”).
government of marzpanate. The Greek language studied in Alexandria and Assyrian and Persian languages well-know to him assisted to this. Thanks to all this, the History of Vardanants appears to be a unique historical source reflecting completely the Armenian, as well as Persian and Roman realities of the second half of the 5th century.

Eghishe emphasizes his being the witness of events several times also in the body part of the history. Some scholars such as Babgen Kyuleseryan\(^{40}\) considered this to be a sign of false validity. But contrary to it, emphasizing his being witness or present to events the historian demonstrates that he considers the reader’s trust towards him (the historian) and his words to be very important. As a court pastor and court secretary Eghishe had been present at the meetings invited by the king of kings Hazkert; Eghishe had heard his speeches which sometimes were threatening and sometimes veiled with hypocrisy. With these speeches the tyrants seethed like a sea the multinational armies consisting of various tribes. And the historian communicated this all to today’s multilingual readers after more than 1550 years: “Neither I expressed my opinion, nor did I receive the news but I myself happened to be at that place and saw and heard the sound of Hazkert’s voice who was speaking impudently like a violent wind that blew in a line and this way moved and swung the crowd of his army”\(^{41}\).

Similarly Eghishe describes the bitter insult and shame addressed to those who had adjured while returning to Armenia from Tizbon in the caravan: “Neither we tell all the malicious events that happened to the Armenian legion in the caravan, nor we wish to conceal the sorrow of trouble, we tell about this more or less to be unanimous with those who lamented bitterly for us”\(^{42}\). But being witness is not defined only by the word *witness*. Very often exact chronological data spread in Eghishe’s history are not paid attention to. They assure the historian’s presence in the events described by him more than the word *witness*. The 12th year of Hazkert’s enthronement\(^{43}\) which as mentioned by Eghishe was not 450 as assumes Maghakia Ormanyan, when the Holy Saturday of Easter was on April 15\(^{th}\) \(^{44}\), but in its previous year, 449, when the Armenian church celebrated the Holy week from March 21\(^{st}\) to March 27\(^{th}\) \(^{45}\). This coincided with Zoroastrian spring solstice celebrated on March 21\(^{st}\) in Iran. This unusual coincidence was an occasion of a good omen for the mages to prompt the king of kings Hazkert to follow their counsel of making Armenia worship fire. Behold an example: on Holy

\(^{40}\) See R. Պետրոսյան, Եղիշէ, գրիմությունները, Պետերբուրգ, 1909:

\(^{41}\) Եղիշէ, էջ 15:

\(^{42}\) Եղիշէ, էջ 54:

\(^{43}\) Even the European Iranologists are not of the same opinion concerning the first year of Hazkert II’s enthronement: whether it was in August of 438 or 439. In fact, Eghishe considered 438 after which Hazkert’s 12th year would be counted 449.

\(^{44}\) Օրմանյան Մ., Ազգապատում, հտ. Ա, Կ.Պոլիս, 1912, էջ 406, 411:

\(^{45}\) Das Zeitrechnungswesen der Völker. iii. Band, Leipzig, 1914, s. 411 (Tafel III): Eghishe «ի մեծի շաբաթու զատկին» was translated into modern Armenian by Y. Ter-Minasian as “the holy Saturday of Easter” (Եղիշէի Վարդանանց պատմությունը թարգմ. և ծանոթ. Ե. Տեր-Մինասյանի, Երևան, 1958, էջ 43), while Eghishe meant the whole holy week without mentioning an exact day.
Saturday before the Armenian Easter in 450, Hazkert, prompted by mages, decided to make the Armenian nakharars invited to Tizbon adjure Christianity and worship the sun and fire. On Holy Saturday of Easter the nakharars arrived in Tizbon and appear to the king Hazkert’s court. Hazkert demands that they accept the religion of magiarism threatening to expel the nakharars to Sagastan making ownerless Armenia an underfoot for elephants. The nakharars, somehow convincing sparapet Vardan, were compelled to undertake seeming apostasy in order to save the country and the nation from unavoidable wreck. Therefore, the fake apostasy of 11 Armenian nakharars took place in 449, on days following March 27th. Adding multitudinous cavalry and more than 700 mages and some great chief mage, Hazkert sent them to the country Armenia. They reached Armenia on the fourth month; the big borough called Ang and camped there.

M. Ormanyan considers Eghishe’s *deadline, the sixth month* the beginning of the deed: “this was the term of beginning the deed”. And one year was given for finishing; *from Navasard to Navasard*. According to Julian calendar the moving Armenian year was from August 6th, 450 to August 5th, 451. Yervand Ter-Minasyan who has comprised and composed Eghishe’s critical original, in his translation into modern Armenian also considers the sixth month as “the beginning of starting the deed”, that is to say the first month of the new year: Navasard. Therefore, he counts the *fourth* and *sixth* months from the beginning of the new year as *fourth* and *sixth* months of Armenian or Persian calendar which match (with slight differences) to the months November and January in Julian calendar, thus the Persian months of the year, where the first month is freward (which is Armenian Navasard), the fourth is tir and the sixth is sharewar, are mentioned in the 73rd notification of the modern Armenian translation.

Y. Ter-Minasyan, like M. Ormanyan, misunderstood the piece in Eghishe’s original “from Navasard to Navasard” which Y. Ter-Minasyan accepted as a basis in the text of critical publication. I do not consider right Y. Ter-Minasyan’s interpretation of the piece of Eghishe’s work included in the critical original: “from Navasard till Navasard, it is said, everywhere” but the interpretation “till Navasard, it is said, everywhere” as is included in four manuscripts. Unlike Y. Ter-Minasyan, M. Ormanyan is absolutely right noticing the time irrelevance concerning the *fourth* and *sixth* months and considers the Persian religious year for calendar calculations: “Counting from August 1st the beginning of the

---

46 Եղիշե, էջ 43:
47 Եղիշե, էջ 51:
48 Let us mention for comparison that after the battle of Avarayr Hazkert demanded the newly appointed marzpan of Armenia Atrormizd to gather all the prominent priests of Armenia headed by the Bishop Hovsep and sent them to Tizbon in bonds and they arrived there in 2 months and 20 days: «Իսկ զսուրբ քահանայսն` վասն զի կապանօք տանէին, յետ երկուց ամսոց և քսան աւուր հասանէին ի ձմերոցն արքունի» - Եղիշէ, էջ 130:
49 Եղիշե, էջ 58:
50 Օրմանեան Մ., Ազգապատում, հ.Ա, էջ 411:
51 Օրմանեան Մ., op. cit., p. 411.
52 Եղիշեի Վարդանանց պատմությունը, էջ 197:
53 Եղիշէ, էջ 52 էջատակի 4-րդ տողի ծանոթագրությունը:
sixth month will be December 29th which does not match to the year beginning with Navasard. And it is not a proper solution to count the sixth month from April 15th of the year of apostasy or appearing to Hazkert as in this case the sixth month would be at the half of October. This problem will be solved with the help of the Persian calendar, in which the New Year is stable: on spring equinox, March 21st\(^{54}\). The first month of the Persian religious calendar frawardi started on March 12th, the fourth month-on June 10th and the sixth month (shahrewar) - on August 9th\(^{55}\), therefore Hazkert gives a deadline to the mages and the chief mage until the sixth month counted after March, that is to say until Navasard (New Year) for sealing and closing: “The deadline is the sixth month. They were frightened and forced to implement the king’s request. “Tell all the high clergymen to close and seal the doors of holy temples until Navasard \(^{56}\) in the power of the great king”: unyieldingly orders Hazkert. Therefore, Hazkert sets the deadline of apostatizing Armenia until the sixth month, i. e. until Navasard rigorously demanding to finish the deed until the beginning of the New Year. This appears at the end of the edict where he again reminds of the deadline: “All this that has been said must be implemented until the beginning of the year and everything else must be ready until this time”\(^{57}\).

Instead of the above mentioned dense and interrelated chronological data with the help of which Eghishe gives today’s historian, geographer and reader much important information about the road from Tizbon to the borough Angł in the Armenian district Tsaghkotn and the deadline of making Armenians worship the fire, Parpetsi implies only one extensive sentence: “And then they forcibly went during the long hours of spring before the beginning of the hot season and when the hot months began a procession started and Armenian people from all the windy places came and reached to the district which was called Tsaghkotn near a firm fortress which was called Angł; they set up camp in that place and they had rest there during the hot hours”\(^{58}\). Thus, with a brief revision of Eghishe’s about 15 pages, Parpetsi assures our assumption that the caravan passed the road from Tizbon to the borough Angł from the first month of the spring to the hot days of the summer. The borough Angł was not chosen accidentally: it was located in the district Tsaghkotn and the summer court of the former Arshakuni kings was located in the township Shahapivan in the neighboring district Bagrevand. This was the seat of the marzpan Vasak Syuni\(^{59}\).

\(^{54}\) Օրմանեան Մ., Ազգապատում, հտ.Ա, էջ 411-412:

\(^{55}\) Օրմանեան Մ., նույն տեղում, էջ 412: the first six months of the Persian year were Frawartin, Artawahišt, Harot, Tir, Amurt, Šathrewar (Das Zeitrechnungswesen der Völker. S. 314):

\(^{56}\) Եղիշէ, էջ 52

\(^{57}\) Եղիշէ, էջ 53

\(^{58}\) Փարպ., Բ., ԼԱ., էջ 60:

\(^{59}\) Շահապիվանի Հայոց արքունիքի մասին տե՛ս Ա. Մուշեղյան, Ովքե՞ր են Քրիստոսի նախանձահույզ պաշտոնյաները. «Քրիստոնյա Հայաստան», 2013, օգոստոս Ա. Բ. սեպտեմբեր Ա, in present periodical.
And after twenty five days, on Sunday the chief mage himself arrived with mages to destroy the doors of the church with great power. Then the pastor Ghevond leading the crowd armed with bludgeons broke the skulls of mages and their chief. The court pastor Eghishe, the future historian was present at the conversations of the Armenian marzpan Vasak and the chief mage at the court, therefore the reproaches of the chief mage survived from the beating with bludgeons addressed to Vasak can be considered absolutely valid. Beginning with the traditional biography, Eghishe was presented as sparapet Vardan’s soldier, servant or secretary. But this all is merely a consequence of a credulous insight to the question. Eghishe’s connection with the commander Vardan has incomparably deeper ideological basis and it is revealed not only in the history of Vardanants but also in Tovma Artsruni’s historical work. Tovma Artsruni does not interpret correctly the following information extracted from a historical source which implies that Vardan Mamikonyan feared from the Persian commander Mshkan and: “escaping went to the environs of Mokk’, the canyon of the mountain Taurus, the defile Jermadzor and resided in the fortress which is now called Zrghayl /.../ because of its unwieldy rustic firmness” and then in the same spirit: “Vardan feared from the marzpan Mshkan and in order to live in peace he went to the fortress in Mokk’ and stayed there… And invited Ohan bishop of Mokk’ and Sahak bishop of Rshtunik’ and Shmavon bishop of Andzavatsik’ and he fulfilled God’s orders at days and nights with unceasing diligence and generous custody for the poor for getting Christ’s mercy. Maghakia Ormanyan is rightfully discontented with the chronological suspense of the data implied by Tovma. Because of this he connects Vardan’s appearing in the fortress Zrayl with the death of his grandfather Catholicos Sahak (439, at the end of Navasard) assuming “that Vardan, Sahak’s grandson, becoming a subject of hate, escaped to the district Mokk’, to the rocky fortress Zrayl, where he received spiritual consolation with the visits of Hovhan bishop of Zrayl, Sahak bishop of Rshtunik and Shmavon bishop of Andzavatsik”. However, as the chronological conditions are indistinct, it is easy to accord that at the time of Sahak’s exile Vardan considered right to draw aside; then he came into sight again after Sahak’s returning to Bagrevand; and Vardan’s wife was with Sahak at the time of his death. Here M. Ormanyan makes an allusion to Vardan’s wife’s presence at Sahak the Great’s funeral mentioned in Koryun’s “Life of Mashtots”: “There was a pious wife of a ruler; her name was Duster and she was Vardan’s wife”. This way Koryun underlines the ruler (not sparapet) Vardan’s absence at the last rites of

---

60 Եղիշէ, Էջ 58.
61 According to Tovma Artsruni, this source is Abraham Khostovanogh’s Համառօտագրութիւնը. Scholars express unfounded doubts about its existence, especially at recent times.
62 This is the fortress Zrayl or Zrel on the mountain Taurus, mentioned in Tovma Artsruni’s history and the history of the Anonymous historian continuing him (p. 86, 89, 307). According to Tovma, the peasants pronounced Zrghayl because of its absurd bigness.
63 Թովմա Արծրունի, Ա., ժա., էջ 86:
64 Օրմանեան Մ., Ազգապատում, հտ.Ա, էջ 379:
65 Կորյուն, Վարք Մաշտոցի, հրատ. Մ. Աբեղյանի, Երևան, 1941, [ԻԴ], էջ 88:
his prominent grandfather (at the last day of the month Navasard, in 438 or 439). Thus, the fact of Vardan’s “isolating in the Mokk’s surroundings” mentioned by M. Ormanyan can refer neither to Catholicos Sahak’s being exiled nor to receiving spiritual consolation on the occasion of his death and this does not disperse the chronological imprecision.

However, in the continuation Tovma brings a later episode from which we would rather guess that at the eve of Avarayr, in 450, Vardan actually had gone to the province Mokk’ in order to prevent the threatening impending disaster of Zoroastrianism. Receiving spiritual consolation for the false apostasy in Tizbon could really serve as a relevant excuse for concealing this. It turns out that he had isolated outside of Mijnashkkharh (Midland of Armenia) in the fortress Zrayl in Mokk’ in order to have a secret council with patriotic nakharars and bishops, hidden from the marzpan Vasak Syuni and other conspirators. And here the immediate engagement of Eghishe from Mokk’ in organizing the secret council is revealed. In Mokk’ Vardan meets with Hovhan, bishop of Mokk’, the famous bishop of Rshtunik Sahak, Father Shmavon from Andzavatsik. The latter is, however, not the bishop of Andzavatsik, as is mistakenly mentioned by Tovma, but nakharar of Andzavatsik Shmavon who is mentioned by Eghishe and Ghazar Parpetsi in the list of participants of the church council of Artashat for several times as well as among the 35 nakharars invited to Tizbon and exiled. The name of the bishop of Andzavatsik participating in the council of Artashat is Yeghbayr. The nakharar of Andzavatsik Vakhritch mentioned by Tovma is not mentioned by Eghishe and Parpetsi. Profiting from the fire worship spread in Armenia by the mages, the hidden local heliolaters, pyrolaters and backsliders took actions. It is not accidental, that Shavasp Artsruni dared to cooperate with the mages even at the center of Armenia, in the former capital city Artashat and he founded a temple of fire and blazed Zoroastrian fire right at the doors of the city, in the former sacerdotal pagoda of the art of education devoted to the pagan god Tir that is known to us from Agatangelos’s history. Although this fact is not included in the works of Eghishe and Ghazar who used his work, it is still preserved in 9-10th centuries’ historian Abraham Khostovanogh’s (Confessor) Concurrency of which is skeptically denied by many philologists. The following information implied by Tovma Artsruni about the punitive activity taken against impious Shavasp Artsruni who founded temple of fire worship in the pagoda of Vormizd near the entrance of the city Artashat and was spreading mazdean worship, certifies the crucial steps implemented by that council. Therefore, Vardan Mamikonyan with nakharars Tatchat Rshtuni and Vakhritch

66 Եղիշէ, էջ 43, 99, 193, Փարպ., էջ 45, 47, 75, 86:
67 Եղիշէ, էջ 28, Փարպ., էջ 44:
68 Ագաթանգեղայ պատմութիւն Հայոց, քննական բնագիրը Գ. Տեր-Մկրտչյանի և Ս. Կանայանցի, Երևան, 1983, § 778 - “... and the king himself moved from the city Vagharshapat to the city Artashat, destroyed there the altars of the goddess Anahit and the ones that were in the place called Yerazamoyn. First they touched the pagoda devoted to the worship of the dream reader god tir and sacerdotal literature and science. It was called divan of Vormizd’s pen, pagoda of art of education”.
Andzavatsiq and 1200 soldiers “suddenly reached to Shavasp and the marzpan Vndo with unexpected speed. And as they had encamped at the watercourse of Yeraskh and Metsamor they first came across Shavasp Artsruni with whom the brave Vardan had come to fight as a lion, as a cub of a lion and with power and speed of his hand he cut Shavasp’s body in two pieces. And Tatchat and Vakhritch locked the marzpan and his son Shiro, captivated them and took to Dvin and burnt the fire grate of the temple of Vormizd and hung Shiro on a wood over the fire grate, drowned him in the river and killed with swords”\(^69\). Here instead of the name Dvin should have been Artashat.

Tovma Artsruni gives basis to insist that the liberation of the prominent Armenian castles from Persian armed garrisons and the destruction of the profane fire temples the day before the battle of Avarayr was planned and lead by the commander Vardan Mamikonyan himself. Liberating those castles before the battle of Avarayr, in fact Vardan secured the Armenian support troops from the threats of the Persian garrisons spread through the whole country and this shows his strategic proficiency.

Eghishe is also well-informed with Persian court ceremonies, state and religious relations. His knowledge of the Persian language is sensational, especially when the official and worship terms are compared with the list of terms of the 3rd century’s Sasanid lithographic inscriptions. Thus, for instance, the Pahlavi word “krpikar” used twice by Eghishe is found twice in the form “krpkry”\(^70\) in the chief mage Kartir’s (the late 3rd century) inscription Naqsh-i- Rajab. The decoder and explicator Martin Sprengling translates this word into English as “well doer” (պուխտաղորդ in Armenian)\(^71\) and this corresponds to Eghishe’s and Parpetsi’s testimonies\(^72\). Before Movses Khorenatsi it is the historian of Vardanants that gives information about ancient Parthian tradition still preserved in the court of Iran in the mid 5th century when except the crown-prince all the other princes were sent away from the court in their childhood in order to escape further

\(^69\) Թովմա Արծրունի, Բ., ա., էջ 89-90

\(^70\) Martin Sprengling, third century, Iran, Sapor and Kartir, Chicago, 1953 – Kartir Naqsh-i-Rajab, p.65, ln. 18-19: Here the head mage Kartir who spread fire worship in whole Iran in the 3rd century implies: “There is heaven and there is hell and the one who is a well-doer (krpkry) will go straight to the heaven forever and the one who is a sinner, will deserve the hell”.

\(^71\) See Sprengling p. 67, ln. 18-19

\(^72\) “Being not a welldoer (krpikar) you strengthen the enemy” (բարեգործ, էջ 46). “As he (Vasak) governed the province Syunik not by order but by killing his uncle Vaghinak with fraud and collusion and took the government as if being a welldoer of the court” (բարեգործ, էջ 137). In the last testimony Eghishe refers the word “krpikar” to Vasak Syuni ironically when the evil-doing of killing his uncle Vaghinak for taking possession of the province Syunik is revealed in the justice court in Tizbon. This exactly corresponds to Arshak Kamsarakan’s ironic characterization of Vasak Syuni as a “welldoer” in the same justice court included in Parpetsi’s history: “And then glorified like a welldoer he was sitting there among you in mitigation” (Գործել, էջ 8). It is clear that Eghishe’s “krpikar” was translated from Persian into Armenian just like our contemporary Iranologist Sprengling interprets into English the head mage Kartir’s krpkry as “welldoer”. But the meaning of welldoer does not correspond at all to Eghishe’s first testimony: Hazkert’s speech. Instead of the word “krpikar” (krtikar) Eghishe’s manuscript Andzavatik has the short form “krtar” which has to be corrected as krpak, Pahlavi krpkry (Sprengling, 65, ln. 20),which Sprengling interprets as welldoing.
courtier troubles and they received heritage in certain districts\(^73\). Eghishe shows this by the example of the king of proper Aghuank Vache\(^74\) who has rebelled against the Persian king of kings Peroz. And the historian of Vardanants translates that heritage of childhood from Pahlavi as “property of childhood”\(^75\).

The information implied by Eghishe about the officials with the highest positions in the Persian court is unexpectedly affirmed in Persian sources, such as “Matakdan i hazar datastan”\(^76\) (the Sassanid Codex)\(^77\) (composed under the reign of Khosrov Parvez). In this codex there are collected legal cases resolved by Persian kings and judges during the previous centuries. Their precedents served as basis for defining punishments of similar crimes in the future.

Thus, according to Eghishe the great chiliarch Mihrnerseh “the upset old man” also received verdict for the various harms he had caused. We find clear information about this punishment in the Sassanid Codex: by command of the king of kings Peroz following Hazkert II and in consent of the head mage of chief mages, Mihrnerseh, the next most influential person after the king of kings Hazkert is convicted to *slavery* (*pat bandakih*) and is given to the fire temple Vormizd Peroz as a slave (*bandak*). Mihrnerseh *found harmful many of his deeds*, he himself confessed that he had destroyed Armenia for which he was sent home with great dishonor but he never wished to slander about the captivated (*nakharars*) till the end of his life\(^78\). “He found harmful many of his deeds” is wordily taken from the king of kings Peroz’s verdict: “ut nam i vinaskarih” (a. 39, 14)\(^79\). Apparently, Eghishe saw Peroz’s command at the newly appointed marzpan of Armenia Atormizd.

***

H. Gatrtchyan refers to Eghishe the interpretations of “Isaiah and book of judges” of the Old Testament as well as that: “It seems that Eghishe himself has retold the allocution of metamorphosis, has been in Palestine and visited the monks on the mountain Tabor\(^80\). The academician Levon Khachikyan, restored the lost original of

\(^{73}\) Musheghyan A. V., Movses Khorenats’ դարը, Երևան, 2007, էջ 256-291:

\(^{74}\) The name “Vache” is not included in Eghishe’s work; we restore it according to Kaghankatvatsi: “About Vache king of Aghuank that denied pagan delusions and believed in living God and after the war against Persians turned monk in desert doing holy acts” Կաղանկատուացի, ա., ժ., էջ 15-17:

\(^{75}\) Arakelyan E., Պատմագրության ժամանակը, Երևան, 1999, էջ 199. N. Adonts was completely right to notice that the Armenian historian of the 8th century Movses Kaghankatvatsi extracted the whole episode of rebellion of the king of Aghuank from Elišē (Կաղանկատուացի, ա. ժ. էջ 15-17). “Chapter 18 in the book I is extracted from Eghishe but our historiographer (Կաղանկատուացի - ա. մ.) has added Vache’s name who is unfamiliar to Eghishe and Ghazar” Ն. Ադոնց, երկեր, հուն. թ., Երևան, 2006, էջ 38: Let us mention that, however, the king of Aghuank Vache’s name became familiar from the paper of the bishop Gyut (пatriarch after 461) which is completely cited again by Kaghankatvatsi (նեղ ձևեր, 3):

\(^{76}\) The anuscript of thousand judgments.

\(^{77}\) Perikhanian A. G., Sasaniyskiy Sudebnik, “Книга тысячи судебных решений”, Ереван, 1973, էջ 424:

\(^{78}\) Arakelyan E., Պատմագրության ժամանակը, Երևան, 1999, էջ 195.

\(^{79}\) Perikhanian A. G., Sasaniyskiy Sudebnik, с. 424.

\(^{80}\) Գաթըրճեան Հ., Հինգերորդ դարու չորս հայ պատմագրությանց ժամանակը, Հանդէս Ամսօրյա, Վիեննա, 1887, թ. 1, էջ 9-12:
Eghishe’s «Արարածոց մեկնություն» (Interpretation of Genesis)\textsuperscript{81}. At the time of relative peace impended after the disaster destined to Armenia, Eghishe decided to devote himself to religious life, that is to say, to endeavoring behavior and made a trip to Palestine, he was on the mountain Tabor where, according to Evangeline, Christ’s prominent transfiguration or metamorphosis took place. He composed the allocutions “On the mountain Tabor” and “About monks\textsuperscript{82} concerning this festival and the conduct of the monks endeavoring on the mountain Tabor. Returning from Palestine, according to traditional biography, wishing to be unknown, Eghishe secretly endeavored in the province Mokk’, in a cave that was called “Saint Eghishe’s cave” but after being discovered and proclaimed by shepherds he moved to Rshtunik and lived for several years near the beach of Van in a cave that also was called “Saint Eghishe’s cave”. And, according to traditional biography, here he deceased after a few years, presumably after 470. Finding him dead, they buried him near the same cave. Gh. Alishan gives information about the last terminus of Eghishe’s relics: “Eghishe’s relics were displaced to today’s monastery of Chaghar (Charahan) Mother of God in the foot of the high and flowery mountain Artos that is surrounded by the river Khoshap in south and the sea Van in south-east and is connected with the dale of Vostan.” \textsuperscript{83}

Eghishe’s history of Vardanants must have been finished at the 5\textsuperscript{th} year of the Persian king of kings’ Peroz’s reign, in 462 as in that year Peroz promises to allow nakharars return to Armenia during the coming 6\textsuperscript{th} year. Giving this information, the historian promises to refer to that question again: “But I have to come back to this place\textsuperscript{84}; instead of this question the book is finished with the most magnificent praise devoted to the delicate ladies of Armenia that has ever been written about feminine chastity: "The delicately bred ladies of Armenia, who had been cared for and pampered..., regularly attended the houses of worship without shoes and on foot, offering up ceaseless prayers that they might be able to endure their great suffering..." \textsuperscript{85}

The information given by Eghishe about Vardanants, numerical data about armies and victims and various other details, his awareness of occurrences in adjacent and distant places actually make the history a valid work created by a well-informed and witnessed author and his poetically powerful, eloquent speech and hot-spirited imagination raise the work to the level of a national epic.

\textsuperscript{81}Խաչիկյան Լ., Եղիշէի «Արարածոց մեկնութիւնը», Երևան, 1992:

\textsuperscript{82}«Սրբոյ Հօրն մերոյ Եղիշէի վարդապԷտի Մատենագ րութիւնք», Վենետիկ, 1859 - «Ի Թաբօր լերին. Յայտնութիւն Տեառն առ Պետրոսեանց», Էջ 213-239. «Բան խրատու. Յաղագս միանձանց», Էջ 159-161:

\textsuperscript{83}Although according to Y. Ter-Minasyan “There is no evidence of Eghishe’s relics displacing, however, Gh. Alishan informs about the facts of his era” (Տեր-Մինասյան Ե., Պատմա-բանասիրական հետազոտություններ, Երևան, 1971, Էջ 123):

\textsuperscript{84}Եղիշէ, Էջ 199:

Life and Education

Voskan Vardapet Yerevantsi was born in 1614 in Nor Jugha (New Julfa). He was named Yerevantsi because of his parents being from Yerevan, who had moved to Persia as a result of the deportation by Shah Abbas (reigned 1584-1629) in 1605.

Voskan is a descendent of a Ghlichents family of the Yerevantsis (Yerevanians), and his brother Avetis was named Ghlichents. The parents of Avetis and Voskan were Toros and Gohar. Voskan was the eldest among the brothers. Avetis and Voskan had two more brothers - Hovhaness who, like Avetis, was a merchant, another brother Mirzayan and a sister Hurusine.

The main sources for Voskan’s biography are the colophons of the manuscripts copied and books printed by him, as well as the 57th Chapter of the History of Arakel Davrizhetsi printed by Voskan. This chapter was written by Voskan and ascribed to Davrizhetsi, that is why it is written in the third person, as if narrating Voskan’s biography in the author’s name.

The narration in the third person starts with the words: “He was an Armenian by nationality…” written in capital letters, while the rest of the text is written in normal letters. The use of such writing style in faraway Holland seems to emphasize further the origin of the Armenian typographer.

Voskan wrote that during the deportation organized by Shah Abbas, after being deported from the country, his parents together with the rest of the inhabitants of Yerevan were taken to Isfahan. Reaching maturity they got married. Voskan wrote he was born in January 1614.

Voskan received his initial education from the priests in New Julfa. From childhood, he dreamed of entering the monastery and studying at the school founded by Khachatur Kesaratstsi in the Monastery of All Saviour in New Julfa.

While studying at Kesaratstsi’s school, Voskan reads the “Psalter” and “Sharaknots” together with Isaiah’s Prophecies and Papers of the Apostle Paul.

---

1 Devrikyan V., Voskan Vardapet Yerevantsi (Life and Typographic Activity), Yerevan, 2015.
2 Ներսես Շնորհալի, Յիսուս Որդի, Ամստերդամ, 1660-61, էջ 612.
After Movses III Tatevatsi became Catholicos (1629-1632) Voskan went to Holy Etchmiadzin, studied in the school opened by Vardapet Melikset Vzhanetsi in Yerevan, then returned to Isfahan.

After the decease of Catholicos Movses, Philippos Aghbaketsi I (1632-1655) ascended the throne; he asked in a letter Khachatur Keseratsi to sent Voskan to St. Etchmiadzin. Arriving to Etchmiadzin, Voskan befriended a Latin preacher Paolo Piromalli.

In 1632, Piromalli was sent to Armenia to teach at Armenian Catholic gymnasium in Nakhijevan. In Armenia, he made good friends with Armenian clergymen, so that they permitted him to preach from the pulpits of the Armenian churches.

Piromalli improved his knowledge on Classical Armenian by taking classes from Voskan since he did not know Classical Armenian well. In his turn, Voskan learnt Latin from Piromalli and he first translated a manual on Latin grammar, and later, imitating the latter wrote an Armenian concise grammar.

In addition, Piromalli taught Voskan logic, philosophy, metaphysics, theology, geometry and astronomy. Receiving relevant knowledge, he became one of the most advanced monks at the Holy See. However, the Catholicos and the clergy of the monastery started treating him with suspicion for his partnership with the Latin clergyman.

Not discouraged by unfriendly atmosphere, Voskan went on translating prayers and The Elements of Philosophy from Latin.

In 1637, in his report addressed to the Pope of Rome Urban VIII, Piromalli described in details the period of his life in Etchmiadzin. He mentioned that in the beginning he was warmly accepted by Catholicos Philippos who named him “the light of his eyes”. Catholicos Philippos had even spoken about his willingness to ordain him a bishop. However, the situation changed shortly. The elder brethren of the monastery told the Catholicos that Piromalli had come to convert them to Catholicism, after which the Catholicos changed his attitude toward him.

Piromalli together with Voskan went to Lviv. Piromalli left Lviv for Rome, and Vardapet Voskan went back to Holy Etchmiadzin, where he took different offices in the Church. He became the abbot of St. Sarkis Monastery of Ushee situated on the slopes of Mount Aragats. He was ordained bishop in Holy Etchmiadzin in 1650s.

Continuing to advance his knowledge, he used to copy manuscripts and do translations from Latin.

**Matteos Tsaretsi and the initiation of the Armenian printing in Amsterdam**

After ascending the throne in 1655, Catholicos Hakob IV Jughayetsi pursued the idea of establishing a new printing house in Europe, especially in Italy. To this end, as well as for realizing the printing of the Bible, he sent to Rome Deacon Matteos Tsaretsi, the clerk of Catholicos Philippos. It's worth mentioning that the majority of Armenian typographers were also scribes versed in the art of manuscript writing, the traditions of

---

3 Կարապետ եպիսկոպոս Ամատունի, Ոսկան վրդ. Երևանցի և իր ժամանակը, Ս. Ղազար, 1975, էջ 52:
which they handed down to the Armenian printed book. Thus, it is not accidental that Catholicos Hakob sent the clerk of his predecessor for organizing the book printing in Rome, since he would have already mastered the art of writing.

Catholicos Hakob Jughayetsi was a bibliophile, but he was displeased with the letters used by Khachatur Kesaratsi in New Julfa and by those of Hovhannes Ankyuratsi. So he decided to have new typefaces of Armenian letters created and was searching for a relevant person whom he could send to Europe with this purpose. Since Deacon Matteos Tsaretsi, who had served at Catholicos Philippos as a notary, was in Etchmiadzin during that period, the selection fell on him and he was sent to Europe. M. Chamchuean writes about Tsaretsi’s visit to Venice and Rome. On arriving to Venice, Tsaretsi did not find a good master who could create new Armenian letter fonts, thus he was preparing to continue traveling to Rome. But, there was a plague epidemic in Rome at that time and Deacon Matteos Tsaretsi had to postpone his visit to Rome for 14 months.

Vatican was willing to keep the monopoly of Armenian typography under its rule and to ban the publication of any book that would contradict the confessional doctrine of Rome. With that aim, the Italian typefounders were prohibited to design molds for Armenian typefaces without the decree of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide.

The fact is also proved by the colophon of Tsaretsi written at the end of the book “Jesus Son.” It may sound strange, but according to Tsaretsi, he was not able to find good typefounders in Rome as well.

However, the real reason becomes apparent after reading the next sentence informing that he had been slandered in the eyes of high dignitaries. Who were those high dignitaries, and what malign speeches were told by the quarrelsome opponents becomes apparent from the following sentence. It appeared that the Congregation de Propaganda Fide ordered to impede Tsaretsi’s plan and not to allow acquiring new Armenian typefaces. Thus, typefounders in Rome were prohibited to prepare new Armenian typefaces.

Before Matteos Tsaretsi, in the 1640s Hovhannes Vardapet Jughayetsi and Hovhannes Ankyuratsi had also addressed with the issue of Armenian typography to Rome and achieved certain results.

Hovhannes Jughayetsi was the disciple of Khachatur Vardapet Kesaratsi and had contributed to the establishment of Armenian printing house in New Julfa. By the order of Kesaratsi, he travelled to Italy to master the art of printing and bring typefaces and printing tools to New Julfa. Jughayetsi went to Italy in 1639 and returned in 1645. Though experiencing great hardship, he succeeded in getting typefaces and together with them, he returned to New Julfa bringing with him printing tools and 1000 copies of “Psalter” printed in Leghorn.

Hovhannes Ankyuratsi being one of the censors of the Armenian books printed in Italy, had more achievements. He succeeded in gaining Armenian typefaces from the

4 Ներսես Շնորհալի, op. cit., p. 602.
publishing house of the Propaganda Fide in Rome and, by its permission he printed the “Psalter” and Nerses Shnorhali’s “Jesus Son” in Venice in 1642-1643.

Arriving to Rome Tsaretsi stayed at the house of S. Zakaria Akam, an Armenian confessor and inquisitor, who had graduated from the Urban College in Rome. By the support of Zakaria, Tsaretsi composed a petition addressed to the Congregation de Propaganda Fide. S. Chemchemean writes that although the letter has not been preserved in the Vatican archives, however, the report of the Congregation based on it is extant. It reads that an Armenian was willing to publish Armenian books in Rome at his own expense, first the Bible, starting from the New Testament, after making the edition acceptable for Rome. To reach this goal, he was ready to cast the matrixes from the already existing molds at his own expense. Following the discussion of the issue, no decision was made.

During the session of the Congregation held on the next day, July 30, it was decided to accelerate the issue of editing of the Armenian text of the Bible according to the Latin canon as well as to cast new typefaces using the existing molds, by attributing the application of the typefaces exclusively to the Urban printing house in Rome, without a permission to take them out of there.

In November, 1657 Tsaretsi addressed a new letter, but with a much more modest request, i.e. to get permission to print Armenian books that have already been published in Armenia in Venice, being authorized by Rome. Not to cast any suspicion on his willingness to acquire those fonts in order to use them later in other publications, Tsaretsi stated that the molds prepared at his own expense can be used for printing books in the printing house of the Propaganda Fide.

Among the books to be published, he mentioned the “Psalter” and “Jesus Son” that have been already published in Italy for several times. As a result of the counsel held on January 15, 1658, Tsaretsi was advised to present those books for censoring.

As a last chance to implement his mission, Tsaretsi decided to apply to the Pope Paul IV. Concerning his travel to Venice and Rome, he wrote that he was sent by the Catholicos to publish the Holy Bible in Armenian and other books as well as to order new typefaces to take them back to his homeland. Not able to implement his plan in Venice, he arrived to Rome being sure that there “he will be able to find skilful masters, printers and designers for the above-mentioned typefaces”.

From this letter, it becomes therewith clear that the next assemblies permitted Tsaretsi to print any book in Rome, but it was prohibited to take the typefaces out of Rome. Clerk Matteos assured that the typefaces would be used to print books spreading the catholic doctrine. That letter stayed unanswered, and disappointed Tsaretsi headed to Holland.

---

5 Chemchemean H.S., Haykakan tpaqrunyan en Hayk, Yerevan, 1989, էջ 81.
6 Ibid, p. 82.
7 Ibid, p. 83.
Tsaretsi’s Printing Activity in Amsterdam

In the colophon to “Jesus Son,” Tsaretsi described in details that after his arrival to Amsterdam he undertook actions to prepare typefaces. There, without difficulties he managed to find skilful masters to mold typefaces.

As described by Tsaretsi, he worked uninterruptedly nights and days for a period of four years and eight months, to finally prepare the typefaces necessary for starting the publication work.

In the colophon of the “Psalter” Karapet Andrianatsi writes that the samples of the typefaces, i.e., the forms as well as a copy of “Psalter” was provided to Voskan by the Catholicos Movses. This proves that already before the Catholicoses Hakob and Philippos, Catholicos Movses was also concerned with the idea of establishing a printing house either in Europe or at the Holy See. During the rule of Catholicos Philippos, the idea was partially implemented by the establishment of the printing house in New Julfa by Khachatur Kesaratsi. The printing house operated in 1638-1642.

The main patrons of the Armenian typography were the merchants from New Julfa and they were mainly supporting publication of those books for which permission from Rome was received. The reason is that the majority of those merchants had adopted Catholicism in order to facilitate their trading in Europe without any obstacle. A typical example is the Shahrimaneans family who had achieved significant prosperity in Venice. The leaders of the Dominican and other Catholic congregations in Isfahan in their letters addressed to Rome and Venice were supporting those traders. That’s why the latter avoided situations that could harm their relations with Rome.

The second reason was the Polish Armenians; this was a core issue for many circles of Armenian clerics and intellectuals. Following the separation of Polish-Armenian Diocese from St. Etchmiadzin, the assimilation process of Polish-Armenians grew rapidly. In such situation, an important role in preserving the national self-consciousness and attachment to the origins was attributed to Armenian books.

On November 27, 1658 Tsaretsin contracted Christopher von Dinkin to design Armenian typefaces: 170 “paternal” forms and 240 matrixes.

In Amsterdam Tsaretsi managed to realize his actions by borrowing money. Avetis Khlichents who continued Tsaretsi’s colophon in “Jesus Son” wrote that the printing house had a bare (lit. “dry”) debt in the amount of 1000 marchils. By saying “dry” he meant the capital amount of the debt to which interests were added as well. Avetis returned the “dry” debt together with all the accumulated interests.

---

8 Ներսես Շնորհալի, op. cit., p. 602.
9 Սաղմոսարան, Ամստերդամ, 1661-1662, էջ 4:
10 A technical term designating a component of the detachable from which is plugged in the matrix.
11 Լեո, Հայկական տպագրություն, Երկերի ժողովածու 10 հատորով, հտ. 5, Երևան, 1968, էջ 228:
12 European silver coin which in different countries had variety: florin, lakri, svile, msketi etc. (~ 24,6-24,9 gr.), see Հովհաննես Տեր-Դավթյանի Հաշվեմատյանը, խմբ. Լ. Խաչիկյան և Հ. Փափազյան, Երևան, 1984, էջ 393.
Avetis also wrote in the colophon of the “Psalter” that he encouraged clerk Matteos to present the printing house to the Monasteries of St. Etchmiadzin and of St. Sargis. While on his deathbed, Matteos called Avetis and asked him to give the debt of 715 marchils that he had to return to the creditors.

Tsaretsi told Avetis that they would print 2000 copies of the “Psalter” and 1200 copies of “Jesus Son” and the profit from the sale would be shared between them. Having experience in communicating with numerous Armenian merchants during those years, Tsaretsi tried to attract Avetis by such a suggestion. However, Voskan’s brother, Avetis was not guided by profits and benefits. He declared that once the printing house is presented to the Monasteries of St. Etchmiadzin and of St. Sargis, he will then become a partner to Tsaretsi and pay the debts. Presenting and giving the printing house the name *St. Etchmiadzin and St. Sargis* meant that when it starts earning incomes, the profits should be equally allocated between two monasteries. After the death of the two brothers, the property the printing house the names would become under possession of the two monasteries.

Matteos gladly accepted the suggestion since all his hardships had the only goal, for St. Etchmiadzin to possess a printing house. He personally was sent to Europe by the order of the Catholicos with that goal, that’s why by accepting Avetis’ suggestion he drew up a will according to which the printing house should later become the property of the monasteries.

Tsaretsi writes that the typesetters were from Holland and they “were not familiar with our letters and language”. Being alone and unhealthy, he conducted the proofreading with difficulty. Then he asked to remember all his relatives by naming all of them separately in the colophon. Tsaretsi’s colophon ends by listing the names of his relatives, and immediately the part written by Avetis follows, that starts the sentence with small letter as follows: “Matteos wrote this colophon with his hand before his death”. Stylistically, even in terms of orthography, these two colophons are incomparable. Tsaretsi wrote in the literary Armenian of his time, while Avetis wrote in “merchant” Armenian.

Avetis writes that “Jesus Son” has 38 quires, i.e. sheets, and that following the publication of quire 24, Matteos died on January 22, 1660, at 11 p.m. He also adds that after Tsaretsi’s death he became an orphaned in Amsterdam since there was no other proofreader except for him.

During that period, the ship from Amsterdam to Smyrna sailed off where Avetis’ merchandise was embarked on. Avetis, however, stayed in Amsterdam to finish the proofreading of the rest 14 sheets. He placed the original book on one side, the composed type on the other and compared the latter with the original, correcting the mistakes. The proofreading was conducted from March 25, 1661 to May 27.

Avetis humbly apologizes for putting his name in the colophon, since he supported both the proofreading process and provided money for printing the book. He also
emphasizes that without him it would be unclear who would own the publishing house at the end.

He also writes that after completing the book he was planning to publish the Bible, but Tsaretsi died and did not manage to order typefaces necessary for publishing. During Tsaretsi’s lifetime 60 matrixes were prepared, but 200 more typefaces were needed. Expenses for the latter were covered by Avetis.

The following example shows what sanctity was the book for the Armenians and what an honor it was to be mentioned in a book’s colophon. Avetis asks to recall Grigor, a merchant from Yerevan in the colophon. Avetis owed money to him and Grigor told him that the debt would be given for publishing needs and instead his name to be written in the colophon. Thus, Avetis mentioned his name there.

**The printing art of the first edition in Amsterdam**

Matteos the Scribe wrote that the publication of the “Jesus Son” was an experiment, which also proved that his main goal was the publication of the Bible. This intention is also confirmed by the diversity of the typefaces ordered by Tsaretsi.

He ordered three different types of fonts, each of them having three sizes: large, medium and small. The type designer, however, was overwhelmed by orders of locals and only managed to prepare *bolorgir* (a style of minuscule writing) with its three sizes before Tsaretsi’s death.

On the typefaces used by Tsaretsi in publishing the “Jesus Son” Ishkhanyan writes: “The book is set up in large (12-14 points) “boloragir” and capital letters (20 points)”\(^{13}\).

The publication of the “Jesus Son” in Amsterdam was the third in turn. The first publication was done by Hovhannes Ankyuratsi in Venice in 1643, the second one – in 1660 by an Italian publisher Joan (Giovanni) Battista Bovis.

In line with the traditions of Armenian manuscript writing, a number of the works of Nerses Shnorhali were copied either as separate books or were included as a separate group entitled “Jesus Son” in collections of works. The name is derived from the first writing of the mentioned group, in which the first line starts with the words “Jesus Son” (pic. 1). Then, the whole poem was entitled by this name. “Jesus Son” is a retelling of the New and Old Testaments in verse and presents the Bible according to the canonical interpretation of the Armenian medieval Church (pic. 2 a. b.).

The publications made in 1643 and 1660 have five engravings. However, the publication printed in Amsterdam has 99 engravings, which is unprecedented in the Armenian books printed so far. Most probably those engravings were acquired not only for the publication of the “Jesus Son”, but also for the Bible, since all the engravings depicted scenes of the Scripture, mainly the Old Testament, which might be explained by the following circumstance. Tsaretsi started acquiring engravings from Dutch masters according to the order of the books of the Bible, that is why, starting from the

---

\(^{13}\) Հիշխանյան Ռ., Հայ գրքի պատմություն, Երևան, 1977, էջ 418:
middle of the “Jesus Son” there are no illustrations except for one image of the “Crucifixion” which is placed in the beginning of the last chapter, “Passion”.

This fact also testifies that the above-mentioned edition was a trial publication of the Bible which should be followed by the publication of the “Psalter” with the same goal. Before that, however, Avetis who after Tsaretsi’s death became alone, managed to print a short “Prayer-book” in August, 1661.

Karaket Vardapet Andrianatsi and the Publication of the “Psalter” (1661-1662)

After buying the printing house of Tsaretsi, Avetis wrote a letter to his brother to come and manage the printing house14.

Chamchean writes that before leaving for Amsterdam, Voskan Vardapet sent there his disciple Karapet Vardapet15.

Matteos Tsaretsi died on January 22, 1661, while the publication of the “Psalter”, the preface of which was written by Karapet Vardapet, started on December 13, 1661. Thus, Andreanaploisetsi arrived to Amsterdam during the same period.

It had been planned by Matteos Tsaretsi to print the “Psalter” after the publication of the “Jesus Son”. As we could see, he had told about this to Avetis as well. The order of printing the books, at first the “Jesus Son”, then the “Psalter” was profoundly well-grounded.

It was not accidental that the Armenian publication of the Bible in 1666 was preceded by three publications of the “Jesus Son” in the course of two decades, while the “Psalter” was published by almost all the printing houses that existed before.

On the issue of the first Armenian publishers starting their activity with the mandatory printing of the “Psalter,” R. Ishkhanyan writes: “In the first half of the 17th century, it becomes clear that the first and the most important issue, similar to the beginning of the 5th century, was the Armenian Bible. It seems that from Hakob Meghapart to Voskan Yerevantsi all efforts of Armenian printers were directed to publish the complete Bible and the publications of its part, the “Psalter,” were just trials on the way of realizing that great and difficult publication in 1666-1668”16.

Before Voskan Yerevantsi, the person who stood close to realizing the publication of the Bible was Hovhannes Ankyuratsi who supposed that Rome would finally permit him to publish it.

Convinced that he was also not destined to be granted permission to publish the Armenian Bible, unlike his predecessors, Ankyuratsi undertook a unique action and printed the “Jesus Son”. Being a poetic retelling of the New and Old Testaments, in fact, it presents the Bible in accordance with the medieval Armenian ecclesiastic canonical interpretations.

14 Առաքել Դավրիժեցի, Գիրք պատմութեանց, Ամստերդամ, 1669, էջ 635:
15 Չամչեան Մ., Պատմութիւն Հայոց, հ. Գ, Վենետիկ, 1786, էջ 659:
Thus its publication is justified as a trial version of printing the Bible, since it is its short retelling. That was the reason that following the publication of the “Jesus Son”, Avetis Khlichents and Karapet Vardapet undertook the publication of the “Psalter”.

The title pages of both the “Jesus Son” and “Psalter” contain the same engravings. Whereas, in the mandorla held by two angels of the former book, the title, “Jesus Son” was written, the same space of the current publication remained blank. The title was written between the two columns.

Shortly after the Preface, on the next page, Prophet David with a lyre in his hands was depicted (pc. 3). Since the Psalms of David were predictions of the birth of Christ and the episode of his life, then, in some cases, the psalms were arranged with evangelical images, though the psalms of David form part of the Old Testament written before the birth of Christ. Thus, it emphasized even more the prophetic nature of the Psalms, for which King David was named not only Psalmist, but also prophet.

The “Psalter” had around 150 engravings, which surpassed the number of engravings of the “Jesus Son” (99 engraving) and was considered unprecedented for that time. The "Psalter" was later surpassed by Voskan’s Bible with 160 engravings, and remained unsurpassed even after the publication of the monumental masterpiece in the series of early printed Armenian books, the Bible published by Mkhitar Sebastatsi.

In the colophon of the “Psalter”, Karapet Vardapet mentioned three principles of placing the engravings in the book.

The first principle was the placing of the engravings in accordance with the titles of the Psalms. The second - they were coordinated with specific Psalms or their chapters. Therefore, in case of the first two principles, the placing of the engravings was conditioned by the meaning of the text and its symbolic value. The third principle – they followed the traditions of the European book design by placing the engravings on exact positions in which they appeared in Latin editions.

As to the number of printed copies, two different numbers are mentioned in the colophon. According to Avetis, Tsaretsi told him to make 2000 copies, but at the end of the colophon it is written that 2700 copies were printed.

In the colophon, Karapet Vardapet provides important information on the publication of the “Psalter”. Apologizing for the errors in the book, he continues that he was not familiar with the art of printing and the Dutch language, and the printers did not know Armenian. Avetis helped him in communicating with them. It is most unlikely that Avetis could manage to learn Dutch language during the period of his printing activities. Most probably, he had learnt it when engaged in trading activities, during which he met Matteos Tsaretsi.

Avetis supported Karapet Vardapet in both communicating with the employees of the printing house and during the proofreading of the “Psalter”, which proves that the publication of the two previous books helped Avetis to master his proofreading skills.
“Psalter” (1664). The last pre-Voskan publication in Amsterdam

Following the publication of the “Prayer-book” in February 1663, Karapet Vardapet did not undertake new publication for that year. Voskan, who already reached Europe and took up the rights of the printing house from his brother, as stated by himself in the colophon of “Sharaknots” (a collection of Armenian church canticles), gave order to Karapet Vardapet to act individually in the frame of his capacities until Voskan reaches Amsterdam. During that period, Avetis ordered to prepare matrixes for khaz (Armenian musical neumes) with the use of which he published the “Sharaknots” and the “Psalter”17 several times.

In the colophon of the previous publication of the “Psalter” in 1661, Karapet Vardapet requests to remember the Dutchman Jan Jannes, i.e. Hovahannes, who learnt to read and write Armenian and was responsible for setting up Armenian books. Within a two years period, Jannes managed to get fluent in Armenian to an extent that Karapet was writing about him in the same manner as he did before about Armenians working in the printing house.

Colophons of old Armenian books provide interesting information about the places where they were printed. Here, it is said that during the book publication (completed on August 2), terrible plague ravaged the city and within a week 795 people died.

At the end of the colophon, Karapet Vardapet consigns the name of one of the devoted traders to the art of printing, Mahtesi (gone to pilgrimage to Jerusalem) Abdullah from Shamb, who bequeathed his wealth to the printing house and the Armenian Patriarchate in Jerusalem. The fact of mentioning of a benefactor in almost every publication shows that among Armenian colonies at that time the importance of the Armenian printing house in Amsterdam was highly praised.

Headed to Leghorn (Livorno) and Rome

As it was mentioned earlier, after the death of Matteos Tsaretsi, Avetis wrote a letter to his brother Voskan asking him to come and manage the printing house. Chamchean writes that Voskan showed the letter to Hakob IV Jughayetsi who expressed his gladness and ordered Voskan to go to Amsterdam to realize the publication of the Bible18.

In his biography, Voskan writes that he was sent to Europe by the order of Catholicos Hakob19. In the colophon of “Sharaknots”, Voskan also clearly writes that he traveled to Leghorn by the order of the Catholicos20. The same is mentioned in the colophon of the Bible as well21.

Referring to European sources, Bishop Karapet Amatuni writes that during the church council held in Etchmiadzin in 1662, it was decided to send Voskan Vardapet to

17 Շարակնոց, Ամստերդամ, 1664-1665, էջ 778:
19 Առաքել Դավրիժեցի, Գիրք պատմութեանց, էջ 659:
20 Զամփունց, էջ 779:
21 Աստվածաշունչ, Ամստերդամ, 1666-1668, էջ 833:
Europe to realize the publication of the Bible and continue Tsaretsi’s work in Amsterdam\textsuperscript{22}.

On June 6, 1662, Voskan was still in St. Etchmiadzin. On that day the archbishop of Heliopolis Francisco Palu on his way to China was in St. Etchmiadzin and one of the bishops receiving him at the entrance of the patriarchate residence was Voskan\textsuperscript{23}. Later he wrote about Voskan as a faithful catholic, probably meaning that he mastered Latin, Italian and western ecclesiastical literature.

After sending Karapet Andrianatsi to Amsterdam, completing his works in St. Etchmiadzin and passing on the position of the abbot of the St. Sargis Monastery in Ushi, Voskan takes up the journey to Europe by again travelling through marine route from Smyrna. In the colophon of the

S. Chemchemean writes about the arrival of Voskan Vardapet to Livorno as follows: “In the beginning of 1663, Voskan took a journey from Smyrna to Leghorn tightly holding in his hands the Bible of Hetum with the aim to realize the new publication”\textsuperscript{24}.

In the colophon of the “Sharaknots” Voskan Vardapet noted that he met with his brother in Leghorn and documented the transfer of the property of the printing house to him.

Though Hakob IV Jughayetsi had sent a letter addressed to the Armenians in Livorno to help him, however, Voskan Vardapet didn’t find necessary help there and like his predecessors directed his steps to Rome.

Based on Vatican archive documents, S. Chemchemean writes that Voskan reached Rome in September 1663. During the assembly of the Propaganda de Fide it was mentioned that several days ago Bishop Voskan arrived to Rome. The fact of informing the Congregation about his arrival certifies the authority of the Armenian cleric and the attention of Rome to the relations with the Armenian Church and the Armenian typography. Testimonies in favour to Voskan were also provided by Clemens Galanus, who had been conducting missionary activities both in the East, particularly in Armenia for a long time and spoke fluent Armenian.

After three months of his stay in Rome, Voskan sends a petition to the Congregation of Propaganda de Fide, saying: “Bishop Voskan of the St. Sargis church of Greater Armenia, on behalf of his Catholicos, addresses Your Excellency with a request to approve the publication of the New Testament in favour of his nation. By the order of the Catholicos, Bishop Voskan has completely compared it with the Latin text and presented to the censurers. Voskan Vardapet humbly requests Your Excellency to console and grant approval to the request of the mentioned Catholicos”\textsuperscript{25}.

\textsuperscript{22} Կարապետ եպս. Ամատունի, Ոսկան վարդապետ և իր ժամանակը, էջ 146:
\textsuperscript{23} Պէրպէրեան Հ., Էջմիածնի վանքը, 1662-ին, “Հասկ” 1950, N. 8-10, էջ 272-273:
\textsuperscript{24} Ճեմճեմեան Հ. Ս., op. cit., p. 89.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid, p. 90.
In the letter, there is no mention of Voskan’s travel to Europe for the publication of the complete Bible and managing the printing house in Amsterdam. If Voskan would have written about his visit to “heretic” Holland, he would endanger the implementation of the plan to publish the Bible from its very beginning. Not mentioning his visit to Amsterdam Voskan testifies that he either had hopes to publish the Bible by the approval of Rome or wanted to move the printing house to Italy to make the operation of the latter acceptable for Rome. S. Chemchemean also writes that reasoning the fact, Voskan did not mention about his intentions to travel to Europe: “Voskan was wise enough to conceal his final goal”.

The Congregation of Propaganda de Fide provides the same response as to other Armenian printers earlier, which, in practice, was an inapplicable agreement. The response reads that the Congregation agrees to publish the New Testament in Armenian; however, there are no specialists for Armenian language to censor and approve the Armenian translation of the book.

Voskan Vardapet stayed in Rome until November 6, 1664. After one year and two months of his stay, he again returned to Leghorn, then to Amsterdam to realize the words of Hovhannes Ankyuratsi, who said late in 1642, that if Rome would not permit the publication of the Bible in Armenian, then the Armenian edition should be published in the “heretic” Holland.

The first publication of Voskan’s Armenian printing house in Amsterdam

Arriving to Leghorn from Smyrna, Voskan Vardapet wrote a letter to Karapet Andrianatsi to operate the printing house the best of his ability until he reaches Amsterdam.

Parallel to the publication of the “Psalter”, Andrianatsi prepared the khaz fonts necessary for the “Sharakanots” and started its publication. Voskan reached Amsterdam when the publication of the canon On Ascension was going on.

In the colophon of the “Sharakanots”, Voskan writes that for the publication of the Bible he ordered preparation of a new type of cursive (notrgir) and when ready he used it to set up the canon of the Martyrs. In the colophon of the Bible he also mentions that he ordered a type of “notrgir” font that was used in setting up the final part of the “Sharakanots”. He writes that preparing those new fonts took four months.

Voskan justifies the need for the new typefaces by the fact that the fonts of Tsaretsi were large. If he had used them when publishing the Bible, the book would have been larger in size.

As stated on the title page, the publication of the “Sharakanots” was launched on August 14, 1664, on the second day of the feast of Assumption of the Virgin Mary and completed on November 1, 1665.

The “Sharakanots” is a collection of spiritual songs called sharakan. Sharakans are placed in it not by the order of authors, but according to the feasts of Armenian Church

---

26 Կարապետ եպս. Ամատունի, op. cit., p. 150.
dedicated to the various events of the Old and New Testaments, as well as of the Universal and Armenian Church life.

The canon for each feast is composed of sharakans dedicated to a certain feast. Some canon is anticipated by engravings thematically corresponding to the given feast.

Armenian printers were taking European engravings and adapting them to the Armenian themes where possible, since preparation of the engraving on national ecclesiastic themes would be too expensive. That is the reason that illustrations are mainly made on the feasts of scriptural and general ecclesiastic themes (pic. 4ab).

Since the “Jesus Son” was dedicated to the Old and New Testaments, some parts of the engravings used in the book were also placed in “Sharaknots”, later the Bible. “Sharaknots” has 99 engravings. They are placed in the beginning of the canons following the principle of thematic and symbolic relevance. For instance, relevant thematic engravings are placed in case of the Birth of Jesus Christ, the Candlemas, and Antony the Eremite. However, since the Shrovetide was not directly connected to any of the themes, but rather it symbolized the happy life in paradise, in the beginning of the canon Adam and Eve in paradise were depicted.

Beneath every engraving, there is a small inscription in verse that interprets the spiritual conception of a given feast.

The following Sunday after the Shrovetide is called the Expulsion and reads about the expulsion from paradise. On the engraving of the given canon the moment when Adam and Eve eat the fruit of paradise and are expelled from it is shown.

Voskan also followed the tradition of the Armenian manuscript writing in such a difficult issue as it was with the science of old Armenian musical notation system called “Khazagrutyun.”

Preparation of matrixes for khaz signs was very difficult, but more difficult was the exact conversion of the signs from manuscript texts to printed books, especially considering the decline of the art of khaz writing, which started from the 15th century.

**The Bible, 1666-1668, 1470 pages in two columns**

The first publication of the Armenian Bible evokes admiration and amazement by its size, quality and art of printing, as well as the tremendous textual work undertaken. Every attempt to transmit a manuscript text or a collection into a printed book is connected not only with printing or technical difficulties, but also creates certain difficulties regarding the text itself, since the inner division of the text has also semantic significance that requires relevant approach in the process of transmitting it from the manuscript version into a printed book.

The above mentioned is true when observing the Bible with its quite complicated structure, since it is composed of the Old and New Testaments, and each in its turn, is composed of a number of books with respective chapter and verse divisions, numbering, preambles and concordances.

The transition from manuscript copies of the Bible to a printed version created the necessity of developing new printing principles and publishing a text which,
corresponding to the Armenian canon of the Bible, at the same time, would be in harmony with the Latin ecclesiastical editions. This relation is mentioned on the title page as following: “in the order of our ancestors” and “with chapter and verse divisions in accordance with the Latins”.

Summarizing all the problems it can be concluded that the main textological difficulties surmounted by Voskan were the following:

A. The selection of the Armenian relevant manuscript or manuscripts of the Bible and their comparison with the Vulgate.

B. The decision on the sequence of the books of the Bible by combining the Armenian canon and the Vulgate.

C. Determining the canonical, secondary and non-canonical books of the Bible. Consequently deciding which books should be included in the main text and which placed at the end of the book as appendices.

D. Making the chapter division of each book, dividing the chapters into verses and numbering them, taking into consideration the differences conditioned by the presence or absence of this or that passage in the Armenian or Latin texts, which confused the whole system of verse numbering of a given chapter.

E. Composing the concordances and placing them in the margins indicating in which book of the Bible the given line, paragraph or chapter has a thematic, semantic or symbolical parallel.

All those issues, including those concerning the placement of the Books existing in the Armenian translation, but absent in the Vulgate, as well as the translation of the Books absent in the Armenian version are discussed in details by Voskan Vardapet in the “Preface” addressed to Hakob IV Jughayetsi, in the appeal to the reader and in the colophon as well.

Strangely enough, Voskan does not write a word about the manuscript or manuscripts that served bases for publishing the Bible. He does not address this issue either when speaking about the publication of the Bible in his biography inserted into Davrizhetsi’s “Book of Histories”.

M. Chamchean when providing a detailed description of the publication of the Bible, again, gives no information on the manuscript, which served the base for printing the book.

Luckily, two facts helped the scholars to find the manuscript used by Voskan and compare it with the printed copy. In the colophon of the New Testament published in 1668, Voskan writes that the Bible of the King Hethum II (1289-1301) served as a base for the publication of the current book. The second fact is that at the end of the printed Bible, Voskan included an untitled poem of King Hethum. These two facts formed a base to conclude that Voskan used the written Bible of King Hethum (pic. 5).

---

27 See Առաքել Դավրիժեցի, Գիրք պատմութեանդվան։ Էջ 635-636:
28 Համչեան Մ., op. cit., vol. III, p. 621, 659-660:
After selecting this manuscript, Voskan had also printed its colophon in verse, copied from the archetype. The scribes of medieval manuscripts, too, when copying texts often also copied the colophons accompanying them.

A two-stage scrupulous comparison of the Hethum’s “Royal” Bible (kept in Matenadaran, № 180) and the Voskan’s printed Bible was done by S. Kolanjyan. This comparison is two-stage since Kolanjyan compared not only the texts of the Bible, but also the later marginalia in the manuscript and showed that they found place in Voskan’s publication as well. He concluded that these are Voskan’s editorial notes in the margins of the manuscript, which were typeset while printing the book together with the additional corrections.

The margins of the manuscript also contain notes in red ink that refer to the time when the manuscript was written: “1st of the Francs,” “2nd of the Francs” or “the Francs’ number of this chapter 24”, etc. Kolanjyan writes about these notes: “It is most probable that the mentioned chapter numbering and notes in red ink belong to the commissioner of the manuscript, i.e. Hethum II who was studying sacred books at a Franciscan monastery in the year the manuscript was completed (1295). Thus, when searching an archetype for his printed book, Voskan considered the mentioned manuscript most suitable, since it was not only a royal manuscript of the Bible, but also was one of the samples of exquisite handwriting and almost perfect content. In addition, as already mentioned, the manuscript also included chapter numbering typical to the Latin Vulgate, something that Voskan had to include in his printed Bible by the order of Catholicos Hakob IV. In the manuscript, a number of later revisions and additions are visible, that were also included in Voskan’s publication”.

The name of the scribe of the manuscript is Stepanos, the commissioner is King Hethum. Due to the fact that since 1656 Hethum’s Bible was preserved at Hovhannavank, near the monastery of St. Sargis in Ushi, Voskan had the opportunity to study both this manuscript and the Bible of Ghukas Vardapet Kharberdtsi or the manuscript of Valakatsi, which was also kept at Hovhannavank (currently manuscript № 201 of Matenadaran).

The fact that Voskan used the Bible of the King Hethum brought to Hovhannavank in 1656 as a base for his printed Bible, proves that the manuscript edited by Voskan and Piromalli in 1642 could not be used for that purpose, rather it could have been compared with Hethum’s Bible after 1656.

In regards to the interventions made by Voskan to the text, it is necessary to mention that in such cases too he tried to remain loyal to the Armenian tradition. He did not reduce the words, sentences or paragraphs absent from the Vulgate, but rather he preserved the Armenian text with notes about their absence in the Vulgate, placing them in parenthesis. Moreover, to make the section numbering in the Armenian text

29 Քոլանջյան Ս., Հեթում Բ-ի ձեռագիր Աստվածաշունչը և Ոսկանյան հրատարակությունը, Էջմիածին, 1966, դեկտեմբեր, էջ 103.
match those in the Vulgate, he did not number the parts placed in parenthesis, thus the verse numbering in the Armenian corresponds to that in the Latin text.

The parts absent in the Armenian text and added by Voskan are inserted without parenthesis and any other sign, by making the Armenian text closer to the Vulgate.

In the section of the New Testament of the Hethum’s Bible there are no marginalia, since Voskan had entirely copied the New Testament and later made some notes in his copied sample, thus keeping intact the New Testament section of this magnificent manuscript.

The number of printed copies, 5000, also was unprecedented for that time.

The 159 engravings or the majority of them found in Voskan’s Bible were obtained by Matteos Tsaretsi, since similar images were also found in Shnorhali’s “Jesus Son” and “Sharaknots”.

H. Kyurtean presented arguments to prove that all those engravings can be found in the Bible printed in 1657 in Holland and their author is priest Christoffel Van Sichem. As he notes, the majority of the engravings have been copied from images of renowned European engravers. Sichem marked his own works with the initials CvS, while there are initials of other painters, AD in case of Albrecht Durer, HG for Hendrik Goltzius, etc.

Voskan used the engraving without any amendment that is why the names of the Evangelists are written in Latin.

As Kyurtean notes, the Dutch engraver numbered the engravings with Latin characters: A, B, C, D, etc., and placed their captions under the corresponding letters at the end of the book. Since the Armenian book has no such a list, thus the letters on the images indicate nothing.

G. Levonyan writes about the book’s title page (pic. 6) the following: “The title page has rather large frame composed of four etchings. Two human figures representing the symbols of faith and hope are placed in the center of ornamental engravings on the right and the left”.

Six engravings representing the six days of the Creation are placed in the beginning of the Book of Genesis (pc. 7). The books of Genesis and Exodus have more illustrations than the others, as they are rich with events and episodes.

In the beginning of almost all the books, there is an engraving that summarizes the content and the mystical meaning of the book.

As opposed to the Hethum’s manuscript, the printed version has no marginal ornaments. Perhaps, Voskan tried to avoid the excessive use of ornaments and ornamented letters preferring to apply the principles of European book printing.

The Old Testament is immediately followed by the New Testament, where the images are placed mainly in four Gospels. On the left page of the Mathew's Gospel the
four evangelists are placed. Inside the engravings, the names of the Evangelists are written in Latin, and the names in Armenian are placed below the frames of the images.

In the beginning of Mathew’s Gospel on the upper part of the page where a magnificent semi-arch (khoran) is usually painted in Armenian manuscripts, here is a frame in similar style, with the image of the Jesse Tree according to the prophecy of Isaiah: “A shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse.” Prophet David was of Jesse’s lineage and this genealogy reaches Christ.

Since the Gospel of Mark starts with the story of the Baptism, thus a scene of baptism is depicted in the beginning of the Gospel. As characteristic of the Gospel of Luke the Presentation of Jesus at the Temple is regarded, so the Gospel starts with a corresponding image. In the beginning of the Gospel of John, instead of thematic images, the image of the Evangelist is placed.

The design of Voskan’s Bible follows the medieval symbolic tradition and is built according to the graphic interpretation of the Holy Bible.

From the distance of 350 years, the Bible still continues to admire and amaze the reader how it became possible to realize such a monumental publication in such difficult circumstances. As characterized by Leo: “It was the first time that the printing world raised the fact that Armenians too are capable of realizing large publications with long and difficult works”32.

The publication of the Bible by Mkhitar of Sebastia in 1733 became the unsurpassed peak of the history of the Armenian antique books.

During the publication of the Bible, Mkhitar applied the typefaces used in the printing house of Archimandrite Voskan. Using the original typefaces brought from Amsterdam, lead typefaces were molded for the publication of the Bible.

The Venice publication of the Bible has 156 engravings, and the Amsterdam publication – 160.

Depictions of the Venice publication thematically go in parallel with the depictions of the Amsterdam publication.

Beginning with the pictures portraying the creation in six days located at the beginning of the Book of Genesis, one can note three regularities.

First, Mkhitar tried to have the depiction copies of the Amsterdam publication engraved in most of the pictures.

Second, depictions copied by the engraver from Venice had much higher quality, as well as delicate and expressive outlines.

Third, in all those cases, when the Venice publication does not have the copies of the Amsterdam depictions, the theme and plot of its new depictions nevertheless correspond to respective ones of the Amsterdam publication and are located at the same places in the Bible text.

As the selection of depictions was not a mere issue of design and beautiful decoration, but rather a full interpretative project, therefore we can definitely say that the

32 Լեո, op. cit., vol. 5, p. 231.
selection of pictures with respective themes and their placement in the book was made by Abbot Mkhitar. He also authored the iconographical composition of the depictions that were missing in the Bible published by Voskan.

The Venice publication has the scene of the expulsion from the paradise, which is missing in Voskan’s publication.

On the next page in both publications the scene, in which Cain kills Abel is portrayed.

The entering of Noah’s family and a pair of every kind of animal into the ark is depicted by the difference between the above-mentioned symbolic approaches. The Amsterdam publication portrays Noah’s three sons with vestments, which remind of the Dutch vestments of the time. Here the painter did not try to convey the spirit of the biblical period, when the world, corrupted with sins, would remain under the flood waters. Mkhitar’s publication has the opposite approach, in which the entering of Noah together with his wife and representatives of the animal world into the ark is depicted, and the overall scene bears the seal of the Antediluvian (Pre-Flood) period.

Voskan’s publication portrays the building of the Tower of Babel with a ruined tower; however, Mkhitar’s publication depicts a skyward tower without the upper part, which the builders could not manage to finish, because God ruined the tower.

The engraving of Noah’s sacrifice in Abbot Mkhitar’s publication of the Bible in 1733 is an outstanding example of interpreting European iconographical traditions of scenes, in which Noah makes a sacrifice, with a national-ecclesiastical tradition in the Armenian milieu.

Colors and outlines of the engraving go down the peak of Mount Ararat and become the sacrifice altar similar to a chapel in Ararat valley, in the place of which, according to Armenian medieval literary sources, the Cathedral of Holy Etchmiadzin is said to have been built later.

The Venice publication includes also the scene of Abraham’s hospitality, which is missing in the Amsterdam publication and that is conditioned by the difference of interpretative approaches. Abraham’s hospitality has a huge meaning for traditional Churches, because it introduces the Holy Trinity in the Old Testament.

Voskan’s publication portrays Isaac’s sacrifice with Sichem’s engraving, which bears the sign of the Dutch master. The angel covered with clouds did not let Abraham sacrifice his son. Isaac is not depicted. Mkhitar offers quite different depiction and interpretation. Isaac is on the table as an oblation, and the angel descending from heaven did not let Abraham sacrifice Isaac.

The depiction placed at the beginning of Exodus is different in both publications; however, both of them portray the same scene. The Venice publication in this case, too, is much richer and has much higher quality as to the scope of the scene and the mastery of its execution. The main protagonist of the book of Exodus is Moses, who by God’s order led the Jews out of the Egyptian captivity to the Promised Land; therefore, the first depiction out of those placed at the beginning of this book portrays the scene, in
which Moses was saved from the pharaoh’s order to kill all the newborn boys by being put in a basket on the river, and the second one portrays the scene, in which God speaks to Moses from a burning bush, it was on fire, but it was not burning up.

The Venice publication has two episodes for the scene, in which Moses in the basket was put on the river. The first one portrays the newborn being put on the river, the second one portrays the moment, when the pharaoh’s maids found him and gave to the pharaoh’s sister. In spite of small dimensions of the depiction, the engraver managed to express the excitement and emotions of participants in those events.

The Amsterdam publication placed only one depiction at the beginning of the book of Job. Job is depicted covered with wounds according to the Bible story and manuscript traditions.

The Venice publication places two depictions at the beginning of the book of Job and thanks to them, his story presents the sufferings he endured. In the first picture, in the sky, over the clouds God is portrayed sitting on the throne and surrounded by angelic orders. Below Job is glorifying the Lord. In the other corner of the picture, devil is depicted with black outlines, who addresses to God for permission to tempt Job. The second picture conforms to the picture of the Amsterdam publication; however, it is more beautiful and rich in scenes. Unlike naked Job covered with wounds, here he is portrayed half-naked, glorifying God. From heaven God gives strength to him (pic. 8).

Nine beatitudes are presented with unique artistic solutions. One can come across this creative idea in Voskan’s publication, but it is expressed more evidently and beautifully in the publication of Abbot Mkhitar.

In the lower central part of the picture, Christ is portrayed and in both sides – the disciples. Christ extended His hands with eloquent expressiveness as if saying “Blessed are the poor, the meek, the merciful, the peacemakers” (Mt. 5.3-12).

Nine beatitudes are portrayed with nine lines going up to heaven and with nine people on each line as personification of nine beatitudes on the way to heaven.

Comparison of Gospel depictions in Voskan’s and Mkhitar’s publications reveals an interesting regularity. Voskan’s publication, as a result of the influence of protestant Holland, has more pictures with themes of homilies and parables, while the Venice publication has more pictures portraying miracles and healings (pic. 9). The latter can be seen also in Voskan’s publication, for example, the healing of the demon possessed. In both publications, though expressed with different depictions, Christ calmly pacifies the demon possessed.

The difference of approaches is also noticeable in pictures of the Last Supper. The Amsterdam publication has thematic pictures in Gospels: Christ blesses the bread and wine. In the Venice publication, one can observe the influence of the Italian Renaissance and Leonardo’s famous work. Here the moment is portrayed, when the disciples react to Christ’s words “One of you will betray me” (Mt. 26.21).

In both publications, the depiction portraying the return of the prodigal son is an evident expression of the difference of approaches in artistic sense. Since the Middle Ages, the son’s repentance has been portrayed. The father, having mercy on his son, went ahead, hugged and kissed him.
The picture of the Amsterdam publication has the spirit of Rembrandt as to its compositional structure.

Perhaps it is a coincidence, but it is symbolic that Rembrandt created his painting in 1668 and the same year the printing of the Gospel of Luke in Voskan’s publication of the Bible was completed.

Sources about the history of the Armenian community of Holland state that Rembrandt lived in a district next to the Armenian street. The icon of taking down Christ from the cross is placed on the main altar of the Armenian Church of Amsterdam, which is considered either a copy of the painter’s work of the same name of the same period, or another version of the same work made by Rembrandt himself.

Compositionally, the similarity is obvious between the engraving portraying the return of the prodigal son in Voskan’s publication of the Bible and Rembrandt’s painting created with the same style.

In Voskan’s publication, the father bowed down and lowered his head to the level of his son. In the Venice publication of 1733, the son’s repentance is already portrayed more expressively, than the father’s bending. The father is not portrayed equal to him, but rather bowed towards him.

The differences between two depictions portraying the scene of prayer in Gethsemane are rather conditioned by the difference of symbolic mindsets.

The Amsterdam publication has more narrative and descriptive nature peculiar to the protestant style. A night landscape is portrayed: smoke is rising from garrets of houses; the moon is depicted on the sky. Such a scene does not create the impression of a dreadful night of betrayal.

Like the night scene, here three sleeping apostles are much more highlighted, than Christ’s prayer and the angel’s support.

The depiction of the Venice publication has another interpretation. Sleeping apostles are portrayed in the background. The village landscape is missing. The main focus is on the acceptance of the bitter cup. In the center, praying Christ is portrayed, to Whom the angel, having descended from heaven, gives the bitter cup. Afar soldiers led by Judas are seen, who notify about the beginning of the night of betrayal and passions.

At the end of the Bible colophon, Abbot Mkhitar writes that the cost of the Bible was doubly expensive because of the high quality paper and engravings used for the publication. However, taking into account the expenses, he did his best to provide finest depictions for the Bible publication.

Archimandrite Voskan and Abbot Mkhitar did not spare efforts for providing publications that were on par with the European typography and Bible publications of the time, confirming the fact that in spite of political unfortunate conditions and hardships in Armenia, the Armenian nation continued to keep in step with pan-European values.

Translated from Armenian by L. Verdyan
1. The beginning of Nerses Shnohali’s poem Jesus Son in the Amsterdam 1660-61 edition
2. a. Ms of Mashtots Matenadaran № 1064, fols. 3v-4r
Nerses Shnohali’s poem Jesus Son,
copied by Voskan Vardapet

b. A page from the poem Jesus Son with the detached rhyme ի (i)
3. The beginning of the first psalm from the Psalter printed in 1661-62 with the image of Prophet David
4 a. Canon of Apostles Peter and Paul from the Sharaknots printed in 1664-65, with an engraving

b. Canon “Descent into the dungeon” with the image of Gregory the Illuminator
5. Ms of Mashtots Matenadaran № 180, fol. 164r
Beginning of the book of Deuteronomy from king Hetum’s Bible
6 Title pages of Voskan’s Bible

7. Six engravings depicting the six days of the Creation in the beginning of the book of Genesis
8. Beginning of the Book of Job in the 1666 and 1733 publications

9. Beginning of the Gospel of Matthew with the images of four Evangelists and the depiction of Christ's genealogy
The aim of this analysis is to present the complex sentence in the form of the simple sentence and to assess the capabilities of translating individual terms of a sentence. The absolute structures named *extended structures* are translated into Russian with subordinate clauses:

*Le repas terminé, je me levai pour prendre congé de mes hôtes.*¹

*Kогда окончился обед, я встал, чтобы попрощаться со своими хозяевами.*

The absolute structures are perceived within the frameworks of a simple extended sentence and are interpreted as a modifier or an adjective, rather than as a separate sentence. The tendency to perceive an absolute phrase as a member of the sentence is so powerful that some past participles have become prepositions through frequent use:

*Tous sont venue, excepté mes soeurs.*

*Все пришли кроме моих сестер.*

*Tous ont pris part a cette excursion, y compris les personnes les plus âgée.*

*Все приняли участие в этой экскурсии, включая и самых старых.*

*Passé onze heures elle ne sortait jamais.*

*Было уже после одиннадцати, а она не выходила.*

*Étant donné les circonstances, sa faute est pardonable.*²

*Учитывая обстоятельства, можно простить его вину.*

The two latter cases are very idiomatic, so that the translation is not very precise. However, its clear that prior to the underscored groups having become prepositions, i.e. at the stage of development of the language when they still had been past participles, they could be interpreted as a verbal term of an absolute structure. To date they are prepositions used for connecting the elements of a simple sentence.

When translating into Russian from English, German, French or Armenian, it can be noticed that in those languages complex sentences are used less willingly than in Russian. Interestingly, Armenian in this regard shows more similarity with the West-European types that with Russian.

Translation into Russia will show the participial phrases, adverbial phrases, absolute and infinitive structures to be translated using a clause. Thus, a statistical research will have shown the clauses in the Russian translation to prevail over the original. Here are some examples:

The Armenian modifier of purpose with a postposition is a member of a simple sentence translated into Russian with a clause:

¹ N. M. Steinberg, Grammaire française. Tome 1, Morphologie et syntaxe du discours, M.-L., 1966, p. 246.
² Ibid.
Грослоу, который не был уверен, что эти два человека - те, кого он ждал, вначале спрятался за одной из тумб, которые были закопаны на берегу для того чтобы за них привязывать корабли.

Here the Armenian text contains a substantive adverbial phrase հարձակման համար, substantive because հարձակման is a substantivized infinitive, i.e., a noun transformed into an adverb by means of the postposition համար. The noun հարձակման being a modifier and a member of a simple structure, has a nonetheless verbal origin governing the subordinates like a verb. Naturally, translating this substantive with a verb will place all subordinates into a clause, e.g.:

La pluie ne cessant pas, j’ai décidé de rester à la maison. 4

A modifier of purpose expressed by the infinitive can also be perceived within a simple sentence:

Նա կարող է այս աշխատանքը կատարել ինչպես ցանկանում է: Он может выполнить эту работу как пожелает.

This version however suggests the influence of the Russian substrate.

An absolute modifying phrase with the preposition with in the English text is perceived as a term of simple sentence:

It was found that at a traverse rate of 1/2 in/ per minute about 0/00002 in/ was being removed from the highs per pass with very little removed from the lows5.

The phrase with with cannot be regarded as a separate sentence, since the second removed is not a verb but rather an adjective (in the sense that it is an attribute). In the Russian translation the verbs снимается and не снимается are joined by an operation of connection, however forming separate sentences.

3 Դյումա Ա., Քսան տարի անց, Երևան, 1964, էջ 667:
4 Steinberg N. M., op. cit., p. 239.
5 Australian Mechanical Engineering, 5 June, 1961, p. 27.
The contrasting connection here is possible due to the semantic non-ambiguity of the verbal term removed (1) and removed (2), however if the latter verb had been something else, there would have been no contrasting, and the whole modifying phrase with would have been translated by a separate sentence containing the words причем or при этом, e.g.:

It was found that at a traverse rate of 1/2 in. per minute about 0.00002 in. was being removed from the highs per pass with very considerable attention given to the true grinding pressure.

A modifier phrase with with can contain a formally unmarked contrasting shade:

This system operates on the same principle as the multi-lens technique with the pinholes performing the lens action.6

This usage of the preposition with has been pointed out by Jespersen in his book “The Philosophy of Grammar”. with both of us absent

I hope I am not the same now with all the prettiness and youth removed

The preposition without also governs the nexus:

Like a rose, full blown, but without one petal yet fallen

also: with the hands empty is meaningfully coincidental with a clause (while his hands were empty).

In the languages English, French, German and Armenian an infinitive or a verbal form can be used nominally connecting to sentence via a preposition:

He goes without seeing me
Il marche sans m’apercevoir
Er geht ohne mich zu sehen

As shown by the Armenian example, the infinitive is morphologically substantivized. The substantivized infinitive joins its subordinate terms as a verb:

Er eilte davon, ohne sich noch einmal umzudrehen.7

The tendency to using prepositions with infinitive is so strong, that it will also involve the clause8.

8 Ditto, paragraph 119.
You don’t know about me without you have read a book by the name of «The Adventures of Tom Sawyer».

Er bot mir seine hilfe an, ohne dass ich ihn erst darum bitten musste.

Le temps s’écoulait sans qu’il en eut conscience.

In the German text we can see a hierarchical connection of an attribute of the noun in the form of a participle having a modal meaning, translated into Russian using a clause having a modal meaning:

Die enzustellenden grossen Y und Z werden als Zahlenwerte in einem Rehmenschieber abgelesen.

When translating, a situation is possible whereby an adverbial phrase is expressed by an adverbial participle, rather than by a clause. It is then not to be forgotten that the Russian gerund has an interesting feature: it can be governed by only a personal form of the verb used in an active diathesis, while in any other of the languages in question a form relevant to gerund can be subordinated to any form of the verb and can have a separate subject. This situation may result in a translation error.

If the verb is not in active diathesis, then the modifying phrase cannot be translated with the adverbial participle, but rather by using a clause, even in the cases when the foreign phrase is morphologically relevant to the Russian adverbial participle.

Participle turns with a separate subject occur in the Armenian language. Such cases resemble a French type of the sentence, meanwhile they rather differ from the Russian language:

… երբ երաժշտի տղան, երբ իր երաժշտությունը, որը պրոցեսին ուղի, տան իրանցից մի գունավոր թերթը, նույնիսկ…

… Un client entre pour … Если заходил клиент...
The tendency to using simple sentences in English is so strong, that complication can be generated not by using an additional predication, but rather by piling up the attributes upon a single simple term:

…but it was rough… living in the house all… all the time.\(^{15}\)

The group living in the house is an attribute to the representant it in the utterly simple sentence it was rough. The tendency to evade the subordinated predication can be seen on the following examples:

**il croit voir**  
**il espère venir**  
**il croit avoir vu**  

Here the second verb joins the first one as an actant. A similar example in an Armenian text:

Մի քանի րոպեից հետո տիկին Մառիամը հայտնվելով իր ամուսնու մոտ, նա ևս Միքայելի նման կանգնած, սպասում էր լսել նրա հրամանը:\(^{16}\)

Here the verb լսել joins the verb սպասում էր as an actant. The English translation can reiterate the Armenian type:

**սպասում էր լսել նրա հրամանը**  

... waited to hear his order

It should be remembered that the verb in nominal usage joins subordinate terms as a verb, rather than as a noun, i.e., after transformation the term will govern the same as before transformation.

To conclude this subsection and to illustrate the presented ideas, see the argument by Hermann Paul on the complicated structure of a simple extended sentence: “Following the paraverbal and paranominal attributes having developed from former predicates and having stood out as autonomous formations, the sentence becomes even more complex. This complication of structure results from the word combinations, which already consist of one determinate and one determining element, can in their turn be determined by one more new element or can themselves pose as a determinant, or else in can result from one determinate element being able to combine with several determining elements, and one determining element with several determinate elements, in the same way as a predicate is connected with several subjects and one subject with several predicates”.\(^{17}\)

This argument by H. Paul clearly shows the reducibility of the two-term relation of predication to a one-term relation of determination, as well as reducibility of several already reduced categories to a position of a single term of relation. That suggests that

---

\(^{15}\) Mark Twain, The Adventures of Tom Sawyer..., M. 1948, p. 211.

\(^{16}\) Րաֆֆի, Ոսկի աքաղաղ:

\(^{17}\) Ditto, paragraph 99, M., 1960, p. 169.
the categories of word, simple sentence and complex sentence are divided by very vague delimitations. This is exactly the finding made by H. Paul: “We have previously trespassed the boundaries of the so-called simple sentence touching upon the complex sentence. It seems that within a truly psychological approach we cannot insist upon that delimitation. It is based on a premise that the primary distinction of a sentence is a verb in personal form. In the meantime, for some languages and epochs this statement absolutely inapplicable, for some others it is only partially true. Wherever a personal verb form is not distinctly shaped, the common discrimination between simple and complex sentences is untenable. Therefore the so-called complex and the so-called extended sentence are essentially the same”\(^{18}\).

**Grammatically homogeneous terms of the sentence can be semantically heterogeneous**

The tendency to reduce a complicated idea into a single sentence can be discerned in English, German and French texts in one more remarkable phenomenon: connection of syntactically homogenous terms, which are semantically or even morphologically heterogeneous, e.g.:

Die Anlagen mit 3-6 Arbeitsaggregaten werden den Erfordernissen jedes Betriebes gerecht und dienen zum Bearbeiten von Querschnitten jeder Art mit ebenen Flachen\(^{19}\).

The latter sentence could be translated with the German substrate remaining intact:


---

18 Ditto, para. 100, M., 1960, pp. 171-172.

19 Промышленный каталог, ФРГ, 1965.
The interpretation of the operation connecting homogenous terms as an operation that does not complicate the simple sentence is not coincidental with the interpretation by L. Tesnière who thinks that it is the connection operation that transforms the simple sentence into the complex one. This is determined by an attempt to regard the formal connection of semantically heterogeneous as a part of a wider class of phenomena – the tendency of the sentence to retain a simple structure.

Transition of the predication into the substantive terms of the sentence

In the previous chapter, a thesis was put forward on the tendency in English, French, German and Armenian texts to produce simpler texts than their Russian translations. To understand the process of simplification of the sentence, it is necessary to trace the mechanism of shifting the meanings and saving the linguistic resources inside the sentence. In this regard it is interesting to explore the transition of predication into the attributes of the subject and of other substantives in the sentence.

The subject and the predicate form a complete utterance. A term with an adjective has no aspect of a complete utterance. Nevertheless, the same meaning can be located either in the predicate or in the adjective, e.g.: The dog barks – a barking dog. It can be suggested that predication is primary, while adjectivity is secondary.

Predication can be expressed in an adjective, while the adjective contains the predication in a removed aspect. The subject connected with this adjective does not form a complete utterance, close to this subject there is a place for a predicate, e.g.:

Этот человек имеет длинные волосы - длинноволосый человек.

In the text длинноволосый человек the predicate имеет длинные волосы is present in a removed aspect, so that the term длинноволосый does not terminate the utterance, but merges with the term человек in a single term of the subject. In this way there is a process of pumping or accumulation of predication in the adjective. Theoretically this accumulation can be brought up to a very high degree, which becomes apparent in filling the subject with content.

Thus, in the development of thought, the following regularity is discerned here: Thesis - subject. Antithesis - predicate. Synthesis - subject with adjective containing in the removed form both thesis and antithesis. Subject with adjective (3) is return to the old (subject 1), but at a higher level.

Interestingly, in Armenian, the removal of predication into an adjective can occur without changing the form of the adjective. This phenomenon can be interpreted as predication removal at an early stage, e.g.: Subject and Predicate

Այս մարդը ունի երկար մազեր

Subject with adjective generated from the meaningful part of predicate:

դлинноволосый человек

---

20 Ditto, para. 100, M., 1960, pp. 171-172.
Here one can see a part of the predicate, i.e., the predicate in the pure form. This complicated subject can be joined by any predicate. Generally, the subordinate terms do not simple join the principal ones, but sort of are included in them, or reduced to them. The reduced categories are recognized as a single body including all categories of the previous stages in a removed form21.

According to O. Jespersen, a group of words representing one member of a sentence, is reduced to one term not in one word, but in the entire group: “Suit (“New English Grammar” § 122 и 120) noted that in the sentence there is thickening, whereby the word what performs the functions of two words simultaneously: it is an object to SAY in the subordinate sentence and also the subject to the verb IS in the principal sentence; in the sentence what I say I mean what is an object both in the principal and in the subordinate sentences, while in the sentence what is done cannot be undone, what is the subject introduced by such a condensed relative word which is commonly placed before the principal one, rather than after it, and if you change the order of sentences, then the absent relative word will be rehabilitated: It is quite true what you say; if I say a thing I mean it.

However, the latter sentence is not a grammatical equivalent of the sentence what I say I mean; it has no antecedent or a referent; as to the sentence It is quite true what you say the word it cannot be called the antecedent of what because it is impossible to say it what you say; … what cannot have an antecedent. The position before or after the principal sentence therefore is quite immaterial for the “condensed” pronouns: some of Suite’s sentences show a common order with the subject in the first place, while in the sentence what I say I mean there is an emphatic positioning of the object in the first place: that is seen from a very natural sentence where what is a relative pronoun, though Suite does not recognize it as a “condensed” pronoun.

The principal objections against Suite’s theory are different: it is odd to claim that what functions as two words at the same time; what per se is not the subject to is true: if you ask a question what is true?, the answer will by no means be only what, but rather what you say; in the same way the matter is with other sentences. what is an object to say and nothing more, same as which in the sentence “The words which you say are true”. However, in the latter sentence, too, one can see the subject to are as the words which you say, rather than simply the words22.

Evidently, O. Jespersen will see the subject not as a referent only, but the whole clause, i.e., the subject of the principal sentence is the entire clause with its predicate. A diagram for the clause what you say is true will look like this:

22 Есперсен О., Философия грамматики, Москва, 1958, с. 117.
The diagram is interpreted as follows: *true* is an adjective transformed into a verb using the transformation indicator *is*; thus, the verb *is true* is the top of the sentence. To be analyzed not is the part *what you say*. "*You*" is the first actant, *what* is the second actant, and *say* is the verb. However the verb of the main sentence *is true* must have the first actant. As clearly shown by Jespersen, this first actant is not a separate term *what*, but rather the whole sentence *what you say*. This rule is not fit for structural analysis, for it is still needed to reduce the whole group to a single term. If a sentence has a verb, it can be easily turned into an actant only by transforming the verb into a noun. That is just what is shown on the diagram. The verb *say* is transformed into a noun and is governed from above as first actant on the part of the verb *is true*. As to governing downwards, the verb *say* as an ordinary verb governs two actants *you* and *what*.

The index of transformation here may be *what*, since prior to the analysis it was supposed that *what* was the first actant of the main verb *is true*. If we take this role away from him, we can at least leave him the role of the index showing transformation of the verb into the first actant and show with a dotted line its two roles: second actant of the verb *say* and the index transforming the verb *say* into noun.

So, let us return to the discourse on removal of the entire sentence in one term. By L. Tesniere, the verb is the main term of the sentence, and the removal takes place in it. Suite, criticized by Jespersen, did not see that removal ripping *what* out of the sentence to discern it separately. O. Jespersen indicated that this term should not be considered asunder, but rather, the whole clause should be regarded as subject. However, this solution has a generalized aspect, no fulcrum is seen for precision analysis. L. Tesnier points to this fulcrum - the verb and transformation of verb into a desired part of speech to construct the hierarchical chains of any lengths theoretically.
From the point of view of the Structural Syntax by L. Tesniere, the compound subordinate sentence shows the following regularly in the development of thought: (1) Thesis: word. (2) Anti-thesis: simple sentence. (3) Synthesis: transformation of simple sentence into a single term included into the sentence of a higher order. (4) Formation of a complete sentence consisting of the terms resulting from the removal of the sentence, i.e., formation of a simple sentence at a level higher than the sentence. The simple sentence is presented in a removed condition in one term. Term is negation of a simple sentence, while the sentence is negation of a simple term. Following the formation of term there occurs the negation of category, namely connection of terms into sentence. This sentence is simple in its structure, it has a complete structural similarity with the simple sentence. It differs from the simple sentence in that it contains the terms with the removed sentence inside them, while as the simple sentence contains simple terms wherein nothing is removed. Thus, the interrelationships of the mentioned categories may also be regarded as thesis - antithesis - synthesis, namely: a simple sentence consisting of several simple terms; removal of a simple sentence in one term, formation of a single term having a complex content. The suggested schemes explaining the mechanism of predication removal and the mechanism of complication of a term of a simple sentence can considered in parallel, overlying each other.

**Substantivized sentences**

If accumulation of predication in an attributes does really take place, then provided the predicate follows the subject, the prepositional attributes are more economical than the postpositional ones. The postpositional attributes will impede the isolation of the predicate from the subject. In this connection the most informative structures are those having prepositional attributes. The mechanism of this heightened informative status can be explained in this way: a concept is fully formalized and becomes very distinct on the final word, the subject. Then follows the predicate, while the subject is still fresh in the memory. If the subject is followed by a postpositional attribute, it formalizes and clarifies the subject, however when the predicate appears, the subject recedes in the memory compared to the prepositional type, e.g.:

1. Predication: This wasp is a parasite.
2. Predication removed in a prepositional attribute: This parasitic wasp is a subject of investigation.
3. Predication removed in a postpositional attribute: This wasp that is a parasite is a subject of investigation.

Evidently, removed predication in a prepositional attribute makes the sentence more perceptible. An attribute is perceived in a close unity with a substantive. Here we see a completely removed predication, whereas in the postpositional order, a removed predication can also be accompanied by an ordinary unremoved predication.

In a French text, where an adjective can be either in preposition or in postposition, a postpositional adjective is semantically closer to the meaning of the adjective in predication, than the same adjective in preposition, e.g.:
un brave homme  чудак
un homme brave  храбрый человек

The meaning of the adjective in the former case is identical to the meaning of the adjective in predication, i.e.:  
Cet homme est brave  этот человек храбр
un homme brave  храбрый человек

In this connection it is interesting to quote E. Sapir who perceives this issue identically with regard to word formation: “In spite of my reluctance to emphasize the difference between a prefixing and a suffixing language, I feel that there is more involved in this difference than linguists have generally recognized. It seems to me that there is a rather important psychological distinction between a language that settles the formal status of a radical element before announcing it-and this, in effect, is what such languages as Tlingit and Chinook and Bantu are in the habit of doing-and one that begins with the concrete nucleus of a word and defines the status of this nucleus by successive limitations, each curtailing in some degree the generality of all that precedes. The spirit of the former method has something diagrammatic or architectural about it, the latter is a method of pruning afterthoughts. In the more highly wrought prefixing languages the word is apt to affect us as a crystallization of floating elements, the words of the typical suffixing languages are “determinative” formations, each added element determining the form of the whole anew. It is so difficult in practice to apply these elusive, yet important, distinctions that an elementary study has no recourse but to ignore them.

Let us go back to the subject of predication transition into the substantive terms of the sentence, namely the first actant. The expression “predication transition” can be understood relatively, meaning “translocation of verb expressed by a verb into a substantive in another language, i.e., it is assumed here that the Russian text is primary and is correlated with the standard “syntactic consciousness”, while the text in another language is secondary, e.g.: Limiting values of dv/dt have been raised from less than 100V per microsecond to between 200V and 1000V per microsecond by this simple device. The consequent increased forward voltage drop, slightly increased forward-gate current requirement and much higher reverse-gate current rarely lead to serious problems.

---

23 E.g. Eskimo, Nootka.
In the English text here the substantive manner of building up the grammatical structure becomes manifest in the noun *drop* being joined by two adjectives *consequent* and *increased*. Despite being semantically interconnected, they are used as mutually independent terms of connection. In the Russian translation this semantic connection is taken into account and the subordination of terms is not parallel, but rather serial. In view of this phenomenon the tendency of English towards substantive expression can be perceived in that the substantive functions as an important semantic unit. It tends to assume as much meaning and as many grammatical connections as possible and strives to release other categories of those functions. The next example clearly shows a transition of the substantive with an adjective into a verb with an adverb:

"Such lenses, however are not yet available, with one possible exception."  

A similar example:

This reduced penetration depth is shown to result from geometrical considerations *alone* if no modifications are introduced into the diffusion processes.

As can be seen, in a sentence having a meaningful verb, this verb tends to evade the governance of terms getting as adjectives into a substantive unit. The more obvious manifestations of substantivity are cases whereby the meaningful verb is substituted with a meaningless verb governing a semantically loaded substantive.

H. Paul has commented on the transition of a predicate into the attribute of an actant: "The relation of the determining element to the determinant is similar to the relation of the predicate to the subject.  
- ... Indeed, an attribute is nothing else but a degraded predicate having no self-sufficient role in the sentence, so that after it has been uttered, the subject (object) can get connected with one more predicate.

Thus, an attribute to the subject was first initiated in sentences with a double predicate."

Here H. Paul made an assumption on the primacy of predication compared to the attribute." Unlike H. Paul, here it is suggested to regard the conversion of the predicate into an attribute not as predicate degradation, but rather as predicate escalation, i.e., not as a low level compared to predication, but as a higher level compared to predication.

H. Paul also attested to the concept of increased capacity of a simple sentence on account of the subject’s attributes, as shown in the previous discourse:

---

28 Cf. Пауль Г., Принципы истории языка, Москва, 1960, §97, с. 165.
“One of the two predicates referring to a single subject, can become dependent upon the other, subjecting to it and thus turning into an attribute to the subject, while the three-term sentence becomes a two-term one.”

The phenomena of subordinating adverbs to nouns can be linked to the tendency of the language to the substantive expression, so that the groups of the type DIE TEILWEISEN VERBESSERUNGEN, SIE STUFENWEISEN FORTSCHRITTE, DIE STÜCKWEISE VERKAUF be treated as those obtained by analogy with the groups “verb-adverb”. Merging an adverb with a noun can result in saving linguistic resources.

Дер Ту́рм dort, der Verschnorkelte, das ist Вон та башня с вычурными украшениями и есть ратуша.

Here the adverb dort is in actual fact a replacement of an entire attributive clause (the tower that is located there). With regard to the function, the adverb dort is an adjective subordinated to the word Turm.

When examining the facts of adverb-to-noun subordination, it is essential to distinguish the cases of adverb-to-adjective transformation from more complicated dependencies, when, i.e., the French adverbial modifier of manner modifies a verbal phrase, being placed between the two elements of this phrase:

Faites bien attention a ce que vous dites. Хорошо следите за тем, что вы говорите.

J’ai tres envie d’allumer une cigarette. Мне очень хотелось закурить сигарету.

In these French examples it is important to determine the subordination of the adverb, whether it is connected with the substantive term of the phrase or with the entire verbal phrase. The adverbs bien and trop are appropriate since they are subordinated to the entire verbal phrase:

FAITES
ATTENTION

BREIN

J’AI PEUR

TROP

The objections of stylists on using J’AI TRES ENVIE are probably based upon the idea that the adverb tres is perceived as a term subordinated to the substantive ENVIE, rather than to the entire verbal phrase. This usage may be regarded as normal provided, similarly with the previous examples, we treat the term tres as a unit subordinated to the entire verbal phrase ‘ai envie or as an adjective subordinated to the substantive envie. In the latter case the translation may be у меня большое желание.

We shall now return to the subject of removing predication in the substantive terms of the sentence. The subordinated and the governing terms of the sentence are in

29 Ibid.
31 Steinberg N. M., op. cit., p. 265.
intricate interrelationships, and do replacements in the course of translation. Therefore, when analyzing translation, it is expedient to examine them in interaction. According to L. Tesniere, the theory of translation is based upon the parallel relations between the pairs of noun-adjective and verb-adverb, e.g.:

un diner léger  
le légé oběd
il dine légemerent  
oh légo obedeet

This profound remark is associated with L. Tesniere’s discourse on the substantive character of some languages33.

M. Abeghyan understands the correlations between substantive and verb in the aspect of correlations between entire syntactic units, citing examples of correlations “verb-object” to “substantive-attribute”:

Ամեն բան սպիտակեցնելը լավ չէ Ամեն բան սպիտակեցնելը
Տիեզերքի ստեղծող Աստված            Տիեզերք ստեղծող
Հիվանդի խնամքը                              Հիվանդին խնամելը 34

And similar correlations in the aspect of word formation:

Երկիրը շարժվում է Երկրի շարժվելը Երկրաշարժ
աքլորը կանչում է աքլորի կանչելը աքլորականչ 35

It can be seen here that when verb is substantivized, an actant becomes an attribute either as a noun in genitive of as a prepositional merging adjective. The merging adjective can also be an adverbial modifier, not only the first actant of the verb:

զորքի մեջ կանչել զորքի
մեջ կանչելը զորակոչ
գերիների դառնալը

Generally speaking, a verb with a complement is a unit, and dividing a text into the verb and the complement can often be seen as a morphologically accidental event. Thus, the verbs of the type bringen can be regarded not as autonomous verbs, but rather as part of a predicate: SOLCHE VERSUCHE BRINGEN UNS ERST DIE BESTÄTIGUNG DASS ... The Russian translation of these verbs either retains the type as verbs with complements, e.g.: такие эксперименты дают нам подтверждение .... or makes use of one verb embracing the meaning of the former complement: Такие эксперименты подтверждают ...  

The concept of grammatical ambiguity of verb is based upon replaceability of different verbal forms with invariant complements, e.g.:

It can be seen that in order to render the meaning of the text an exact rendering of the subordinate term dans la suppression proves to be more important than an exact

33 Ibid., p. 61, § 5.
34 Աբեղյան Մ., Հայոց լեզվի տեսություն, Ե. 1965, էջ 422:
36 Ibid.
rendering of the principal term - the verb *reside*). Moreover, an exact rendering of the subordinate term rules out an exact rendering of the principal term.

The same picture can be seen further on in the same sentence (*suppression des exitatrices* ...). Here, too, the exact rendering of the subordinate term *exitatrices* proves to be more substantial than the exact rendering of the principal term *suppression*. The principal terms - nouns, both in the original and in the translation having verbal origin, and it can be seen that when replacing the main term with an ambiguous one (*в отказе* or...), the new main term matching the given subordinate term has the valency different from the original main term (*suppression*), which results in the genitive case being replaced by a prepositional phrase (*des exitatrices*).

The random morphological character of identifying the verb and the complement in the text is very elegantly noted by M. Abeghyan: "A noun or an adjective forms along with a verb a compound verb or predicate, e.g.: Ներսես Դ կոչվեց Շնորհալի. Here կոչվեց Շնորհալի is a verb-predicate, while the word taken separately is a link-related word. In this compound verb-predicate, the predicate is expressed not only by the meaning of the verb, nor by only the link-related word, but rather by both of them at once, as in the abovementioned example the predicate is not only an attribute provided by the verb nor it is the meaning of the word Շնորհալի, but rather both together, as if it could be said in a single compound verb Ներսես Դ շնորհալիակոչվեց. As seen here, M. Abeghyan so clearly understands the random character of the concept being divided into a verb and link-related word that he suggests their substitution with an artificial term joining the two meanings together. Incidentally, this word has been devised only lexically, but grammatically this model does exist, e.g.: Ենթադրում շնորհալիակոչվեց (transform).

In German, too, there are verbal one-word terms containing complements and modifiers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teilnehmen</td>
<td>take part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetteifern</td>
<td>compete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freisprechen</td>
<td>to vindicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frohlocken</td>
<td>rejoice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bekanntgeben</td>
<td>inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verlorengehen</td>
<td>to get lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaltstellen</td>
<td>to suspend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When translating verb and complement, the first one to be translated is the complement, and then the verb. A previous knowledge of the complement translation will considerably reduce the number of possible translations of a complement with a known verb, especially with regard to the context.

A. M. Peshkovsky and M. Abeghian corroborate the idea on the adjectival character of the adverb when subordinated to a noun: The word *вечера*, e.g., having no special form, is always related to a verb and is incapable of combining with nouns or

---

37 Ibid, p. 368.
adjectives. One can say вчера приехали, вчера случилось, etc., but not «вчера приезд», «вчера случай», etc. In the latter combinations, it is necessary to add the verb: вчера приезд состоялся, вчера случай представился, so that the word вчера will be related to this verb. If instead of мы приехали вчера очень кстати we said наш приезд вчера был очень кстати, connection between words would change: the word вчера would move away from the word приезд and would hitch to the words был кстати, i.e., with a verbal combination. Only by applying special intonation, joining the words приезд вчера and putting вчера under a stress followed by a stop, we could have managed to tear the word вчера from the verb fixing it to a fixing point extrinsic for him - to a noun (ваш приезд вчера был очень кстати, where приезд вчера would replace вчерашний приезд). "When adverbs are used as attributes of the noun, they retain some adverbial-modifying meaning, which makes them differ from the true attributes of noun or adjectives, nevertheless, adverbs in this usage can no more be regarded as adverbs, but rather as adjectives."

In German and French there is a tendency not only to convert the attributive adverbial elements into adjectives, but also to abbreviate the attributive adverbial groups or adjectives containing adverbial elements down to pure adjectives, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>междуэлектродное поле</td>
<td>elektrodenfeld</td>
<td>toile silcarbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ткань под карбид кремния</td>
<td>silkarbotuch</td>
<td>toilesilcarbo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the former example the word междуэлектродное is grammatically an adjective, though containing an adverbial element между, one can even imagine the adjective междуэлектродный, expressed by an adverb: поле между электродами.

It can be suggested that the capacity of adjectives to subordinate adverbs is an evidence of the verbal origin of the adjective corroborating the hypothesis of the removal of predication in the adjective. If we assume that the adjective originated in the form of a predicate, rather than an epithet, then it must have subordinated the adverbs quite naturally, like a verb. In the same natural way, having moved to the class of the epithets, it fetched along the adverb, i.e., the ability to govern the adverb. The predicate, i.e. the verb, is removed in the adjective, being subordinated at this stage to the noun.

Assuming the verb and the predicate to be at the same syntactic level, the verb should be considered a term subordinated to the noun, like the adjective, only the adjective is a term subordinated after removal, while the verb is the term subordinated before removal.

While the verb is removed in an adjective, the verb with a complement is removed in a compound adjective: Человек любит трудиться - трудолюбивый человек. Arm. մարդասեր - человеколюбивый - a compound adjective, derived from a verbal form with a complement մարդ սիրող (любящий человека). Arm. զասևըսզու

38 Пешковский А. М., Русский синтаксис в научном освещении, Москва, 1935, с. 89.
39 Աբեղյան Մ., Հայոց լեզվի տեսություն, Ե., 1965, էջ 394:
(совершеннолетний) - a compound adjective, derived from a verbal form with a complement: չափի հասած (word for word: достигший размера). The verb with an adverbial modifier can be removed in a compound adjective or in an adjective with an adverb. Arm. դիմումքված (заснеженный) - a compound adjective, derived from a verbal form with an adverbial modifier: դիմումքված (покрытый снегом); Arm.: հավաքված (живущий во мраке) - a compound adjective, derived from a verbal form with an adverbial modifier հավաքված (покрытый).

A special case is removal of an adverb of comparison in a compound adjective, e.g.: արծաթափայլ (блестящий как серебро).

A certain group of German compound adjectives are translated into Russian using an adjective with an adverb of comparison: sonnenklar - ясный как солнце, steinhart - твердый как камень. When a Russian equivalent is stylistically unavailable, one has to revert to an adverb of degree: federleicht – очень легкий, steinalt - очень старый.

In light of the structural syntax, the groups like как серебро, как камень, как солнце are viewed as homogeneous members with regard to the object that is being compared. Schematically it can be presented in this way: хлеб твёрд и камень твёрд. Here one can see the operation of connecting two homogenous terms, the element как being equivalent to the marker И of connection. Thus, removal of the adverb of comparison in a compound adjective can be presented as removal of a connection operation in a compound adjective. Incidentally, an adverb of comparison can be removed not only in a compound adjective, but also in a compound adverb.

In contrast to compound adjectives, in compound nouns removal does not occur, but rather there is a compression of the adjective. While prior to forming the compound noun there was a simple noun with another simple or scattered attributive term, after forming the compound noun this term becomes its part, i.e. the first part of the compound noun is an adjective converted from a genitive case of a noun or from a relational adjective indicating material:

from a genitive of a noun:

- ehrsucht тщеславие
- rabenvater жестокий отец

From a relational adjective:

- Pelzhut меховая шляпа
- Glasscheibe оконное стекло
- Goldring золотое кольцо
- Gummiball резиновый мяч
- Laubhütte хижина из листьев
- Lorbeerkrantz лавровый венок

It can be seen here that the adjectives making up the first part of compound nouns have been transformed from the adjectival and prepositional attributive phrases. In the latest examples it can be noted that a simple parataxe of speech elements may have various relations unmarked formally.

Die Bedingungen, welche dazu veranlassen dergleichen Sätze zu erzeugen und es dem Hörenden ermöglichen die nicht ausgedrückte Beziehung der Begriffe zu erraten, sind natürlich nicht bloss in den Anfängen der Sprechätigkeit der Einzelnen oder der Menschheit vorhanden, sondern zu allen Zeiten.

The German nouns containing adjectives are translated into Russian using prepositional phrases:

- Papiergeld ➔ бумажные деньги
- Apfelbaum ➔ яблоня
- Rosenbusch ➔ куст розы
- Kartoffelsuppe ➔ картофельный суп
- Nußtorte ➔ ореховый торт

the first part shows the place where the second part is located:

- Bergbahn ➔ горная дорога
- Fussbank ➔ скамейка для ног
- Waldbaum ➔ лесное дерево
- Waldblume ➔ лесной цветок

the first part shows time:

- Winteranzug ➔ зимний костюм
- Mailuft ➔ майский воздух
- Julihitze ➔ июльская жара
- Nachthemd ➔ ночная рубашка

the first part shows the object targeted by the second part:

- Bierfaß ➔ пивная бочка
- Wasserflasche ➔ бутылка с водой
- Mistgabel ➔ навозные вилы
- Weinglas ➔ бокал для вина

42 La Parataxe: Tome 1. Entre dépendance et intégration (Sciences pour la communication) (French Edition), 1st Edition, by Marie-José Béguelin (Editor), Mathieu Avanzi (Editor), Gilles Corminboeuf (Editor), Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2010.
43 Пауль Г., Принципы истории языка, Москва, 1960, с. 148-149.
Das städtische Treiben gefiel ihm und liess ihn die vielen Monate Kuraurenthalt in einem langweiligen herzbad vergessen.

Leutearger, Steuerarger, Geldarger, Handwerkarger (und der schlimmste von allen war der Schwiegerarger).

Городской шум и суета были ему приятны и заставляли позабыть о долгих месяцах пребывания на скучном курорте для сердечно-больных.

Leutearger, Steuerarger, Geldarger, Handwerkarger (und der schlimmste von allen war der Schwiegerarger).

Городской шум и суета были ему приятны и заставляли позабыть о долгих месяцах пребывания на скучном курорте для сердечно-больных.

The Russian prepositional phrase has a more precise meaning than the German word, allowing no ambiguous interpretations. Translation of compound nouns with prepositional phrases is widely used in the language of technical documentation.

The German noun is very compact and can be reiterated any number of times without overloading the text. In translation this compound noun is bound to be handed down using several words. Meanwhile, the translation can be relieved by omitting definitions and using only the main noun, e.g., the technical term Ausgleichebene when frequently used can sometimes be translated not in full as плоскость балансировки, but simply as плоскость.

L. Tesniere noted that one of the important features of the theory of translation is the substitution of the substantive unit for the verbal one. This remark is clearly associated with the assumption that most languages on the globe have no verbal unit in the sentence. All meanings of those languages are located in the substantives.

When analyzing texts and their translations, it can be noticed that in the accessible languages the distribution of meanings in sentences is very irregular. Ignoring the exotic substantive languages mentioned by L. Tesniere, it is difficult to imagine substantive sentences completely devoid of verbs. However, in familiar languages one can see a tendency to forming substantive sentences having a verb, however, but that verb is formal and is not loaded semantically, e.g.:

Դուք, երևի այս գիրքը կարդացած կլինեք

You, наверно, читали эту книгу.

In the Russian sentence the verb читали is the principal verbal term, at the same time carrying the main semantic load, i.e. being the predicate. In the Armenian sentence the verb with a complement գիրքը կարդացած կլինեք is conveyed using the complement գիրքը, and all that group of participle with a complement can be regarded as an attribute of the noun դուք in the same way as in the text գիրքը կարդացած մարդ. Thus, in the Armenian sentence we have already denoted the substantive and the attribute. It remains to clear out, how the predication is expressed. We see that the role of the predicate is played by the verb be (կլինեք). This verb is a formal predicate providing the sentence with tense and mood, while the semantic content goes into the sentence per se. This concept of the verbal unit is in agreement with the interpretation given by Zh.Vandries to the Sanscrit verbal forms: “In classical Sanscrit and in the

44 Федоров А. Ф., Немецко-русские языковые параллели, Москва, 1961, с. 64.
language of Mahabharata we already see the tendency of substituting verbal forms with participles, sometimes accompanied by a sort of link. This is not so much to replace he nominative phrase with the verbal phrase, but rather a deployment of one phrase into another, since the concepts to be expressed belong to the verbal domains: it is either action or condition, rather than quality.45

The cited substantive interpretation of this sentence does not stand if we consider the group կարդացած կլինեք a verbal form with an auxiliary verb. In the example

Նա այնպես էր փաթաթվել թիկնոցի մեջ, որ ճանաչելու ոչ մի հնար չկար

i.e., the subject հնար + verb չկար = the short form of an adjective in the predication իմանալ չի լինիլ, հիշել նրա անունը կտակի մեջ49:

In the following Armenian sentence example use is made of a formal noun with little content and a formal verb:

Այդ ձեր գիտնալու բանն է, պատասխանեց տիկինը ...50

The main semantic load of the sentence falls on the attribute of the noun.

English and French easily form the substantive type of sentence similar to Armenian:

This is a thing for you to know C’est une chose pour vous a connaitre

One can quote an Armenian sentence with the central node governing like a verb:

…ինքն էլ մասնակից էր այն ուրախությանը51:

45 Вандриес Ж., Язык, Москва, 1937, с. 123.
46 Դյումա Ա., Քսան տարի անց, էջ 502:
47 Շիրվանզադե, Քաոս, Երևան, 1950, էջ 54:
48 Ibid., p. 14:
49 Ibid, p. 75.
Here the node մասնակից էր has a verbal nature and requires using a dependent to fill in the free valency; however, this dependent is used not in accusative, but in genitive, as is due to a dependent of the noun. The central node of the Armenian sentence can also be an adjective with a meaningless verb, just like the noun in the former example is translated into Russian using a single meaningful verb:

են համաձայն իմ մեկ ու քաղաքի տարիք... ու նրային ազդեցություն... ինչ ցե է ասել մենք!... ու կանգնեցվել է Դուարտի ծովի մայրամուտ առավոտյան ձայնից52: ին-դեմ դերակել գործ Կալո.

Substantivation can be accompanied with a simplification of the sentence compared to the verbal type.

... կանգնեցվել է լսելի եղավ Կալոյի լալագին ձայնը52: ին-դեմ դերակել գործ Կալո.

Trying to translate the Armenian sentence with a better precision will have to deploy the substantivized infinitive գնալու into a clause.

... կանգնեցվել է պակաս53 ... ին-դեմ դերակել գործ Կալո.

The first actant գնալու becomes the verb շել, while the attribute – adjective of the first actant becomes the first actant of the clause. Thus, in the Armenian text here there occurs simplification of the sentence compared to Russian and removal of the verb and actant into the substantive with attribute. The mentioned substantivized infinitive is a substantive to such a degree that it can be transformed into adjective modifying another substantive.

The adjective adduces the subordinate terms like the verb whence it comes, therefore, a complicated content can be conveyed with one single sentence, a sentence having a predication done with a meaningless verb, while the main meanings are expressed by substantives and their attributes, e.g.:

... կանգնեցվել է Դուարտի ծովի մայրամուտ առավոտյան ձայնից ին-դեմ դերակել գործ Կալո.

Armenian uses sentences with the infinitive in the substantive form playing the role of an object. This infinitive as a noun can have adjectives, while as a verb it can have objects. The simultaneous subordination of both complements and adjectives to a single term creates great potential in the capacity of a simple sentence. This model translates into Russian with a compound subordinate clause:

որպես ձիերը, նույնպես շները, կատուները և բոլոր ընտանի անասունները ունեն առանձին նշաններ, որոնցով ճանաչում են նրանց չար կամ բարի ազդեցություն ունենալը տիրոջ բախույք55: Կան ձիեր, տան շներ, կան և այլ տարեկան կատուներ, որոնք ունեն միայն մեկ ազդեցություն, որը տալիս է տիրոջ բախույք55:

52 Ibid, p. 10.
54 Ibid.
55 Րաֆֆի, Ոսկի աքաղաղ, էջ 48:
Here, the substantivized verb ունենալը, being a verb, governs the object ազդեցություն, and being a noun, governs the adjective նրանց.

The substantive manner of expression can be perceived in the Armenian combinatorial verbs like թույլ տալ (to allow), սիրտ անել (to take heart), շուռ տալ (to turn over), ռիմ գալ (to come up), ռիմ տալ (to drag along), et cet. In this way the vocabulary resources of the language are expended very economically. In Russian those combinations are expressed with separate verbs.

A substantive phrase can be a modifier:

Here the substantivized verb ունենալը, being a verb, governs the object ազդեցություն, and being a noun, governs the adjective նրանց.

In the Armenian text here compared to Russian one can see a removal of the verb and adverb into the noun and adjective, while the substantive, through syntactic condition is subjected to indexless transformation into an adverb. This results in the transformation of the compound subordinate clause into a simple sentence. In the next example one can also see the folding of predication in the substantive modifying phrase:

A subordinate clause is also appropriate when translating this Armenian sentence into English:

In English, substantive sentences occur quite frequently, their translation being not too easy with regard to finding formal correlations, e.g.:

Plan your evenings in advance. Having something to look forward to can do a lot to stave off fatigue from boredom.

The subject having of the second English sentence is a substantivized verb. At the end of the sentence there is also a substantivation compared to the Russian translation.

A literal translation: …to drive away the fatigue from boredom.

This distortion arises from the use of a low angle bevel which magnifies the dimension perpendicular to the semiconductor surface …
In the latter example, the English structure employs the name of action *use* with an adjective *of a bevel*; when translating with the aid of a clause use is made of the verb *используется* with the object *фаска*\(^{59}\).

The phenomenon of wrapping up a predication in verbal substantivations is noted by A.V. Fiodorov. Verbal substantivations with the preposition *bei*, expressing the modifier of time, are matched by the Russian clauses with the conjunction «*когда*», while the lexical meaning of the substantivized infinitive is expressed in the personal form by the predicate of the clause, the subject being the word indicating the actual doer or the source of action (*Bei dem knarren – когда ступеньки заскрипели, beim abgleiten – когда он скользил*)\(^{60}\).

A.V. Fiodorov confirms the hypothesis uttered in this discourse on formal predication of verbal substantivations by means of lexically meaningless verbs: *War es wirklich die Schlacht vor Verden die die Schulbuben horten, wenn sie sich hinter Zahlbach auf die Erde Legten, oder nur das fortwahrende zittern der Erde unter den Eisenbahnsugen und Marschen der Armeen?*  

*Er musste im einschlafen gewesen sein. Er erwachte vor Schreck.*  

*Verоятно, он задремал – и вдруг проснулся в ужасе.*

In the former example: *War es wirklich die Schlacht vor Verden... oder nur das fortwahrende Zittern der Erde...* the substantivized infinitive *zittern* is the predicative of a nominal predicate, with the main (lexical) content expressed by substantiation, the verb *sein* carrying grammatical attributes.

The same can be said of the latter example with the combination *einschlafen* making up the main content of the predicated group, while the conjugated verb will express tense, modality or other grammatical categories\(^{61}\).

A similar German example with a meaningless verb *haben*:  

*Und das An schnurren der Riemen sitterte ihm bis in die Haarwurzeln. Jetzt *hatte* der Riemen schon ein belles, endgültiges *surren.**  

*Начавшееся шуршание приводных ремней пронизало его дрожью до корней волос. Но вот они зажужжали ровно и звонко.*\(^{62}\)

Here an attempt has been made to outline some issues of the verb transitioning to substantive in translation. It is to be noted that L. Tesniere regarded this subject one of the main problems of the theory of translation. Regarding the layout of the material, the article favors the deductive principle, rather than inductive.

\(^{59}\) Пешковский А. М., Глагольность как выразительное средство, Сборник статей, Л., 1925.  

\(^{60}\) Федоров А. Ф., Немецко-русские языковые параллели, с. 78.  

\(^{61}\) Ibid, pp. 74-75.  

\(^{62}\) Ibid, p. 76.
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ARMENIAN GENOCIDE
The Armenian Massacres.

Horrible Details.

LONDON, May 19.

The London newspapers to-day publish details of the massacre of Armenians at Orfah, a town in the north of the province of Aleppo, reported to have been perpetrated some time ago.

The details disclose the fact that a fearful holocaust was executed locally under the orders of superior Turkish officials.

Eight thousand inhabitants of the town and district of Orfah were massacred.

Three thousand of the victims took refuge in the Cathedral. The building was set on fire by the Turkish soldiers, and the inmates, who were prevented from escaping, were burnt to death.
More Armenian Massacres.

LONDON, March 24.

The Turks have massacred 100 Armenians at Tokat, a town of Asia Minor, in the province of Sivas.

The massacre lasted eight hours. The Turks afterwards looted the bazar.

The Porte, at the request of the Embassies in Constantinople, has dismissed three of the chief officials.

The correspondent of the Standard states that constant telegrams were passing between Tokat and Constantinople, and that the massacre could have been easily prevented.

Sir Philip Currie, the British Ambassador, has protested in the strongest terms against the atrocities at Tokat.

March 25.

The Porte promises to take prompt measures to punish the perpetrators of the atrocities upon Armenians at Tokat.

A special Court is to be constituted to inquire into the massacres.

The Embassies have warned the Porte that neglect to punish the offenders will bring about serious results.

The Standard states that Tokat was chosen as the scene of the outrage in pursuance of a policy to crush the Armenians in populous centres.

The Vali of Adana (Moustafa Faik Pasha, has been dismissed.

Owing to the massacre at Tokat, the Turkish mutessarif and the commander of the police and gendarmes at that place have been dismissed from their positions and have been arrested.

THE SYDNEY MAIL, SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1897.
MORE ARMENIANS KILLED.

MASSACRE IN THE SASSUN DISTRICT—ORDERS TO BURN A TOWN.

Constantinople, Aug. 9.—Advices received from Bitlis, Asiatic Turkey, say that two hundred men, women and children have been massacred in the Armenian village of Spaghank, in the District of Sassun, by troops and Kurds under Ali Pacha, the commandant of Bitlis. He is also said to have ordered the village to be burned.
AWFUL ARMENIAN MASSACRES.

Mussulmans Pillage, Outrage, and Murder Unchecked for Five Days—Eight Villages Destroyed.

PARIS, Oct. 20.—A special dispatch from Constantinople to the Petit Bleu says new and frightful massacres of Armenians have just occurred in the district of Diarbekir.

The Mussulmans, it is asserted, pillaged, outraged, and killed during five days without the intervention of Turkish troops.

Eight villages, it is added, were entirely destroyed and burned.
SULTAN AGAIN ORDERS ARME NHIAN MASSACRE

BERLIN, April 29.—Die Information today reports that the sultan recently summoned the Kurdish chiefs in Asia Minor to Constantinople and instructed them to recommence the Armenian massacres, which caused such a sensation in the civilized world six years ago.

Abdul’s idea, the paper asserts, is that bloodshed on a large scale in Armenia would distract attention from Macedonia and relieve the pressure in European Turkey. Armenian massacres, the paper’s correspondent says, have already occurred in the districts of Van, Vaspurakan, Mush and Sassum.

In a fight near Van the Armenians fought the Kurds fiercely, with the result that 200 were killed and several hundred wounded. The majority of the casualties were among the Kurds. The Armenian fugitives crossed the Russian frontier, pursued by Turkish cavalry. The Turks continued the pursuit over the border front. Guards raised an alarm and a regiment of Cossacks appeared and fired on the Turks and after a brief encounter the Turks retreated.

A local Anzeiger correspondent also reports the encounter and says a Turkish officer and six of his men were killed.

THE SPOKANE PRESS: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1903.
COSSACK AND TURK
CLASH ON FRONTIER

Russians Cover Flight of
Armenian Fugitives.

SULTAN ORDERS MASSACRE

German Paper Asserts That He Would
Thus Distract Attention From
Macedonia.

BERLIN, April 29.—“Die Information”
reports that the Sultan recently
summoned the Kurd chiefs in Asia
Minor to Constantinople, and instructed
them to recommence the Armenian mas-
sacres which caused a sensation in the
civilized world some years ago. Abdul's
idea, the paper asserts, is that blood-
shed on a large scale in Armenia will
distract attention from Macedonia and
relieve the pressure in European Tur-
key.

Many Massacred.

Armenian massacres, “Die Information” continues, have already begun in
the districts of Van, Vas Puakan, Mush
and Sassum. In the fight near Van the
Armenians resisted the Kurds fiercely,
with the result that 200 were killed and
several hundred wounded, many of the
casualties being among the Kurds.

Armenian fugitives, according to the
papers, crossed the Russian frontier
near Sarikamish, pursued by Turkish
cavalry. The Turks continued the pur-
suit even into Russian territory. The
frontier guards raised an alarm and a
regiment of Cossacks appeared and fired
on the Turks. A brief encounter fol-
lowed, after which the Turks withdrew.

Turkish Officers Killed.

The “Lokal Anzeiger” also reports the
encounter between the Turkish forces
and the Cossacks, and says that one
Turkish officer and ten men were killed.
The “Vossische Zeitung” today as-
serts that the Russian embassy at Con-
stantinople has informed Russian con-
suls throughout Europe that Turkey
that the Macedonian committee has resolved
to assassinate them.

The Macedonian leader, Mortenjeff,
according to the report, who already has
a bloody record, has been delegated to
supervise the murders, which will be
carried out by three practiced assassins.
Three others, Constantin, Deltscroff, and
Tumberf, the paper adds, have been sent
to assassinate the Servian consuls.

The Washington Times.

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY,
APRIL 29, 1903.
PARIS, May 13.—An official despatch to the foreign office from Constantinople confirms the reports that Turkish troops have burned villages throughout the Sassan district of Armenia, killing the inhabitants. The French ambassador, M. Constans, has joined with the Russian and British ambassadors in sending consuls to Erzerum, in the hope of limiting the destruction and bloodshed. However, the official advices, although brief, indicate that the work of exterminating the Armenians occupying the mountainous district of Sassanoun is practically accomplished.

The Turkish methods appear to have been much the same as those adopted during the Armenian massacre. The official reports do not give exact details as to the number of towns burned and people killed but they show that the action of the Turks has been sweeping. The French authorities were advised some time ago that Turkey was taking advantage of Russia’s pre-occupation in the far east and intended to adopt a decisive course toward the rebellious Armenians. The information then showed that the Turks would begin the work of suppression about April 15. In order to prevent this the powers made an energetic protest. This delayed Turkey’s action, which, however, has now been executed with the same severity as at first contemplated.
CALLS ON AMERICA TO AID ARMENIANS

Anatole Beaulieu Urgest Union With France to Put an End to Atrocities.

TURKISH POLICY IS CRUELTY.

Extermination of His Christian Subjects the Sultan's Deliberately Chosen Way of Settling Troubles.

I tell you that these massacres of which you read have not been isolated and have not been mere incidents of Oriental life, but have been the individual proceedings of an Oriental policy.

"I have been over the ground of these massacres and I have visited the villages whose populations the emissaries decimated. The Armenians who have thus suffered are the first people of Asia. Of all the Oriental races they are the most habituated to the Christian civilization of Europe and, being more intelligent and capable than their neighbors, they have excited their jealousy."

The lecturer proceeded to review the efforts made by the Armenians themselves. He showed that before they could do anything order must be re-established in the Armenian countries.

"The American nation," he said, "being without jealousy of other Powers, is the one that can act most efficiently. You have a Minister at Constantinople and Consuls in Turkey."

"What did you do in the Roumanian affair, when your Government addressed a note to Turkey, you can do now with the same justification as regards the Armenians."

"You drew the Sultan's attention to the migration of the Jews from Roumania to the United States. There is a similar movement of Armenians from Armenia. I want to see this Government act, and when I arrive in Asia Minor, for I am going there before long, I want to represent there the sentiment of the United States, as well as of France."

"Before closing I want to urge that a Republic so free as this cannot remain silent when such atrocities as these are being committed in the Orient."

Saloonkeeper Shoots Negro.

When Joseph Oldanie, a saloonkeeper at No. 5200 Shaw avenue, refused to open his saloon yesterday morning, Edward Fairfax, 18 years old, a negro living at No. 5549 Manchester avenue, it is said, began to abuse him. Oldanie drew his revolver and shot Fairfax in the left thigh. Fairfax was taken to the City Hospital.

Labor League Mass Meeting.

The Central Trades and Labor Council yesterday decided to hold a mass meeting at hall No. 7 in the Fraternal building on Thursday night next in order to discuss the affairs of the Woman's Labor League, which will hold its regular session at that time.

THE ST. LOUIS REPUBLIC:
MONDAY MAY 9, 1904.
MANY ARMENIANS KILLED BY TURKS

1,200 in all Die in Bloody Engagement.

More Fighting in the Sassoun District
—Another Big Gold Shipment.

A BIGAMIST CONVICTED.

Constantinople, May 14.—A report has reached here that three hundred Turks and nine hundred Armenians were killed in a fight in the Sassoun district of Armenia. Fighting has been reported in this district on several occasions lately.

MORE GOLD TO GO.

New York, May 14.—Additional engagements for two million dollars in gold were made today for export Tuesday. This makes a total of ten millions to be shipped to Paris Tuesday and completely exhausts the supply of gold bars at the assay office for the present.

THEY WILL MISS HIM.

Siou Falls, May 14.—Rev. Charles A. Lyons, who pleaded guilty to bigamy was sentenced to four years imprisonment here at hard labor. Lyons had wives in Montreal, Cincinnati, Providence, Texas and Colorado.

The Paducah Sun.
SATURDAY, MAY, 14, 1904.
FRANCE WARNS TURKEY.
Atrocities in Armenia Must Stop—Delcassé Tells of Investigation.

PARIS, June 9.—Foreign Minister Delcassé made a statement in the Chamber of Deputies to-day giving a summary of the official investigation into the atrocities in Armenia. The question came up upon the request of M. de Pressensé (Socialist) that France make a naval demonstration against Turkey in order to stop the Armenian persecutions.

M. Delcassé said he received on Monday a report from the French Ambassador at Constantinople giving the result of the investigations of the French Consul sent into the Sassun district. It showed there had been a number of bloody combats and villages had been captured by the troops and destroyed. It was impossible to estimate even approximately the number of villages destroyed or the number of people killed. Some accounts said that twenty-five and others that fifteen villages were destroyed. There was no doubt that the uprising resulted in the killing of many rebels and also many peaceful peasants.

The facts in the case, said the Minister, had been exaggerated, but they were none the less deplorable. The Porte maintained in Armenia an administration of such a character that insurrection was the only recourse for the population. M. Delcassé added:

"I have informed the Porte that the time for repression is over, and that it must beware what responsibility it incurs. The French Government will not cease to do its whole duty."

The New York Times
Published: June 10, 1904
Copyright © The New York Times
3,000

Armenians Murdered by the Turks.

Constantinople, June 16.—The consular reports confirm the destruction of many Armenian villages in the Sassun district. The number of killed is estimated to exceed 3,000 persons.

THE SHIELD, MANSFIELD, OHIO,
THURSDAY EVENING, JUNE 16, 1904
ARMENIAN MASSACRES.

Terrible Atrocities Committed by Turkish Soldiers.

(Special Cable to The Gazette.)

London, June 29.—It is stated from an anti-Turkish source that the victims of the recent Armenian massacres numbered nearly 6,000, instead of 3,000. At the village of Akhbi, the number of persons killed were so many that their bodies, which were thrown from a bridge, dammed the river, which the Turks freed by firing artillery into the heaps of corpses.
GENERAL ARMENIAN MASSACRE.

Is Reported to Have Begun in Van Province—Travelers Slain.

LONDON, July 4, (Monday.)—In conncction with the cablegram which the American Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, received from Ispahan, Persia, July 2, signed by "Armenian Bishops in Persia," saying that "Turkish barbarians are massacring thousands of Armenians," and humbling solliciting the "United States Government, in the name of Christianity and humanity, to save innocent lives," The Daily Chronicle this morning prints the following telegram, dated Tauris, Persia, June 30:

"It is announced from a perfectly reliable source that in the vicinity of Van, (a fortified city of Turkish Armenia,) on June 24, Kurds and Turkish regulars attacked Armenian travelers, killing them as revolutionists.

"This is the beginning of a general massacre in the Province of Van. The people are in terror."
ROOSEVELT MAY AID ARMENIANS

Steps to Prevent Further Massacres Considered—Cranks Threaten President.

New York Sun Special Service.

Oyster Bay, N. Y., July 6.—The president is expected soon to make an important move in the matter of the Armenian atrocities. Every day letters and cablegrams tell him of recent massacres of Armenians and urging him to take action to prevent further slaughter. The state department is in possession of all the facts and President Roosevelt is informed as to latest developments.

Both President Roosevelt and members of his family are staying much closer home this summer than in past years. Formerly the president and Mrs. Roosevelt frequently were seen riding and driving thru the village and over the country roads, and scarcely a day passed that the children were not seen riding bareheaded thru the village without escort or guides. The villagers do not take kindly to this new exclusiveness.

An unusually large number of threatening letters received by the president this year is said to be the chief cause of all the precautions. Crank letters from all parts of the country are opened by Secretary Loeb daily. It is feared that despite the extra precautions of secret service men some of these cranks may get into the village and attack members of the president’s family.

THE MINNEAPOLIS JOURNAL. July 6, 1904.
KILL CHRISTIANS IN ASIATIC TURKEY

Town is Burned and Soldiers are Powerless to Stop Slaughter of Armenians.

Constantinople, Apr. 17. A massacre of Armenians has taken place at Adana, Asiatic Turkey, and according to the latest telegrams from Mersina still continues. Soldiers, powerless to control the situation, are joining in the pillage of the town. The fatalities are said to be numerous. The riots began last Wednesday and the town of Adana has been burned and many Christians killed in the streets. The Moslems, having practically wrecked the town, are said to have now begun operations against the Christians in the village. The foreign consuls at Mersina have requested that warships be sent to that port.

Sixty Armenians Massacred.
No definite information is obtained as to the number of persons who lost their lives in the fighting, though one report says 60 Armenians were massacred. Two American missionaries are said to be among the dead, but no names are given and the report as to these is unconfirmed. The British vice consul at Mersina, Major Daugty-Wylle, is said to have been injured during the trouble.

Later dispatches from Mersina say that the massacres are spreading to the vilayet of Adana. Disorders have commenced at Tarsus, the little town between Adana and Mersina noted as the birthplace of the Apostle Paul, and at noon yesterday many houses there were reported to have been burned. The number of victims at Tarsus, according to dispatches, was unknown.

American Missionaries There.
It is known that the regular district meeting of the American missionaries was due to be in session at Adana and that Mr. and Mrs. William Chambers, the Misses Elizabeth and Mary G. Webb, Miss Wallace and Miss Borel, missionaries, were to have been present there. Ambassador Leishman has instructed Vice Consul Debbas at Mersina to go immediately to Adana.

Turkish Situation.
London, Apr. 17. Telegraphing from Constantinople, the correspondent of the Times says: "I learn from a high authority that the officers of the Third army corps have telegraphed from Saloniki threatening to attack the capital unless Hilmi Pasha, former grand vizier, and Ahmed Riza Bey, former president of the Turkish parliament, are restored to their positions within 12 hours. In official circles this is regarded as a bluff, but should such a hostile movement be attempted Edhem Pasha, the new minister of war, and Nazim Pasha, who is in charge of the troops in Constantinople, certainly will not permit the concentration of the committee of union and progress' forces within striking distance of the capital."

The Wayne County Democrat.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1909.
30,000 KILLED IN MASSACRES

Conservative Estimate of Victims of Turkish Fanaticism in Adana Vilayet.

DEADLY WORK CONTINUES

Tribesmen Besiege Towns and March on Others—Messengers to American Women Slain.

CLASH FEARED AT BEIRUT

Druses Gather to Avenge Murder of Deputy and Mohammedans Prepare to Oppose Them.
BEIRUT. Asiatic Turkey, April 24.—A conservative estimate now places the number killed in the Armenian massacres in Adana vilayet at from 20,000 to 30,000. Help is needed everywhere along the coast.

At the town of Adana more than 100 girls are missing. It is known that twenty-one native pastors have been killed. Fears are entertained that other American missionaries than those whose deaths have been reported, have been murdered. There are 15,000 refugees in Adana and Tarsus and 5,000 in Mersina.

Conditions at Hadjin, where five American women were reported two days ago to be in danger from the tribesmen, are becoming critical. A messenger dispatched for relief by Miss Lambert, the American missionary, who two days ago sent an appeal to Constantinople, has been killed in the streets. A second messenger, a soldier, was shot at. The Vali, however, has given assurances of the safety of the Americans, and there are reports that the insurgents show signs of withdrawing. The town lacks food.
The Captains of the British, French, and German warships and the American and French Consular officials at Mersina today conferred with the Governor concerning the disturbances. They gave particular attention to the question of prompt relief for Hadjin. The Governor promised to do everything possible to calm the Mohammedans. The British Vice Consul has telegraphed to the Hadjin mission to try to persuade the Armenians in the town not to fire on the besiegers, as the Mohammedans probably will withdraw at the Governor’s commands.

Dortyole is holding out.

An appeal for help has been issued from Latakia, as the mob is nearing that city, and American property is threatened.

Antioch is quiet, there being no Armenians left in that town.

The Armenian village of Kessab has been burned and many persons killed there. The women and children of Kessab are fugitives in the surrounding mountains, exposed to hunger and mob violence.

The situation at Beilan, a short distance south of Alexandretta, is most critical.

Native hordes are moving on Suediah, eighteen miles southwest of Antiooh.
Fear Vengeance by Druses.

While the situation in Beirut remains unchanged, and there have been no disorders, a serious outbreak is expected to-morrow, when the body of Emir Mohammed Arsian, the Deputy who was murdered recently at Constantinople, is due to arrive here by steamer. Mohammedans are coming into Beirut to-day to resist the expected vengeance of the Druses tribesmen, the chief of which is Arsian's father. These tribesmen from the Lebanon have concentrated their forces, and are coming into town in large numbers.

The New York Times
Published: April 25, 1909
Copyright © The New York Times
Smyrna, Nov. 26.—Sweeping the province of Diarbekr, in Asia Minor, a force of Kurds and irregular Turkish troops, under Ibrahim Pasha, plundered and burned 151 villages and massacred hundreds of Armenian Christians. Survivors of the slaughter fled to the mountains, where those not hunted down by the soldiers must die of cold and exposure.

Ibrahim was sent to suppress trifling local disorders, but instead marched through the entire province, apparently bent on completely wiping out the Christian population. The massacres were attended by frightful tortures of the victims, women being outraged, men mutilated and children butchered before their parents’ eyes.
ARmenian massacres renewed.

Ibrahim pasha active.

London, Nov. 27.

German newspapers report a serious renewal of massacres in Armenia, under the direction of Ibrahim Pasha, and that 140 Diabekir villages have been destroyed.

The Sydney Morning Herald, Friday, November 29, 1907.
30,000 KILLED IN ARMENIAN MASSACRES

Fears are Entertained That Other American Missionaries Than Those Reported Have Been Killed.

By Associated Press.

Beirut, April 24.—Conservative estimates place the number of killed in the Armenian massacres at Adana vilayet from twenty to thirty thousand. At Adana more than one hundred girls are missing. Twenty-one native pastors are known to have been killed. Fears are entertained that other American missionaries than those whose deaths are reported have been killed.

Fifteen thousand refugees are in Adana and Tarsus, five thousand in Mersina and others in nearby towns. Conditions in Hadjin are becoming critical. A messenger dispatched for relief by Miss Lambert, an American missionary, who two days ago sent an appeal to Constantinople, was killed in the streets, and another messenger shot at.

The Vali has given assurances of the safety of Americans. Conditions at Alexandretta are unchanged. Beilun and Doryole are holding out.

An appeal has been issued from Latakia, as the mob is nearing that city. American property is threatened. Antioch is quiet, there being no Americans left in that town. Disturbances occurred at Beirut tonight.

PENSACOLA, FLORIDA, SUNDAY MORNING, APRIL 25, 1909.
30,000 IS ESTIMATE OF
KILLED IN MASSACRES

Feared That Many American Missionaries Have Been Killed

Beirut, Asiatic Turkey, April 24.—A conservative estimate now places the number killed in the Armenian massacres in Adana Villeyte at from 20,000 to 30,000. At the town of Adana more than 100 girls are missing. It is known that 21 native pastors have been killed. Fears are entertained that other American missionaries than those whose deaths have been reported have been murdered.

There are 10,000 refugees in Adana and Tarsus and 5,000 at Mersina. Marash and Aintab are quiet, but conditions at Hadjin are becoming critical. A messenger dispatched for the relief by Miss Lambert, an American missionary, who two days ago sent an appeal to Constantinople was killed in the streets. A second messenger, a servant was shot at. The vali has given assurances of the safety of the American.

Conditions at Alexandretta are unchanged. Beilan and Dortoyle are holding out. An appeal for help has been issued from Ltaakina, as the mob is nearing that city, and American property is threatened. Antioch is quiet, there being no Armenians left in town. No disturbances occurred in Beirut tonight.

BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA, SUNDAY MORNING, APRIL 25, 1909.
ARMENIAN MASSACRES.

UNITED STATES ANXIOUS.

The Government of the United States at Washington has inquired of the British Minister for Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey, how far Turkey is taking steps to stop the Armenian massacres, in accordance with the Berlin Treaty.

During the massacres in the Adana vilayet 19 Protestant pastors were killed.

Massacres continue at Antioch, in Syria, and in many Armenian villages in the vicinity of Alexandria.

THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD, MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1909.
THE SLAUGHTER OF CHRISTIANS IN ASIA MINOR

On the Cilician Plain
To-day There Are Left
Sufficient Evidences
Of the Moslem Massacre
To Warrant Estimate of
30,000 Christians Killed.

The Adana Relief Committee in Session—C. Nesbit Chambers and
Major C. H. Doughty-Wylie.

Remains of a Thriving Village Near Adana, Destroyed in Massacre.
By James Creelman.

The most appealing figure I saw in all the scene of death and destruction that stretched over the Cilician Plain for a hundred miles was a bent, white-haired Armenian of seventy years who stood among blackened ruins of his Christian village, with a skull in his wrinkled hands and a pile of bones at his feet.

"He was my son-in-law," said the old man. "The Moslems surrounded Gliaur Kur, [the village.] calling on their prophet's name and screaming to us that they had orders not to leave a Christian alive in the whole country. We defended ourselves in our houses for three days, but our ammunition became exhausted. Some swam the river at night and escaped. Some got into the fields and hid in the wheat, but the Turks hunted them out with dogs and killed them all. The rest started for the City of Adana, but were hacked to pieces on the road. Our pretty girls were carried away as prisoners. Then every house in the village was plundered and burned. It is the same everywhere on this plain—there is not a single Christian house left standing."

His face was blackened by the fierce sun, seamed and puckered by age and hard work; his quaint blue and red jacket was rent, and his sturdy legs were wrapped in loose white cotton; a faded black cap covered his head, and his feet were in cowhide moccasins. He spoke in a dreary monotone, now and then glancing nervously at the Turkish soldiers who accompanied me.

"They had no pity in their hearts," he said. "They killed every Christian they found, everywhere, everywhere"—extending his arms and shaking his white head.

The venerable survivor of the ghastliest massacre in history strode a few steps and stopped beside some charred bones.

"Here they burned a Christian alive," he said. "A poor fellow who had done them no harm."

Again he walked through the flower-carpeted field, starting up the singing larks as he went, and halted beside another blackened spot.

"Here they burned another Christian alive," he said. "They used wood and kerosene."

Trudging on slowly, he brought me to the foot of a tree where skulls and bones were scattered about, and beside them blood-stained clubs.

"These ran to climb the tree, but were caught; the dogs have eaten their flesh—Christian flesh," he explained.

It seemed unreal. The wide, sunlit landscape; the glow and perfume of flowers; the never-ceasing warbling of larks and skimming of swallows; the green stretches of young cotton and sesame; the yellow surge of ripe wheat—and silent Moslems, in red fezes or dirty white turbans, cheerfully gathering in the crops of the Christians they had murdered, while a group of slattern Turkish soldiers smoked cigarettes among the ruins of the silent and empty Christian village, which only a few weeks before had sheltered three hundred contented Armenians.
The old man studied my face eagerly. "When will the American ships and soldiers come to protect us?" he asked. I shook my head. "What!" he pleaded, his lips trembling and his breast heaving. "The Christian nations will not abandon us? The Americans will come to save us? We are helpless. The Turks will kill us all. They have no mercy."

I left him standing beside the bones of his slain neighbors with bowed head and clasped hands, still hoping and dreaming that help would come from far-away America.

It is this amazing belief in the power and swift humanity of the American people that stirs the soul of an American who goes out over the blood-stained soil of the Cilician Plain, or moves among the thin, white-faced refugees crowded in the cities.

For more than half a century American missionaries have been working among the descendants of the Armenian kingdom, which was established in the high lands about Mount Ararat 500 years before Christ, the first kingdom in the world to accept Christianity. The Armenian people were slaughtered and robbed by Persians, Macedonians, Romans, and Byzantines. Then the Arabs, Kurds, and Seljuk Turks alternately attacked them. In the eleventh century the Byzantines again swept into their country and extinguished their kingdom, when the unhappy people fled to the Cilician Plain, where they founded another kingdom and maintained it for 300 years, but were finally conquered by the Egyptians.

Never since the Apostle Thaddeus went from Christ to the Armenians have they abandoned Christianity, and through war after war, massacre after massacre, they have proclaimed their religion openly.

Hundreds of American lives and millions of American money have been sacrificed in the attempt to raise the Armenians out of the dead ritualism of their ancient church into the active spiritual and moral life of modern Christianity, and to-day more than a half million dollars a year are spent through the American missions.

It makes one’s blood leap to see the glorious work that has been done by brave American men and women in the heart of Asia Minor, a work of education, of compassion, of active rescue from poverty and despair.

The scene of this last great massacre—more terrifying and unspeakable even than the bloody sweep of Tamerlane and his Asiatic horde—is filled with monuments of American courage and devotion—missions at Mersina, Tarsus, Adana, Hadjin, Talas, Kassab, Antloch, Marash, Aintab, and Lattakia, and more than a hundred native Christian churches scattered about the towns and villages of the great plain over which the armies of Xerxes, Cyrus, Mithridates, Alexander, Caesar, Pompey, Harun-al-Rashid, Saladin, and Ibrahim Pasha moved through centuries of conquest.
It was here the Moslem Arabs barred the way of Christian pilgrims to the sepulchre of Christ at Jerusalem and drew from Europe the mail-clad Crusaders under Godfrey de Bouillon, who camped on the very soil where whole Christian populations have been ruthlessly destroyed this year.

Nowhere in the world is there such a confusion of races and religions to be found as in this ancient battlefield where Europe and Asia have contend ed for thousands of years.

I have seen American missionaries feeding and comforting the refugees of five different religious sects in Tarsus, the birthplace of St. Paul, beside the little hill where Marc Antony received Cleopatra when the Egyptian queen, disguised as Venus, sailed up the Cydnus, whose waters were, only a few weeks ago, filled with mutilated Christian corpses.

And out of this dreadful country, where I have traveled for fifty miles without seeing a single Christian house standing, and where I have seen dogs eating the bodies of murdered Christians, there rises a cry of appeal to America from widows and orphans and from men who starve and hide while the murderous Turks gather their crops and make worse than slaves of their wives and daughters.

It is easy for American statesmanship to ask, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” But that was the answer of Cain to God.

Come with me to old Tarsus, whose buried magnificence lies beneath the grounds of an American mission founded by a New Yorker, and, in the sight of whole streets of burned Christian homes, stand beside me and listen to the gentle voice of a young Armenian widow of 24 years, Paka Sarajian, of the near-by mountain village Kozolook.

She is slim and as graceful as a deer as she leans against a crumbling wall, clad in a red jacket and loose blue native trousers, her small oval face tanned by the sun, her great brown eyes shining with devotion and her pretty little childish mouth trembling as she talks. A white cloth is wound around her shapely head to conceal the fact that her hair was burned off. Her left arm is in a sling. She holds her ragged little son by the hand.

As she talks, a squad of dirty Turkish soldiers leer at her and groups of hungry and ragged Christians, who only a few days before were living in good houses, pass and repass between the American mission and the Turkish court-martial.

“There were eighty Christian families in the village of Kozolook,” she says, “and I lived there with my husband, who was a carpenter, and my four children, one a baby.”

Her face twitches, and a big tear rolls down her face.
"On Friday, in the week of the massacres, the Turks from the surrounding villages came and persuaded all the men of our village to give up their arms, promising that they would protect them.

"Then they took us in different parties to their villages, telling us all the time that Christians would be safer with them. There were thirty-six persons in my party, and they took us to the village of Chavooshlu, about a mile away. I trembled all the time, because I learned that they had murdered my husband. They shot him nine times before he died."

The forlorn little peasant beauty shivers and touches her son on the head with inexpressible tenderness.

"When we reached Chavooshlu we were shut up in a Turk's house until Sunday. Then a crowd of Turkish villagers, people who had always been our neighbors, came and said that they had orders from the government to kill us all. They had guns and swords and clubs. We begged for our lives. We kissed their feet. But they said we must die. It was the order of the government—all Christians must die. We had done nothing, nothing at all. It was because we were Christians.

"They took us to a field to kill us, and when I saw that there was no escape I threw my little baby in a mountain river and saw it drown."
Tears gush from the brown eyes, and a sob shakes the light, graceful figure.

"In the field they told us to lie down in a line from east to west, and made their swords ready. We got on our knees and put our faces in the dirt. We crawled before them and kissed their feet. We begged them for the sake of God to let us die some other death. We asked them to shoot us in the head so that we might die at once. They answered that cartridges cost money and they did not propose to waste money on Christians. The government had ordered them to kill us, and it was cheaper to use swords than guns—they would cut our throats; it was a good way for Christians to die."

She writhes, bites her lips, and coddles her son. Her voice sinks to a whisper. Her eyes roll upward.

"Then we all stretched ourselves on the ground, I and my three little children, too—oh, my God, all I had left!—and the Turks raised their swords and hacked at the necks—oh! oh!"—she covered her eyes and bent her head—"and I heard my little ones cry out to me. They chopped the arms of one of my boys. They chopped the neck of another. How I escaped death I cannot tell. But I kept one boy by my side. Then they made a pile of wood and hay and put all the bodies on it, some of them still living, and set fire to the pile; and I heard my two dying children calling to me in the flames. But I held my other boy and kept still, pretending to be dead. Even when my little ones were burning to death I did not dare to move. They threw hay over me and set fire to it, and my hair was burned off, yet I did not move or speak. Then a Turk helped me and my boy to get away and—" she hung her head.

Poor little Christian woman! She was in her rescuer's hands for three days before she reached Dr. Christie and his wife at the American mission of St. Paul's Institute in Tarsus.

"Am I my brother's keeper?" Is that to be the reply of Christian America to the widows and orphans of the thirty thousand Christians murdered in Asia Minor? All, all look across the contending European nations to America for some sign. That is the tremendous fact of the situation. Priests, bishops, merchants, peasants, old men, women, the starving, the wounded, the homeless, and the hunted have all asked me what America is going to do now for Christ's people.

There is no doubt that Abdul Hamid secretly ordered the massacre of Armenians in Asia Minor from his palace in Constantinople. That fully explains the indifference or complicity of the public authorities of Adana. The fact that massacres began in Adana, Hamidiye, and Osmanle simultaneously on the very day that the garrison of Constantinople murdered its officers and seized the Parliament building, shows an exact concert between the despot and his agents in Asia Minor.

But the command of the guilty Sultan does not account for the indescribable barbarity of the mobs on the Cilician Plain, where men were burned alive in the presence of their wives and daughters, where not one Christian house was spared, and where Christian fugitives in the fields were for days hunted with dogs by men who had been their neighbors and had worked for years side by side with them. One Turkish farmer near Adana killed in cold blood Armenian laborers who had been in his service for twenty-five years.
No words can describe the horror of what occurred. The details are unprintable. I have heard stories from the few survivors on the spot that actually sickened me. There is nothing in the history of the most savage Indian tribes of America comparable to this outburst of cruelty and lust in which the Christian population of a widespread, fertile country was almost totally annihilated.

The Turkish Government may protest that the figures have been exaggerated, but I have seen enough with my own eyes to know that the Consular estimates of 30,000 deaths are moderate. In the country districts the massacre was not confined to Armenians, but Greeks, Chaldeans, "Syrians, Mesopotamians;" and other Christians were slain without distinction and their houses looted and burned.

In my journey among the destroyed villages I asked many Turks to explain how it came that in a single day the people of a prosperous farming country could change into wild beasts. The answer invariably was that the Armenians intended to rise in arms and establish an independent kingdom, and that it was only fair that loyal Turks should defend themselves. Here and there a Moslem spoke of photographs representing Armenians dressed as Kings, Princes, or armed warriors.

Six weeks before the first massacre—if the first fight may be called a massacre—there was a powerful reactionary agitation among the Moslem masses all over the country. The Constitution was bitterly criticized. The Christians were getting too pretentious. The Armenians were organizing a revolution. Islam was in danger. So the story ran from city to city, village to village, and farm to farm. Turk, Arab, and Circassian looked with deadly, greedy eyes upon his Christian neighbors. The subtle mind and matchless methods of the Armenian-hating monster in the Yildiz palace was at work everywhere. The Mohammedan League spread exaggerated accounts of what the Christians were doing and intended to do. The air was full of suspicion and hatred.
Early in April there was a brawl in the city of Adana between an Armenian and some Turks over a disreputable woman. The Armenian wounded three Turks, and one of them died. His funeral was made the excuse for a great demonstration against the Armenians, and threatening speeches were made by excited Turks. There was a great Turkish mass meeting on the night of Tuesday, April 13, near the Konak, or government building, under the direction of the Mohammedan League. An Armenian who ventured near the scene was caught by the crowd and clubbed to death. His friends carried the news about the Armenian quarter of the city, and the 200 oath-bound Armenian riflemen, the Fedayee, got themselves in readiness.

The whole city was in a thrill of excitement on Wednesday morning. All Moslems appeared in white turbans—a dreadful signal that Christians have learned to understand—a Turkish mob gathered in the streets near the Armenian shops, armed with knives and clubs, which they tried to hide under their coats. The Armenians began to close their shops. The Turks put marks on their own shutters to distinguish them from the property of Christians—another fearful sign.

Soon the narrow streets of Adana were filled with screaming, armed mobs, all moving toward the Armenian bazaars, the finest shops in the city. All wore white turbans, and all were armed. The rush of their feet and the angry roar of their voices could be heard for a great distance. They brandished daggers, pistols, and clubs. The crush of their bodies almost filled the streets from wall to wall. One mob was led by a mullah, or Moslem priest, in a huge green turban. Another followed a mullah who shook a green banner and cursed all Christians. Butchers waved sharp cleavers, carpenters held aloft their axes and knives. Some chanted verses from the Koran, some shrieked for vengeance, others called for the looting of the shops. Soon the street of the Armenian bazaars was packed with a raving, furious multitude of Turks, Arabs, Circassians, Afghans, the most ignorant, fanatical, and bloodthirsty mob that the world could furnish, faces contorted with rage, eyes blazing, and voices swelling shriller every moment.

Ordinary Armenians withdrew from that spectacle. The oath-bound secret soldiers of the Fedayee gathered in the middle of the market place. Their young, boyish captain, with his long blond hair streaming from under a red-topped cap, stood among them, white-faced but resolute. He called upon them to show themselves to be true Armenians and true Christians.

The Moslem mob pressed closer and closer. It howled and leaped in the air.

Suddenly a few Armenian shops were attacked, the crashing of shutters was heard, and the mob began the work of looting.

Instantly the Fedayee began firing their revolvers in the air. At this the mob surged forward and began a general pillage of the Armenian shops.

Under the direction of their leader, the members of the Fedayee and their friends now fought a regular battle in defense of the Armenian quarter. They posted marksmen in the windows commanding strategic points. They threw up barricades in the streets. They poured volleys from the roofs. Scores of Moslems fell under this steady and careful fire. The mob wrecked many
of the shops, but it could not penetrate into the Armenian residential quarter. As the young Armenians picked off their enemies the streets were red with Moslem blood.

There was no government left; the city was given up to anarchy, save where the consecrated Fedayee kept the Armenian quarter from invasion and slew Moslems without ceasing. Men claiming to be reservist soldiers received military rifles from the arsenal and at once joined the mob. The attack on the Armenians now became more terrible as the Government rifles were brought into play, but they stood their ground; and in the midst of the battle squads of the Fedayee were sent even into the Turkish quarter to conduct Christian women and children to places of safety in the churches and schools.

The battle went on, night and day, for two days and a half. Thousands of Armenians, mostly women and children, took refuge in the American mission school, in the house of Dr. Chambers, in the house and factory of the British dragoman, in a German factory, and in the schools of the French Jesuits and nuns.

In time the Moslems mounted rooftops and climbed into the minarets of the mosques. They also took possession of a clock tower. From these high points they were able to kill the Armenians with ease. The tide of battle seemed to be changing.

Then the long-haired captain of the Fedayee and a band of his most trusted comrades disguised themselves as Moslems by winding white turbans about their heads. They made their way to the nearest mosque, killed its keepers, and, mounting the minaret, opened fire on the men in the other minarets and in the clock tower. For hours the battle in the air went on, and roars of anger went up from the mob as it saw Moslem after Moslem fall in the minarets. When his ammunition was exhausted, the Armenian captain withdrew his men from the minaret, rejoined his comrades, took the turban from his head, and, with his fair hair tangled about his face, resumed the battle in the streets.

It is said that this, one Armenian fighter killed thirty-seven Turks with his own hands in a single place on the second day of the struggle, and that at times his white, pinched face and blue eyes would light up as though he were inspired. Yet he was but a boy of 20 years, who had closed his shoemaker's shop to teach Christian children in the Gregorian school, and then had abandoned his books and scholars to strike for liberty.

The whole world has heard the story of how Major Doughty-Wylie, the gallant soldier, who was serving as British Vice Consul at Mersina, went to Adana on the first day of the fighting, forced the trembling Turkish Governor to give him a small body of soldiers, posted guards at the American mission and school, furnished protection to imperilled foreigners, and rode about the crazed city, entreating, threatening, and persuading the Moslem mob, until a bullet broke his arm on the second day. The world also knows how the two American missionaries, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Maurer, were murdered in cold blood while trying to save a widow's burning house that threatened the American school with destruction—murdered by Moslems who were plundering a Christian house and who had promised not to harm them.
Before night Dr. Chambers and a Jesuit priest signed a petition to the Governor asking for protection.

The mob, which had burned several buildings, was threatening the American school and attempting to set fire to it. An Armenian preacher had been murdered in Dr. Chambers’s arms. The Moslems were insisting that the Armenian refugees in the American Mission should be surrendered to them for slaughter.

The gray missionary, haggard with anxiety and grief, had gone out into the mob and argued with it.

“You have spilled enough blood,” he cried. “Be satisfied.”

Until one old Moslem, moved by the courage of the Christian, had put his back against the wall of the American school and shouted, “My life for this building!”

The petition was taken to the Governor by a friendly Turk, a body of troops appeared, the mob was dispersed, and order was restored.

It was found that about 600 or 700 Moslems had been killed by the Armenians, whose own losses amounted to something like 1,000.

Then the members of the Fedayees and their blond-haired captain promptly fled from Asia Minor. It was the absence of this trained body that made the Armenians so helpless in the great massacre which followed. The general leader, Bezdikian, and one of his associates, were sheltered by the wounded British Vice Consul in the house of his dragoon, but, search as they might, the Turks could find no trace of the little army that had defended the Armenian quarter so bravely.

While the flight in Adana was drawing to a close on Friday, about 200 Moslem ruffians seized a railway train and went to Tarsus. They killed two unarmed Armenians at the railway station and, rushing into the town with shrieks and curses, were joined by native Turks and Afghans, when a general massacre and pillage of the Armenian quarter began. The mob first went to the government armory, where it was supplied with hundreds of rifles and plenty of ammunition.

Here the Armenians made no attempt to resist, but, such as were caught in the streets or houses, died like sheep. Three thousand fled for refuge to the American school, which had a guard of four soldiers.

More than 300 Christians were murdered in Tarsus and its surrounding fields and farms. But for the shelter of the American school the massacre would have been many times greater. At the time of the attack there were seven ladies there, including Mrs. Christie, Mrs. Gibbons, and Mrs. Rogers, whose missionary husbands were absent in Adana, and two sisters of Justice Brewer of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Cut off from communication with Adana or Mersina, with 3,000 wailing men, women, and children huddling about them; with the flame and smoke of the doomed Armenian quarter rolling toward them; sparks constantly starting small blazing fires in their buildings; men and women shot, stabbed, or clubbed by the mob, being carried to them for help; these ladies saw the Moslems plunder the splendid stone houses of their victims, systematically pour kerosene on the floors, and then burn them.
All day long in Tarsus the stabbing and shooting went on, the violation of women, the wrecking and burning of homes. The government did nothing to stay the mob. Men who knelt and begged for mercy were literally cut into pieces. Children were dashed to death against stones. Fourteen victims were tied and thrown into the river alive.

The massacre spread to the fields and farms and to the village of Kozolok in the mountains. Five victims were bound and burned alive. Nineteen young Christians were circumcised by force and had turbans put on their heads, while their torturers feasted and mocked them as converts to Islam; after which they were murdered in cold blood, lest they should repent. Even one of the students of the American school was compelled to submit to circumcision and wear a turban, but when he escaped to the school he tore the white wrapping from his head and declared himself a Christian. One old woman of Kozolok described to me how her husband and two sons were deliberately beaten to death before her eyes, and, when 138 of the villagers had been killed; she was told that, as all the Christian men were dead, she had better give her two daughters-in-law to Moslem husbands.

I have walked among the ruins of Armenian houses in Tarsus, splendid, solid stone buildings, street after street filled with wreckage, and it seemed almost impossible that human hands could have wrought such destruction in one day. The jumble of shattered masonry and tumult of overturned walls suggested an earthquake. In the Armenian church, about which Christian women and children of good families were living in tents or crouching in corners, the savagery of the Moslems was shown in the broken marble altar railing, the slashed pictures of Christ and the Madonna, the charred wood of the altar, and the torn Bibles.

At the American school, where Dr. Christie, one of the snowy-headed veterans of Shiloh, and his wife had been working day and night among the refugees, comforting widows and orphans, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, nursing the sick and dying, the survivors of the massacre told me stories of atrocities almost unbelievable. Here, too, the appeal was always for protection from America, the country that had done so much for oppressed Christians.
BOOKS AND BOOK REVIEWS
ON GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WRITING CULTURE OF PRE-MASHTOTSIAN ARMENIA

By: Movsisyan A. E.

Doctor of Sciences (History)

The development of written culture is a process lasting centuries and millennia. The Armenian Golden Age literature (the 5th c. which commenced with the Mashtotsian scripts’ invention) is a product of writing thinking which reached its high level. Written culture had long history in pre-Mashtotsian Armenia. Until the present hieroglyphs continue to be used in Armenia as forms of magic script, as marks of artisan masters in the form of a single ideogram. They appear on the walls of Christian temples, on coins of Cilician Armenia and as separate signaries attested in Armenian medieval manuscripts, being used also in applied art, etc.

The first results of the decipherment of the hieroglyphic system of the kingdom of Van are in favour of the latter’s Armenian origin. Moreover, along with voluminous Armenian lexicon in the language of the cuneiforms of the kingdom of Van, recently it became possible to read separate sentences. Therefore, within the circle of our knowledge, we can ascertain that Armenian was a written language, at least fourteen centuries before the great invention of St. Mesrop Mashtots.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/252.pdf
ARARAT, THE SACRAL TERRITORY: IN THE NOTES BY EUROPEAN TRAVELLERS

By: Karagyozyan G. L.


ANNOTATION

The monograph is a historical-literary study of the formation and development of the myths about Mount Ararat and adjoining territories, based on the Book of Genesis, the material of travel notes by European travellers of the Middle Ages and later periods, involving texts from travel literature by Oriental and Russian authors. The book consists of five chapters:

1. Formation of the tradition. The myth of the Flood and Ararat.
2. The road to the East. The image of the sacred mountain.
3. Ararat as an Impregnable Mountain.
5. Ararat, the Sacral Area (The first city in the world Noah built at the foot of Ararat; Etchmiadzin – Three churches – The Descent of the Only Begotten Son; Martyrs of Mount Ararat); the concluding chapter.
THE ANCIENT DRAMA IN ARMENIA

By: Hovhannisyan H. V.
Member-Correspondent of NAS RA

THE ANCIENT DRAMA IN ARMENIA
On the Origin of Drama

The book covers the issue of ancient Armenian mystery play. The research is based on medieval sources, linguistic data and pieces of folklore. There appear to be two types of evidence to suggest the occurrence of drama and theatre in Armenian History. The ancient Armenian mystery play displays thematic associations with “the myth of perpetual recurrence” symbolizing the universal cycle, and an interrelation with the Prometheus theme. The thematic mode is common for all cultures, but the ritual itself, representing the act of mystery (“the joint of time”) relates to early medieval literary sources of Armenian origin and appears to be closely tied to ancient Armenian beliefs. The captured power appears to be a restrained energy, a sort of anticipated release, a Messiah in the final chapter of “Sasna Crer”, the Armenian heroic epic.

KING OF KINGS TIGRAN THE GREAT AND THE ARMENIAN EMPIRE AS EVALUATED BY MODERN ARAB HISTORIOGRAPHY

By: Nikolay Hovahannisyan


A book review by Eduard L. Danielyan

The book provides detailed analysis of the evaluation of the history of the Armenian Empire of the period of King of Kings Tigran II by modern Arab historiography. The period of the Tigran's Empire is specified by the civilizing role of the Armenian statehood which included the lands and peoples beyond the borders of the Kingdom of Great Armenia. According to the author of the book, the period of Tigran the Great's reign was the climax of the Armenian statehood, armed forces, town building, architecture and culture, when appeared “the first in history Armenian Empire on the world political map. The historical role of Tigran the Great is not confined within the Armenian borders, but goes over and beyond, embracing an entire geopolitical region” (p. 5).

Until the present this period of the Armenian history was mainly researched in Armenian and European historiographies. N.Hovahannisyan’s book is the first research work presenting modern studies of the Arab historiography on the state and political activities of the Armenian King of Kings Tigran II the Great. The author explains such an interest to the Armenian Empire by worldwide historical significance of Tigran the Great’s phenomenon.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/258.pdf
AYBBENAGIR. ARMENIAN APLPHABETIC POETRY (7TH-19TH CC.)

By: Grigoryan S. T.

Erevan, 2016, 943 pages (in Armenian)

Armenian written culture comes from the depth of thousands of years and has undergone evolutionary cycles of written culture: petroglyphs, hieroglyphics, a syllabic script and alphabet. The Alphabet is the last cycle of the Armenian writing. The present collection consists of the works of Armenian literature from the 7th to the 20th century, having certain structural peculiarities. These works, in their structure, make the Armenian alphabet of Mashtots. On that basis, we called them "aybbenain": "ayb" + "ben" (the names of the first and the second letters of the Armenian alphabet), that is alphabetical. For such works, that make up the Latin alphabet and have similar structure, the term abecedarium is used.

This collection, due to its thematic characterization and within the set purpose, is the first experience of collection, description, classification and analysis of Armenian literature alphabetic products. Of particular importance is the target investigation of works, belonging to this special literary kind, with regard of the structural features of the Armenian Mashtots alphabet.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/305.pdf
GANDZASAR MONASTERY

By: Danielyan E. L.

Doctor of Sciences (History)

Er.: Gandzasar, 2009. — 228 pp. (in Armenian, Russian and English)

The book is devoted to the past and the present of the Gandzasar monastery and its significance in the history of the Armenian Apostolic Church. The significance of Gandzasar as the spiritual, educational and scientific centre of the Artsakh diocese, as well as the inspirer and organizer of the liberation struggle of the Armenian people is revealed in the book. There are also memoirs of the participants of the Artsakh liberation struggle about liberators and the clergy of the Artsakh diocese. The book is recommended for the specialists in the history of Armenia and the Armenian Apostolic Church and for wide readership.

THE PERIODICAL “ARMENIA” AT THE SOURCES OF LIBERATION IDEOLOGY

By: Sargsyan S. T. Doctor in History

The Armenian national liberation struggle experienced an unprecedented rise at the end of the 19th century due to the national, economic, political, international, cultural, ideological impulses that generated a demand for changes. A great number of facts resulted in the rise of the national liberation struggle and undoubtedly prove that it was a direct consequence of the Turkish government’s inhumane policy.

The firstborn of the Armenian political press, the newspaper “Armenia”, spread the ideology of the Armenakan Party - the first and the only party established in Western Armenia which became its speaker. “Armenia” provided a great service. The newspaper openly reflected the way of thinking of the social and political circles of the mentioned time, their desire to see the freedom of the Motherland, their efforts in searching for the strategic means and finding answers to them.

KOMITAS. SONGS

By: Villy Sargsyan


Natural, sincere and emotional performance, this is what corresponds to Komitas’ songs. The author believes that the way of the chosen transcriptions will reveal to the listeners the world of thoughts and feelings of Armenian people so powerfully expressed in Komitas’ songs. The present collection comprises various music pieces different in character and complexity of performance. They can be performed both selectively and in cyclical order. The pieces of the present collection are supposed to be used in academic repertoire as well as in concert practice.

An impressive amount of literature has been compiled on the mass extermination of the Armenian people in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. Many of these works have been written in foreign languages, with photo documentation of the victims of the Armenian Genocide. Most recently, audio and video recordings of the accounts of survivors and foreign witnesses have added to the variety of documentation on the subject. Besides providing first hand evidence to the present historian, these records convey testimonials to the ongoing and relentless efforts of Republican Turkey to destroy remaining Armenian historical monuments and to eliminate any evidence of historic Armenia. The markers and monuments testifying to the existence of the Armenian people in their Homeland have thus become the final victims of the genocide begun in 1915.

To produce a complete photographic survey was out of reach for us, given the serious obstacles involved in any effort to record evidence in Asia Minor (Anatolia) and Western Armenia. However, the evidence within Syria was much more accessible and presented no problem. Refugees from Western Armenia who were deported towards Iraq, during the First World War were all Armenians from Vaspurakan, the heart of Armenia.

We trust that any persons having in their possession any relevant documents would offer them so that we may bring nearer to completion the present collection as a more comprehensive historical document.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/266.pdf
THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN ENCYCLOPEDIAS

By: Kirakossian A. J.

Doctor of Sciences (in History)

The Armenian Genocide is an approved fact of history, and a public knowledge recognized not only by specialists but also by the international community. For more than thirty years, the successive authorities of the Ottoman Empire have succeeded in cleaning out the native-born Armenian population not only throughout the Armenian Highland but also within the entire territory of the Empire by carrying out a genocidal policy of massacres and deportations, the culmination of which was the Genocide of the Armenians during the First World War.

The field of genocide studies emerged with the analytical and comparative books published in the 1970's and 1980's and was formalized with the establishment of the International Association of Genocide Studies in 1994. The strong efforts of the researchers and academicians in the field of genocide studies, as well as the position of civil societies in many countries and the united policy of Armenia and Armenian Diaspora in this regard were able to radically change the situation in the world public opinion and historiography. The Armenian Genocide strengthened its position as both a public knowledge and a recognized fact of history. The author studied and analyzed nearly forty specialized and thematic encyclopedias, dictionaries, resource guides and handbooks published in the United States during the last fifteen years. The respective material is divided in this book into chapters which are representing conceptual and factual aspects of the Armenian Genocide. The book consists of 16 Chapters, list of encyclopedias, list of entries, a bibliography of a literature related to the Armenian Genocide found in encyclopedias, and an index.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/265.pdf
GLOBAL FORUM, YEREVAN, 22-23 APRIL 2015 AGAINST THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE


This publication is aimed at providing wider resonance to the statements delivered and the viewpoints presented at the Forum, which will have an importance in raising the international awareness on the matter. It provides to those interested in the Yerevan Global Forum with all the necessary information on delivered statements and remarks.

BORIS LAZAREVSKY ABOUT ARMENIA AND ARMENIAN WOMEN

By: Zakaryan A. H.
Doctor of Sciences (in Philology)

Summary

Among Russian literary workers of the 10s of the 20th century that reflected Armenian reality in their works famous novelist of his time Boris Lazarevsky (1871-1936) has a deserving place. Newly-found materials show that a lot connected Boris Lazarevsky with Armenia and its culture, which found reflection in his literary-social activities.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/263.pdf
THE TERRITORIAL LOSSES OF SOVIET ARMENIA
AND THE NKAR IN THE 1920-1930s

By: Khachatryan K. H. Doctor of Sciences (History)
Badalyan G. M. PhD in History
Sukiasyan H. K. PhD in History

In the book, on the basis of the many-sided research of archival documents and materials, scientific and historical literature are presented the territorial losses of both Soviet Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region. As a result of the territorial losses in the 1920-1930s NKAR, Soviet Armenia and later its legal successor the Third Republic of Armenia appeared from the strategic perspective in unfavorable conditions. Due to the heroic victory of the Armenians in the Artsakh Liberation War has been liberated a considerable part of the Armenian territories annexed to Azerbaijan during the Soviet period. They constitute inseparable part of the NKR - the Artsakh Republic.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/257.pdf
Varazdat M. Teroyan (Deroyan, born in the city of Van, Western Armenia 1887- died in 1938 in GULAG) - an intellectual, scholar and public figure of great merit came into the field of science and public work since the beginning of the 20th century and devoted himself to a number of various problems during his short creative life.

V. Teroyan left numerous valuable studies on the difficult problems of philosophy and literature thus contributing to the development of various aspects of Armenology. He translated major works of classical philosophers from the original. He was also occupied with scientific-organizational work.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/262.pdf
By: Baratov B.

(Linguist Publishers, Moscow. 2010. 512 pages, printed in Italy)

A Book Review by Danielyan E. L.

“The Chronicles of Karabakh” (ARTSAKH) is an illustrated book of huge cognitive, cultural and political significance. The deep love of the author (a writer, screenwriter and film director Boris Baratov) for his Homeland permeates the book, which is full of historical and contemporary facts, presented in chronological order and illustrated with documentary evidence. “The Chronicles of Karabakh” covers a twenty-year period, but it is illuminated by the millennia of the heroic history of the Armenian people, which forms the very roots of Artsakh.

In its ideological integrity this book draws the reader towards its key concept: the Motherland Armenia. The book consists of five chapters: “The Road of Life”, “The Angel”, “Death in Karabakh”, “Paradise Laid Waste” and “Twenty Years After” and contains more than 1,000 original photographs of historical monuments, natural surroundings and human fates.
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